

TURMEL: Edward Decision Could End Prohibition Officially

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.econ/2004-09/0749.html>

From: John Turmel (*bc726_at_FreeNet.Carleton.CA*)

Date: 09/14/04

Date: 14 Sep 2004 03:44:40 GMT

JCT: Let's face it. Judge Edward is probably between a rock and the hardest place imaginable. The doctrine of stare decisis says that he should follow the rulings from above. But it doesn't say always. The Nuremberg trials say that he should follow only righteous rulings from above. I was just following bad orders is no excuse. If it's a bad order from above, a judge always has the responsibility to treat the accused justly and then take the consequences of an appeal.

Of course, most such higher judicial errors are corrected when appealed to the Supreme Court. It's rare that the opposition to the bad ruling takes place back below like it can here.

Of course, my two upcoming Supreme Court applications for leave in the Lederman appeal against the Resurrection Order and the Aitken appeal against the Remember Order (no need to reprint the legislation, courts will remember which sections no longer apply even if they already forgot) are just waiting to be triggered at my discretion.

Imagine that Alan Young and Paul Burstein had their chance to challenge the Resurrection Order in their leave to appeal and did not object to the resurrection. They're now out of the game. No one else is poised to move these nationally important medpot issues into the highest court but little old non-lawyer John Turmel. Har har. And it looks like we're in the end game. I don't know when some judge is going to refuse to obey the Resurrection Order or even the Remember Order but it has to happen. If not in Ontario, more likely in other provinces.

Of course, while none of Canada's lawyers have noticed that the Ontario Court of Appeal has no power to re-create a penal sanction and they keep pleading their clients guilty, I wonder if there isn't some sort of recourse to a charge of

incompetence. Consider the hundred thousand people who pleaded guilty under the guidance of lawyers while the law was dead. Should the lawyers keep that money or were they so incompetent that it should be returned to their clients? Big issues when you deal with big screw-ups.

And how about when we find that the law is still dead? Shouldn't the lawyers be giving back all the money they've taken for pleading their clients guilty to a law that did not exist since last October too? That could be one reason why we see no lawyers arguing that the law is still dead. Still, you have to wonder at every single one of them being wrong and The Engineer always being right.

Much like all the economists in the world are wrong about inflation being the inverse function of the interest rate when I've proven it's a direct function. All economists being wrong and one engineer being right. All lawyers being wrong and one engineer being right. Neat that it's the same engineer too, putting down both oppressor professions.

Excuse me if I feel like crowing on the eve of what could prove to be the biggest win of my career. They had to drop 4000 simple possession charges last December because of our appeal and now they're going to have to drop every single charge left since then because of tomorrow's win. Remember, if Judge Edward rules logically, then The Engineer will sustain that logic in the courts above. But if he rules cowardly, then The Engineer will chop him up in the courts above.

I think that is a sufficiently scary proposition to ensure most sensible people will want to do right. If the Government can be freaked out of re-introducing the legislation to Parliament because of Turmel at the door, if Jean Chretien can be convinced to prorogue Parliament without pushing through re-criminalization because he didn't want to have bad-mouthing Turmel dogging his door for the rest of his retired life, if Paul Martin can be convinced to call an election before re-criminalizing, I think there's the good chance that if the junk-yard dog wins the bone, no one's going to try to take it away from me again.

There aren't many judges who get the chance to over-rule 3 higher judges in 2 major issues and be sustained at the top. Judge Edward has the chance to make history with a blow for righteousness and freedom.

Or he gets to be my example of the Nazi Judges below obeying bad orders to prosecute harmless citizens.

Quite the cross-roads in his career. A hero or a Nazi. A guy who'll defend his decision with logic or a guy who'll defend it with the Nuremberg "I was just following orders" defence.

Final point, Judge Edward has it in his power to end the genocide of the epileptics. Just like I told Justice Doherty that he had the power to inform epileptics that it was legal and advisable to obtain their anti-seizure medicine now, he should be able to do the same.

So Judge Edward if facing his judgment day too. He has the power to end the conveyor belt of death, 4 epileptics a day, and if he doesn't, all the regular genocidal allegations I've made against Doherty, Goudge, and Simmons JJ.A. for causing 1,500 epileptics to die for nothing will also apply.

Anyone with the power to end the genocide who does not is responsible for the number who die during the delay until it is ended.

Maybe I should have told Judge Edward right in the written representations as forcefully as I told Justice Doherty in person that I was holding him responsible for all the extra deaths due to the delay in legalizing the world's Guinness Record safest herbal medication. Ah well, let's hope Judge Edward realizes that legalizing good medicine saves lives.

Like I said, a hero or a genocidal villain is his choice. We know the higher court chose to be genocidal villains but I've provided a way for a non-murderer judge to disobey the murderous judges who re-prohibited anti-epilepsy medicine from above.

Talk about exquisite tension on the eve of a big one! The Edward Decision Could End Prohibition Officially

--

Abolitionist Slave Leader John C. "The Banking Systems Engineer" Turmel for UNILETS interest-free time-based currency in U.N. resolution C6 to Governments in the <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration.htm> <http://www.cyberclass.net/turmel> 519-753-0645 USENET: can.politics