

# Republican Form of Government

by Michael H. Keehn  
updated September 12, 2015

Because of the perversion in our of our system of justice, law, in so many ways, has become what the people believe it to be. While law may be variable, justice is not. There is a right and a wrong no matter how much Leadership tries to obscure the distinction.

In ways similar to clouding our system of justice, the concept of ***Republican form of Government*** has been made just as unclear. Can you describe the character and nature of a ***Republican form of Government***? Can you find a school teacher who can clearly describe a ***Republican form of Government***? I cannot.

Yet our Constitution mandates that:

“the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government...” - Constitution for the United States, Article 4, Section 4

And to be clear, ***Republican form of Government*** has nothing to do with the *Republican Political Party*. In this matter the Constitution gives Congress no latitude.

In other sections of the constitution that confer powers or authorities to Congress, as the overseers of the Federal Government, there is latitude in the exercise of that conferred power or authority. For example:

"The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises . . . ." - United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1:

In granting this authority, Congress ***may*** or ***may not*** choose to exercise this power. But Congress may not choose whether, or not, to provide a ***Republican form of Government***. They are required to do so, period. Yet, those characteristics that define a ***Republican form of Government*** are never discussed, either by the mainstream *misleadia*, our schoolmasters, our churches, or our political leadership. Generally, all four of these groups refer to our government as a democracy. But, if the people can be convinced it is a democracy, it will become one in default by virtue of the fact that insufficient numbers of our population will recognize the difference. Very few now do, thank you public school system.

If we allow this, we will have caused great harm. Harm to our loved ones, and harm to our fellow man. We will also have stabbed in the back all those Americans who fought and died to provide this form of governance. Therefore we need to explore and identify those characteristics that comprise a ***Republican form of Government***.

We begin by looking in *Blacks Law Dictionary*, and look up the term *Republican government*.

**“Republican government.** A government in the republican form; a government of the people; a government by representatives chosen by the people. - Blacks Law Dictionary (Sixth Edition)

That’s about as helpful as saying that an *automobile* is a conveyance. Not exactly concise is it? Whenever there is so little to be found on such an important concept we should all become suspicious that there is a concert effort to keep that knowledge hidden from the public at large. It is very unlikely that such an important concept would be virtually impossible to find an accurate description to define it unless someone (or group) does not want those characteristics known.

From *Black’s* definition I gather that *Republics* are very *Republican* in nature. It does seem unlikely that the only distinguishing characteristic of a ***Republican form of Government*** is that it is a *government of the people* by virtue of their capacity to elect representatives. Other forms of government also have elected representatives... Democracy for example. I believe that Parliamentary governments also have elected representatives. There must be more to the **Republican** concept than this alone. Even dictatorships and various communistic forms of government have representation of the people, or so they say.

Although *Black’s* seventh edition does not list the phrase ***Republican government***, it does list the term ***Republic***. Let’s look at it.

**“Republic.** n. A system of government in which the people hold sovereign power and elect representatives who exercise that power. It contrasts on the one hand with a pure democracy, in which the people or community as an organized whole wield the sovereign power of government, and on the other with the rule of one person (such as a king, emperor, czar, or sultan).” - Blacks Law Dictionary (seventh edition)

Although it may not be immediately clear, this definition provides a good beginning in understanding the foundations of a Republic. The definition hinges on who holds the ***sovereign power***. And of course, the ***sovereign power*** is the ultimate power within the country. It is the power that a King or Monarch holds over his country. It is the power of ultimate authority. And the definition above hinges on who holds this power.

So that we understand, the above definition provides a ***contrast***. It points out that in a democracy, the people as an ***ORGANIZED WHOLE*** wield the sovereign power. Democracy is majority rule, or more precisely, ***mob rule***. The mobs of Democracy are easily swayed and controlled in their thinking. All it takes is money and television. Democracy is two wolves and one sheep sitting down to discuss what they are going to have for dinner, and because the two wolves are a ***majority***, the sheep loses every time. In a ***majority rule*** government, the majority could easily confiscate the property of one or more individuals if it were deemed that such a

confiscation were beneficial to *the majority*... mob rule.

In the other example provide, all the sovereign power is concentrated in one individual, such as a king, emperor, czar, or sultan. And in the first sentence the definition points out that in a Republic the sovereign power is held by the people, but not as an *organized whole* as in a Democracy, but as *INDIVIDUALS*. Therein lies the key to understanding the *Republican form of Government*. The individual is the source of sovereign power.

Now, we must ask the question, “where does the individual derive his power or authority?” Those familiar with Western civilization already know the answer, but we may also refer to our founding documents for the answer.

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” - Declaration of Independence

*Rights* are powers and authorities and of particular importance is to notice that *all men are created EQUAL*, meaning that we all hold exactly the same power and authorities. Here we see that *RIGHTS* (power and authority) is granted by the *Creator* (God). That these *rights* include, but are not limited to, *life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*<sup>1</sup>. Important to note is that we all possess the same rights since we were *created equal*. That you have no more *RIGHT* than I, and I do not have any more *RIGHT* than you.

Next in understanding the characteristics of a Republic form of Government, is to understand the conferring of *OUR POWERS & AUTHORITIES* upon government as we create it.

"It has been justly thought a matter of importance to determine from what source the United States derives its authority... The question here proposed is whether our bond of union is a compact entered into by the states, or whether the Constitution is an organic law established by the People. To this we answer: *'We the People... ordain and establish this Constitution'*...The government of the state had only delegated power (from the People) and even if they had an inclination, they had no authority to transfer the authority of the Sovereign People. The people in their capacity as Sovereigns made and adopted the Constitution; and it binds the state governments without the state's consent. The United States, as a whole, therefore, emanates from the People and not from the states, and the Constitution and the laws of the states, whether made before or since the adoption of that Constitution of the United States, are subordinate to the United States Constitution and the laws made in pursuance of it." - [Bouvier's 14th Edition Law Dictionary (citing 4 Wheat, 402)]

---

<sup>1</sup> It has been long established that *pursuit of happiness* is the freedom and/or liberty to labor and then enjoy the fruits of that labor.

As can be seen, we *the Sovereign People* conferred upon government some very limited powers and authorities within the very document that establishes that central government, the Constitution **for** the United States<sup>2</sup>. Important to notice is the fact that we did not confer any power or authority that we do not possess. If we were to attempt to confer a power or authority that we do not have, it would corrupt (pervert) the system of justice that we are trying to establish. For example, if I as an individual *Sovereign*, do not have the power or authority to go into the wallet of another individual *Sovereign*, take out a hundred dollars and give it to whomever I feel is needy, then I cannot confer that power or authority upon government because I didn't have it to begin with. If I did so it would corrupt our system of justice.

**MIGHT** (or *majority rule*) does not make right, as is practiced in a democracy. Just because the majority thinks that it is appropriate (right) to take your property for the benefit of others, does not mean that it is appropriate (right), nor lawful to take your property. It only means that majorities may be easily corrupted with money and television. If the individual is not protected from the mob mentality, then no one is protected. And this is the way Leadership operates government today.

The fact that God is the source of our individual power and authority is also the premise for the *divine right of kings*. The premise here was that *the King* had been endowed by God (the Creator) with certain *divine rights* (enter the Catholic Church) and that the individual people under his rule had no rights or privileges other than what the King might confer and take away at will. The people were *subjects* to the will of the King. And if you are a history buff, you know that Kings have been very liberal in their interpretation of what rights have been conferred upon them by God through the Catholic Church. All too often they were despot bullies, feeling no restraint on any power they wished to exercise.

But, when everyone is *created equal*, no one individual has more power or authority than any other individual. Therefore, the challenge for those who want to wield all the power, is to convince the masses that they have no power.

All sources of assumed power and authority, except that which is conferred by God, is temporary and based on raw physical power and force. These powers are the concept of *survival of the fittest*. The concept of democracy is... **MIGHT MAKES RIGHT**. Think how you would feel if two-thirds of a class room full of students voted to make a law that they could take the lunch money of the other one-third. That is a democracy, however, it is not possible to pass such a law in a Republic so long as the people know the foundational principles of our Republic. For in a Republic, the majority lacks the authority to take the property from the individual for they have no

---

<sup>2</sup> The word "**for**" is bolded and underlined above for a reason. When the Constitution was written, the corporate United States did not yet exist. However, when it did come into existence in 1871, a new corporate Constitution was created. To confuse and mislead the people only one word was changed. The word "for" was changed to the word "of", thus it reads "Constitution **of** the United States." This changes the source of the Constitution. It was intended to mislead the people into believing that it is their original Constitution when it is not, it is more of a corporation by-law.

more lawful power or authority than the individual.

Sovereign powers conferred by God may not be challenged by man. Such powers conferred by God will always remain superior to any power (political or otherwise) & authority conceived by man, regardless of the noble, or selfish, intent of man.

**Divine rights** were supposedly conferred upon Kings by God, generally through the Catholic Church. Accordingly, given that **all men are created equal**, it becomes clear that the **divine rights** of Kings would equate to **unalienable rights** held by the people of these United States of America (republic of). **Unalienable rights** are rights that cannot be lost, sold or transferred. That is, one cannot *alien* them, they are **un-alien-able**. Keeping in mind that there is a world of difference between **civil rights** and **unalienable rights**. **Civil rights** are created by law (man's), regulated by law (man's) and taken away by law (man's). **Unalienable rights** are given by God and man may not **alien** nor interfere with them.

**Alien.** n. To transfer or make over to another; ... - Blacks Law Dictionary (sixth edition)

**“Unalienable.** Inalienable; incapable of being aliened, that is sold and transferred.”  
[Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

Therefore, you may have *civil rights* as part of a political plan, or you may have *unalienable rights* as part of a heavenly plan.

Now that we have **unalienable rights** and **sovereign power**, how are we to keep it? Enter **government**.

**“That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.”** - Declaration of Independence

There you have it ladies and gentlemen, the primary purpose of **Government** is to secure our rights. What rights? Our **unalienable rights**, the same **sovereign power** granted to the Kings by God via the Catholic Church. It should be remembered that when the Constitution **for** the United States was written, there was no corporate United States, and no civil rights. *Civil rights* are just a ruse.

## **Reviewing what we have covered:**

*Unalienable rights* are conferred upon the individual, not groups, not the majority, not the collective as a whole... the individual. No other individual or group of people has any more lawful power or authority than one individual. How do we know this to be true? Because **all men are created equal**. A very important concept, remember it!

Understanding this is important because it relates back to the definition of **Republic** provided by Black's seventh edition law dictionary. In that definition, the distinction between **Republic** and other forms of government lies in who holds the **sovereign power**.

Thus, we have the definition of a **Republican form of Government**. It is a system of government which recognizes that each individual is endowed by the Creator with certain **unalienable rights (sovereign power)** and that the primary purpose of government is to protect the **unalienable rights** of the **sovereign people**.

The concept of *individual empowerment* is important because it then does not matter how the majority might vote, they are not empowered as a group to deprive an individual of his **unalienable rights**. Such as the right to keep his property, that is anything he might own.

### **The Covenant:**

The only one that can deprive us of our **unalienable rights** is ourselves. How might we do this? Simple, by violating our covenant with God. That is, breaking God's law's. Law's like *thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not murder, thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor*. You break your covenant with God when you disobey his law.

The law of the Republic is the **common law**. The *common law* is biblical law applied. That is to say it is God's law applied. The *common law* is a very old and just body of law. It provides for punishment when you break your covenant. In this, your **unalienable rights** are forfeit. And you may be imprisoned, or you may be required to pay a fine (have your property [money] confiscated). Things that your **unalienable rights** would normally protect.

For example, if it could be proved in court of law that an individual has broken his covenant with God to "*not murder*" another, then this individual forfeits his **unalienable right to life** and may be lawfully executed. It is the concept of *an eye for an eye*. You might notice that I said *murder*, not *kill*. In God's commandments he did not say "*thou shalt not kill*", he said, "*thou shalt not murder*". In our republic there are legitimate reasons to kill in defense of ourselves or our families, our family being an extension of ourself. To murder is to kill someone who is not deserving.

In a Republic, execution cannot be lawfully imposed on individuals or groups of individuals when they have not breached their covenant with God. If an individual has not breached his covenant with God, no State or Government may lawfully deny the individual his **unalienable rights**. Why? Because the opinion of the whole of mankind lacks sufficient collective authority to revoke or violate the covenant with God.

### **When has a crime been committed?**

The answer is simple in a Republic. When a sovereign individual has been injured. And when has a sovereign individual been injured? When another individual or group of individuals has injured the property or person of a **sovereign individual** and the injured individual files a *complaint*. For

example, you hit my car parked in front of my home. I have suffered a financial injury to my property. I now have a claim against you. In a Republic there are no crimes against ***the State***. Why. Simple, ***the State***, as a legal fiction, and all *legal fictions* are a *dead person*. And dead-people have no ***unalienable rights***, nor can they be injured.

In our republic, if someone were to vandalize public property, then that would be an injury to the people. All that is needed is for a *sovereign individual* to step up to the plate and file a complaint. Government would then have cause and reason to act.

The action is taken in the name of the ***sovereign people***. Just because there are no crimes against the State possible in a Republic does not mean that you can vandalize public property. I as a ***sovereign individual*** can file a complaint and you can be arrested and convicted on that complaint. In the republic mandated by the Constitution, all public property is owned by ***the sovereign people of these united States of America***. And the ***sovereign people*** have a right to protect their commonly owned property. But the State does not have the authority to file a criminal action, naming itself as the injured party. We should remember that the Federal Government is *a State*. Not a *State of the Union*, but a *State* as that term is defined in law.

Government is a ***legal fiction***. That is, it is a creation of the mind of mankind. Without the mind of man, government would not exist. This defines a *legal fiction*. Under the laws of God, no natural individual is to be harmed under the pretext of an injury to a ***legal fiction***.

If government was to do this, it has acted criminally under ***color of law***. Because they proceed in court<sup>3</sup> that are administering the bankruptcy of the United States (corporate), it has the appearance of being legitimate, but it lacks the necessary elements to define a crime. Thus the injury they cause to an individual through their court proceedings lacks the necessary authority, it is a crime. But, when the masses lack knowledge, it goes un-noticed. When the press fails to do its job, it goes un-noticed. When the churches fail to do their job, it goes un-noticed. When the schools fail to do their job, it goes un-noticed. Uneducated juries will then *rubber-stamp* the unlawful behavior of government.

***Color of law***. The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of legal right. Misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state, is action taken under *color of law*. - Blacks Law Dictionary (Sixth Edition)

There are no ***victimless crimes*** in a Republic. There are lots of victimless crimes in a democracy. In a democracy, ***the majority*** (or their presumed agent... the government), may vote to make any

---

<sup>3</sup> The United States (corporate) has been bankrupt since 1933 and the Judges of today are administering the bankruptcy in their courts at all levels. Reading [the United States in a Nutshell](#) may be enlightening. "Judges are instructed to take 'silent judicial notice' that America is a bankrupt nation. As such, it is not operating under Constitutional Law but under certain 'public bankruptcy policies,' the very existence of which is **not** to be made general public knowledge." – [Sui Juris, Pardon me but... #5](#)

act a crime<sup>4</sup>. For example, *hate speech*, which abridges the first amendment. Who is going to sit in judgment of *hate speech*? Someone ***the majority*** (or its agent) designates, that's who. And so we have a crime even though no one is injured. Having one's feelings hurt is not considered an injury in the Republic, only our bankrupt democracy. What's not comprehended here is that there is a difference between "*legal*" and "*lawful*".

***Victimless crimes***, while virtually non-existent in a Republic, are quite common in a democracy. Federal Prisoners convicted in Victimless Crimes Constitutes 86% of The Federal Prison Population. Why?<sup>5</sup> Because there are no legitimate victims in our democracy. Again... why? Because only in a Republic do we have ***individual unalienable rights***. There are no ***individual unalienable rights*** in a democracy. There is only collective (mob) rights. And the mob can determine that anything they don't like is a crime, even though there is no one injured in a true sense of injury.

Without ***individual unalienable rights*** you cannot be an injured victim for there is nothing there to damage. To illustrate the point, suppose an individual who has no ***unalienable rights*** were to be shot and killed. In a legal sense it would be no different than killing a cow. Without ***unalienable rights*** conferred by god, there is nothing intrinsic to violate. If you think this is a reach, ask the survivors of WACO, TEXAS in which our government murdered 80 plus people, 22 of which were children. This is how a democracy operates. Two wolves and one sheep sitting down to discuss what is for dinner, and the sheep loses every time.

It is certainly possible that a democratic system of government may vote that murder is wrong, at least when murder is committed by someone other than Government Agents. Remember, Government is a corporation since 1871, and it has a board of directors that we call Congress. Thus, the United States Government is WALMART with guns. Whereas WALMART provides products and services the people are willing to buy on a voluntary basis, the Government uses its guns to force the people to do business with them, their way!

And since every Office, Agency, Bureau and Department, the whole of Government is *publically traded for profit* (see Publically [Traded for Profit Sampling](#) or visit [Dun & Bradstreet](#) and do your own search), Leadership protects their bankrupt cash register or attempts to fill the cash register with their guns. Leadership, using their control of the mainstream *misleadia* psychologically profiles the American people to *not care* when murder is committed against an individual or a small group like the *Branch Dividians* at Waco, Texas. It is a fact that in our democracy the murderous government agents walk away with bonuses and promotions. With our

---

<sup>4</sup> Since 1933, all crimes are commercial and upon successful conviction, have a dollar value to the court. This means that because the court is administering the bankruptcy to its own benefit, it has an irreconcilable conflict of interest and cannot dispense justice without bias.

<sup>5</sup> Not well known nor very well understood is the fact that when the people of the United States join Social Security, their Government converts their status from *living man (or woman) of the land* to *legal fiction*, in this case a *trust and transmitting utility*. For more information read [Shinola 101](#) or [Dear Archbishop Annotated](#).



own ability to ignore the criminal breach of *unalienable rights* committed by government, at Waco and in many other incidents as well, we set the stage to someday be in the same boat. Such is the case when we do not demand and restore the *republican for of government* mandated by the Constitution. Someday it will be us or our loved ones whose *unalienable rights* are being abridged by government and prison is in our future. Or like Waco, death. In our current democracy, a citizen has no more individual rights than a cow.

If you disagree, you might try asking Vicki Weaver about her *right to life* in our current democracy. Vicki was standing in the doorway of her cabin, holding her ten month old infant, was unarmed, had harmed no one, represented a threat to no one, when Lon Horiuchi, a government agent (hit-man, goon, thug) shot Vicki in the head with a model 700 .308 caliber snipers rifle. The bullet ripping away her lower jaw, severing her carotid artery. Her blood bathing her 10 month old infant as she fell to her kitchen floor. That's Democracy as brought to you by the Leadership we elect ladies and gentlemen.

There is a price to pay for ignorance and a bigger price for stupidity. Often times the price is in safety. Sometimes the price is to watch a fellow American die and know that *it is done in our name* and we are at fault by virtue of our unwillingness to be responsible for the behavior of the Leaders we elect to office. Democracy, because it begins by ignoring the rights of some individuals, eventually must ignore the rights of all individuals. For this reason, it will ultimately fail. Our Republic has not failed, it is simply being set aside and replaced with democracy by those who want raw power in full view of our own ignorance and inability to see what is happening.

Let us not forget the wisdom of the former Director of the United Nations World Health Organization, Brok Chisolm, who said, "To achieve world government, it is necessary to remove from the minds of men, their individualism, loyalty to family traditions, national patriotism and religious dogmas." Can you see that this is what is being done by a government whose declared primary purpose is to protect our *unalienable rights* and *sovereign power*? **DEMOCRACY**, the perfect tool to implement *One World Government / New World Order*. And so we no longer *pledge allegiance* to the flag of the united States, and to the **REPUBLIC** for which it stands, **ONE NATION UNDER GOD...** Does this sound like someone may be attempting to remove from the "*minds of men*" their "*religious dogmas*?"

Although a **Democracy** may allow its **subjects** (read *slaves*) to engage in religious ceremonies, the **democracy** itself cannot officially recognize any of the religious principles put forth. Further, the government in a democracy controls the corporation churches through their *corporation status*. Can you read into this *separation of church and state* when none exists in our Constitution. The Constitution simply states that:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof..."

New World Order cannot tolerate this!

It certainly does not say that God, or his law, shall be separated from the State. But, if you are trying to erect a **democracy** in place of a **Republic**, you cannot give validation to any religious principles nor God's law. In fact you must destroy or alter them. Democracies, like all collective types of government, require that their subjects be either atheists or that they worship only the **state approved** religions, which the state controls, in our country, through corporation status.

In our current *democracy*, you own nothing. Government can take your guns, your children, your property, even your life. In support of these actions, they would certainly have the authority to increase the size of existing agencies or create new ones as necessary to engage in all this taking of property. You already see this in the emerging *Police State*. All because you no longer have true (unalienable) rights.

Although the last president to refer to our system of government as a Republic was John F. Kennedy, and all the rest have maintained that it is a democracy, the fact remains that Article 4 Section 4 of the Federal Constitution is still there, un-amended, and mandating that "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government ..."

This would seem to create a problem for the Leadership of the Federal Government. Given the fact that they have failed to do that which has been mandated within the Constitution, could we make the case that they are acting criminally, even in treason? That when Leadership, at any level, takes action against anyone, they do not have **clean hands** when they come into court. Could it be that if someone were to make this their argument it would raise political issues too embarrassing for the courts and prosecutors. Would it be possible that if an American would make such a case, they would act to dismiss the charges **in the interest of justice** to avoid answering the allegations of Leadership's *unclean hands*?

If so, cases against defendants in which there is *no injured party* might "disappear" if those defendants essentially argued that, as individuals "endowed with certain unalienable Rights," they could not be subject to the statutes, regulations and enforcement activities of an unlawful democracy — which, by definition, denies unalienable Rights.

More importantly, any government official who's taken an Oath of Office to support and defend the (organic, not corporate) Constitution<sup>6</sup> is duty bound to "guarantee" a "*Republican form of Government*" and the accompanying "**unalienable Rights**." Therefore, if an official sought to impose rules or regulation upon you that were based on democratic principles abrogating your unalienable Rights — that official might violate his Oath of Office and incur personal liability.

---

<sup>6</sup> Swearing an oath to *protect and defend the Constitution* presents a dilemma since there are now two Constitutions, the Organic (original) and the corporate. Thus, when an elected official swears to protect and defend the Constitution, to which Constitution is he swearing this oath. Without clarifying language it is probably impossible to tell, but it is most likely the corporate Constitution, not the organic Constitution that so many American's died to provide.

But, but... one would have to determine which Constitution he has sworn to protect and defend, the *organic Constitution* (“Constitution **for** the United States”), or the *corporate Constitution* (“Constitution **of** the United States”).

The question here is, “have we, as a people, become so ignorant that the government can deny that any individual has unalienable rights in the public forum of court without causing the people to raise up and correct that problem?”

Democracy only works so long as the general public has no idea how big of a mess they are in, nor how criminal government has become. Do a good job of preparing your argument (case) and government may refuse to prosecute. We won’t know until someone tries.

Suppose, appearing in court on a traffic issue, you advised the courts that the *hands* of the government were *unclean* since it was operating as a democracy or corporation, rather than the required **Republican form of Government** mandated by the Federal constitution? The question here is, “could failure to provide that form of government which is mandated by the constitution be grounds for dismissal of action based in the failure to provide that form of government which provides for proper judicial procedure?” Arguably, failure to provide the mandated *Republican form of government*, may be treason. Departments are not *Republic Institutions*, they are elements of a corporation. For example, I can remember the **California Division of Highways**, now it is called **The California Department of Transportation** or **Cal-Trans**. At one time we had a United States Army, and a United States Navy. Now we have the **Department of Defense**. *Departments are corporate not Republic institutions.*

Once faced with the charge that they have knowingly refused to provide a **Republican form of government** and to **secure** our **unalienable rights**, what could agents of the government do? Are they going to admit to a jury that the American people have not had any **unalienable rights** since the 1930's? Herein lies their vulnerability. They are attempting to install a democracy, a criminal fraud imposed through deception, enforced through public ignorance that they control.

Because the government controls our educational processes, an argument could be put forth that the government is involved in fraud and deception by virtue of its failure to educate American students on their true status, rights, citizenship & law form. It is this failure that allows government to unlawfully take our property, our children, our income... whatever they want. Ultimately, it has allowed government Leadership to enslave us and force us to serve **them** instead of **them** serving us through protection of our **unalienable rights** and providing a *republican form of government*. It is government Leadership that enters into a contract (Social Security) when we are still children and too young to contract. The whole time pretending to be so concerned about *the children of America*.

Ask yourself this simple question: “Are your freedoms being maintained and enhanced, or are they being reduced and set aside?” Question #2: “Are you paying taxes to be enslaved, or are you paying taxes to have your freedom maintained and enhanced?”

Government leadership was forced to secretly impose the democracy for they knew that the American people would never accept it, especially if they understood that abandoning their Republic meant abandoning their *unalienable rights*, losing their law, losing their property, losing their money (gold and silver coin), losing everything that made them prosperous and independent.

## **GOVERNMENT as it exists now:**

In this section, we examine the price we pay for ignorance.

To change the form of government from a Republic to *something else*, it would be necessary to decrease the knowledge and understanding of its Citizens. *Dumbing down* is the current phase used to describe this action. Therefore, government takes over our educational processes by creating the Department of Education. This *Department* controls the curriculum in the schools, making certain that students know nothing of the principles of a Republic, nor their true status as *sovereign individuals*. Schools make certain that we do not even know that *State citizenship* exists and that it is considerably different than *United States citizenship*. Once the people are so ignorant that they are not able analyze what is occurring, the door is open to proceed.

The whole issue of public education is wonderfully put forth in [\*The Underground History of American Education\*](#) by J. T. Gatto. It's an extraordinary book and should be read by every parent.

To begin, I will try to fill in some of the missing puzzle pieces that the school has omitted so that a better understanding is gained.

To proceed, we need to understand that *the District of Columbia* **IS** "The UNITED STATES" and is a jurisdiction separate from the Republic of these united States of America. The jurisdiction of *the District of Columbia* is not within (inside) the Republic of these united States of America, it is *without* (outside) or external to the Republic. As such, it is a jurisdiction *foreign* to the Republic. This provides congress with a dual character. In one character they can make law for *the District* that is not limited by constitutional restraint. That is, the law's Congress makes for *the District* do not have to be constitutional in nature, they can be **un-Constitutional** and often this is the case. This fact is set forth in the Constitution...

"The Congress shall have power...**To exercise exclusive legislation** in all cases whatsoever, **over such district** (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful Buildings" - Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, Constitution for the united States

There are at least two important points to be garnered from this section. First, Congress may exercise *exclusive legislative authority* over *the District*, allowing them to make any law they wish for that jurisdiction, and two, that they have this same authority over any property owned by *the District of Columbia*, whether within in a State or otherwise. It is for this reason that I have been bolding *the District* in the text of this document. It is so that the reader begins to realize that *the District* is a *foreign jurisdiction*. Travelers should be cautious about carrying firearms into *National Monuments* (like Death Valley) and *National Parks* when traveling, those properties are owned by *the District*. *The District* is foreign to the Republic with its own body of laws separate from those of the Republic.

As already put forth, in the other character Congress can make laws for the republic of these united States of America. The lowercase “u” on “united” is not an oversight or accidental, it recognizes that the term “united” is an adjective.

*The Constitution* was signed in 1787, yet we declared our independence from England in 1776. During this eleven year period the several States had all functioned as *INDEPENDENT NATIONS*. The States were very jealous of this status for their people had fought hard and many had died to acquire this status. Consequently no State was going to sign or agree to any document, if that document took their *INDEPENDENT NATION STATUS* from them. Delegates to the Constitutional convention knew this. As a result *the Constitution* does not create a country, it *forms a Union*. A *Union* of several *independent nation States*.

WE THE PEOPLE of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect **Union...**  
(Constitution for the united States of America)

Again, the Constitution does not form a country, it forms a *Union*. Thus, the States retained their *independent nation status*. This is important because of *original citizenship*. Because the State was an independent nation, the original citizen of the Republic is the *State Citizen*. Any other form of citizenship is second class citizenship. It is only the individual who has not corrupted his citizenship that retains *sovereign capacity*.

Continuing with this concept of citizenship and its corruption, we find that in the 1860's President Lincoln issued the *Emancipation Proclamation* to supposedly *free the slaves*. If you were to research this I believe you will find that he issued this Proclamation, not out of compassion for the Slave, but as an effort to keep the French from entering the war on the side of the South. You will also find that the Northern States also have slavery, and slaves, but the Emancipation Proclamation only applied to the Southern States, where Lincoln had no authority, it did not apply to the Northern States. Although not taught by public schools when I attended, this Proclamation was struck down as *unconstitutional* by the Supreme Court.

This in turn became the driving force for the passage of the thirteenth amendment, which, when it passed, did free the slaves. However, the courts of the *white establishment* took the position that the *freed slave* had no ability to sustain *personna standi judicio* (no personal standing in the

court) for lack of citizenship. The courts recognized the Negro as a free human being, but not a citizen. And with no standing in court, the *freed slave* had no access to ***recourse and remedy*** within our courts. This meant that you could defraud him of everything he had worked for all his life, and he could not go to court for *recourse and remedy*.

Congress used this situation to further their goals by passing the *Civil Rights Act of 1866*. This act came under immediate constitutional challenge and as such, became the driving force for the passage of the fourteenth amendment in 1868. The fourteenth amendment provides citizenship for the freed slave.

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.” - [Fourteenth Amendment; Section I]

This language provided ***DUAL*** citizenship for the freed slave, making him a Citizen of the State (State Citizen), and a citizen of the United States. Logic suggests that there must be a difference between State Citizenship and United States citizenship or they would not go to the trouble to list them separately. There is a difference and it is this. United States citizenship owes its existence to ***the District of Columbia***. As such, that citizenship is attached to that *foreign* jurisdiction. Anyone who has citizenship attached to the jurisdiction of ***the District of Columbia*** would be subject to the un-constitutional laws that Congress passes for that jurisdiction. Perhaps now, it is becoming clear why the intelligence and knowledge of the general population must be reduced.

Proceeding, we observe that there are many cases in which Congress has passed law for ***the District***, of particular interest right now is a law passed in 1871 which says in part:

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**An act to provide a Government for the District of Columbia.**

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, That all that part of the territory of the United States included within the limits of the District of Columbia be, and the same is hereby, created into a government by the name of the District of Columbia, **by which name it is hereby constituted a body corporate for municipal purposes**, and may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, have a seal, and exercise all other powers of a municipal corporation not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States and the provisions of this act.

With this, *the District of Columbia* became a **CORPORATION**, municipal in nature, but still a corporation. With this Congress may pass *corporate laws* for this jurisdiction, and anyone subject to this jurisdiction would be subject to these *corporate laws*. The goal would be to convert as many *sovereign Citizens* as possible into this jurisdiction as Fourteenth Amendment citizens (lowercase "c") as opposed to Citizens (uppercase "C") in the organic Constitution. Since the *sovereign Citizen* has an unlimited capacity to *contract*, if he is sufficiently ignorant & uneducated, this capacity to contract can be used against him. Once in this jurisdiction, the former *sovereign Citizen* would be subject to any law Congress wishes to impose upon them through their contract. Here is some information the reader may find interesting.

"Had Lincoln's policy been implemented, America would have found its way out of its war debts. Just five days after General Lee [11] surrendered and Mr. Lincoln won his War, he was shot. Neither Mr. Lincoln nor any future President ever repealed the martial law instituted during the Civil War.

The Private Laws of the District of Columbia: In 1871, three years after the illegal ratification of the 14th Amendment, the government defaulted on its war debts, forcing America into bankruptcy.[12] What resulted is considered the death blow to the united States for America.[13] On February 21st, England claimed what was theirs, according to international law, and incorporated the ten mile square that is Washington D.C.[14]

England also incorporated the American Constitution and names for its new corporation, such as THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, U.S., and USA, as well as other titles, as declared in the District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871.[15] A point of interest in these copyrighted names is the implementation of the article "THE". Before this time, America was a union of "united States," not a union of "the united States". The article "the" doesn't exist when

referring to other countries, i.e. Canada and Britain aren't referred to as "the Canada" or "the Britain". The British-controlled Corporation, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, exclusively uses the article "the" in its name, which is distinct from the "united States" or the "United States". One other immense change to America simultaneously occurred: being a bankrupt nation, the united States retained only the power to settle civil disputes, not criminal matters, allowing room for the illusion that only Britain's private, ever-changing laws appertain to America's criminal disputes. British law literally attempted to fill the gap created by the bankruptcy without anyone knowing, making it appear that everything was going just as usual. Since this point in history, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA has been governed entirely by foreign, private, corporate law and Washington, D.C. has been under British control.

The UNITED STATES OF AMERICA is a corporation, whose jurisdiction is applicable only in the ten-mile-square parcel of land known as the District of Columbia and to whatever properties are legally titled to the UNITED STATES, by its registration in the corporate County, State, and Federal governments that are under military power of the UNITED STATES and its creditors." – [Economic History Ron Paul Wants Americans To Know](#)

Changing an individual's status to *Fourteenth Amendment citizen* was accomplished with the creation of **Social Security**. When you *voluntarily join Social Security*, you are entering into a **contract** with a *Federal Municipal Insurance Corporation* known as *Social Security*. When you *sign up*, you must declare your status to qualify for the *benefit(?)* offered. Because of public education we Americans do not distinguish any difference between **United States citizenship** and **State Citizenship**. I have already put forth that *United States citizenship* is citizenship within the jurisdiction of **the District of Columbia** and subject to its laws. But a definition of the term *United States* may be helpful.

"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]

I notice that this term (United States) and the above definition is missing from Black's seventh edition. As soon as we begin to learn, ways are found to keep us ignorant. And leaving out a definition this important is one of those ways.

As you can see there are three separate definitions. The first defining an individual *union state*, like Maine, or Massachusetts, or South Carolina, the second defining the *municipal corporate United States*. Because there are now two Constitutions, the third definition remains a little uncertain. Is the *organic Constitution* being reference, or is the *corporate Constitution* being referenced? If it is the organic Constitution then this definition refers to the *republic of these united States of America*.

To join Social Security and be eligible for its benefits, you must have the correct status. And so they have little boxes for you to check to identify your status. Because the public education



provided by our government Leadership does not allow us to distinguish between United States citizenship and State Citizenship, we check the box that says “United States citizen”. We then sign the form (contract) under penalty of perjury. We have now made a declaration at law, declaring ourselves to be United States citizens and subject to the laws of *the District of Columbia*. That jurisdiction in which they can make any law they want to abuse us. With our signature, we have just enslaved ourselves, or now, our children.

The question might arise, “If I were purely, and only, a State Citizen and not subject to the corporate laws of *the District*, how would I be able to determine corporate law from constitutional law?” Good question, and here is the answer. To begin, you need to know that law which is constitutional in nature is called **Positive Law**. Now, knowing this, you may go down to any law library and pick up a book of U. S. C. (United States Code) printed by the **government printing office** and not Bancroft Whitney or West Publishing or one of the other law book publishers. On two pages, you will find listed by name, all fifty U. S. Titles. Whenever Congress passes a law, it will find its way into one of these 50 U. S. Titles. As you look at the names, you will notice that some have an asterisk (\*) beside their name and some do not. When you look down at the bottom of the page to see what the asterisk means, it will say... “this Title has been passed as **Positive Law**”.

**Positive Law** Titles are passed in accordance with the constitution and its limitations, are constitutional in nature and apply to both Citizens of the Republic and citizens of *the District*. **Non-Positive Law** Titles are not passed in accordance with the constitution and its limitations, nor are they constitutional in nature. They are **corporate commercial law** and they apply to citizens whose citizenship is attached to the jurisdiction of *the District*.

Another method to identify corporate law vs. constitutional law is in the identifier. You may have noticed that when an Act is being set forth it contains an identification. For the House of Representatives it might be HR1234 and for the Senate the same measure might be SR5678. The ‘R’ stands for **Resolution**. This is **corporate law**. If it were constitutional law there would be no ‘R’ in the identifier. It would be H1234 for the House of Representatives and S5678 for the Senate.

Title 26, all of your IRS laws, are non-positive law. If we were purely a **State Citizen**, this would be a body of law to which we would not be subject (see [Sui Juris, Pardon me but... #5](#)). We would not be a tax-protestor, we would not be a tax-resistor, we would simply not be in the jurisdiction from which this law emanates. And not being subject to the jurisdiction, it follows that we are not subject to its laws. But because, with our signature on the Social Security application, **we have volunteered** into this jurisdiction in which Congress has made a law to abuse us and they take about 35% of our earnings if we are an *average* income earner.

There is now (March 13, 2012) more detail available on these matters in a document titled: “[The Core Problem](#)”, and may be accessed by clicking the blue link here.

## **States:**

Without going into a lot of detail, the “*Buck Act*” paved the way for the several States to become corporations, municipal in nature, under the laws of *the District of Columbia*, making them an *entity* of *the District* and subject to its jurisdiction. The *corporate State* then has essentially the same authority as *the District of Columbia* to make un-constitutional laws for all *United States citizens*. Again accomplished through fraud and deception for *the people* have never given the government the authority to regulate them, only residents (those whose citizenship is not within the Republic) and commercial enterprise. The only way they gain jurisdiction is through contract as already explained.

Well, this should give you some idea of where we stand and how deep the rabbit hole goes.

## **What should we do?**

As always, first educate ourselves and then share the knowledge with others. Bad things and bad people don’t survive long in the bright light of knowledge. **Educated juries can really begin to turn things around** by asking themselves if there is an *injured party* that is living. With knowledge we begin to challenge government to provide our *republican form of government*. If we were to do this, we might see the atheist-based democracy began to crack and fall apart. And please, I’m not promoting tax exempt 501(c)3 corporate churches as places to worship God. Corporations calling themselves churches have the same option as the individual, to be an *entity* of the republic under God’s law, or a corporation (Fourteenth Amendment Citizen) under man’s law. Today’s so-called churches have chosen the latter and abandoned God’s law for the *almighty dollar*.

School teachers, do you feel like teaching truth? You too could begin by teaching the differences in citizenship, the foundational principles of our Republic, the protections afforded by the organic Constitution (original constitution and Bill of Rights). You could teach that if we were to allow government to set aside just one RIGHT within the Bill of Rights, then we open the door to have them all set aside. You could teach about municipal corporations.

From the book *Law of Contracts* by John Calamari and Joseph Perillo we find that *valid contracts* must meet these six requirements:

1. Offer by a person qualified to make the contract.
2. Acceptance by party qualified to make and accept the contract.
3. Bargain or agreement and full disclosure and complete understanding by both parties.
4. Consideration given.
5. Must have the element of time to make the contract lawful.
6. Both parties must be sui juris; that is, of lawful age, usually 21 years old.

Ask yourself some basic questions. For example, when you joined Social Security did you even know that this was a contract? Was there full disclosure. In other words, did you know that you would be contracting yourself into a *foreign jurisdiction* and making yourself subject to its laws. Were you old enough to enter into a contract. Did two people sign the contract? Was there an

element of time? If the answer to any of these questions were NO, the contract is probably invalid.

## Clearfield Doctrine

"Governments descend to the Level of a mere private corporation, and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen...where private corporate commercial paper [Federal Reserve Notes] and securities [checks] is concerned. ... For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government." - Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 U.S. 363-371

What the Clearfield Doctrine is saying is that when private commercial paper [Federal Reserve Notes] is used by corporate government, then Government loses its sovereignty status and becomes no different than a mere private corporation and takes on the character of a mere private citizen. As such, government then becomes bound by the rules and laws that govern private corporations which means that if they intend to compel an individual to some specific performance based upon its corporate statutes or corporation rules, then the government, like any private corporation, must be the holder in due course of a contract or other commercial agreement between it and the one upon whom demands for specific performance are made and further, the government must be willing to enter the contract or commercial agreement into evidence before trying to get to the court to enforce its corporation demands, called statutes.

What do you think might occur the next time corporate government attacks you when there is no injured party, and you were to compose a letter to the agency from which the action originates, putting forth the Clearfield doctrine and demanding a copy of the document being held in *due course* that requires the specific performance which they are attempting to compel upon you? Suppose you sent the letter *Certified mail, return receipt requested* so as to have proof it was sent?

I'm going to offer a clue in dealing with government agencies in legal proceedings. Make your case before you get to court. If you do not, you will not be allowed to bring up salient arguments or points of law that you wish to make. ***You must pursue an administrative remedy, otherwise you will not be allowed to put forth your arguments in court.*** If you did not make demand upon the administrating agency, you are probably not going to be allowed to do so in court. You need to assert all your legal positions with the administrating agency (the agency from which the action against you originates) and make appropriate demands upon that agency to answer to your asserted legal positions. You will want response by ***someone with the legal authority to make such response***, not some clerk, and you would make this demand within your letter. You would also give them a time limit to respond, perhaps 60 days or perhaps a week prior to the court date. This means that you need to get busy immediately and not put it off. If you dilly-dally around, the court may perceive that you did not provide sufficient time for the agency to respond. If they fail to respond, this is admission your asserted legal position is valid, the same as if you fail to respond

to their court summons. If you fail to show up in court, the court will automatically find against you. You may also benefit from reading "[The Belligerent Claimant](#)".

"To be smart is easy... you start by being stupid. When you're stupid others will show you what you need to know. It's when you know everything that you remain stupid. Never be afraid to be stupid and ask questions." - Michael H. Keehn