

DECEPTION ABOUND (I put my children into economic slavery)

© March, 2011

1st in a series

by Michael Keehn

mhkeehn@gmail.com

mhkeehn.tripod.com

I was recently communicating with a good friend on the limits and reach of federal jurisdiction, which seems to be limitless, even extending to other countries with our new policy of killing other people because they might, someday, cause us harm. But *other countries* are not the focus here. Here we will target the almost limitless assertion of federal jurisdiction in the States of the Union.

Most of what will be presented here is not, to my knowledge, taught in public schools. We should remember that those leaders who wish to deceive and control us are successful because they control the curriculum in public schools, and make certain we remain ignorant. It is not that we are stupid, we're simply not exposed to the factual information. We will try to clear away some of the smoke and mirrors in this series.

I will make reference to the "*American people*", and this is reference to the people of these united States of America. OK – let's begin.

Congress has a dual character. The constitution empowered Congress to make laws for the republic of these united States of America (the lower case "u" is not an oversight). The constitution also gave Congress exclusive legislative authority over an area of ten miles square which the constitution refers to as ***the District***. Later to become, Washington, District of Columbia, the seat of the federal government.

The District is a jurisdiction outside the republic of these united States of America, in other words, it is a foreign jurisdiction, a separate country if you will. With its own laws, separate from the republic of these united States of America.

This *exclusive legislative authority* granted to Congress over ***the District***, also extends to anything owned by the federal government, in other words territories and enclaves.

So OK, Congress has a dual character and can make laws for the republic of these united States of America, constrained and limited by the constitution, and they can make laws for Washington D. C. and territories which are not constrained by the constitution and need not be constitutional. And most of the time they are not.

To gain control over our lives, it was necessary for the lawmakers to find a way to subject the American people to their unconstitutional territorial law and deception is one of their tools. It acts to keep us ignorant.

When these united States of America defaulted on the payment of their national debt in 1871, England, the creditor of the United States, took title to the collateral being held in lieu of

payment. The collateral was all the property owned by the federal government, which included Washington, District of Columbia. And so, in 1871, our creditor became the owner of Washington, D.C. The plot thickens.

The creditor (the new sovereign) forced incorporation on *the District*, and this is where we get the corporate UNITED STATES, which is NOT these united States of America. It is a British controlled and owned corporation. It was a great deception because it worked, at least for quite a while. However, a growing number of American's have figured out the difference, so this deception is beginning to wane. If this information is new to you, it may be confirmed with some internet research.

So what happened with the creation of the [corporate] UNITED STATES? Well, this happened:

“United States. This term has several meanings. It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in a family of nations, it may designate territory over which sovereignty of United States extends, or it may be collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution. *Hooven & Allison Co. v. Evatt*, U.S.Ohio, 324 U.S. 652, 65 S.Ct. 870, 880,89 L.Ed. 1252.” [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

“It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous [equal] to that of other sovereigns in a family of nations...” Were we taught that at the signing of the constitution the States were *independent nation States*? Well, they were, and each State was sovereign. And when these States became part of the Union of these united States of America, they were all equal [analogous]. And so this first definition of United States refers to the Union States, like Iowa, Nebraska, California, etc.

“it may designate territory over which sovereignty of United States extends...” This refers to the territories controlled by our creditor through the [corporate] UNITED STATES and defines the corporate UNITED STATES.

“or it may be collective name of the states which are *united by and under the Constitution*.” This identifies the republic of these united States of America. The use of the plural “these” is the proper English reference to the republic. But I’m certain we were all taught this distinction in public school.

And since this comes from a Supreme Court decision we can see that all three United States exist in law, it’s not an opinion. Therefore, when we check the little box titled “U. S. citizen” on the Social Security application, and then sign that document under penalty of perjury, to which United States have we just identified as having given our allegiance and obedience? Since our signature attachment to a particular jurisdiction will control which body of law we are subject, I think it might be important to have knowledge of such matters. What do you think public school system? What do you think local leadership?

If we have identified ourselves as a citizen of a British controlled corporation (the UNITED

STATES), then we have made our self subject to the *territorial laws of the UNITED STATES* [corporate]. And that's a whole lot different than the laws of the republic of these united States of America.

By the way, there are now parents who are not acquiring a government issued Birth Certification nor Social Security account number for their new born. No, the parents cannot claim the child on their income taxes, but the child has no attachment to the corporate jurisdiction and does not legally exist, he (or she) lawfully exists in the republic. The child is not a taxpayer and the birth would be recorded in the family bible, a lawful record. The government cannot legally take such a child from its parents since the government doesn't own it and the child doesn't legally exist.

More deception to come, so stay tuned...