

Appendix E - Caveat's

Caveat #1 - Money

Not surprising, things change as we begin to learn. I just picked up a 7th edition of *Black's Law Dictionary*, and I see that the definition of **Money** has changed. The fact that it has been redefined in this edition allows me to make a point. Let me present definitions from both Black's 6th and 7th editions so that they may be compared.

money. In the usual and ordinary acceptance it means coins and paper currency used as circulating medium of exchange, and does not embrace notes, bonds, evidences of debt, or other personal or real estate. - Blacks Law Dictionary, *Sixth Edition*.

money. **1.** The medium of exchange authorized or adopted by a government as part of its currency <coins and currency are money>. UCC § 1-201(24). **2.** Assets that can be easily converted to cash <demand deposits are money>. **3.** Capital that is invested or traded as a commodity <the money market> **4.** (*pl.*) Funds; sums of money <investment moneys>. — Also spelled (in sense 4) *monies*. See MEDIUM OF EXCHANGE, LEGAL TENDER.

current money. Money that circulates throughout a country; currency.

fiat money. Paper currency not backed by gold or silver. — Also termed *flat money*.

hard money. **1.** Coined money, in contrast to paper currency. **2.** Cash

lawful money. Money that is legal tender for the payment of debts.

paper money. Paper documents that circulate as currency; bills drawn by a government against its own credit.

real money. **1.** Money that has metallic or other intrinsic value, as distinguished from paper currency, checks, and drafts. **2.** Current cash, as opposed to money on account. - Blacks Law Dictionary, *Seventh Edition*

The immediate observation is that the new definition includes *Federal Reserve Notes* as a form of money, whereas the definition from Black's Sixth, excludes *Federal Reserve Notes* as money. There is an excellent point being made here, it is simply this. A corporation, such as the Federal Government, may make any law it wishes to make. They can change the rules to suit their desired outcome. If they so choose, they can define **Elephant Excrement** as money and it will be recorded as such in Black's Law Dictionary. But thank you Black's, you still have done your job if one is awake enough to see.

fiat money. Paper currency not backed by gold or silver. — Also termed *flat money*. - Blacks Law Dictionary (*Seventh Edition*)

And looking up the term **fiat**.

fiat. *n.* [Latin “let it be done”] **1.** An order or decree, esp. an arbitrary one <judicial fiat>. - Black’s Law Dictionary - *Seventh Edition*

From this we see that *fiat money* is a simple arbitrary decision to call something money. Like I said, they could call *elephant excrement* money if they so choose... it’s an arbitrary decision.

Black’s comes through a second time... good for you Black’s.

lawful money. Money that is legal tender for the payment of debts. - Black’s Law Dictionary, *Seventh Edition*

Referring back to chapter six of **Perceptions**:

From the Emergency Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933, Title 4, we read:

"Upon the deposit with the Treasurer of the United States; (a) any direct obligation of the United States; (b) any notes, drafts, bills of exchange or bankers acceptances acquired under the provisions of this act, that any Federal Reserve Bank making such deposits in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall be entitled to receive from the Comptroller of the Currency, circulating notes in blank, duly registered and countersigned."

- (a) public debt OR
- (b) private debt

Here we see the authorization to issue the new currency and how it is to be issued. We see the security backing the currency is debt, both public and private. This legislation was **Emergency Legislation** and read from the clerk's desk since the Congressmen did not have a copy. When you are trying to stampede Congress, you certainly would not want them to have a copy of a pending legislation ahead of time so that they could educate themselves and be prepared for true debate. We might also notice that this language authorizes **currency**, not **money**. There is a difference.

This excerpt is a verbatim copy and is based on the definition put forth in Black’s Sixth Edition. But the premise here asserted still holds by virtue of the **lawful money** definition... “*money that is legal tender for debt’s.*” Ask yourself this question, “can you retire or discharge a debt with a debt?” Answer... of course not. Since *Federal Reserve Notes* are issued upon the acquisition of debt, then they are backed by debt. They are a **debt currency**. Since we can not discharge or

retire a debt with a debt, this excludes *Federal Reserve Notes* as **lawful money**.

And Black's comes through yet one more time... way to go Black's.

real money. **1.** Money that has metallic or other intrinsic value, as distinguished from paper currency, checks, and drafts. **2.** Current cash, as opposed to money on account. - Blacks Law Dictionary, *Seventh Edition*

Federal Reserve Notes have no intrinsic value and are a *paper currency*, ergo, not **real money**.

It is important to keep in mind that corporate government can make and change **corporate laws** as they see fit to achieve their control and enslavement goals. But when congress passes laws for the **Representative Republic** known as **the united States of America**, those laws must pass constitutional muster. As you learned in chapter seven on *State Citizenship*, you get to make a choice whether you wish to subject yourself to the changing corporate law or whether you wish to be subject to the fair and just laws of the Representative Republic. However, if you choose to live your life under the corporate laws, do not cry and whine when its your ox that gets gored. You get the whole package. You don't pick and choose.

Caveat #2 - United States

Again we are dealing with a definition from Black's Law Dictionary. And as above, we should list definitions from both the sixth and seventh editions for comparison.

“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]

This definition actually defines three separate **United States**. The third definition clearly defines the Republic when it states, “or it may be collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution.” In the seventh edition, the term **United States** no longer is listed as such. There is now a listing for **United States of America**. You can almost bet that when they do this, someone is trying to trick somebody. Let's take a look.

United States of America. A federal republic formed after the War for Independence and made up of 48 conterminous states, plus the state of Alaska and the District of Columbia in North America, plus the state of Hawaii in the Pacific.

Notice that this defines a *Federal Republic* when our constitution establishes a *Representative Republic*. This new definition is defining the corporate United States and makes no reference to the *Representative Republic* as does the definition in Black's Sixth Edition. First thing to notice is that the *District of Columbia* is included in the definition. **The District** is a State alright, just as Israel is a **STATE**, but neither one are a *State of the Union* united by and under the Constitution for the Republic of the United States of America. This is probably the most predominant indication that this definition is of the *corporate United States*. Remember, **the District** is a jurisdiction outside the Republic, it is exclusive... not inclusive. If it were inclusive or inside the jurisdiction of the Republic, its laws would have to pass constitutional muster. That is to say their laws would have to be constitutional. But, by making this a jurisdiction outside the Republic, there are no constitutional restraints upon the laws of this jurisdiction. Thus they can declare *elephant excrement* to be money if they so choose.

You may also notice that it says, "*formed after the War for Independence*". This is true, so was the **STATE OF ISRAEL**. The Corporate United States, created by the Act passed in 1871 (nearly one hundred years *AFTER* the *War for Independence*) and found at *16 United States Statutes at Large 419* was indeed created *AFTER* the War for Independence. It is important to notice, in this definition, that they are not saying that the *United States of America* was formed *BY* the *War for Independence* nor by the Constitution signed in 1787, but was formed *AFTER* the *War for Independence*. By virtue of this suggestive choice of words, they lead the ordinary reader to believe that this definition refers to a *United States* established by the *war for independence* when it does not.

The more intelligent and informed the American People become, the more effort that will be put into confusing them. Stay on top and pay close attention to the wording. The definition put forth in Black's Sixth and earlier editions must not be forgotten.

Caveat #3 - Arrest... U.S. citizen

If you don't yet know the difference between a corporate citizen and a Citizen of the Republic, you need to read *Perceptions* or *Sui Juris... pardon me but #5*.

Suppose you were stopped by a Highway Patrol Officer, how could you proceed? First, you have a right to remain silent. You don't have to talk to him. He might arrest you, and that's fine, but he will not have a case. What's the charge going to be? *He didn't talk? He didn't answer my questions?* Well, **HE** don't have to.

But suppose you do choose to talk with the officer. As Ron White puts it, "*I had the right to remain silent, but... I didn't have the ability.*" And so this officer wants to see your drivers license. You might respond, "*if I had such a document could it be used in a court of law against me?*" He might say, "*I just need it for identification.*" A lie... he needs it to proceed against you, to put you in his jurisdiction. You respond, "*that's fine, then you won't mind signing a statement*

that anything I provide will not be used in court against me?” Angry, he states, “I don’t have to sign anything?” Politely you say to him, “Officer, I’m not trying to antagonize you, I’m just attempting to secure my rights under the fifth amendment not to become a witness against myself nor to incriminate myself in any action that government or one of its agents may be going to take against me. So I’m asking you to help me secure the rights you are sworn to uphold and provide me with a signed statement that anything I provide you will not be used against me in a court of law.”

Notice that you have not refused to provide that for which he is asking... its very important that you do not refuse to provide that for which he is asking for if you are a licensed driver, you are obligated to give this to him by contract, but not before you secure your rights. And you have a right to not incriminate yourself and this right comes above and before his right to see your license.

It is most likely he will not sign anything, for to do so will nullify any citation he may issue. But if he does sign a document, then he can not use your license as a proof of your contractual obligation to perform to whatever issue is put upon your citation. If the court in which you find yourself is not criminal itself and you have prepared and presented your case well, then the matter will be dismissed.

Let’s talk a moment about preparing your defense. The citation is an affidavit, signed under penalty of perjury by the police officer. If you attempt to go into court and make your case orally (verbally), you will loose. Why? Because a signed affidavit will generally stand over any oral argument. So the first thing you must do in preparation of your case is to compose your own affidavit of facts. That is those facts surrounding the incident in which you received the citation. And you must also sign your affidavit under penalty of perjury and that must be so stated on the affidavit. “Signed under penalty of perjury Your Name . After composition, you would file your affidavit with the court clerk under your case number.

Next, you might compose a letter to the Highway Patrol CEO. That is the person who is in charge of which ever police agency issued the citation. In the *United States v. Clearfield Trust Co.* (known as the Clearfield Doctrine), the supreme court ruled that in using private commercial paper (*Federal Reserve Notes*) and securities (*checks*) Government loses its sovereignty status and becomes no different than a mere private corporation. 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 demands, called statutes (page 146 in *Perceptions*). After a study of the Clearfield decision, you might make a demand upon the CEO of the Highway Patrol for the *document being held in due course that requires the specific performance set forth in citation number such&such*.

You would send the letter *Certified Mail*. When you received a return receipt, you might photo copy it and put it with a photo copy of the letter sent and file this with the court clerk under your case number. Of course the Highway Patrol is not going to respond to your letter, and that's good, for that becomes evidence that they do not hold such a contract signed by you. If they try to hold you accountable to anything you may have signed when you applied for your license then you would bring the six elements of a valid contract into play (page 174 in *Perceptions*). Make certain all your communications are by certified mail.

In regards to being stopped by a police office who wants to test you for intoxication. You have the same right not to be compelled to become a witness against yourself or to incriminate yourself in any action government may be contemplating against you. Your bodily fluids (breath, blood, etc.) are private, as are your finger prints and you may secure a signed statement that *any information garnered or gathered from testing any of your bodily fluids will not be used in court against you*. By doing this you **have not refused to provide the bodily fluids for testing**. It's very important that you do not refuse. Your goal is to secure your rights before doing so and once those rights are secured you will happily provide bodily fluids for testing. But, of course, once you have a signed statement, anything they discover as a result of testing your bodily fluids can not be used against you in court. Remember, you can't be stupid and free at the same time. Nor can you be a coward and free. You can only be a stupid and/or cowardly and enslaved.

Caveat #4 - State Citizen; Court Appearance

It is assumed that the reader has already read *Perceptions* and/or *Sui Juris, pardon me but... #5* and has an understanding of State Citizenship v. United States citizenship. That as a State Citizen, you have no contractual obligation or attachment to the laws of corporate government, being only subject to the Constitutional law of the Republic. That you would travel in your car without a *drivers license*, that there would be no *current registration* on your car, nor would there be *license plates* on your car, that you would have *no taxable income*, that you would not be subject to *draft laws*, and a host of other corporate law.

Having the status of State Citizen (Sui Juris) places one at risk. If you were to have a child and refuse a *birth certification* (birth certificate) and *social security number*, this would make the child a State Citizen (sui juris), and not subject to the laws of a corporation known as the STATE OF TEXAS, or the STATE OF CALIFORNIA, or the STATE OF YOUNAMEIT. This individual now represents a threat to the corporate government for it holds a status superior to them. An individual who holds such a status has a great potential to show others how to be free and I suspect that this is something that government may not be able to tolerate. Governments

sui juris. ADJ. (*Latin*) of one's own right; *emancipated*; of legal age; having the right to handle one's own affairs and not under the legal control of anyone else. - *The Essential Law Dictionary*; ISBN 0-7607-3950-1

goal is total control of every aspect of your life... total enslavement. A society where *'they'* own every second of your productivity. And slowly but surely they have been accomplishing this... average income earners now have to work to near the end of May to pay the cost of government. Now comes a State Citizen, living free of their control and keeping everything they earn, traveling in their car without *their license* to do so, adding on to their home without *their permits*, and by example showing others how to do the same. This places the entire power structure in jeopardy.

I suspect that corporate government may do everything in its power to *squash* this State Citizen. In court, if possible, where it becomes visible to others who are thinking about reclaiming their freedom. We certainly have evidence of this in various court cases, which brings us to the meat of the caveat.

We have heard it said that we have a right to a trial by a *jury of our peers*. What the constitution actually says is:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed...

“By an impartial jury...” What do you think might be an *impartial jury*? Do you think it would be a jury composed of citizens from a foreign jurisdiction? NO, of course not! Citizens of a foreign jurisdiction would not necessarily understand your status as purely and only a State Citizen. To complicate matters further, their *foreign status* may subject them to a huge body of corporate law, that you, as a State Citizen, are not subject. Yet, they might be biased in their decision, thinking that if they are subject to these corporate laws, then you should be also. Therefore, how do you get a just and *impartial* judgement from this jury? Clearly, you can not! That's why the framers of the Constitution for the united States of America seen fit to provide that you shall have an *impartial jury* to sit in judgement. For the State Citizen, this would mean a jury composed of men of the same status and subject to the same jurisdiction as himself and no other jurisdiction... that is all State Citizens who are Sui Juris and have no citizenship attached to a *foreign* (District of Columbia) jurisdiction.

If you are a State Citizen who finds himself in court, insist on this right guaranteed in *your Constitution*. United States citizens may not insist on this right for they have contracted to make themselves subject to corporate law, but the individual who is purely a State Citizen can. United States citizens have things they can do to protect themselves as put forth in caveat #3, but it takes some study and effort.

Caveat #5 - Demurrer; A method of pleading

A scenario: Two men show up at your door one evening and take you into custody for knowingly and intentionally driving a car in California without a Kentucky drivers license. I know this is a reach, but there is a point worth knowing so bear with me. Tomorrow, you show up in court facing a charge of knowingly and intentionally driving a car in California without a Kentucky drivers license, how do you plead?

Guilty? - you're going to jail!

Not Guilty? - you're going to jail! Why? Because of your pleading.

You must remember that the court is a place of doing business and you have had a *civil contract charge* brought against you. A *case* is an accusation that places a **question** before the court. And it is the purpose of the court proceedings to answer this **question**. Did you speed? Did you drive without a license? Did you fail to have current registration on your car? Did you murder this person? The court is going to find an answer to the question set forth by the pleading.

When you pleaded **not guilty** to the above charge you told the court that this was the **question** to answer. Now the trial is in progress and you are on the witness stand. The prosecution asks if you did in fact drive a car in California and you answer yes, you did. Then the prosecution asks if you have a valid Kentucky Drivers License and you respond, "*but your honor (or ladies and gentlemen of the jury), I'm not a person required to have a valid Kentucky Drivers License!*"

"Objection" says the prosecutor, "*goes beyond the scope of the pleading*".

"Objection sustained" says the judge, "*the witness will confine himself to the questions posed to him by the prosecutor.*"

And so you answer, "No, I do not have a valid Kentucky Drivers License" and so off to jail you go.

But suppose you pleaded in demurrer instead of *not guilty*? "Pleaded what" you say! Let's look at the definition...

demur: v. to object to a point of law or fact alleged by the opposing party on the grounds that it does not advance the interests of the party making the statement; to present a *demurrer*.- *The Essential Law Dictionary; ISBN 0-7607-3950-1*

demurrer: N. (*French*): to stop; at common law, a formal allegation by a defendant that the facts stated in the complaint are true but nevertheless are not legally sufficient to allow the case to proceed, and requesting judgement for the defendant and dismissal of the cause of action; the use of demurrer has mostly disappeared under the *Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*. - *The Essential Law Dictionary*; ISBN 0-7607-3950-1

“Mostly disappeared”, but not completely. Because there are still State Citizens who have access to the law of the Republic... the **common law**. Essentially, a demurrer pleading is saying, “*yeah, I drove a car in California without a valid Kentucky Drivers License... so what?*” To continue we now have to get down to the *so what* part of the demurrer pleading. If it is established that there is insufficient grounds to continue, the case is wisely dismissed.

The individual should remember that not everyone in government is against you. There are still some honorable people in government who will do what they can to help you, who are covertly on *your team*. So don't treat everyone in government like they are the enemy... they're not. Many of them can also see the criminal activity of government and they take stands, sometimes at great risk to their jobs and future, to stand up for what is right. Let us not forget that the dishonorable Bill Clinton fired all United States Attorney's. Could it be because as a collective force they were unwilling to engage in unlawful and criminal behavior by corporate government against the American people? Probably! These are learned and honorable people who have risked much and lost much to try and protect you. Develop a little back bone and stand up. Challenge the authority of corporate government. Understand that many people died at the beginning to give you the rights contained in the **organic Constitution** and **Bill of Rights**.

If America is to avoid the armed confrontation or the complete enslavement and subjection planned for them, the only hope to win without great loss of life is education and knowledge. Do we think that a military or police force would become the willing tools of an enslaving government if they knew and understood what has been put forth in **Perceptions** and other fine documents available for review? Only if they are criminal themselves! This is why it is so important that teachers begin doing their jobs and **educate**. Not just continue to distribute the pablum set forth in **government approved curriculum**. Teachers, if you fail to do your job, I suspect that many defenders of freedom are going to die because of your failure. And yes, I recognize that you too may be at risk but many people have been so on your behalf.

**In a time of
tyranny, telling
the truth is a
treason. How
treasonous do
you feel?**

If we continue to remain un-educated, un-knowing, un-caring and un-willing to wake up, then I suspect that many people will ultimately die to defend their constitution from all enemies, both foreign **and domestic**. If we wake up and become educated, or if the defenders of the constitution are ultimately successful, then you retain freedom, otherwise you loose your freedom. What do you choose?

Quotes:

None are so hopelessly enslaved as those who falsely believe that they are free." Johann Wolfgang von Goethe

If you're not paranoid, then you're not paying attention!!!

Truth is called Hate by those who Hate the Truth.

The attempt to silence a man is the greatest honor you can bestow on him. It means that you recognize his superiority to yourself. — Joseph Sobran