



INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR NATURAL JUSTICE

Report of the ITNJ Board of Trustees on Results of the Annual Constitutional Review

Approved on 14 February 2017

Overview

Each year the Board of Trustees convenes to consider the adequacy of the ITNJ Constitution to fulfil its **mandate by the people**.

When conducting its reviews, the Board gives consideration to the following matters:

1. General observations and questions arising throughout the year
2. Strategic considerations
3. The alignment of each constitutional provision, and the constitution as a whole, with the ITNJ Founding Treaty
4. The questions and suggestions received on the form and content of the constitution from those who have ratified the ITNJ Treaty
5. Minority concerns of trustees from previous constitutional reviews

The results of the 2016 annual review are summarised below, and form the basis of the constitutional amendments which have been approved and published on this website. Being the first annual constitutional review, and given that the Trustees were aware of some constitutional inconsistencies from the outset which were temporarily set aside to facilitate a successful launch, the amendments resulting from this particular constitutional review are likely to be far more extensive than in future years.

1. General observations and questions arising throughout the year

Enforcement

One of the principle questions raised by those looking in to date has concerned ‘enforcement’ — the ability to enforce decisions rendered by the Tribunal. Likewise, since the ITNJ was conceived in 2011, this question has formed the basis of many discussions. Prior to launch in 2015, it was generally understood by the Trustees that, absent some unforeseen change in the wind, that the ITNJ needed to position itself as a name and shame initiative. It is clear that the ITNJ has not communicated this position effectively since its launch, and the Trustees have agreed that the Constitution, and the ITNJ’s other publicly presented material, needs to be clearer in this regard.

Number of Trustees and the quorum requirements generally.

The Board has experienced difficulties with having all seven Trustees attend all regular meetings. This has often meant that there has not been a quorum of sufficient size to address matters of importance (particularly this constitutional review exercise which requires a greater quorum than day to day matters). In order to facilitate this exercise and prevent future issues, the Trustees agreed to amend the constitution to provide that: “When one or more Trustees vacates their office or are otherwise indisposed, and replacement(s) are yet to be appointed, the remaining Trustees may by majority vote to temporarily amend the quorum requirements so that the Board of Trustees can continue to function in the interim.”

2. Strategic Considerations

What is the actual strategy of the ITNJ in fulfilling its mandate by the people to restore truth and reason to the delivery of justice in the world?

It was unanimously agreed by the Trustees that the principal strategy of the ITNJ ought to be a focus on Judicial inquiries and landmark cases only; that all attention ought to be placed on setting major precedents in areas of critical importance to humanity — addressing matters of a high-profile nature with far-reaching potential.

Should the ITNJ be seeking to facilitate decentralised judicial system(s) as well as a centralised tribunal?

The Trustees agree that decentralised justice [meaning justice distributed without a centralized authority being responsible for its distribution] is the most appropriate means of ensuring integrity in the delivery of natural justice, and that any such courts, in whatever form they may take, must necessarily be founded and administered by those whom they are purposed to serve. The Trustees remain open to supporting the establishment of such decentralised operations, but agree that any such courts themselves must never be part of the ITNJ framework or be otherwise subject to centralised oversight.

To this end the Trustees are independently exploring the possibilities of employing blockchain technology to create a non-proprietary open justice platform capable of removing from judicial administration all third party positions such as judges, registrars, lawyers, and court staff, for willing communities to implement in their own sovereign fashion. The outcomes of these explorations will be shared at the next constitutional review, if not before.

3. Misalignments of the existing constitution with the ITNJ Founding Treaty

The constitution permits a case to be brought against an unnatural person; the will of the ITNJ's Founders as stated in the Treaty does not.

Likewise the Constitution permits a case to be brought by an unnatural person; the will of the ITNJ's Founders as stated in the Treaty does not.

The Trustees recognize that the ITNJ Treaty implies that justice ought to be delivered between real people. But the ITNJ is receiving applications from and against unnatural persons, and the Trustees do not feel that this contravenes the spirit and intent of the Treaty because all other elements are present, and the cases do offer to facilitate Natural Justice.

The Trustees further agreed that the constitution should be amended to reflect that "all applicants and respondents must be natural persons except in extenuating circumstances, to be determined on a case by case basis, in which the application is in line with the spirit and intent of the ITNJ Treaty."

4. Questions and suggestions received on the form and content of the constitution from those who have ratified the Treaty (not covered elsewhere in this review)

Why does the constitution contain references to International Law, Equitable (Equity) law, etc. when the Treaty mandates natural law?

Because International Law (minus international treaties) is acknowledged to be natural law, and equity is the application of conscience which is also in alignment with natural law. These terms are widely recognised and so were included so as not to alienate those practitioners from within the existing legal systems of the world who might otherwise be supportive of the ITNJ and its purposes.

What is the role and function of the Grand Jury in Article 3?

In light of the strategic considerations stated herein, there isn't one. The Trustees agree that these sections should be removed.

Why are judges required to have legal qualifications from the existing recognised institutions, many of which have participated in causing the perversion of justice?

Because requiring such is necessary to garnering the support of good people within the existing judiciary. Not all legal practitioners and judges are corrupt — the ITNJ only appoints officers whose integrity has been proven beyond question. That said, owing to the fact that the ITNJ is concerned with facts and Truth over and above arcane legal principles, the Trustees consider that the Constitution should allow for special individuals who do not have legal qualifications to be appointed as judges.

You should not permit a presiding judge to be the sole arbiter of measures against corruption.

The Trustees agree that the Article in question (Article 5) in its present form is congruent with internationally recognised practices, and that sub-paragraph 3 is superfluous given the nature of the Tribunal's organization.

You should remove “swear” from the Oath of Office, and remove “specifically” and remainder of section.

The Trustees agree with this suggestion.

Judges should not have immunity in a court of natural law.

The Trustees initially agreed with this suggestion, but on further reflection, and in light of attacks against the ITNJ and its judiciary received in the latter part of 2016, we determined that, at least until such time as corruption has been eradicated from legacy judicial systems, this clause is of great benefit to fending off baseless attacks brought within legacy judicial establishments against honourable ITNJ court staff.

All evidence should be admissible.

The Trustees agree with this suggestion, notwithstanding that every party to a case has a duty to the court to submit only that which is genuinely relevant to the outcome of the case. The relevant Article of the constitution should be amended to reflect that the ITNJ is founded on the principle of self-responsibility.

You should remove ‘human rights and the rule of law’ from the applicable law section.

The Trustees agree that it is superfluous in the context of the article.

You should create an ITNJ Glossary and use that to positively define words and phrases that could be misinterpreted.

The Trustees agree with this suggestion.

5. Minority concerns of Trustees from previous constitutional reviews (not covered elsewhere in this review)

Funding

To date the Tribunal continues to operate solely on the good will of its team and a handful of dedicated donors — no significant funding has been raised. The Trustees agree that the present mechanisms permitted for funding the Tribunal's activities are too restrictive and should be extended to include any funding avenues — the ITNJ will use money from any source to uphold Truth and justice.

All these things being agreed, the Constitution has been amended to suit. The revised version can be found [here](#).