September 10, 1996 A.D.

Representative Lita Indzel Cohen
Chair-person
The Pennsylvania State House of Representatives
Judiciary Committee Task Force on Domestic Relations
for House BILL 2003 and 2562

145A East Wing
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Dear Representative Lita Indzel Cohen,

It was a pleasure meeting you after the Judicial Committee Hearing on August 20, 1996 A.D. and briefly discussing my positions on the alleged "NO-Fault Divorce" statutes, codes, rules, regulation, practices & procedures, etc. in Pennsylvania.

Enclosed are copies of the ten (10) documents in a three-ring binder which I showed you on August 20, 1996 A.D. As I am unable to have more copies made, please have sufficient copies of these documents and this letter made for, and delivered to, each of the Task Force members for your and their careful and complete reading and review.

Also, please have these documents included in the record of the August 20, 1996 A.D. hearing as you stated on that day you would do.

The ten (10) documents are quite extensive and can best speak for themselves. They should be carefully read and studied in total in the order in which they are presented. The referenced documents should also be carefully read in order to fully understand the lawful positions presented by me in these documents. It is imperative that these documents be carefully studied by each of the Representatives involved in this current Task Force and ultimately by each State Representative and Senator voting on this most important matter if each elected official is to meet the mandatory requirements of his or her solemn oath of office.

Clearly these are but a few of the documents which I have prepared and filed on this and related matters. I strongly recommend that additional hearings be held with me and others on this subject as soon as possible. The severe damage caused to individuals, families and our society at large by the alleged "No-Fault Divorce" statutes, codes, rules, etc. has gone on much too long. No additional delay(ies) in eliminating this and other plagues on our society can be justified or tolerated.

Without question the alleged "No-Fault Divorce" statutes, codes, rules, etc. are unconstitutional and always have been so.

Further, they are un-Godly, unlawful and just plain wrong. The evidence clearly proves this and why this and other un-Godly, unconstitutional, unlawful, immoral, unethical, dishonest, etc. actions and/or lack of actions have been done.

Though no substitute for an in-depth study of the documents presented, consider the following:

A. Today we are told that there is such a thing as "Separation of Church and State" in Pennsylvania and in the united States of America. This is emphatically false!

B. Today, we are told that it is unconstitutional to have the Ten Commandments displayed in public schools and in other public buildings. This is emphatically false!

C. Today, we are told that God, Jesus the Christ and the Holy Spirit have no place in the governments of Pennsylvania or the united States of America and/or in their institutions, laws, etc.. This is emphatically false!

D. Today, we are told that there is no such thing as "Creation", but rather we evolved by chance from the slime of billions of years ago ("Evolution"). This is emphatically false!

E. Today, we are told that there is no longer any common law in Pennsylvania or in the united States of America. This is emphatically false!

F. Today, we are told that common law in Pennsylvania and America only consisted of English and Colonial court decisions before and/or at the time of the Revolutionary War/ War for Independence. This is emphatically false!

G. Today, we are told that the so-called 14th Amendment to the Constitution for the united States of America is constitutional. This is emphatically false!

H. Today, we are told that because of the so-called 14th Amendment the First Article of the Bill of Rights, and in fact most of the first eight articles of the Bill of Right of the Constitution for the united States of America, apply to individuals and to the States. This is emphatically false!

I. Today, we are told that marriage is no longer a religious and civil contract, but rather a "status". This is emphatically false!

J. Today, we are told that a man and a woman must have a marriage license from the state in order to get married. This is emphatically false!

K. Toady, we are told that a "Wife is guaranteed under our state and federal constitutions the rights of happiness and freedom of association. See U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 1, Pa. Const. Art. 1, sect. 1. Freedom of association must necessarily include freedom of disassociation. Wife wishes to assert these two rights so as to be happily disassociated (divorced) from Husband." This is emphatically absurd and false! But this is today's Chester County court interpretation of "No-Fault Divorce".

L. Today, we are told that "truth is no defense" and that the "constitutions have no place in our courts" and that "the constitutions mean whatever the judge says they mean" and that "statues are the controlling laws" and that "the people are not constitutionally entitled to a "trial by jury" in all cases in Pennsylvania" and that "a jury can not determine both the laws and the facts in all cases". These statement are emphatically false!

Examples of the facts, also confirmed by the documents presented by me and referenced therein, with respect to the issues stated above herein are:

A'. This is and always has been a Christian State and Nation. There is no such thing as "Separation of Church and State" in Pennsylvania or in the united States of America. "Christianity has always been a part of the common law of Pennsylvania." [Updegragh v. the Commonwealth, 11 Serg. & R. 393 (Sup. Ct. Penn),(1824)] See other references on this issue which are stated in the documents contained in the three-ring binder.

B'& C'. The courts have no authority to declare that the display of the Ten Commandments anywhere in Pennsylvania, or in any other republic union State of the united States of American, is unconstitutional.

> "We have staked the whole future of American civilization not upon the power of government, far from it. We have staked the future of all our political institutions upon the capacity of each and all of us to govern ourselves .... according to the Ten Commandments of God."
> [Founding Father James Madison]

D'. Scientific, Mathematical Statistics have now shown that for the complexity of the human "DNA" to have randomly happened, a probability of 10 to the 40,000th power would be requited. Further, it is concluded that a random probability of greater than 10 to the 50th power is statistically all but impossible. Even if one allows for many orders of error, clearly getting from 10 to the 40,000th power from 10 to the 50th power is NOT mathematically possible. This is but one of the many points of

irrefutable evidence now available to prove that the Humanists' "Evolution Theory" is false. The Bible is absolutely true.

John Randolf Tucker, LL.D. states on page 31 of his 1899 book, THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES - A CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF ITS GENESIS, DEVELOPMENT, AND INTERPRETATION, that:

> "32. Having thus deduced the personal and property rights of man - these jural rights - from man's exclusive liberty of self-use to the fruits of self-use, it is necessary now to say that these jural rights are not always realized in the legal rights; that is, in the rights allowed to man by the social polity under which he lives. But while this is so, we must not forget that the jural are none the less real because the social polity does not make them legal rights. The "jus" cannot be abrogated, but ought to find full expression by the "lex".
>
> 33. These jural rights of man, constituting in their aggregate what we call his liberty, have, as we have seen, been given to him by his Creator to be used under responsibility to Him. Can he rightfully surrender them? Is he not religiously bound to defend them?
>
> We have further seen that society is ordained by God to conserve the rights of man and not to injure them. These rights embrace life (limb, health and self-use as part of life) and property as a result of life work and enterprise. To conserve these society is ordained. ...."

E'. The "common law", according Thomas M. Cooley, LL.D. in his 1880 book, THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, is defined on pages 7 and 8 as:

> ... "That law was the growth of many centuries; its maxims were those of a sturdy and independent race of men, who were accustomed in an unusual degree to freedom of thought and action, and to a share in the administration of public affairs. So far as they declared individual rights, they were a part of the constitution of the realm, and of that "law of the land" the benefit of which was promised by the charter of King John to every freeman. They were modified and improved from age to age, by changes in the habits of thought and action among the people, by modifications in the civil and political state, by the vicissitudes of public affairs, by judicial decisions, and by statutes. ...."

Here Judge Cooley stated, in the order of importance, that the common law consists of five things. Only one of these is "judicial decisions", which is next to last in importance.

Blackstone's Commentaries, with their Biblical foundations as their authorties, formed the basis of law in America until they were unlawfully removed by specific lawyers, judges and professors-of-law in the late 1800's and early 1900's. The section titled "OF THE NATURE OF LAW IN GENERAL" in Volumn I of Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries states in part that:

> ...."Man, considered as a creature, must necessarily be subject to the laws of his Creator, for he is entirely a dependent being. ..."
>
> .... "This will of his Maker is called the law of nature."...
>
> .... "The law of nature, being coeval with mankind, and directed by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe, in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original."....
>
> ..... "And if our reason were always, as in our first ancestor before his transgression, clear and perfect, unruffled by passion, unclouded by prejudice, unimpaired by decease or intemperance, the task would be pleasant and easy; we should need no other guide than this. But every man now finds the contrary in his own experience; that his reason is corrupt, and his understanding full of ignorance and error.
>
> This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of divine Providence, which, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, hath been pleased, at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce its laws by an immediate and direct revelation. The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the Holy Scriptures."....
>
> ...."Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these."....

The meaning for the words "Laws of Nature and Nature's God" found in America's "Declaration of Independence" are based on the Founding Fathers' understanding of the writings of Sir William Blackstone in his 1758 Commentaries as stated above.

F'. The Constitution for the Pennsylvania commonwealth and the Constitution for the <u>u</u>nited States of America are common law documents. They must be interpreted in common law and the words

contained in these constitutions, and other written documents, must have the meanings understood at the time of their writing.

Alexander Hamilton confirmed Blackstone's common law position on the authority of laws when he wrote "Federalist Paper #78", which states in part:

> "There is no position which depends on clearer principle than that every act of delegated authority, contrary to the tenor of the commission under which it is exercised, is void. No legislative act, therefore, contrary to the Constitution, can be valid. To deny this would be to affirm that the deputy is greater than his principal; that the servant is above his master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that men acting by virtue of power may do not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid."
> [Federalist Papers #78, page 467]

G'. The so-called 14th Amendment is and always has been unconstitutional. The law libraries contain many volumes which confirm this fact. Only a few of these references are: 1) [STATE v. PHILLIPS, 540 P.2d 936(1975); 2) DYETT v TURNER, 439 P.2d 266 (1968); 3) "The 14th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States and the Threat That It Poses To Our Democratic Government", South Carolina Law Quarterly, Vol II, pages 484 - 519, (1959); 4) "The Dubious Origin of the Fourteenth Amendment", Tulane Law Review, Vol. XXVIII, pages 22 - 44, (1953); and 5) United States of America Congressional Record - Proceedings and Debates of the 90th Congress, First Session, Volume 113-Part 12 (June 13, 1967) pages 15641 - 15646]

Justice Ellett of the Utah Supreme Court stated on pages 941 and 942 of his 1975 concurring opinion in STATE v. PHILLIPS, supra, that:

> "The dissenting opinion asserts that "The Fourteenth Amendment is a part of the Constitution of the United Sates". While this same assertion has been made by the United States Supreme Court, that court has never held that the amendment was legally adopted. I cannot believes that any court, in full possession of its faculties, could honestly hold that the amendment was properly approved and adopted."

Justice Ellett's opinion in DYETT v. TURNER, supra, provides an excellent overview of the events during the 1867 and 1868 period in America when the so-called 14th Amendment was allegedly "approved and adopted".

The Congressional Record of June 13, 1967 on page 15646 cited above, states in part:

> "It would be inconceivable that the Congress of the United States could propose, compel submission to, and then give life to an invalid amendment by resolving that its effort had succeeded - regardless of compliance with the positive provisions of Article V.
>
> It should need no further citation to sustain the proposition that neither the Joint Resolution proposing the 14th Amendment nor its ratification by the required three-fourths of the States in the Union were in compliance with the requirements of Article V of the Constitution.
>
> When the mandatory provisions of the Constitution are violated, the Constitution itself strikes with nullity the Act that did violence to its provisions. Thus, the Constitution strikes with nullity the purported 14th Amendment." .....
>
> "The Constitution makes it the sworn duty of the judges to uphold the Constitution which strikes with nullity the 14th Amendment.
>
> And, as Chief Justice Marshall pointed out for a unanimous Court in Marbury v. Madison (1 Cranch 136, 179):
>
> * * * * *
>
> "Why does a judge swear to discharge his duties agreeably to the constitution of the United States, if that constitution forms no rule for his government?"
>
> * * * * *
>
> "If such be the real state of things, that is worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe, or to take this oath, becomes equally a crime."
>
> * * * * *
>
> "Thus, the particular phraseology of the constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions .... courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument."

Clearly the so-called 14th Amendment, among others, is unconstitutional. Similarly, the alleged "Emergency War Powers" actions by F.D.R and others in 1933, and beyond, and the 1968 Pennsylvania constitution are unconstitutional. These averments have been proven by the writer. The evidence for these positions

is a matter of public record and can be obtained or provided.

H'. Since the so-called 14th Amendment is without question unconstitutional, it can not be used in any attempt to give the Federal government authority to impose its will within Pennsylvania or any other union republic State of the united States of America. The compelling evidence, however, proves that today's result was always the intent of the corrupt framers of the so-called 14th Amendment.

I'. Marriage is and always has been a contract and a solemn compact between one man and one woman. However, on page 972 of the 6th Edition of Blacks Dictionary we read:

> "Marriage, as distinguished from the agreement to marry and from the act of becoming married, is the legal status, condition, or relation of one man and one woman united by law for life, or until divorced, ..."

Clearly an agreement to marry and the act of becoming married are contracts. However, the lawyers have allegedly changed the meaning of the word "marriage" so the laws concerning contracts do not apply to a marriage and thus to a divorce. While this started many years ago, it did not start until after the "War between the States"/"Civil War" and the so-called 14th Amendment. Obviously, it would be impossible to have "No-Fault Divorce" while the laws of contracts applied to marriage and divorce. So the lawyers and judges, as they often do, simply changed the meaning of words. This is clearly unlawful and unconstitutional and thus can not be tolerated in this situation or in any other.

J'. The authority for marriage, family and children in Pennsylvania, and elsewhere in America, is God and the Holy Bible, not the state. Clearly, no licence from the state is required. The definition of a licence is:

> "permission granted by competent authority to engage in a business or occupation or in an activity otherwise unlawful" ....
> [Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, page 668]

> "The permission by competent authority to do an act which, without such permission, would be illegal, a trespass, a tort, or otherwise not allowable."
> [Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, page 920]

However, Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, as flawed as it often is, states on page 973 that the definition of a "marriage license" is:

> "A license or permission granted by public authority to persons who intend to <u>intermarry</u>,

> modify or alter. The bond is absolutely indissoluble in every case, except in the single case of adultery, which the great Lawgiver himself has excepted."

As with all unconstitutional positions, if one accepts Judge MacElree's position, there is no law.

L'. The unlawfulness of these statements should be obvious to the objective, informed reader.

In conclusion, "No-Fault Divorce" is, and always has been, unconstitutional. This very damaging "social experiment" has proven to be so. The common law condemns it! Those who have perpetrated this fraud, etc. upon the people are in direct violation of the law and their solemn oaths of office.

There is no need to pass a BILL that repeals "No-Fault Divorce". The existing alleged "No-Fault Divorce" statutes, codes, rules, regulations, practices & procedures, etc. are unlawful and unconstitutional on their face. Thus, they are all null and void, "ab initio". The only lawful action(s) of the Pennsylvania Representatives and Senators, the Governor and all Justices, Judges and Justices of the Peace, etc. is to affirm and declare the fact that "No-Fault Divorce" is and always has been unconstitutional. These declarations must be taken immediately by all government official/officers. There is no other lawful option!

To not confirm this obvious fact is as Chief Justice Marshall stated in Marbury v. Madison, supra, "worse than solemn mockery. To prescribe, or to take this oath, becomes equally a crime."

I stand ready to discuss the contents of this letter and the documents which I have presented. Many more documents are available to support and prove the positions which I have taken herein and elsewhere. Now that you are informed of the facts and the law, you are constitutionally required by your oath of office to act lawfully. I trust that you and all others shall do so.

Sincerely and Respectfully submitted;

William Taylor Reil

William Taylor Reil -
sovereign, Christian Citizen;
In Propria Persona, Sui Juris

file # 03-03-030

NOTICE AND DEMAND

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I, William Taylor Reil, a free born sovereign Christian Citizen, in my proper person, having and reserving all of my God-given and constitutionally secured rights, privileges, and immunities, waiving none of these rights, privileges and immunities at any time or place, shall only accept mail if it is directed to me strictly in the following manner:

FILED
94 OCT 28 PM 12:5
OFFICE OF THE PROTHONOTARY
CHESTER CO., PA.

William Taylor Reil
c/o 261 Jefferis Road
Downingtown, Pennsylvania
(Non-Domestic)

Any use of my name and/or reference to me in any document that is not in strict compliance with plain English language construction as herein stated shall not be accepted. For example, I am not a fictitious entity as denoted by the use of all capital letters in my name or elsewhere.

ANY and/or All letters, packages, Notices, Complaints, Petitions, etc. not strictly complying with the lawful directions stated herein shall be refused for cause, returned un-opened and thus have the lawful effect of never having been written and/or sent to me.

Any document which does not use my correct Christian name and other information as herein stated shall be dishonored, on its face, with prejudice and have no lawful force and/or effect. It shall be, in all ways and all places, as if it had never been written and/or sent.

If the information visible on the outside of the letter, etc. is correct and all of the information on the enclosed document(s) is not strictly correct as herein stated, the letter, package, NOTICE, Complaint, Petition, etc., shall immediately be resealed and returned because of fraud, deceit, misrepresentation and/or mistake. The mistaken opening shall not effect the dishonor of the document(s) in any way and thus its shall continue to have no lawful force and/or effect.

Strict compliance with these directions is demanded.

Thank you for your cooperation in this matter at all time.

William Taylor Reil

William Taylor Reil
In Propria Persona, Sui Juris

file # 03-03-030