

Petition for Admission To Practice

<http://famguardian.org>

10/16/2003

At the end of this document, you will find a scanned image of the card which attorneys must fill out to apply to be admitted to practice before federal district courts in San Diego, California. This card was current as of 9/6/03. After you see this card, you will understand why attorneys who practice in federal courts have both a conflict of allegiance and a conflict of interest for all the clients they represent before said court.

The oath on the card says the following:

*"I do solemnly swear or affirm to support the Constitution of the United States. That **I will bear true faith and allegiance to the government** of the United States. That I will maintain respect due to the courts of justice, and judicial officers, and that **I will demean myself** as an attorney proctor, advocate, solicitor, and counselor of this court uprightly. (So help me God)*

"I certify that I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of California."

Notice some oddities about this card:

1. The allegiance of the attorney is to the "**government** of the United States" instead of the "**people** of the United States", who are the *only* sovereigns that make up the "state" within our republican form of government.

"The people of this State, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative. Through the medium of their Legislature they may exercise all the powers which previous to the Revolution could have been exercised either by the King alone, or by him in conjunction with his Parliament; subject only to those restrictions which have been imposed by the Constitution of this State or of the U.S." Lansing v. Smith, 21 D. 89., 4 Wendel 9 (1829) (New York)

2. The attorney says he will "**demean** myself". Here is the definition of "demean" as a transitive verb, from the 1983 edition of Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary, p. 337¹:

"demean. *Degrade. Debase"*

Anyone who signs that card is degraded and debased and subservient to the judges and the government, and not the people either collectively or individually.

3. The document talks about maintaining "*respect due to the courts of justice, and judicial officers*" but mentions **nothing** about respect for the natural and constitutional rights of clients or the proper relation of that respect to respect for the courts and judges. If "the people" are the sovereigns in our republican form of government, respect for judges and courts and the government **must** be exceeded by the allegiance of the attorney to the true sovereigns, the citizens of the states, who collectively are called the "state" in our system of government.

A "citizen", according to the Supreme Court, is someone who is a member of a "nation".

*"There cannot be a nation without a people. The very idea of a political community, such as a nation is, implies an [88 U.S. 162, 166] association of persons for the promotion of their general welfare. Each one of the persons associated becomes a member of the nation formed by the association. **He owes it allegiance and is entitled to its protection. Allegiance and protection are, in this connection, reciprocal obligations. The one is a compensation for the other; allegiance for protection and protection for allegiance.***

*"For convenience it has been found necessary to give a name to this membership. The object is to designate by a title the person and the relation he bears to the nation. For this purpose the words 'subject,' 'inhabitant,' and 'citizen' have been used, and the choice between them is sometimes made to depend upon the form of the government. **Citizen is now more commonly employed, however, and as it has been considered better suited to the description of one living under a republican government, it was adopted by nearly all of the States upon their separation from Great Britain, and was afterwards adopted in the Articles of Confederation and in the Constitution of the United States. When used in this sense it is understood as conveying the idea of membership of a nation, and nothing more.**"*

[Minor v. Happersett, 88 U.S. 162 (1874)]

¹ Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary, Merriam Webster, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, p. 337.

In Title 8 of the U.S. Code entitled Aliens and Nationality, the concept of membership in the “nation” consisting of the confederation of states called the “United States” is described as a “national”. 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) identifies a “national” as follows:

[8 U.S.C. §1101 Definitions](#)

(a) (21) The term “national” means a person owing permanent allegiance to a state.

The definition of the term “citizen” under federal statutes is different from that in its constitutional sense. Nowhere in federal statutes is the term “citizen” described including “allegiance”. “National” is the only term that includes the concept of “allegiance” in 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(B). The term “state”, which is the object of that allegiance is then defined as follows:

“State. A people permanently occupying a fixed territory bound together by common-law habits and custom into one body politic exercising, through the medium of an organized government, independent sovereignty and control over all persons and things within its boundaries, capable of making war and peace and of entering into international relations with other communities of the globe. United States v. Kusche, D.C.Cal., 56 F.Supp. 201 207, 208. The organization of social life which exercises sovereign power in behalf of the people. Delany v. Moralitis, C.C.A.Md., 136 F.2d 129, 130. In its largest sense, a “state” is a body politic or a society of men. Beagle v. Motor Vehicle Acc. Indemnification Corp., 44 Misc.2d 636, 254 N.Y.S.2d 763, 765. A body of people occupying a definite territory and politically organized under one government. State ex re. Maisano v. Mitchell, 155 Conn. 256, 231 A.2d 539, 542. A territorial unit with a distinct general body of law. Restatement, Second, Conflicts, §3. Term may refer either to body politic of a nation (e.g. United States) or to an individual government unit of such nation (e.g. California).

[...]

The people of a state, in their collective capacity, considered as the party wronged by a criminal deed; the public; as in the title of a cause, “The State vs. A.B.” [Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1407]

To have “allegiance” to a “state” as a “national” is to have allegiance to the sovereign within the government, which in a republican government is the people collectively and individually and not necessarily the government or anyone serving in government. This is especially true when the government, such as the one we have now, has gone bad and is not representing the sovereign will of the people documented in the Constitution. When we have a rebellious government that has strayed from the Constitution, which is its only “de jure” foundation, to become a wicked “de facto” government, then the allegiance we as citizens have to the Constitution and the people who ordained it must supercede our allegiance to the government that has violated its charter to execute and protect the Constitution and the people who ordained it. The people, not the government, must always be regarded as the ultimate sovereigns within republican systems of governance, and our allegiance to them individually and collectively as “nationals”, or members of the political union, should never be superceded by our allegiance to the government or anyone in the government. Consequently, the attorney who signs the Petition for Admission to Practice has a conflict of interest because:

1. His allegiance to the “government” and the “judges” exceeds his allegiance to the “state”, which is the people.
2. If that government is violating the Constitution, as ours presently is, then he will have to put allegiance to the people of the “state” above that to the government as a citizen, in which case, he thereby risks losing his admission to practice law before the court. When federal attorneys admitted to practice are up against corrupt judges, here are the kind of things that such judges say, as a matter of fact, from an actual case of a tax honesty advocate:

232. At sidebar, the Court tells the defense counsel, “... This is the most improper-- this is the worst conduct I've ever seen of a lawyer, Mr. Stilley. ...” “... (W)e're going to visit this further at length, Mr. Stilley. **The practice of law, sir, is a privilege, especially in Federal Court. You're close to losing that privilege in this court, Mr. Stilley.**”
P685, 5-11 [Case of Phil Roberts, found in the transcript for the case posted on our website at: <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/CaseStudies/PhilRoberts/PhilRoberts.htm>]

3. The constitutional rights of the people are nowhere mentioned in the oath, and therefore are subordinate to allegiance to the government. Constitutional rights take a back seat to all federal attorneys. As a matter of fact, according to the Supreme Court, there are no constitutional rights on federal property.² It's more important for the federal attorney to “demean” himself to the court and the judge so that the judge is, in effect, an imperial “monarch”. Our federal judiciary is an imperial monarch. They “legislate from the bench” using “judge-made law” in the context of income taxes. This

² Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).

relationship is shown graphically in the article on our website entitled “How Scoundrels Corrupted our Republican Form of Government” at:

<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm>

Attorneys who are admitted to practice before federal courts, are simply officers and agents of the government. They are not there to protect your rights. Their allegiance is to the government, not to you as a member of the body politic. They have a conflict of interest. Here are their priorities, in descending order, based on their oath:

1. **Looking good.** Morality and religion used to be the foundation of our laws and the legal profession. In the original universities founded in the American colonies such as Princeton and Yale, you had to major in religious subjects in order to become a lawyer. Now, the main focus of law schools is rhetoric, debate, marketing, and English composition and law schools no longer care about morality or the religious background of their students. As long as students pay the \$30,000/year tuition, the schools simply don't care what kind of ethics their students have. Money is the new God. Consequently, our law schools have transitioned from teaching Natural Law concepts to becoming etiquette schools that disdain morality, promote homosexuality, and graduate people like President Clinton. They teach future lawyers how to look good without being good. Here is what Jesus said on this very subject:

“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees [lawyers], hypocrites! For you cleanse the outside of the cup and dish, but inside they are full of extortion and self-indulgence.¹¹ ²⁶Blind Pharisee, first cleanse the inside of the cup and dish, that the outside of them may be clean also.

“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs which indeed appear beautiful outwardly, but inside are full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness.

*“Even so, you also outwardly appear righteous to men, but inside you are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.”
[Matt. 23:25-27, Bible, NKJV]*

Attorneys may wear suits and look civilized, but underneath they are savages and cannibals who only appear civilized. The thin veneer covering this hypocrisy is obvious to any religious or moral person, which explains why attorneys are so predominantly held in contempt by our society. Get one of these cannibals mad and find out what *really* makes them tick: greed, arrogance, and power. The legal profession motto is:

“The secret of success is sincerity. If you can fake that, you've got it made and can laugh all the way to the bank with your stolen loot.”

2. **The judge.** If you piss off a judge, you'll lose your admission to practice. Always keep the judge happy, no matter what.
3. **The government.** The oath says that. By “government”, we mean the “de facto” government, which is the assembly of corrupt men in power at the moment and how they actually behave, as opposed to how the law says they are supposed to behave. The “de jure” government as described in the Constitution defines how these corrupt men are supposed to behave, but they don't do so because of financial and personal conflicts of interest, sin, and arrogance.
4. **The almighty dollar.** You can't earn a living unless you can practice before the court, which means never saying anything that would embarrass or undermine the financial interests of the judge first, or the government second. After you have brown nosed the judge and the government, the only way to maximize profits is to prolong and extend conflict and the resolution of conflict. Therefore, it is not in the best interests of any attorney to settle a case or dispute as quickly as possible. He will instead try to maximize conflict to extend the litigation and enlarge his personal profits. This is the only way he can pay off his student loans and make his Mercedes/BMW payments.
5. **His fellow bar members and golf buddies.** He works with these people every day and he needs their help in prolonging litigation and thereby outsmarting the clients. Sharks look out for each other and don't take more than their fair share during their endless feeding frenzy on ignorant clients.
6. **His client.** Do or say anything necessary to please the client, provided that doing so doesn't conflict with the above higher priorities and is “politically correct”.
7. **Censoring the truth as a defendant.** The cardinal rule as a defendant is never let the truth into the courtroom. The weapon in this process is the abuse of the rules of evidence to keep the jury and the judge from hearing the truth about your client.
8. **Slandering your opponent.** Try to get as much derogatory information into evidence about your opponent as you can. The best defense is a good offense, and there is nothing more offensive or injurious than the lies that lawyers tell to juries and judges about their opponent in order to prejudice their opponent and win the case. Win at all costs is the motto.

9. **The Constitution.** After all the above priorities have been met, do whatever you can to satisfy the Constitution, but only as an afterthought.
10. **The citizens and people of the state, collectively and individually.**

In conclusion, then, federal attorneys are financial mercenaries and intellectual whores of the court. Only a fool would hire an attorney who would sign the *Petition for Admission to Practice*, because they can't provide representation without conflicting and bad priorities.

The judges these corrupted lawyers work for are no different. First of all, all of them at one time or another used to be lawyers. Secondly, instead of being whores of the court, they are whores of the democratic majority, a corrupted legislature, and they are coerced debt collectors for the Federal Reserve and the IRS. We established in the [Great IRS Hoax](#) sections 2.8.10, 7.1.3, and 7.1.4 that neither the Federal Reserve nor the IRS are a part of the U.S. Government, and therefore these corrupted federal judges are acting as "foreign principals" in regards to income taxes. The Federal Reserve, in fact, is a private consortium of banks, while the IRS is a federal corporation out of Puerto Rico in which the U.S. Government owns more than 51% of the capital stock. The law requires these judges who are acting as such "agents of foreign principals", to register under 18 U.S.C. §219:

[TITLE 18](#) > [PART I](#) > [CHAPTER 11](#) > *Sec. 219.*

[Sec. 219.](#) - *Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals*

(a) Whoever, being a public official, is or acts as an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 or a lobbyist required to register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the representation of a foreign entity, as defined in section 3(6) of that Act shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

(b) Nothing in this section shall apply to the employment of any agent of a foreign principal as a special Government employee in any case in which the head of the employing agency certifies that such employment is required in the national interest. A copy of any certification under this paragraph shall be forwarded by the head of such agency to the Attorney General who shall cause the same to be filed with the registration statement and other documents filed by such agent, and made available for public inspection in accordance with section 6 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

(c) For the purpose of this section "public official" means Member of Congress, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner [IRS Commissioner!], either before or after he has qualified, or an officer or employee or person acting for or on behalf of the United States, or any department, agency, or branch of Government thereof, including the District of Columbia, in any official function, under or by authority of any such department, agency, or branch of Government

None of the judges are so registered, to our knowledge and therefore are criminals. Would you want a criminal ruling on your case? Worst yet, these judges are subject to extortion by these foreign organizations by being required to file income tax returns. As officers of the federal government, they are in fact among the few who actually have an obligation to file tax returns and pay federal income taxes. Read Chapter 5 of our [Great IRS Hoax](#) book for confirmation of this fact. All income taxes are on activities associated with a "trade or business in the United States", and "trade or business" is defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as follows:

[26 U.S.C. Sec. 7701\(a\)\(26\)](#)

"The term 'trade or business' includes the performance of the functions of a [public office](#)."

For those concerned citizens who want to inquire about the allegiance of their judges, you can write to the Article III Judges Division of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts at:

Administrative Office of the Federal Courts
Article III Judges Division
Washington, D.C. 20544
Phone: 202-502-1860

The Article III Judges Division keeps the oaths of all federal judges on file. They told us on 9/23/03 on the phone that they don't give out copies of judges oaths and that the federal judiciary is *not* covered under FOIA, but they could not give us the

authority for this. We asked what we would get if we did an FOIA for the oath of a federal judge, and they said they would send out a certificate that the oath is on file, but would not provide a copy of the original oath. We asked the clerk in the above office to read us one of the judge's oaths. The judge oath is prescribed in [28 U.S.C. §453](#) and [5 U.S.C. §3331](#). The oath that all judges take is a combination of these two code sections and reads as follows, according to the clerk:

"I, _____, do solemnly swear and affirm that I will administer justice without regard to persons and do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all of the duties incumbent upon me as _____ under the Constitution and laws of the United States, and that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic, that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same, and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

Apparently, your judges in your courts don't want you to know where their allegiances are. Does this surprise you, that they want you accountable to them but don't want to be equally accountable to the public at large? If you would like to see the oath of office of one of our current Chief Justices of the Supreme Court, see the last page of this article. You would have to bribe someone to get a copy of something like this today.

In closing, if you would like to learn more about why Federal Courts are far too corrupted to hear cases involving income taxes, consult the article on our website about this subject at:

- ***Why the federal courts can't properly address these questions:***
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/WhyCourtsCantAddressQuestions.htm>

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Petition for
Admission to Practice

1. _____
(PLEASE TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF PETITIONER)

_____ CALIFORNIA STATE BAR NUMBER

hereby petition to be admitted to practice before said court, and in support of petition state,
on _____ I was admitted to practice before the Supreme
Court of the State of California, and I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of California.
I have also been admitted to practice in the following court:

Date: _____ Court _____

My residence address is: _____
_____ Phone _____

My Business Firm is: _____
Address _____
_____ Phone _____

AUTHORIZATION TO SEND NOTICES BY FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION Fax: _____

By entering your fax number, the Clerk of Court for the Southern District of California is authorized to transmit notice of entry of judgment or orders under Fed.R.Civ.P. 77 and Fed.R.Crim.P.49 by facsimile transmission in any case where the undersigned appears as attorney in charge. I understand that this electronic notice will be in lieu of notice by mail.

NOTIFY THIS COURT OF ANY CHANGES

SIGNATURE REQUIRED ON REVERSE

OATH

I do solemnly swear or affirm to support the constitution of the United States. That I will bear true faith and allegiance to the government of the United States. That I will maintain respect due to the courts of justice, and judicial officers, and that I will demean myself as an attorney proctor, advocate, solicitor and counselor of this court uprightly. (So help me God.)

I certify that I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of California.

Dated _____

(SIGNATURE OF PETITIONER)

Admission May be Upon Oral Motion or Without Appearance

Fee Paid: _____

Date: _____

Certificate Issued: _____

APPOINTMENT AFFIDAVITS

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT
(Position to which appointed)

January 7, 1972
(Date of appointment)

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
(Department or agency) (Bureau or division)

Washington, D. C.
(Place of employment)

I, WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that—

A. OATH OF OFFICE

I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

B. AFFIDAVIT AS TO STRIKING AGAINST THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I am not participating in any strike against the Government of the United States or any agency thereof, and I will not so participate while an employee of the Government of the United States or any agency thereof.

C. AFFIDAVIT AS TO PURCHASE AND SALE OF OFFICE

I have not, nor has anyone acting in my behalf, given, transferred, promised or paid any consideration for or in expectation or hope of receiving assistance in securing this appointment.

William H. Rehnquist
(Signature of appointee)

Subscribed and sworn (or affirmed) before me this 17th day of December 1971 A.D. ~~1972~~

at Washington, D. C.
(City)

✓
(State)

[SEAL]

Walter E. Burger
(Signature of officer)

Commission expires _____
(If by a Notary Public, the date of expiration of his Commission should be shown)

Chief Justice of the United States
(Title)

NOTE.—The oath of office must be administered by a person specified in 5 U.S.C. 2903. The words "So help me God" in the oath and the word "swear" wherever it appears above should be stricken out when the appointee elects to affirm rather than swear to the affidavits; only these words may be stricken and only when the appointee elects to affirm the affidavits.