

PERCEPTIONS

(Complete update October 12, 2008)
(Cosmetic updated February 22, 2017)
(Proofread & recompiled November 4, 2017)

by Michael H. Keehn

mhkeehn@lycos.com

v 171103

Dedicated to
those whose hearts
seek freedom

Children of tomorrow

Children of tomorrow
I apologize to you
On behalf of those in my time
For the things we didn't do
We didn't stop the tyrants
So your fate could be prevented
We watched them steal our freedom
By our silence we consented
We didn't choose to circumvent
The doom you've not escaped
While the 'BILL of RIGHTS' was murdered
And the 'CONSTITUTION' raped
Some of us were lazy
Others too afraid
To think about our children
The ones we have betrayed
I guess we were too busy
To be concerned or care
To try to ease the burden
Of the chains we made you wear
We could have been good shepherds
When the wolf got in the fold
But we watched the flame of freedom die instead
And left you cold
We changed our great republic
Which was forged in liberty
To a socialistic welfare state
We laughingly call democracy
I'm sorry we were timid
My selfish generation
We left but a remnant
Of a free and prosperous nation
I'm sorry for our actions
Like cowards we behaved
We could have left you freedom
Instead you are enslaved
Children of tomorrow
Descendants of our land
I'm sorry we allowed this
The fate you now withstand
(Author - unknown)

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1.	Page 1
INTRODUCTION.	Page 1
As we begin.	Page 1
By what method?..	Page 1
A preempting apology....	Page 3
Formal Publication.	Page 4
Abbreviations.	Page 4
The Misspelled Worid..	Page 4
Acquired Knowledge..	Page 4
Education v. truth.	Page 5
Fleeing from the truth.	Page 5
"Are you free?".	Page 7
Freedom..	Page 7
License..	Page 8
Control..	Page 8
The Herd.	Page 9
DISCLAIMER..	Page 10
CHAPTER 2.	Page 11
AUTHORITARIANISM	Page 11
Obedience to authority	
.....	Page 15
Code Enforcers.	Page 16
The Educators.	Page 17
Thinking in unison..	Page 18
John Dewey.	Page 19
The Teacher/Spy.	Page 19
Code Enforcer behaviors ... Weaver.	Page 20
Weaver Trial ... Day 26.	Page 21
Gordon Kahl & Sheriff Gene Mathews..	Page 22
The Farmer - Guilty of Environmental Crimes..	Page 23
Those not affected.	Page 25
CHAPTER 3.	Page 27
ABSOLUTE POWER CORRUPTS ABSOLUTELY.	Page 27
One of many problems.	Page 27
Difference Between War and Law Enforcement:..	Page 28
Psychologically Profiling the Sheeple..	Page 28
Redefinition of Words..	Page 29
Everybody's Satan.	Page 29
How Political Opposition Was Neutralized..	Page 29
The Role of the Press..	Page 30

Technology.	Page 31
The pretext of a raid.	Page 32
Assault based on allegations.	Page 33
Who shot first.	Page 33
Not an Ambush.	Page 35
Blind Fire.	Page 35
Entry of Agents into Second Story Window.	Page 36
Killed by Expert Marksmen.	Page 36
Death of ATF Agents Necessary for Escalation of War.	Page 37
A Helicopter Attack.	Page 38
A Davidian child drew	Page 38
Eyewitness Statements.	Page 40
Death of Jaydean Wendel.	Page 40
Attorney Inspection of Building.	Page 40
Unmarked US Army Helicopters Used.	Page 41
Historical Perspective.	Page 42
Are we proud?.	Page 42
Negotiations.	Page 45
Civilian Head of FBI Told to Take a Walk.	Page 45
First Amendment Canceled.	Page 45
Tanks.	Page 46
Grenades:.	Page 46
Electricity Turned Off.	Page 47
Radio, TV Signals Jammed.	Page 47
Morse Code Signals Jammed.	Page 48
Mind Manipulation Experiments.	Page 49
Davidian child, Mt. Carmel Doe 51A.	Page 50
Melissa Morrison before she was rescued.	Page 51
Mt. Carmel.	Page 51
Mellisa Morrison after she had been rescued.	Page 52
Ruby Ridge.	Page 54
April 23, 1997 - John Hirko.	Page 55
Returning from the tangent.	Page 57
 CHAPTER 4.	 Page 58
LAW & IT'S PERVERSION.	Page 58
Natural Law.	Page 59
Law Defined.	Page 62
Individual right.	Page 62
Lawful Defense.	Page 63
A trip back in time.	Page 64
THE COLLECTIVE RIGHT & THE COMMON FORCE.	Page 65
CONFERRING POWER & AUTHORITY.	Page 67
A warning.	Page 67
USE OF LAWFUL FORCE.	Page 68

HOLDING EACH OTHER ACCOUNTABLE.	Page 69
CORRUPTION OF THE COMMON FORCE.	Page 71
Color of law.	Page 76
Detecting Perverted Law.	Page 76
Plunder.	Page 78
Example of perverted law.	Page 79
The proper function of law.	Page 80
Destructive change.	Page 81
The perception of Law.	Page 81
Allowing yourself to be corrupted.	Page 83
The Jury.	Page 83
Methods of Legal Plunder.	Page 84
Legal Theft Defined.	Page 84
Bodies of Law.	Page 85
Who's responsible?.	Page 85
SOCIALISM:.	Page 87
ATTORNEY & CLIENT.	Page 90
Represent yourself?.	Page 90
Attorney Considerations.	Page 90
Growth Industries.	Page 91
Vermin - by Paul Harvey.	Page 91
Michael H. Brown.	Page 92
HOW JURY NULLIFICATION STARTED.	Page 93
QUAKERS ON TRIAL.	Page 94
GUILTY?.	Page 95
NO VERDICT!.	Page 95
WE WILL NEVER YIELD OUR RIGHTS!.	Page 96
NOT GUILTY!!..	Page 96
MY LIBERTY IS NOT FOR SALE!!..	Page 97
ACQUITTAL BY JURY - ABSOLUTE.	Page 98
HOW JURY TRIAL ORIGINATED.	Page 98
TODAY'S JURY.	Page 99
THE GREAT SANHEDRIN.	Page 100
Magna Carta.	Page 101
Summary.	Page 103
 CHAPTER 5.	Page 104
PUBLIC EDUCATION.	Page 104
John Dewey.	Page 104
ABSOLUTE EDUCATION versus RELATIVE EDUCATION.	Page 106
Accountability.	Page 109
The Voucher.	Page 110
Tightening the thumb screws.	Page 111
Home Education.	Page 111
A REMINDER.	Page 113

ACTS HAVE NO CONSEQUENCES.	Page 113
Dr. George Counts..	Page 114
REACH FOR THAT POWER.	Page 115
An Educational Question:..	Page 115
CHAPTER 6.	Page 118
WAR & EMERGENCY POWERS.	Page 118
War & Emergency Powers in a nutshell.	Page 118
The Big Picture.	Page 119
CONSPIRACY?.	Page 120
War & Emergency Powers in depth!..	Page 121
EMERGENCY.	Page 122
THE HOOVER PAPERS.	Page 122
Roosevelt’s Inaugural Speech.	Page 123
Governors Conference..	Page 124
Asterisk, Asterisk, Asterisk ***.	Page 125
The Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933.	Page 126
Rule of necessity.	Page 127
TITLE I.	Page 128
Of whom are we talking?.	Page 128
A Dictator?.	Page 129
Delegated Powers.	Page 129
Enemy.	Page 131
The New Currency.	Page 132
The new WAR currency authorization.	Page 133
The <i>Money Trap</i> and how it works.	Page 134
Public Debt.	Page 134
Money Caveat.	Page 136
Orchestration (a conspiracy?).	Page 139
Agricultural Adjustment Act.	Page 139
POLICY OF CONGRESS v. LAW.	Page 140
THE SUPREME COURT.	Page 140
The Court now says:.	Page 141
Charges by Congressman McFadden.	Page 142
FRB ORIGINS.	Page 143
SOURCE OF THE EMERGENCY.	Page 144
SENATE HEARINGS.	Page 147
Does the Emergency Continue Today?..	Page 148
The New Rules.	Page 149
The Rapid:.	Page 149
The Julia:.	Page 150
The Sally:.	Page 150
The Rapid:.	Page 151
The William Bagaley:.	Page 151
THE PUBLIC GOOD.	Page 152

Supreme Court.....	Page 153
OTHER HISTORICAL FACTS OF INTEREST.....	Page 153
THE CHANGE IN OUR LEGAL SYSTEM.....	Page 154
Clearfield Doctrine.....	Page 155
A little more enlightenment.....	Page 157
Are you being attacked by the IRS?.....	Page 158
Terminating the EMERGENCY.....	Page 158
Senator Church.....	Page 159
Department of Justice.....	Page 159
Occupation of the Land.....	Page 160
Emergency Powers Conclusion.....	Page 160
Birth Certification Bond.....	Page 161
CHAPTER 7.....	Page 165
STATE CITIZEN.....	Page 165
Understanding the evolvement of American Citizenship.....	Page 166
Exclusive Legislative Authority.....	Page 167
The Dual Character of Congress.....	Page 167
United States defined.....	Page 170
Enfranchisement.....	Page 172
The Buck Act.....	Page 173
W8.....	Page 174
Explaining the W8.....	Page 175
How we Change Our Citizenship Status.....	Page 175
Specific Performance.....	Page 176
U.S. TITLES.....	Page 177
Positive Law.....	Page 178
A side issue.....	Page 180
Returning from the side issue.....	Page 181
Natural Person.....	Page 182
Unalienable Rights.....	Page 183
Artificial Person.....	Page 184
Person.....	Page 184
Law of Contracts.....	Page 187
Concession of a King's rights.....	Page 189
A Little History.....	Page 189
Source of United States authority.....	Page 190
an old printing.....	Page 192
The Make Believe Christian.....	Page 194
District Churches.....	Page 194
More Declaration of Independence insights.....	Page 195
TRAPS.....	Page 199
ODDS AND ENDS.....	Page 203
Additional information.....	Page 206
Marriage and Children.....	Page 209

Misc.....	Page 212
Slaughter House Cases.	Page 212
Particular 'rights, privileges, and immunities'..	Page 212
A Federal Area?..	Page 217
Employment.	Page 217
Real Estate.....	Page 219
A FLY IN THE OINTMENT.	Page 219
Due Process.....	Page 220
Review.....	Page 223
Political Maxim:.....	Page 225
 CHAPTER 8.	 Page 227
RANDOM TOPICS.	Page 227
FORM OF GOVERNMENT.....	Page 227
TREATIES.	Page 228
A FEW MORE THOUGHTS ABOUT CHILDREN.	Page 229
Abortion.....	Page 231
Welfare.	Page 232
INDIRECT WELFARE.....	Page 234
LAW SUITS.	Page 234
Jurassic Park.	Page 235
<u>A little background on corporations....</u>	Page 236
Inflation.....	Page 236
Military - Combat Arms Survey.	Page 237
29 Palms Marine Questionnaire.	Page 238
Combat Arms Survey	Page 239
Part I. Demographics.	Page 239
Part II. Attitudes.....	Page 240
Gun Ownership.	Page 245
ONLY BELLIGERENTS HAVE RIGHTS.	Page 247
IF ONE WHY NOT ALL.	Page 247
Educated Warriors.....	Page 248
Freedom isn't free.....	Page 250
CONCLUSION:.....	Page 250
Your Vote.	Page 251
 Chapter 9.	 Page 252
THE FUTURE.	Page 252
Last bean theory.	Page 252
 APPENDIX A - References.....	 Page 255
 APPENDIX B - More on flags.	 Page 258
 APPENDIX C - An understanding of the Buck Act.	 Page 264

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

As we begin

Before we get to meat of this document and the material it contains, I feel that I need to prep the reader a little. This work will contain knowledge, facts, and ideas that will seem a little foreign to the average reader, simply because of our education process. Generally speaking, we Americans may be fairly well educated and skilled to perform a particular task, but for the most part we are not taught to think and analyze. We are not shown how to truly research. This document will not contain the ordinary baby food that the 'Main Stream Media' feeds the American public. You will be challenged to think, and to confirm that which you doubt. With that, I think we may begin.

By what method?

A difficult question. We Americans are such an inept people in a political sense. Many if not most Americans are completely indifferent to politics and politicians. Yet, I believe that what is going on in the political arena is ultimately going to cost us our country and freedom if it continues. If we Americans continue to be apathetic, acting like children, waiting for our 'government parent' to take care of us, then we have abandoned the sacrifices of the people who founded America. Sacrifices in property, fortunes and the many lives lost. By doing nothing and waiting to be taken care of by government, we are relegating the sacrifices and deaths of those who gave us freedom, to insignificance. Our cavalier attitude seems to be... 'sure, you can die for my freedom - then watch me lay down like a sheep and squander it.'

While other peoples of the world are politically aware, we are not. Many people of other countries know that if Americans allow their Constitution to be set aside, then not only do Americans lose their freedom, but their lives become more at risk. Without the constitutional potential to restrain the actions of the UNITED STATES government, as currently directed by the *global elite*, the lives and resources of the entire world are at risk. Those who are exercising control of our psyche are constantly finding rationale to use our military in other countries under a guise that most Americans will accept. In truth and in fact we use our military to establish the government our leadership desires in most any country, followed by suppression of the people, who inhabit that country. We install whatever government suits our purpose and then use that government to strip the country of its natural resources.

May we remember that it was America who installed Castro in Cuba? Do we remember that it was America who supported the 'Shaw of Iran', trained his secrete police to brutalize his own people, and financed his operations... all for oil. Did we not use the Kuwait invasion by Iraq as a vehicle to install American forces in the middle east *to protect vital American interests (the oil)*.

Diverting from that for just a moment. Does anyone remember the ‘Volstead Act’? It established prohibition. The goal of the American Oil Cartel, was to solidify or perfect their monopoly over automotive and heating fuels. They did not want the farmers producing cheap alcohol fuels, undermining the profits of their oil based fuels. As such, the American Oil Moguls lobbied and bought off whatever politician was necessary to acquire the passage of the Volstead Act, making alcohol illegal. They knew ahead of time that the act would ultimately be overturned, but the secondary goal was to have a large Federal Police Force in place by that time. And so we have the legacy of the Bureau of Alcohol And Tobacco (BATF). As years have gone by, research would prove that the badges of the Bureau of Alcohol and Tobacco (BATF) tie them to an extortion and money laundry racket domiciled in Puerto Rico, hiding behind the defunct Prohibition laws. "Treasury Department" history. In the end, the petroleum cartel conspired to outlaw alcohol, perfect their monopoly in automotive fuels, and in the process fielded a large federal police force which stayed when Prohibition was repealed. A fairly successful strategy to pull the wool over the eyes of the American sheeple.

Leaving our diversion behind, we return to remembering our participation in this world. Have we (America) not been involved in politics at the end of a gun barrel for a long time now, including South America? We have been undermining governments, undermining societies, religions, beliefs, values... all over the world. Yet, not one Main Stream Media source asks the question: “What have we been doing to the people of this world that so many of them want to cause us harm?”

If you do ask the question, you are likely to be told that ‘they are jealous’ of what Americans have. Nonsense. That is pablum (baby food) for idiots. Do you get up in the morning and decide that you are going to go kill your neighbor because he has a nicer home and car than you do? Do you see the nonsense here? In so many ways the people of this world know that their well being is tied to America and its well being.

Questions:

1. Can you name one country the United States has militarily entered since the close of World War II that we have left as a “representative republic”, the form of government our constitution mandates for the united States of America?
2. Can you name one country the United States has militarily entered since the close of World War II that we have not left as a dictatorship or similar form of totalitarian government?

And so, now we are down to the problem. Your home has a time bomb in it but how do I communicate this to you? If you have no interest in your home (country), I have a most challenging task. I know that there will probably be changes (losses) that are going to negatively affect your life but how do I get you to consider them. I might remind you about the loss of all your family pictures and heirlooms (the freedom to work at what ever occupation suits you and live where you like), but if this means nothing to you it is doubtful that you are going to mount an attempt to locate and neutralize the time bomb (educate yourself, then your family and friends), especially if you think I'm a nut case. I might suggest that you check the house (country) for your children and evacuate them (put them beyond the reach of government) but if there is no care or concern about your family, it is doubtful that this will motivate you, especially

if it means that you will have to forego watching Monday night football, sailing your sail boat, fishing, drinking beer, trying to get someone pregnant, trying to get pregnant, sewing, gossiping, shopping, riding your motorcycle, playing Mr. Macho, playing Miss (Ms. Or Mrs.) Madonna or one of the other countless and meaningless ways that we fill our lives. Maybe if I suggest that there is a good chance that you are going to die in this fire (do you think biological terrorism is happening by accident), perhaps this will motivate you.

The problem is that if you do not believe there is a danger, I may very well be ignored to a point where it is too late to save you or your loved ones. So how do I communicate with my apathetic fellow American? I have knowledge and information to share that clearly indicates that there is indeed a looming danger to you and your loved ones. But if you are not willing to be responsible, not willing to be mature, not willing to be an adult, then do not be surprised one day when you no longer have a home. That is, you no longer have the life you thought would never change except by your hand or the hand of age. And if the explosion does not occur in your lifetime, the bomb is still ticking and it may well go off during the lifetime of your children. Those that we adults pretend to love but are so often unwilling to do what is necessary to prevent their doom.

This danger of which I am speaking, is not the problem of someone else, it's yours. "Somebody got mad when Nobody did what Anybody could have done." (Source unknown) I know that you might be thinking, "What can I do, I'm only one person". To that I would answer this way. Do you remember the movie "The Ten Commandments"? If you seen this movie there were scenes where they were moving gigantic rocks of hundreds of tons, to build the pyramids. They had no engines, no tractors, no heavy equipment.

They were moving the stone with ropes and tens of thousands of people. No one person could move the stone, but each person, doing their part, pulling 'their weight', were able to move the stones. And so it is with this problem. It is a problem like all others. No one person is going to solve it, but if we all do what we can, the problem can and will be solved.

"I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. And because I cannot do everything, I will not refuse to do the something that I can do. What I can do, I should do. And what I should do, by the grace of God, I will do." - Edward Everett Hale

A preempting apology...

Writing this document has taken a lot of long hours at the computer. I am just one person with no one to assist me in this ongoing project and as a result there are probably spelling or grammar errors within. I have probably been a little redundant, sometimes by accident, sometimes by design. Since there is no one volunteering to proof read this document there remains a good possibility I will miss my own errors when editing. Most errors are probably obvious and corrections easily determined. Please be charitable and forgiving of these.

Brackets []

At several locations I will be presenting the words of other researchers, writers and commentators. Occasionally I will wish to comment on the content of their words and will do so inside [brackets].

Formal Publication

I have thus far chosen not to seek publication of this document simply because I do not wish to lose control of its content nor see it suppressed. It was never my intent to make money from it. My goal is to simply to make the information available to those who wish to see a little better and may have their vision obstructed to some extent. I have tried to avoid the use of uncommon words as much as possible so that the material has the potential to be understood by the widest possible audience.

Abbreviations

BLD- Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition

Bouvier or Bouv - Bouvier Law Dictionary - 1857 edition (I believe this is the one Congress uses. Bouvier is available on the Internet and pertains primarily to the law of the Republic of the united States of America, not to the corporate law of the United States (alert readers might notice that the 'U' in *united* is capitalized in one usage, but not in the other... there is a reason for this as we will discover). Blacks Law Dictionary seems to be the choice of the corporate world.)

The Misspelled Word

There are many of us who, when we encounter a grammatical error or misspelled word, dismiss or discount the entire document based on these findings. What these shallow people fail to recognize is that what they read in magazines, news papers, books and other sources, is prepared, proof read and edited by professional people. Often the source material contains spelling errors or grammatical errors that the person doing the research and writing could probably spell or correct if they were reading the work of someone else. I would, therefore, caution those of you, who would discount a writing based on discoveries of this type, not to be so hasty in your assessment for there is much substance within.

Acquired Knowledge

What do we know? And of that knowledge what portions can we be certain are valid? Our formal education generally begins in public schools. Schools that are 'DEPARTMENTS' of a corporation. Within the Department of Education, the curriculum is controlled. The corporations that we call government, have goals and agendas far removed from what we might think. They want a quiet, docile, submissive people, who do not question their actions, laws, treaties and behavior. They want a people who believe whatever government and its lackeys tell us. They do not want a people who are intelligent and coldly analytical. They do not want a population who thinks for itself. They want people who *think herd thoughts in unison* and often behave emotionally. Who don't ask questions. Who do not assert their rights. The best of these

corporate created sheeple are hired by the government as ‘code enforcers’.

When we really begin to think we must first ask ourselves "Do I think or am I a parrot?" Am I an individual or a sheep in the herd? How easy am I to lead around? How easy am I to herd? Do I accept the beliefs of others to be accepted by others, or maybe to be part of a larger group (herd)? The philosophy of safety in numbers.

How much am I willing to modify my beliefs for acceptance? What are my opinions about the environment, abortion, education, marriage, child rearing, family bonds, the government, New World Order, as opposed to the opinions of others? Perhaps the most important question is, "Where did my opinions originate?" Were these opinions obtained through my own painstaking research, reading and knowledge based on a careful analysis, or are my opinions what I have been taught or profiled to think because this was the only side of the issue presented to me? Are my beliefs as they are because these are the positions held by my peer group or do they come from a teacher or college professor?

Most of us probably believe what we think because 'we think it' and we wouldn't lie to ourselves (Well, maybe some of us do, but the great majority of us probably do not). But where did the perception that we hold to be true, originate? If we acquire opinions and knowledge from those who are not fully knowledgeable, then we may very well be left knowing only half the truth, a distorted truth or perhaps not knowing the truth at all. If good and truthful information is filtered through a system whose goal is not that of truth then the information is slanted to the goal of that system. If that system is public education and we find that educational system under the control of those whose policies, goals and direction are not of the same mind as those who founded America and established the Constitution for the United States of America then we may see history taking a different slant as well as our laws taking on a new character. In this system, all of the information, all of the truth, may not be presented to the student and that information which is presented may be a considerable distance from the truth.

Education v. truth

As you read this material, you will be exposed to knowledge, understandings and truths that, for many, will be difficult to accept. They will be difficult to accept because they are not in accordance with what you have been taught in the public school system, college and the main stream media. In other words, this material is not the conventional wisdom. What you will learn here will fly in the face of much of what you have come to accept as absolute. But if you pursue the truth by reading the material contained in the reference listings at the end of this writing, you will ultimately find the truth and a much greater understanding.

Fleeing from the truth

“Unfortunately we find systems of education today which have departed so far from the plain truth, that they now teach us to be proud of what we know and ashamed of ignorance. This is doubly corrupt. It is corrupt not only because pride is in itself a mortal sin, but also

because to teach pride in knowledge is to put up an effective barrier against any advance upon what is already known, since it makes one ashamed to look beyond the bonds imposed by one's ignorance.” - G. Spencer Brown. LAWS OF FORM (1969)

“My principal aim has been to examine the various reasons why human beings so frequently neglect the genuine knowledge that is available to them and prefer to base their conceptions and their actions on false information, even though it is often against their interest to do so.” Jean-Francois Revel (From the book; "The Flight From Truth" - Introduction)

What I will share with you, if permitted, is a trek that started in the fall of 1993 and continues. Someone, with whom I became acquainted, suggested something to me that I was not initially willing to accept as true. But when that person provided a legal cite, I became curious and so I began researching his allegation. My research took me far beyond the area of original interest and what I have learned is, to me, quite extraordinary. I have spoken with many people about what I have learned and there are very few people whom I've encountered who know anything of what is presented in this writing.

Some people, with whom I have talked, almost cover their ears and run for cover as though they are being subjected to unauthorized knowledge. Others listen in amazement. Some are afraid when they begin to understand what has occurred and where it is leading. Many just stand there with a blank face as though they were waiting for a bus.

I have found that our educational systems have not prepared many of us for the impact of truth and knowledge. As I have gained more knowledge and understanding, I feel compelled to include it in this work. Sometimes I wonder if a writing of this nature is ever truly finished. The learning certainly is not.

The material contained in this writing is a start, a sort of primer. To gain a full understanding, you will have to find and cultivate your own sources and resources of information. It is my hope that this writing is by no means, the end of your quest for knowledge, education and truth. It is only to open your eyes, allowing you to see what has been hidden, and perhaps motivate you to know more... an invitation. If it does this, then it has done its job.

For those of you who are parents or are to become parents, this book may help you to retain the rights and liberties of your children before you, as parent, contract them away. So many parents simply sell their children into slavery since they do not know differently.

The Question:

Our quest to thinking and analyzing will begin with a simple question. A question that provokes thought.

"Are you free?"

Please take a moment to give this question serious consideration before going on. We will travel through many areas but the focus of this writing will be our liberties and freedoms with an examination of what they were, verses what they have become. We keep telling each other how free we are and we hear it so often on the radio and T.V. We see it in magazines and other periodicals. Are we deceiving ourselves?

Freedom

As we read the definition of a Freeman, we should keep in mind that the 'law' to which Bouvier's Law Dictionary refers, is 'the law of the *Republic of the united States of America*', not the corporation law of corporate government. There is a difference as we shall discover.

America, "land of the free and home of the brave," right? Although this may have been quite true at one point in our nations development, the truth is that you do not have anything close to the freedom enjoyed by the founding fathers or citizens of 1920. Some of our most notable orators of today do not know this, or if they do, they never reveal it in their oratory. If you think otherwise and feel that you are, indeed, a free man (or woman), consider what our founding fathers and citizens of the early 1900's were able to do, that now are crimes. The list which follows is only a SMALL SAMPLING of the things that American citizens could do in the early 1900's without permission from the government.

FREEMAN. One who is in the enjoyment of the right to do whatever he pleases, not forbidden by law. One in the possession of the civil rights enjoyed by, the people generally. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 164. See 6 Watts, 556: - Bouvier

1. Build a home or dwelling to house themselves and their families.
2. Operate their carriage (conveyance of the day - vehicle) on the *public rights of way* (roads) in an ordinary manner as necessary to conduct their daily lives.
3. Cut trees growing on their own property, for any reason.
4. Raise their children as they saw fit and did not have to worry about the government taking the children because of the opinions of someone else.
5. Work their land without restriction by the government or fear of being arrested or having their farming operation shut down (especially for killing a RAT with the farm equipment - a situation which occurred in the 1990's when a million dollar farming operation was shut down because a 'protected rat' had been killed by plowing the ground).
6. Fish.
7. Hunt.
8. Camp on public lands.
9. Build a shop.
10. Drill a well.
11. Burn fire wood to keep warm. (There are now restrictions in some areas)

12. Have a Bar B Que (There are now restrictions in some areas).
13. Install a new toilet.
14. Install a new hot water heater.
15. Work at a job. (Don't forget your Government issued Socialist Security Number that, you are told, allows [licenses] you to work).
16. Replace your roof.
17. Build a garage.
18. Live in your house. (Not allowed unless the government approves of its construction)
19. Ride your bicycle. (Not allowed in some areas unless you're wearing a helmet approved by the government)
20. Ride your motorcycle without a helmet.
21. Operate your car without a seat belt.
22. Smoke.
23. Build a porch or deck.
24. Build a tree house or play house for the children.

License

Why is it that so many common and ordinary activities have become illegal so that you must be licensed in order to do them, but your forefathers did not? Remembering that a 'LICENSE', is permission by the government to do what is otherwise illegal. This would include the 'MARRIAGE LICENSE'. Did you know that getting married was an illegal activity? If the activity is *licensed*, it is illegal, a trespass or a tort. What has occurred that requires licensing of virtually any business activity and, in many cases, activities of everyday living? Well, through the tedious and time-consuming research of others, there is now an answer. But it would not be wise to present the answer out of context or understanding. When the answer is presented without the supporting proof of its accuracy, it becomes far too easy to assign the name 'nut case' to the person providing the answer, which in this case - is me. And I can guarantee you that I did not go to this much trouble to be thought of as a nut. On the other side of the coin, there will be those who will think that if you choose to ignore the information contained in this writing, you will be considered to be a 'nut case'. So I guess it works both ways.

License. The permission by competent authority to do an act which, without such permission, would be illegal, a trespass, a tort, or otherwise not allowable.
[People v. Henderson, 391 Mich. 612, 218 N.W.2d 2, 4 - Blacks Law Dictionary, sixth edition]

Control

It should be obvious, but, in the event that it is not, let me flatly state that there are those who wish control of you and everything you do. Let's take a brief look at whom 'they' (the controllers) are. They are those people who feel that 'they' have learned how to think in a manner superior to the general population of the world and want to do so for the rest of us. 'They' are simply not happy with making decisions in their own lives in accordance with their own best interest. Given a chance, 'they' will make decisions for all of society and all of the world. You know the type,

the ones who feel smugly superior. The ones who want to decide what is good for you to eat, what you should wear, whether you should be allowed to smoke or take a drink of an alcoholic beverage, whether or not you should be allowed to eat 'red meat,' who should be hired, what opinions you should and should not be allowed to express, what you should be allowed to say to a coworker, to what life styles you should be exposed and 'taught' to accept as legitimate, to what level standards are to be lowered as a means of qualifying incompetent people and graduating incompetent students, who is a cripple and who is a victim in our society, all the way to how the earth should be populated and by whom. We will be taking a closer look at the actions of the people who comprise this mentality as the writing progresses.

The Herd

For most of you, the material presented will be a completely 'new way of thinking' or perceiving things. It may make you uncomfortable and/or a bit uneasy. It may make others of you angry. Such is the case when you strike off on your own and remove yourself to unfamiliar territory. All new adventures require risk. Whether you will subject yourself to risk is one of the qualifiers as to whether you are a herd animal or not. To keep matters in perspective, remember that 'Progress is impossible if you continue to think as you always have'. As long as you stay as you are or only with the familiar, then, it is by definition, impossible to grow. It is my hope that I may provide a few of you with a new pair of eyes. Eyes that see what may be hidden from others.

Crazy defined: Doing the same thing over and over, expecting a different result. (Voting comes to mind.)

Plato speaks about this in the 'Myth of the Cave'. His thrust is that people who have lived their whole lives in a cave and are chained in such a manner that they cannot see the mouth of the cave or the sunlight outside, have a reality based in the shadows that can be observed on the far wall. And that if you were to unchain these people and lead them into the sunlight of reality, it will hurt their eyes and they will wish to return to the cave and their familiar reality. A reality that is fraudulent, and is without form or substance. But to them, it is comforting even though it is what keeps them enslaved. And so it may be with you. After reading this material, or while reading, you may wish to stay with the familiar patterns of thought rather than give this a serious evaluation. And if that is the case you should thank the public school system for an education that left you unprepared. For my part, I thank you for trying and wish you all the best.

Some of the material presented is complicated. I make no apologies. The world that has been created for your enslavement is complicated. A fact which strikes at the heart of my purpose in writing this document. It is my hope that I have taken some complicated issues, events, occurrences and law, and presented them in a manner that makes their significance and impact understandable by the average American (whatever that has become). What is contained in this writing affects your life and the lives of your loved ones.

While reading this material, I would like your evaluation to proceed in a manner that may be foreign to you. That is I would like you to evaluate this material from your 'inner-self'. Let me explain. Many of us have a tendency to 'accept' material, data and opinions because it has come

from someone we have accepted as an 'authority', or someone whose name we have heard others mention, or perhaps it may be someone we know. If you are going to break free and be an 'individual', you need to evaluate material in a new way. You need to get in touch with that 'inner person' who knows if the presentation makes sense, and knows if it is right for you. Regardless of who is saying it and demanding that you accept it. References sources for those whose eyes desire to see more will be provided at the end.

OK, we've got a stone to move, let's all get together and pull a little.

DISCLAIMER

I have tried to the best of my ability and research facilities to provide factual information to the best of my knowledge and understanding. However, it is your responsibility as reader to verify any information or facts presented herein. I assume no responsibility for any actions taken on your part, legal or otherwise, as a result of reading this material. It is my hope that I will arm some of you with sufficient knowledge that you will become a RAM. We currently have enough sheeple.

CHAPTER 2

AUTHORITARIANISM

Authoritarianism appears to be a core deficiency in our make up that accounts for much of the general behavior one may observe as well as many problems in society and perhaps our personal relationships. An understanding of this concept and the people who constitute this group is an understanding of how we have become so enslaved. This knowledge then provides insights to the road back to freedom.

This is where we get into it. I have made mention of sheeple and now we are going to discover who they are. First, we need to define an 'authoritarian'. If you think you know the qualities of an authoritarian then take a moment and write them down.

Does the following portrait sound familiar or roughly agree with your conception?

An Authoritarian is a person of a domineering sort who expects blind obedience from anyone he can bully or intimidate into accepting his position on matters. Usually a male and most often narrow-minded, opinionated, impatient, arrogant, and unreasonable.

This common perception of an authoritarian is not correct. If you look in a dictionary, you will find a definition that will probably conform to one of the two which follow. Both were taken directly from two different dictionaries.

authoritarian. one favoring subjection to authority as opposed to individual freedom.

authoritarian. one who favors a concentration of power in an individual who is not constitutionally responsible to the people.

I believe the first definition says it best with the words: "...subjection to authority." Instead of individual freedom, which requires one to be responsible for himself and his actions, an authoritarian is quite willing to place another person in a position of higher authority than themselves. By doing so they, in their mind, absolve themselves of any responsibility for their actions and beliefs.

When I speak of an authoritarian, I refer to the first definition. The authoritarian seeks *his* higher authority. Generally the *higher authority* sought by the authoritarian is one that *he feels* the rest of us will also accept as such. This higher authority could be parents, teachers, government, spouse, boss, the church's view or position, neighbors, our children, or a lover, just to name a few. Subjecting yourself to God's authority (which is different than that of the church) does not necessarily qualify you as an authoritarian for God gives you 'free will' to act as you may.

Let's examine some of the actual characteristics of an Authoritarian. An authoritarian acquires his values, opinions and directions from his chosen authority, whom he has accepted as higher than himself and to which he will give blind obedience (the classic sheeple). I believe that when authoritarians do this they may be trying to appear as intelligent and knowledgeable by aligning themselves with someone they feel the rest of us will also accept as knowledgeable and intelligent.

God does not deny you your freedom in any manner, he fully gives you your freedom to do as you wish so long as you do not injure another person (this would include infringing on their rights, the same rights common to all human beings).

Therefore the claims an authoritarian type makes about the self-evident, undeniable correctness of his opinions, are only the positions held by his authority. It should be evident that the authoritarian is not the master of himself, or of anything else. His identity lies outside himself, in the great, unquestionable authority, and this is where his allegiance lies. The fact that the authoritarians identity lies outside himself is also the reason that they are so easy to corrupt. Notice that I said 'unquestionable authority'. Authoritarians seldom challenge authority or ask questions, they just do what's expected. While we may generally view a male as authoritarian, it is apparent that the authoritarian could easily be a female and quite often this is the case.

This does not mean that an Authoritarian will not argue. They will 'argue the position of their authority' with great tenacity. They are wonderful parrots.

Fortunately there are relatively few of us who are total (100%) authoritarians. By this I mean that there are few of us who would murder another because of the wishes of some higher authority. Although there are those among us who will murder, (and have - examine gang activity - gangs are full of sheeple [authoritarians]). Unfortunately there are far too many of us who are (by appearance) 85% to 98% authoritarian. Such false mastery can be extremely dangerous. In Adolph Hitler's Germany, Hitler was not the authoritarian. It was those German people who blindly followed him (and the policies of the Nazi party). It was those German people who consented through their silence. It was those Germans who turned their heads when other groups of people were being carted off to the death camps. And it was especially those German youths and children who turned their parents in to the Nazis' for things which that political movement could use to assert their authority over them.

Is it not a tactic for a corrupt government to give a child a little authority over its parents and by this means the government begins the process of breaking down the order and authority of the family whereby government can then establish itself as the child's benevolent benefactor, both outside and inside the house. Instead of the father being the protector of his family, the government steps in and does it for him even to the point of protecting the child from his natural parents and whatever discipline they may feel is necessary or appropriate. Government replacing the male in the family leads to many divorces as well. It's simply a means of undermining the family and its bond to each other.

In actuality the government simply uses the children to expand their control over everyone. Anyone who speaks out in opposition is quickly silenced by being asked if they wish to see children abused. It never occurs to anyone that children are abused because of government intervention. It is a fact many parents will 'quit' their parenting job rather than go head to head with an all powerful government agency. This leads to a breakdown in the morals of children. When the family values are sufficiently undermined and there is enough moral decay, gangs appear on the scene. Gangs who are often violent and who abuse other children, including murdering them outright and in so many ways causing the deaths of their own membership. The children are left with the choice of becoming a gang member themselves, in hopes of survival or of becoming an immediate victim of a gang, lacking anyone to protect them.

It never occurs to anyone that government sponsored welfare is a means of being a drug addict in which case "who cares about the children"? Welfare subtly indoctrinates its users to be dependent. The children of welfare parents are simply a means to an income. It never occurs to anyone in a position of making policy (or perhaps it does), that those who live their lives having everything handed to them and not having to earn what they acquire, are not going to value anything for they do not have to work to provide it. If they are not providing for themselves, they certainly are not providing for their children. If the welfare dependent adults have no values, then how can they pass on values to the children? To me, this a far greater abuse than many other scenarios with which children are faced.

It is well enough documented that a controlling government capitalizes on an individual's inability to analyze and that is especially true of children. The ease by which their minds can be molded (profiled, indoctrinated) is taken full advantage of in schools and other avenues. And because these schools have been failing to properly educate for such a long period of time, most adults do not have the ability to know that their children are not correctly educated and, thus, they do not take on the role of teaching their children actual history as opposed to politically correct history. Parents fail to teach their children how to think and analyze.

Thus the authoritarian type described near the beginning is not at all what he seems. He is a person with no real self-confidence, with a weak ego, and with perhaps a touch of paranoia, who clings to his authority figure as a helpless infant clings to its mother. All the makings of the perfect 'sheeple'. Dependence fosters authoritarianism.

By now, many of you, who are honest with yourselves, have figured out that you are an authoritarian. You may also have come to the logical conclusion that you don't want to be an authoritarian. Congratulations! The drawbacks to being an authoritarian are many and subtle, but let's cite the most obvious. The authoritarian 'mind set' is going to restrict, stifle, and dominate. If you are an alert observer of society, you can plainly see how few people think for themselves. Re-visiting Jean-Francois Revel:

"My principal aim has been to examine the various reasons why human beings so frequently neglect the genuine knowledge that is available to them and prefer to base their conceptions and their actions on false information, even though it is often against their

interest to do so."

It is so much easier (and safer) to be a sheep in the herd than a clear thinking, analyzing individual, doing your own research and coming to your own conclusions. It is even more risky to express your opinions. Generally, most Americans now like to be 'spoon fed' through their thirty second sound bytes so they know what to think about a particular subject. As such, social scientists have estimated that 77% of the people in our culture exhibit more authoritarian qualities than non-authoritarian on a daily basis. This means that 77% of us are at least 50% authoritarian thus creating quite a herd of sheeple for which the 'controllers' can think.

Authoritarians tend to blame others when things go wrong. Since they are great at following rules, the authoritarian will simply pass the blame onto the rule maker as the cause for the current crisis since the authoritarian was simply following the rule that caused the tragedy or crisis.

I remember reading an article about the State's control over the farmer in Russia. The State determined all the farmers activities, including when to plow the fields. The farmers were given a certain date to plow the field and on that date they started up their tractors and to the fields they went. The farmer knew that the field was too wet to plow, but that didn't matter. They have instructions to plow and so the authoritarian farmer headed out. In short order the tractor was stuck and there it stayed until the field dried out enough to get the tractor going again. A perfect example in the way authoritarians think and perform.

Authoritarians are great parrots since they do not think or analyze for themselves. We see the Main Stream Media doing this all the time. Let someone murder another human being and the press will not only parrot that he may have murdered because of eating too many Twinkies, but give that line of thinking validity by failing to assign responsibility for the act of murder. Why don't all who eat large quantities of Twinkies murder others? The press (individual journalists) never ask the question. Any one with non-Authoritarian brains knows that this line of defense is a crock. Yet, if we accept this line of defense, would that not make the manufacturer of the Twinkies liable since this product has been identified by a jury as the reason and cause that drove an individual to murder another (same as the gun manufacturers?)

For those of you who feel that I've lost it with a presentation of a 'Twinkie defense', with a little research you will find that one Dan White murdered San Francisco city councilman Harvey Milk and Mayor Moscone and used this very defense at his trial. I don't remember the outcome of the trial.

Remember that as a human being, you were built to think for yourself. In fact, it is the free and independent thinker who is often condemned, by the sheeple, as authoritarian. Partially because the sheeple don't really know the characteristics of an authoritarian but mostly because it is quite likely that the opinions of a free and serious thinker are in complete opposition to a true authoritarian and this will serve to make the authoritarian feel threatened. This is because the free and serious thinker has the confidence to rest his position fundamentally on his own judgment (HIS inner self - self actualization). Nothing makes a 'herd member' more nervous that someone who does not think 'herd thoughts'.

One of the most frustrating things about authoritarians is their inaccessibility. It is virtually impossible to have a substantive conversation with them because the authoritarians have taken their values, opinion and ideas from someone else. Then to complicate matters further, once they lock onto an idea, value or opinion derived from 'their authority', they will so openly commit themselves that there is no way to reach them. Thus, if you are intent on communicating, it is quite likely that the only way that you are going to be successful is to find their authority (if that is possible) and discuss the matter with this person. If you can get this authority figure to alter or modify his (or her) position (and that will be doubtful), then the authority can inform your authoritarian friend how to think on a given topic. It is a lot of work just to communicate with a robot but what are your options? Do you just cave in and join them giving up your sense of self?

Obedience to authority

An Authoritarian loves rules and being told exactly what to do. If something goes wrong, they will step back and say - "I was doing exactly as I was told!" (An answer often heard in Germany from people who were involved in the deaths of so many civilians). And it is in this manner that the authoritarian avoids taking any responsibility, for their actions.

This points to one of the dangers of Authoritarians (sheeple). They will not only stand-by, while you and your family are carted off to certain death, they may very well participate in the process. These are the people who have been referred to as spineless. Authoritarians foolishly believe that if they participate in the beheading of others they will save their own necks. They are easily conditioned to obey immoral law.

When the authoritarian encounters a stumbling block or problem, for which there is no policy or procedure, they will seek out 'their Authority' for advice on how to proceed rather than try any idea they or others may have. They have entered the '*no thought zone.*'

A brief interlude here: We Americans were appalled at the behavior of the German people who participated in the 'rounding up', documenting and ultimately, murder of over six million people. We didn't understand how an intelligent and civilized country such as Germany, could commit such a act. In college I was exposed to a summary of a study done to understand this type of behavior. Who made the study now escapes me after 25 years but the title remains with me - "Obedience to Authority". The study was done under the guise of a forced learning experiment. Volunteers would draw straws to see who would 'teach' and who would 'learn'. The drawing of straws was rigged so that a person working for the Study was always the 'learner' and the real volunteer was always the 'teacher'. In practice the learner was given a series of things to remember (learn) and if he failed, he was punished. The punishment was that the 'learner' was strapped down and connected to a source of electricity controlled by the teacher. In most all cases the 'teachers' were able to advance the dial to 500 volts no matter how much pain the 'learner' appeared to be experiencing so long as the person directing the session (the authority) encouraged or instructed the teacher to continue advancing the dial. It was learned that we Americans were no different than the Germans we condemned. By the way, the learner had visual indication of when he was supposed to be receiving a shock and at what magnitude so he could act appropriately. This information was not visible to the 'teacher'.

[The paragraph in the previous text box was part of the original release. I now have access to the Internet and have performed a search for information regarding 'obedience to authority.' What I found follows.]

<http://www.science.wayne.edu/~wpoff/cor/grp/obedienc.html>

"obedience"

I was only following orders.

Some situations move beyond requests for action and entail **direct orders** from one person to another. Surprisingly, a demand for behavior often results in obedience for many people, despite an authority figures lack of power to enforce an order.

Research conducted by Stanley Milgram (1969) involved leading subjects to believe they were administering shock to a person who was making errors in a learning experiment. Results of this study revealed that 65% of the subjects were **obedient** with the experimenters request to provide a shock at a level that was extremely painful and dangerous to the learner. Factors that seemed to contribute to this outcome include the authority figure's gradual escalation of the scope of their orders and their visual cues of power (e.g. a white lab coat). Additionally, subjects often assumed that the experimenter, not themselves, would be responsible for their actions.

Certain people tend to be more obedient than others. Individuals who have the tendency to adopt a submissive, uncritical attitude toward authority figures -- authoritarian submission (Adorno, 1950) tend to perform tasks when demanded. Also, people with an **external locus of control** (a sense that fate rules their life rather than their own actions) tend to be more obedient. However, despite the popular myth that women are more submissive, women and men are relatively equal in the degree to which they will obey demands (Eagly & Carli, 1981).

Notice the reference to 'authoritarian' and 'external locus of control'.

Code Enforcers

So, who are the Authoritarians in our society? Well - they can be found in just about any occupation but some occupations appear to house more of them than others. Probably in first place are the 'Code Enforcers'. These are the bureaucrats that enforce building codes, land use

codes, raising children codes, vehicle codes, business codes, and all the other codes seldom thought about by the average person. Of these 'code enforcers', the most visible is the policeman. As we learn about the perversion of law, we will see and understand that these people enforce much unconstitutional code and as such are highly developed authoritarians. What they know is; "this is what the code says and you are going to obey the code if they have to arrest, beat or kill you".

The Educators

The second place holders of Authoritarian office are those in the field of Education. The people involved in this group, the Teachers, the Principals, the Superintendents, the Administrators, have invested their whole lives in being authoritarians and now are training the children of our nation to be one also. In so many ways their advancement is directly related to their ability to adhere to the authoritarian discipline.

Consider this - they are not allowed to utilize books and materials that have not been approved by the State (their Authority). The State has indirectly told them that they are not competent enough to properly select teaching material and they have accepted this premise. As it was originally conceived, by standardizing the material within the books for the respective grades, the children could go from one school to the next and the school would know their level of skill by the grade they were in. Schools would no longer have to make an assessment and place the youngster accordingly.

Of course we all know that fell apart long ago. Today (1992) a student can graduate from high school and not be able to read. And further, when teachers were allowed to run their classrooms, selecting the material from which to teach, children, who were more capable, more talented, more achieving, were allowed to progress at their accelerated pace. As a matter of fact, all children were able to progress at their own individual pace, not some arbitrary pace conceived by some government academic, who thinks they are capable of prescribing for everyone. Sometimes, ten year olds were able to spell, read and do math problems better than some 12 year olds. In the one room schools where these 'teachers' (not educators) worked, the more accomplished children worked with other children to help them through problems and studies not fully understood. This made the accomplished student even brighter and more rounded as well as helping the lesser advanced student and the teacher. But this was back in the days when we wanted children to be educated individuals rather than just another herd member.

It was in these times that teachers were able to select the material from which they wished to give instruction. What a thought ... teachers in control. Teachers responsible for the outcome. They organized their classroom as they saw fit. Involving the more advanced students to help the struggling ones. When this was the case the teachers actually taught and the children actually learned the core subject material necessary to be successful in this country. The teachers of this era answered to the parents. If they were not doing a good job, they were replaced. Now the parents are answerable to the teacher and if these parents are not doing the job expected by the government, they are replaced.

We have all seen that the teachers are able to form a teacher's union and participate in the demands of that union. Is it likely that teachers will band together and return control of education to themselves including control of the students and classrooms? For this to take place the majority of the teachers could not be authoritarians. So, do we think it likely that teachers are going to retake control of education?

I firmly believe that there are some quality teachers in America, who are not socialists and have the ability to select material and teach. I believe that we have teachers in America that believe in and can teach independence rather than dependence. I believe that non-authoritarian, non-socialist teachers could do a much better job of selecting material from which to teach than some *administrative academic* who feels that they have some superior ability under which only they would be qualified to select the proper material. I believe that if this were the case, we would see a rebirth of authors who know and understand the American way and would be writing new text books that would provide the values and understandings that made this country great for so long. Their talents and genius are there, just waiting for the call. And so are the talents and genius of many teachers who are simply waiting and hoping for the handcuffs to be removed so that they may teach. Yes, it's time for teachers to stand up together, reclaim your right to teach and help reclaim America. Do that, and then be responsible for the outcome. Stop hiding behind tenure, stop blaming the system (you are the system - it is to you that young people look to see how to affect changes) and stop being an authoritarian.

Thinking in unison

If you want sheeple to be 'thinking the same thoughts in unison' then you cannot give teachers this much latitude. By this I mean that those in power, who desire total control of all aspects of your life, require a predetermined outcome in values, philosophy, ideology, morals, thinking and academic non-achievement. This requires that a *controlling body* have control of the *teaching material*.

The controllers have two ways of approaching the problem of education control. They can either establish themselves in positions that produce the educational material and policy or they can select and reward those who produce the type of educational material desired. The reward can be grants of money, behind the scenes deals that provide for promotion, jobs without high demand giving them more time to produce educational rot, undeserved press recognition, grants for bogus research and a host of other things.

Those *local educators* who quietly allow this are the authoritarians. Those teachers and educators, who cannot continue with this much restraint, move onto other jobs. This is unfortunate, because it is these *free and independent thinkers* to whom students need exposure. But, as it turns out, we are educated by the *best of the sheep*.

I believe that many students recognize that they are defectively educated. Perhaps the recognition is not consciously made, yet many rebel in one form or another. They may attain the label 'problem student' or perhaps just drop out of school. For these students, the challenge is to maintain their identity, autonomy and individuality in the face of enormous pressures to 'conform

and don't make waves'. It is interesting to note that some of the most successful people in America have very limited formal Public Education. It is also interesting to note that the most prominent of Americans send their children to 'private educational institutions', not public.

Giving Teachers and Principals the latitude to select their own material also gives them 'responsibility'. Remember now, authoritarians 'don't want responsibility'. They want rules which allow them to avoid taking responsibility (one of the purposes of a corporation). If this is what the rule says then, when things go wrong, "I was only doing as I was instructed". Responsibility has accountability attached to it. And so the teachers do exactly as instructed and now are teaching the children to perform in exactly the same manner. The children are taught to 'just follow instructions' and by doing so they too can avoid responsibility and accountability. In the Authoritarian world, if something goes wrong, even if you knew it would, you are exonerated. Welcome to the 'no thought zone'. At least no 'original' thought, just herd thoughts.

John Dewey is a perfect example of those in power rewarding, promoting, positioning a person whose goals undermine American principles and values. The goals of John Dewey are consistent with enslaving a populace. What we might call 'psychological profiling'.

John Dewey

John Dewey was an 'educational philosopher' who managed to establish himself at Columbia University as the dominant figure and perhaps the most influential man in American education. His influence may be measured by the fact that at one point (and perhaps still today - 1993) 20% of all American school Superintendents and 40% of all 'Teacher College' heads received advanced degrees from Columbia University.

In 1897 Dewey published one of his works titled "My Pedagogic Creed". In this work Dewey saw the destruction of a child's individualistic traits as the primary goal of education. Once this was accomplished the youngster would conform or adjust to whatever society he finds himself located. The prime measuring stick of a child's progress then becomes his ability to 'get along with the group' (herd). And take a look at where we are at today! A big thanks is due to all you teachers, principals and superintendents who have made John Dewey's dream a reality! Perhaps you have heard the radio commercial that is aimed at enticing you to become a teacher. In this commercial they state that a 'teacher has the power to effect a change ... REACH FOR THAT POWER'. Well, they could not be more blatant about it. But the 'change' that the teacher is trained to effect, is one of submission and slavery.

The Teacher/Spy

To complicate matters further, Educators have allowed their profession to be corrupted by becoming spies on the parents. One method by which teachers now make parents accountable to them, rather than the other way around. A person would think that parents would be the one group of people from whom Educators need support and assistance and yet teachers are constantly seeing mistreated children that can be reported to 'their authority' (the State). I have a friend who works in the realm of Child Protection. Here are examples of what Teachers have

reported as Child Abuse.

The child was walking home alone and it is a long walk. While walking the child was crying.

The child is living in a room with 4 other people.

The child is scared of animals and timid around people.

Through these examples we can see what often occurs if you give an authoritarian a little power and a rule to follow. Many authoritarians are in love with 'control' (because they are controlled). And they manage to avoid responsibility when they have a 'rule' to follow. The authoritarian goal is to bring as many of you under the domination of their authority as possible.

Code Enforcer behaviors ... Weaver

At this point I'm going to go into some detail of the behavior of Code Enforcers. We probably all know about Frank Serpico and his efforts to expose police corruption in New York City that led to a 'set up' in which Frank was shot in the face. For those who don't know, rent the movie 'Serpico'. At this point I would like to address more recent events. In 1992 there occurred a shoot out between BATF (Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms) agents on one side and Kevin Harris, Randy Weaver & Sammy Weaver on the other side.

In the initial shootout, fourteen year old Sammy Weaver was killed as was BATF agent William Degan. Shortly after the initial shootout, the FBI became involved. A person known to Randy Weaver was allowed to speak with him. After speaking with Randy Weaver, this person was interviewed by an FBI psychologist who portrayed Vicki Weaver as the dominant figure in the household and that she may kill her children rather than have them taken by Government Authorities.

Using this as a foundation of reason, FBI sharp-shooter Lon Horiuchi targeted Vicki Weaver (the mother) standing in the door way of the Weaver cabin. Vicki was unarmed, had injured no one, was holding a ten month old infant, and represented a threat to no one when Lon Horiuchi (an agent of the United States Government and graduate of West Point) shot her in the face. The bullet tore away most of her jaw and severed her carotid artery. Vicki's scream lasted for about 15 seconds. At the same time a shot was taken to kill Randy Weaver (the father), but the shot only wounded him. In the days that followed the FBI was so concerned about the children that they placed explosive charges around the cabin and fully intended to detonate them, which would have killed everyone, including the children. From this you may conclude that their concern about the mother's treatment of the children was bogus and only self serving. You might be well advised that if you or any member of your family become a *perceived* hostage, that the FBI's HRT (Hostage Rescue Team) never comes to the rescue.

In this case the FBI was reacting to what other federal agents had said, without truly knowing if they were telling the truth (authoritarians never question authoritarians). From the perspective of

the Weaver family, they had been attacked by agents of the Federal Government and didn't trust anyone, FBI included.

In the days which followed, there was a stand-off where the law enforcement personnel had the cabin surrounded with the remaining Weaver family inside along with Kevin Harris. The cabin was rigged to be blown up by law enforcement personnel as a preliminary to killing the remaining Weaver children along with any other adults which may have been in the cabin. It was the intention of Federal law enforcement personnel to blow up the cabin and they would have done so if it had not been for the efforts of retired Col. 'Bo' Gritz and Arizona police officer Jack McLamb, who talked Randy into giving himself up to stand trial.

And so, we have those Law Enforcement Officers who will murder because of the wishes of a 'higher authority'. But Lon will say, "I was only doing as I was told", "I was only following orders", "I was only following the rules".

[As of this date (October 1997), I understand that the Boundry County prosecutor has filed charges against one or more of the agents involved in the shootings surrounding the Weaver family and Kevin Harris. Charges were brought against Kevin Harris and Randy Weaver and although I don't remember the outcome of the charges against Harris, those against Randy Weaver were all found to be not guilty except for the original weapons charge against him, which was that he purportedly sold a shotgun with a barrel that had been sawed off one quarter inch too short. That's right lady's and gentlemen, a fourteen year old boy and a young mother are both dead for one quarter of an inch on a shotgun barrel. Would anyone like to make the argument that Police Agencies under control of the Federal Government are not out of control? Also, since that time a wrongful death suit was brought against the government on behalf of the Weaver family and the government has paid out (I believe) at least \$3,000,000 in damages. - But that still does not bring back Mom or 14 year old Sammy, does it?]

Weaver Trial ... Day 26

On day 26 of the Randy Weaver trial, and before the jury enters the court room, the prosecuting Attorney, representing the United States government, apologizes to the court for introducing fabricated evidence. Much of the FBI's photographic evidence had been fabricated.

So here we have a case of our law enforcement personnel manufacturing evidence against an accused person to secure a conviction. [I'd like to take this opportunity to thank that prosecution attorney for not participating in the deception at hand. I'm certain his life has changed greatly. I noticed that he was not able to complete the trial.]

When the FBI is involved in fabrication of evidence, I would ask the question, how can *we the people* trust any police officers. Well, many citizens do not and the number is growing.

Gordon Kahl & Sheriff Gene Mathews

Let's now discuss the case of Sheriff Gene Mathews and bad guy Gordon Kahl. Officer Jack McLamb, a highly decorated Arizona police officer, was an academy instructor at the time that he received notice of the deaths of Sheriff Gene Mathews and Gordon Kahl. As an academy instructor, one of his jobs was to review the deaths of officers throughout the nation, analyze those deaths and provide instruction to the cadets on how they might stay alive in a similar situation. These deaths occurred in Arkansas in what the Government reports detailed as a face to face shoot out between Sheriff Gene Mathews and Gordon Kahl at a distance of about ten feet. Yet when the autopsy reports were reviewed, they indicated that both of these men had been shot in the back.

This disturbed officer McLamb and so he made inquiries of the FBI and US Marshals who were present when this supposed shoot-out between Sheriff Gene Mathews and Gordon Kahl took place. The responses provided did not satisfy the concerns that officer McLamb had in this case. And so officer McLamb joined a team of officers down in Arkansas and these men re-investigated the case on their own time, buying their own tickets.

Two months after returning from this investigation, Officer McLamb received a knock on his door from two IRS officials who claimed that he owed the government fifty thousand dollars back taxes. And so this was his punishment for not being a good Authoritarian (Sheeple).

Officer McLamb and the team of investigators now know that the FBI and US Marshals did execute Gordon Kahl because he had killed two US Marshals in North Dakota in a shoot-out. Also known is that the Federal Government wanted to silence Gordon Kahl because of appearances on television and otherwise, informing the people on tax matters that the government did not want the sheeple to know. Sheriff Gene Mathews witnessed the execution of Gordon Kahl and for this he ended up getting shot twice. A shot gun blast to the back and a high power rifle shot up underneath his bullet proof vest. Since Sheriff Mathews is no longer able to inform us we may surmise that he was not willing to be an accomplice to murder and paid the price of that decision. From both Frank Serpico and Sheriff Gene Mathews, we may learn that when you are not an authoritarian and willing to participate in criminal behavior with your fellow police authoritarians, you may well end up shot.

It should be pointed out that the investigation team consisted of twelve officers from nine different states. The team included Federal, State and Local officers all of whom bought their own tickets and provided their time and talents at no cost to the American Citizen. These twelve men represented one hundred eighty years of investigative experience.

These men went to Arkansas, not to investigate Gordon Kahl's death (he was an alleged cop killer as portrayed by the Government), they went to investigate the death of Sheriff Gene Mathews. What did they find out about Gordon Kahl in their investigation? They found out that Gordon was a 63 year old farmer, who was a Constitutionalist and Patriot, was a highly decorated war hero during the second world war, and who was well loved by everyone who knew him. Then there is Sheriff Gene Mathews whose reputation was smeared by Government agents who

asserted that he acted like a bull in a china shop running into the kitchen without their permission and getting himself shot to death by Gordon Kahl.

The investigation revealed that this was a total cover up, that Gordon Kahl did not kill Sheriff Gene Mathews, and that Sheriff Gene Mathews did not kill Gordon Kahl. Officer McLamb asserts that Gordon Kahl was executed as he sat watching television with his back to the kitchen door while one 'Federal law enforcement officer' came in behind him.

Officer McLamb asserts that the Constitutionalist, Freeman, Patriot, Sovereign Citizen, State Citizen or what ever name they are currently going under, are the greatest threat to the planned socialization of America (known as New World Order). And so these people are treated like Public Enemy #1. Anyone who lives outside the system and does not depend on government for their existence is a major threat to that total control. Why? Because their example shows others that it can be done and how to do it. Read Sui Juris - Pardon me but ... #5
<http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/suijuris5a.pdf>

The investigation reveals that there are many high ranking ' law enforcement officials' involved in this cover up. Some in the Arkansas State Police, the Medical Examiner and more. Since Arkansas was being run by Governor Bill Clinton at the time, the investigation team was not able to get the evidence to a state Grand Jury and now that Bill Clinton is president, the same players are blocking the presentation to a Federal Grand Jury. In reality, since Federal Officers are the enforcement arm of New World Order, it probably would not matter who was president, this investigation team would probably still be blocked from presenting their evidence to a Federal Grand Jury.

And so we see that, like the educational community that has some good teachers, the 'law enforcement community' has some officers that have honor and integrity.

The Farmer - Guilty of Environmental Crimes

In recent times, but now a few years back (this re-write takes place in 2003 [now 2016]) there was a California farmer who was plowing his field when federal officials arrived and charged him with a felony for the death of rats protected under the endangered species act. In a plea bargain effort, the Government offered to drop charges if the farmer would sign over half of his acreage and pay a fine of, I believe, one hundred eighty thousand dollars.

In so many ways government says to private enterprise, "If you are going to do business on our street this is what it's going to cost you". And so we may ask the question: "What is the difference between the United States Government and the United States Mafia or any other organized Crime Syndicate ?"

Add to the list of code enforcers the environmental police, the Forest Service, Fish and Game, Bureau of Land Management, and a host of others. Organized crime is organized crime, whether it be called government or not. Question is: Do you wish to be part of it?"

There may well come a day when those who wish to 'control everything' attempt to install 'one world government' here in America. [That sentence was from many years ago, around 1993. The fact is that America is very close to losing her sovereignty, constitution and freedom. See “*End Game*”. Order the DVD or watch it on the web, for as long as it is allowed to stay, at:

<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=1070329053600562261>

If we the Sheeple allow this takeover, it will bring all of America (meaning you) under a new set of laws. Laws that I know you are not going to like. Enforced by methods just described and worse. To accomplish this will require the cooperation of the code enforcers and especially the Police. Now which way are they going to point their gun. Are they going to 'protect and defend the constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic' as they are sworn to do in their oath of office, or are they going to obediently follow the instructions (orders) of 'their authority' and point their guns at those Americans who will defend our freedom and Constitution to the death? Are the Police and other code enforcers sufficiently educated to recognize those acts which undermine and destroy our constitution? Are the Police men of honor, frightened sheep or just in it for what they can get? I feel that the time that will provide us with an answer to this question may not be far off.

To identify other Authoritarians (Sheeple) look for those who:

- Wear their hats backwards to be accepted by the herd;
- Join a gang to be part of the herd;
- Wear certain clothing to be accepted by the herd;
- Run with other herd members;
- Speak a certain street slang (herd talk);
- Greet (shake hands) each other in weird (herd) ways;
- Steal at the request of another person;
- Injure someone at the request of another person;
- Commit a crime requested by another person;
- Takes drugs to be accepted by the herd;
- Provide false testimony to protect fellow herd members (officers);
- Frame others for crimes or offenses they did not commit;
- Pass out citations for failure to wear a belt (seat);
- Pass out citations for failure to wear a hat (helmet);
- Pass out citations for failure to wear the 'required' safety equipment when riding a bicycle;
- Run campers out of public forests for camping without permission. (Let us not forget that this is the King's forest and they (the Sheriffs of Nottingham) are here to keep you peasants out);
- Arrest people for cutting trees on their own property and charge them with a felony;
- Arrest and charge farmers with a Felony crime for killing rats while plowing his field;
- Spy on parents; (through the children)
- Convict and imprison someone when no one has been injured;
- Pass judgment on a person in court without a jury;
- Disregard and throw out the verdict of a jury because it did not conform to the opinion of

the court;

- Instruct the jury that they can only consider the guilt or innocence of a person under the law when in reality the purpose of the jury is to judge the guilt or innocence of a person under the circumstances and to judge the validity of the law under these same circumstances;

Welcome to the land of weasels! All of these and many more are Authoritarians. Avoid them, period. It should be evident that there are a great number of Authoritarians, both inside and outside of government. But that can be changed, if you want. And if you don't, then get used to being herded.

Those not affected

I know a man who has often said: "I'm not affected." This is a classic example of a person placing their head where the sun does not shine. He is affected, he just doesn't want to know about it. Not only is he affected but so is everyone he loves. But for various reasons, most of which require some sort of action on his part, he is not willing to see, learn, teach, speak, or to help in any manner. The best he can do is eat.

[THIS SPACE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

TO ALL THOSE NOT AFFECTED

ALL THAT IS NEEDED

FOR EVIL TO SUCCEED

IS FOR GOOD MEN

[and women]

TO DO NOTHING

EDMUND BURKE

CHAPTER 3

ABSOLUTE POWER CORRUPTS ABSOLUTELY

One of many problems

I have collected considerable information during my research. One of the many problems I've faced in presenting and discussing this factual information with many people over the past several years or so, is that when they are presented with information that does not fit their view (*perception*) of 'facts' or 'events' as has been previously presented to them in main stream T.V. news, magazines, news papers, etc., they will often stop listening, some run for cover as though they are being exposed to unauthorized information, others anger and become openly hostile. Then there are always the '*name assigners*' who assign a particular name that is generally un-complimentary and designed to put a person in a *category* as a means of not dealing seriously with the person or the information they present. *Extremist* might be an example of this tactic. Let the label 'extremist' be attached to you and the sheep will immediately stop listening.

I've given considerable thought to this phenomenon and it has occurred to me that when people are exposed to information which requires that they take responsibility and become involved, that is where the line is drawn. The moment that one of the sheeple can see that the information being presented is going to interfere with their watching of ball games, fishing, sailing, motorcycle riding, tennis playing, beer drinking, party activities, or whatever else the sheep does for enjoyment, then it is time to assign the term 'radical' to the person presenting information rather than see our collective and individual responsibilities. Responsibilities that may take some of the time the sheep use to play.

As long as information presented doesn't cause them to alter their lives in a manner that cuts into play time, then they may listen. As soon as information does cut into play time, they stop listening. And yet we have wondered how so many people were murdered by the German Government in the 1930's and early 1940's. It comes from ordinary citizens not taking responsibility for their government and its actions.

We like to think that at scenarios like that of Waco, Texas, we have no responsibility because we did not 'pull the trigger'. Yet we financed it and as we will find out later, we authorized it. Our money bought the military tank that was used there, bought the guns used there, bought the bullets used there, bought the helicopters used there, bought the CS gas used there, bought the 'pyrotechnic' devices used there. Our money bought everything used to cause harm to those adults and 22 children. Yes, we are responsible so let us stand up and accept that responsibility.

The preceding paragraphs were presented because the information which follows in this chapter will probably impact upon you. But it's information that you, as a responsible American, need to know. I know that we all want to party, including me, but if we are to party on the rail road

track, it might be nice to know a train is coming. If we know this we might take off our headphones or turn the sound system down a little. *Those who don't heed this warning are doomed to be surprised when the train arrives in the middle of their party.*

Difference Between War and Law Enforcement:

"War and law enforcement have different goals. The purpose of law enforcement is to enforce the law. Alleged violators of the law are apprehended with only the minimal amount of force necessary to arrest and deliver them to the judicial system for trial.

The purpose of war, on the other hand, is the total domination of the target. It is the job of the war machine to kill, to maim, and to destroy (kill people and break things). The war machine must also create terror to convince potential opponents to submit on command. Therefore, the war machine must not only inflict maximum death and suffering on its victims, but must also broadcast its achievements to convince others to submit on command." <http://vader.com/war/war.html>

On February 28, 1993, a military style raid was conducted near Waco, Texas. The ultimate outcome of this action was the death of over 80 men, women and children. Also killed were four BATF agents. What were the events leading to this raid and the siege which followed?

The facility we came to know as Mt. Carmel had been there for decades. The people the media had identified as *Branch Davidians*, had lived at the Mt. Carmel Center for various lengths of time. They did not refer to themselves as *Branch Davidians*, this was a name created by our media at the time of the government assault. All were free to come and go as they wished. They were a group of Christians who had splintered from the Seventh Day Adventist Church years before. The Christian folk of this simple community lived in a communal plywood house they had built themselves. Some people have severely criticized this form of living and have so stated from the front room of their condominium, duplex, penthouse, apartment or hotel room. The Branch Davidians called their home the Mt. Carmel Center. It was located on 77 acres of slightly elevated prairie land. From the Treasury Report, we know that the government had taken numerous photographs of the Mt. Carmel home from the air as a prelude to the raid.

[Note: Paragraphs that are indented, are generally quotes and if so, their source follows at the end of the indentation.]

Psychologically Profiling the Sheeple

"Modern warfare strategy uses public relations (now called *psychological operations* or *PsyOps*) as a tool in the pacification of an occupied territory. Thus it was during Operation *Trojan Horse*. Integrated in the military plan was a public relations strategy designed to neutralize national opposition to the military action about to unfold."

<http://vader.com/war/war.html>

The strategy called for the language of war and law enforcement to be collapsed, and then reversed. The language of war was ascribed to civilian activity, and the language of civilian law enforcement ascribed to military activity.

Redefinition of Words

Thus, the simply made plywood home of the Branch Davidians was redefined as a "fortress", "compound" or a "fortified compound"; a fourth-floor residential tower became a "watchtower" or "lookout tower", tornado shelters became "bunkers", and shooting back in self defense became an "ambush", etc. And they were no longer ordinary Americans, they were now *Branch Davidians*. All of it words of art to psychologically profile the sheeple.

And the children of the *Branch Davidians* were no longer their children. The Branch Davidians children became their "hostages." May I ask the question, "How many American Mothers would turn their children over to government agents who just murdered their neighbors, perhaps even murdered their husband?"

Meanwhile, agents of the U.S. government who strafed (fired bullets into) a building full of mothers and children with machine guns one Sunday morning were called "law enforcement officers" engaged in the execution of a "search warrant" (extended usage of term "law officer" also seen in Dallas Morning News, March 2, 1993). The black helicopters, surely belonging to the Special Operations covert 160th Task Force, were described as "National Guard" helicopters.

The military occupation and actions of the U.S. government, achieved through the redefinition of words at Waco, can no longer be doubted. Witness the armored personnel carriers deployed to Jordan, Montana during the Freeman siege in June, 1996. The war vehicles have been painted over with the letters "FBI" (Washington Times, June 1, 1996). It seems as though someone forgot to take the masking tape from the hasty stenciling of the letters -- it is visible in the photograph.

Everybody's Satan

How Political Opposition Was Neutralized:

"Every one of us has areas of strong beliefs or strong dislikes which move us to action or make us turn our faces away. For most, there is a class of activity that is abhorrent. In the language of the propagandist, these areas are called "buttons." Propagandists associate the *buttons* with persons or subjects or images--we have all seen the macho Marlboro man riding his stallion: "Smoke Marlboro's, and you, too, will be manly," is the message.

This marketing technology was used to neutralize political opposition to the annihilation of the Branch Davidians. David Koresh was marketed as everybody's Satan. To the atheist, he was presented as the religious fanatic; for law-and-order types, he was presented as the killer of four law enforcement officers. And to the fundamentalist, demonization was effected by juxtaposing two allegations anathema (loathed) to their ears: Koresh claimed to

be Jesus Christ, and he kept a harem of other men's wives. Koresh was also variously presented as a gun nut, a New Age adherent, and involved in the drug trade. Finally, the coup de grace: David Koresh was a child molester. Was there anyone in the U.S. not offended by this picture? But, do any of these accusations justify the attack and murder that took place? It seems to me that when we Americans are accused of some crime, we are supposed to have a trial in which we are given the opportunity to defend ourselves. I read that somewhere in our founding documents. Documents that provide foundational law.

Of course the Branch Davidians had been cut off from all contact with the outside world during the siege, and they could not respond to any of the charges. The news services conducted no critical investigation of the charges made by the government or disaffected Branch Davidians – they just repeated (parroted) the allegations as fact. The media became full partners with U.S. government officials in creating an orgy of hatred and contempt. See, for example, the Dallas Morning News, April 10, 1993, which describes a press conference at which reporters and FBI staff roared with laughter as each tried to outdo the other in ridiculing the Branch Davidians.

After the government/media hate campaign, the public was so taken up with derision that the words "due process" and "tolerance" were not even whispered by civil libertarians, civil rights leaders, or church leaders. As a result, the U.S. government was able to torture, gas, shoot, and burn to death 80 peaceful men, women, and children on daytime TV, to the virtual roar of public approval.

Derision. To laugh at in scorn or contempt. To mock.

Rachel Koresh and her two babies were among them."
http://vader.com/war/page/w_da.html

Are there any more doubts about the dangers involved with authoritarianism? Should the journalists present be tried as an accomplice to murder for not doing their jobs, which, if they had, could and probably would have prevented murder.

The Role of the Press: For those who foolishly believe all that is told them by the various news and media outlets, the psychological stage had been set. For those who continue to believe what they read and hear through the main stream media, I submit the following toast from John Swinton, who at the time of the toast, was chief of staff at the New York Times and considered by his peers to be the Dean of his profession (journalism). This toast was given during a luncheon of the New York press club celebrating the *free and independent press*.

"There is no such thing, at this date of the world's history, in America, as an independent press. You know it and I know it.

“There is not one of you who dares to write your honest opinions, and if you did, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid weekly for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for

similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone.

“The business of the journalist is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it, and what folly is this toasting an independent press?

“We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes.” - John Swinton, Chief of Staff, New York Times.

What, for decades, had been a quiet, peaceful religious community, was now identified as a 'cult' by a press who was doing their job as described by John Swinton.

Technology

What technology was used to spy on the people of this religious community? In part, some of the technology is described:

"During the 1994 San Antonio trial of the Branch Davidians, Texas Ranger Capt. Alan Byrnes, who headed the Texas Ranger operation in Waco, alluded to "people inside that were giving some of the information" about the residents of Mt. Carmel Center during the siege, but successfully evaded answering questions about a list of names. He said "we had a rough count of about a hundred people in there, the best we could calculate," but at the same time said the ages and even the genders of the persons inside was in question. Transcript, pgs. 604, 637-38, 661, 667). Surely this is improbable.

There were also, possibly, deep cover professional intelligence agents living in the Mt. Carmel Center. These agents set up a virtual test laboratory of surveillance devices within the Center. According to the London Times, March 21, 1993, a month before the raid, agents replaced normal telephones with converted sets which doubled as microphones to relay all conversations to government listening posts. Fiber optic microphones and cameras were inserted into walls and air vents. These fiber optic devices relayed audio and visual images back to a control center. - http://vader.com/war/page/w_c.html

The fact that the London Times printed information that did not appear in the American press should provide insight into the involvement of the American main stream media in the psychological profiling of the American Sheeple.

Later on, during the siege, thermal imagers scanned outside walls, and tracked body heat to reveal the whereabouts of each of the residents at any given time; LASERS were used to detect window vibrations to reveal conversations, and *the British Special Air Service* flew a multi-sensor surveillance aircraft with forward looking infra-red radar and a low-light television. The equipment on the aircraft could pinpoint the location of anyone throughout the center.
" http://vader.com/war/page/w_c.html

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized." - Constitution for the united States of America.

So much for being secure in our persons and our papers.

The pretext of a raid

And now we ask the question, what, exactly, was the pretext for the raid on the people living at Mt. Carmel Center?

Some years before the raid, there had been a political power struggle between Koresh and a rival for the leadership of the Branch Davidians. When Koresh became victorious, members of the losing faction contacted the authorities with stories that Koresh hoarded illegal arms and engaged in unorthodox marital practices with women. Further allegations of child abuse arose against David Koresh from a custody dispute involving Branch Davidian Sherri Jewel and her ex-husband.

These complaints against David Koresh found their way to the U.S. Treasury Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF or ATF). The BATF has the statutory authority to collect taxes on firearms possessed, purchased, or traded. Hence, it was this gun business that provided the pretext for the action, and it was the BATF, or ATF as it is often called, that provided the front for the operation.

According to the Treasury Report, allegations were made that David Koresh was converting regular guns into machine guns, and that he possessed machine guns for which he did not have a license. Non-US visitors should know that *it is legal* to own a machine gun in the US provided one has paid the tax. The tax levied on machine gun ownership is \$200.

Despite the minor nature of the alleged offence, and despite the known presence of men, women and children who were not involved in the gun business, only two methods of serving a search warrant were considered: raid, and siege (Treasury Report, pg. 43).

It is of interest that at the time of the action against the Branch Davidians, there was no legal limit on the number of guns Texans could own.

At the time of the raid, Texans owned an average of four guns each; and 16,600 Texans legally owned machine guns. In order to own a machine gun legally, the owner had only to pay a tax to the ATF. Kevin S. Van Horn, Assault on Waco (kevin@axon.cs.byu.edu).

“It was on the basis of this relatively minor tax on guns that the assault, siege, and death of approximately 80 Americans, including many children, took place.

http://vader.com/war/page/w_i.html

Assault based on allegations:

Here we see that it is only necessary for a Treasury Report to assert (allege) that you may be breaking some minor law, and this becomes reason to conduct a raid on you, your family, and your friends if they are also present. Does anyone see anything wrong with this picture? May we now ask the question: Who started shooting first? The following HTML document begins with a picture of the Davidians home. Several windows and the front door are visible. This next paragraph quote refers to this picture.

"Then gunfire erupted from virtually every window in the compound." --Treasury Report, pg. 96. We see the agents, the broken windows, and the bullet holes in the building. But would you please point out the Davidians and the Davidian guns?

Who shot first, and who shot whom in the February 28, 1993 Mt. Carmel gunfight?

The Treasury Report states that when the ATF agents left the cattle trailers they were met with a hail of gunfire and homemade grenades.

"In the face of overwhelming firepower the agents displayed extraordinary discipline and courage," (pg. 11).

Perhaps unknown to the raid planners, most of the guns owned by the Branch Davidians were off the premises that day, having been taken to a gun show in nearby Austin, Texas by Branch Davidian Paul Fatta. Concerning the ATF claim that they were met "by a hail of gunfire" as they approached the building: photographic evidence shows the agents firing blindly into a building with empty windows and drawn blinds.

Let's have a look at the Treasury statement in more detail:

"Koresh appeared at the front door and yelled, 'What's going on?' The agents identified themselves, stated they had a warrant and yelled 'freeze' and 'get down.' But Koresh slammed the door before the agents could reach it. Gunfire from inside the Compound burst through the door. The force of the gunfire was so great that the door bowed outward. The agent closest to the door was shot in the thumb before he could dive for cover into a pit

near the door. Then gunfire erupted from virtually every window in the front of the Compound." (Pg. 96)

A picture published in *Soldier of Fortune*, July, 1993 (our copy was slightly damaged at the centerfold as it was removed from the magazine) shows about 11 agents in front of the building. Note that eight of the agents in this picture are using the automobiles for cover, while the rest are in the open.

The ATF said the Davidians had illegal machine guns. The ATF Report also said the agents were ambushed by waiting Davidians (pg. 11). When talking to the press after the raid failure, ATF public relations agent Sharon Wheeler explained: "They had bigger guns than we did." But these agents don't seem concerned about Davidian guns, big or small, manual or automatic. Where are the guns? Where are the Davidians? Where is the ambush?

Automobiles are not good cover from firearms. Most bullets will easily penetrate the thin steel of a car body. If a Davidians were shooting at an agent who was taking cover behind a car, he could as easily hit the agent by aiming through the car at the hidden portion as by aiming at the exposed portion.

On Monday, March 1, 1993 the Dallas Morning News published a page of color pictures from the raid. One 7 x 11 shows the main entrance of Mt. Carmel. Judging by the number of visible bullet holes in the walls, the condition of the window to the right of the door, and the condition of the second floor window frames, this picture was taken later than the *Soldier of Fortune* picture. We see (Dallas Morning News, March 1, 1993, Figure 21) agents in the foreground are carrying off an injured comrade. Looking over the picture for details, we see a spray of bullet holes around the second floor windows (magnified view at Figure 21A). Those holes were quite obviously caused by shots aimed at the general area of the windows from the outside--that is, by agents shooting at Davidians or at guessed locations of Davidians.

The Dallas Morning News photograph has been magnified to verify the point: The windows and bodies of all the automobiles within the frame of the picture reveal not a single bullet scar (Figure 21B). In addition, not a single tear appears in the canvas of the cattle trailer (Figure 21C).

Had the Davidians been returning fire, we should be able to see evidence in the photo. The shots should have left scars, similar to the scars in the building, on the trailer canvas and the metal and window glass of the cars and trucks the agents were hiding behind. A careful examination of the vehicles in this picture reveals not a single bullet scar to compare with the bullet scars on the building.

The Treasury Report contains a picture of the second trailer to arrive in front of the Mt. Carmel Center. The side facing the camera is the same side that was visible to the Branch Davidians; that side should bear bullet marks if the agents had received fire as they claimed.

In a final test of the veracity of the Treasury Report account, a magnification of the double door reveals that it is not "bowed out" from gunfire (Figure 21D), as alleged in the Treasury Report. It stands as any normal door, with the exception of a few bullet holes (disregard crease mark in newspaper). One section of the double door which bore many bullet holes would have been a key piece of defense evidence when the Branch Davidians were charged with the murder of the ATF agents. The trajectory of the bullet scars would have told the story of who shot whom; but the door section mysteriously went missing after the April 19 inferno, while the crime scene was under control of the ATF's allies, the Texas Rangers. [Here we see and note that local law enforcement agencies will participate with each other, even so far as to help evidence disappear. Does this give you the impression that you can depend on local law enforcement to protect you?]

[It should also be noted that evidence of this event was evidently kept at the Federal Murrah Building in Oklahoma City, the one that was blown up. Just a coincidence, nothing to be worried about!]

TV footage of the scene clearly shows the agents firing into the building, and not one Davidian returning fire – or even visible. The ATF also took videos of the raid as it was occurring. Later, the ATF claimed that their video camera malfunctioned and that no pictures had been taken after all. Just a coincidence, nothing to worry about!

[Is this not convenient? I'm not going to ask the question 'how many of us' believe this. Instead, I'm going to ask the question: "How many of you police reading this actually believe that their video camera failed to operate?"]

Not an Ambush

As noted, the Treasury Report claims their agents were killed and wounded in an ambush. The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language defines ambush as (1) A lying in wait to attack by surprise and (2) a surprise attack made from a concealed position. The same dictionary defines attack: "To set upon with violent force; begin hostilities against . . ." But it was the ATF that intruded upon the Davidians, attacked them by surprise and began hostilities against them. Using the common meaning of the words as defined in an American dictionary, it was obvious that the Davidians ambushed no one.

Had the Branch Davidians been armed for warfare with a 50 caliber machine gun and spoiling for a fight with the government, as the ATF said, the ATF agents were at a deadly disadvantage. Given the Davidians had cover and elevation, the ATF agents could have been slaughtered wholesale. But that didn't happen.

Blind Fire

TV footage of the scene show an animated version of the still pictures: agents carelessly peppering the building with pistols and rifles. The timing and manner of their shots does not suggest they were picking their targets, aiming, and firing, but rather emptying their magazines.

In the light of other information, however, this manner of shooting is more sinister. As researcher Ken Fawcett points out, diagrams left in a diner by ATF agents at the time of the raid show the floor plan of the Davidian Center and names of Davidians listed for each room (see the Smart Diagrams). Given the relatively flimsy structure that was Mt. Carmel, bullets would penetrate the walls almost as easily as the windows. Peppering the outside walls of rooms of individuals selected for death just might work.

Entry of Agents into Second Story Window

Sometime during the morning of February 28, a team of four agents climbed a ladder onto a roof which led to another section of building that was a 'story' above the roof and had a window. The window on that roof lead into the room marked "Koresh's Quarters[--] Guns" on the diagram of Mt. Carmel, Second Floor. Waco researcher Ken Fawcett captured footage apparently taken during the incident, footage which was heavily edited even before it was beamed down from the TV satellite. The footage shows three agents entering the room, and a fourth agent remaining behind on the roof. The fourth agent then throws at least one grenade into the room that the other agents had just entered and then fires in blindly with his gun. Whoever is in the room [presumably the other agents] fires back at the fourth agent.

Only a few frames of this footage appeared on commercial news coverage and in news magazines. Those frames usually showed the agents at the window, or an agent shielding himself from shots coming through the walls of the room. Footage that showed the fourth agent throwing a grenade and firing blindly into the room *was not shown*.

On March 5, 1993, the Dallas Morning News reported that all the agents who had entered that room, Robert Williams, Conway LeBleu, and Todd McKeehan had died. Later, this report was changed.

Killed by Expert Marksmen

The ATF charged that a fourth agent, Steven D. Willis, had been killed by the Branch Davidians. All four agents appear to have been killed by professional assassins; three were killed by shots to the head, and one by a shot through the aorta (main artery of the heart).

[You may find it interesting to note that all four of these dead men were former body guards for Bill Clinton. Just a coincidence, nothing to be concerned about!]

Conway LeBlue's head bore two gunshot wounds (see Autopsy Report diagram); Todd McKeehan was killed by a single shot to the left upper chest which ruptured the aorta (see Autopsy Report diagram); note the "tracheotomy" wound in the throat: a tracheotomy is not an recommended treatment for a bullet puncture of the aorta. Note: Branch Davidian Peter Gent (Mt. Carmel Doe 76) was also killed by a shot through the aorta. Robert Williams' head bore two gunshot wounds (see Autopsy Report diagram); and Steven Willis's head bore at least two gunshot wounds (see Autopsy Report diagram).

This was remarkable shooting for Bible students. In fact, such precision killing is more typical of professional assassins, the likes of which have had military training, are currently in the military, or on "retired" status in the military, and work as snipers for a paramilitary government agency.

All four, who were killed by expert marksmen, were treated by private physicians or emergency medical technicians on the scene; none were taken to nearby hospitals, despite the severity of the injuries (Treasury Report, pg. 102). [Question: Was there some concern that an injured individual may reveal detrimental information?]

Death of ATF Agents Necessary for Escalation of War

The deaths of ATF agents was used as a justification for the siege.

"The first thing I did after the ATF agents were killed, once we knew that the FBI was going to go in, was to ask that the military be consulted because of the quasi-military nature of the conflict, given the resources that Koresh had in his compound and their obvious willingness to use them," President Clinton said (Washington Times, April 24, 1993).

[Question: Are frightened Christians attempting to avoid death under the assault of a murderous government to be defined as a conflict of a 'quasi-military nature'?)


Certainly there would have been little public support for tanks, torture, and escalating the hostilities (war) had agents not been killed. In the War Gallery Entrance, we see that heavy military equipment was at Mt. Carmel from Day One, February 28, 1993 indicating that the failure of the raid was a forgone conclusion.

In the analysis of this information, I think we can all agree that if the BATF agents were being assaulted with "heavy gun fire" and with "home made hand grenades", there would be considerable damage to the vehicles, behind which agents were taking cover, and to the trailer in which they arrived. The bottom line is that it was a lie. The press, doing its job, never reported the trial of the Branch Davidians accused of planning and executing an ambush of Federal Agents. Obviously the jury was not deceived. Are you?

NOTE: Four Branch Davidians were ultimately tried for conspiracy to murder the ATF agents. In a trial that took place in San Antonio in 1994, they were all acquitted of murder. As a result of a press blackout, their acquittal has been a carefully kept secret from the American people. See Burial Gallery. http://vader.com/page/w_m.html

I've had the opportunity to see the video footage described above in which agents entered an upper story window while one agent remained outside. After agents enter the window there is this brief lapse in the video footage and it again picks up on the agent outside the window that his comrades have just entered. This outside agent then sticks the barrel of his machine gun in the open window and with the barrel, pushes the drapes aside while spraying the room with bullets. Someone in the room returns fire, and one bullet strikes the helmet of the agent outside who then stops firing and gets off the roof.

Up to now, I've not included any graphics as part of this document. However, I believe the following drawing to be of special significance, I've decided to include it as my first graphic.



A Helicopter Attack

A Davidian child drew a picture of the Mt. Carmel Center. She dotted the roof with her dark crayon: "Bullets," she said. Dr. Bruce D. Perry, chief of psychiatry at Texas Children's Hospital in Houston, conducted the interview with the child. Newsweek, May 17, 1993 published the drawing.

***** BEGIN: http://vader.com/war/page/w_L.html *****

Sometime in the morning--we are lead to believe that the time was a few minutes earlier than 9:48 a.m.-- 100 "federal agents" in cattle trucks, and three black helicopters arrived at the Mt. Carmel Center.

Video footage broadcast by KWTX-TV shows three black helicopters low over the horizon while ATF troops fire blindly into the Mt. Carmel Center. These were the helicopters the Davidians say fired down into the second floor women's and children's quarters.

The National Guard did not possess black helicopters--they would have no reason to do so. Black US Army helicopters are characteristically flown by the 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment (the "Nightstalkers") , headquartered in Ft. Campbell, Kentucky, a secret unit that delivers and picks up commandos working CIA and illegal Pentagon junkets (see A Death Cult Wears Black and The Black Army). Typically the 160th's flights are made at night, perhaps prompting the commanders of the 160th to paint the helicopters black.

The US government denies that the helicopters were armed, and denies that they strafed the building, but the evidence leaves little room for doubt.

At the time the raid began, the Davidians placed a call to the 911 emergency number of the Waco police force (a strange action for a group of people conducting an assault, wouldn't you say?). The call was taken by a Lt. Lynch. It was recorded and a transcript made. The transcript was introduced into the 1994 San Antonio trial of the Branch Davidians, and is reproduced in *The Waco Whitewash* by Jack DeVault (pg. 212). The Museum's copy of the 911 tape contains background noise that is clearly a helicopter rotor and automatic gun fire.

The transcript of the 911 call shows that at one point, while listening to the background noise, Lt. Lynch says: "That's automatic weapon fire . . ."

Automatic machine gun fire can be heard as helicopters pass overhead during this conversation between Lt. Lynch and the Davidian, who is identified as Wayne Martin:

Martin: They're still attacking.

Lynch: Awright.

Martin: There's a chopper with more of 'em.

Lynch: What?

Martin: Another chopper with more people--More guns goin' off. Here they come!"

Lynch: Awright. Wayne Cah (unintelligible)

Martin: More firing!

Lynch: [Unintelligible]

Martin: That's not us. That's them!

(tape played in *Waco, the Big Lie Continues*, and quoted in DeVault, pg. 214-15).

The footage taken by KWTX-TV and shown in *Waco, the Big Lie Continues* shows bullets hitting the roof and eaves of the Mt. Carmel Center. In that video, the American Justice Federation made an analysis of the trajectories of the bullets. The bullets must have come from the sky above the building.

Eyewitness Statements

Davidian survivor Catherine Mattson said:

"I heard three helicopters. The reason I knew they were three was I looked out the window and I could see they were firing on us . . . And they turned, and when they turned I fell to the floor, because I could see that those bullets could hit me if I was standing. They went to the front of the building. And it seemed like by the time they got to the front, they were firing again." (Shown in Day 51, a video available from the Mt. Carmel Survivors Fund.)

Davidian survivor Annetta Richards:

" I was actually getting ready for worship. I heard a noise like a helicopter, and then I heard bullets start firing; bullets start coming in from every direction. And the helicopter were flying low over the building. The sound of it was so low that at that time I thought they had landed on the roof. Bullets were coming in from all directions." (Day 51)

Davidian child's interview with Dr. Bruce D. Perry. See photograph and caption on page header.

Death of Jaydean Wendel

Jaydean Wendel, a nursing mother, was killed instantly when a bullet from one of the strafing helicopters smashed through the top of her skull (Autopsy Report, Mt. Carmel Doe 78, pg. 6). Months later, the Department of Justice Report attempted to cover this up by stating that Jaydean Wendel died from a gunshot wound to the chest (Department of Justice Report, pg. 313).

Attorney Inspection of Building

Attorneys who were at the Mt. Carmel Center during the siege attempting to negotiate between the FBI and the Davidians say that they saw the roof bearing bullet holes, and that these holes were clearly made from the sky downward. Jack B. Zimmerman, attorney for Branch Davidian Steve Schneider, testified on this point at the 1994 San Antonio trial of the Branch Davidians. Mr. Zimmerman is a graduate of the Naval Academy in Annapolis, spent 14 years on active duty in the Marines, is a Vietnam War veteran, and, at the time of his testimony, had been in the Marine Reserves for 15 years. His rank in the Marines is Colonel. His two grown children are also in the Marine Corps.

Mr. Zimmerman testified that when he visited Mt. Carmel during the siege and inspected the premises, he found holes in the plywood roof. All the splinters were facing down, indicating the shots had come from the sky into the rooms below (1994 San Antonio Trial of the Branch Davidians, Transcript, pgs. 6610-11).

Unmarked US Army Helicopters Used

At the 1994 San Antonio trial of the Branch Davidians, Capt. Bryan Dickens, one of the "National Guard" pilots said to have been flying one of the helicopters, was questioned about markings on the side of the helicopters. He inadvertently made an interesting admission.

- Attorney Carroll: And they didn't have any distinct markings on them identifying them as Texas National Guard or US Army or anything like that, did they?
- Capt. Dickens: No, sir.
- Attorney Carroll: You just couldn't tell whose helicopters they were by looking at them, unless you knew something specific about your helicopter, right?
- Capt. Dickens: Yes, sir.
- Attorney Carroll: I wouldn't have known, would I?
- Prosecutor Johnston: Your honor, I object to what Mr. Carroll would know. I have no idea--
- Court: Sustain the objection.
- Attorney Carroll: The man on -- a man on the street without any special experience wouldn't have known, would he?
- Capt. Dickens: All Army helicopters are marked the same.
- Attorney Carroll: But this helicopter didn't have anything in white paint that said "U.S. Army," did it?
- Capt. Dickens: No, sir, not . . . [Questioning continues on different subject]

(Transcript, pg. 3296)

Note that the "National Guard" pilot has inadvertently admitted that the helicopter he was flying was an unmarked US Army helicopter.

As noted before, National Guardsmen can be selected to go on Special Operations missions, as can Army Reservists (Army Times, January 2, 1996, Special Ops: Bosnia's Best Hope, pg. 51). And Special Operations can form ad hoc teams for special missions--including commandos from ATF or FBI.

Whether the helicopters used in the February 28 assault were "National Guard" helicopters is an empty issue. Even if the helicopters that strafed the Mt. Carmel Center were owned by the State of Texas, when National Guard equipment and personnel are used in federal service, they operate on federal (Pentagon) command lines.

Now, there is an exercise in Constitutional absurdity: to cast as a "states rights" issue the use of some military helicopters, when that use consisted of strafing women and children with machine gun fire!

Historical Perspective

Surreptitious use of military aircraft by the Pentagon and CIA is not unusual. Falsely marked US war equipment was used in the Vietnam War. For example, in Laos, dozens of US bombers were painted with Laotian Air Force markings. They were manned by pilots of Air America, a CIA front operation. The CIA operatives flew reconnaissance flights over North Vietnam in the falsely marked planes to gather intelligence for upcoming bombing raids. (Pentagon Papers, pg. 239.) Using unmarked Army helicopters during the Waco operation and calling them National Guard helicopters is in keeping with established practices.

* * * * * END: http://vader.com/war/page/w_L.html * * * * *

Here we have clear evidence of the attack by those in the Black Helicopters. They shot downward into the roof of the Branch Davidians home without knowing who would be in the path of their bullet(s). Even of more concern for all of us is the fact that they did not care who was in the path of their bullets (*authoritarians* at their best). I'm certain that Jack B. Zimmerman, attorney for Branch Davidian Steve Schneider, who spent 14 years in the Marines, was absolutely correct when he testified that the bullets all came from above the roof as evidenced by the splinters being inward on the underside of the roof. If you think otherwise, take a board to your favorite shooting range and shoot it. The splinters will all be out the back side with nice neat round holes at the entry.

We also have evidence that the Justice Department is quite willing to lie in their reports as evidenced by method of death recorded in the Justice Department report of Jaydean Wendell in which it was reported that she died of a gun shot wound to the chest when she was actually shot from above with the bullet entering the top of her skull and traveling down into her body.

Also take special notice of the testimony that establishes the use of unmarked black helicopters. These helicopters are used by the military assassin squads. If you have Internet access, do a search and see what you come up with.

Are we proud?

As time and wisdom would have it, I was not one of those who was cheering on a murderous group of government agents. Twenty years before in the ignorance of my youth, I might have

been. At one time in my life I believed that the leadership of our government and its agencies was populated with good and honorable people. But then I observed a number of events that changed that confidence and belief. Now I can ask the question: Are we proud?

The modest plywood shelter the Branch Davidians had built with their own hands could not be expected to withstand the barrage of helicopter machine gun fire and the hail of bullets from the frontal infantry assault of February 28.

Early accounts indicated that a child, or "children" had been killed that day. This was surely not unexpected, because the helicopters had fired into the second story quarters where the children lived.

When the Davidians were attacked, they called 911. The call was taped. The recording captured David Koresh's voice: "You see you brought your bunch of guys out here and you killed some of my children. We told you we wanted to talk. . ." Dallas Morning News, March 1, quoted Steve Schneider: "People are lying dead in here, babies and everything . . ." (pg. 13A), and also reported David Koresh saying a 2-year old girl was killed.

Early in March, Waco researcher Ken Fawcett captured raw TV footage, not shown on nightly newscasts, which showed several black clad men carrying what appeared to be a small body in a body bag to an ambulance waiting outside the Mt. Carmel Center. The identical footage is shown in "Waco, the Big Lie."

On March 2 arrangements had reportedly been made to end the confrontation. David Koresh was to tape a message he wanted the American people to hear. The taped message would be aired on national radio. The dead and the wounded would be taken to Hillcrest Baptist Medical Center and the Branch Davidians would confront the government in the courtroom (Dallas Morning News, March 3, 1993).

* * * * *

Hillcrest Hospital had set up a temporary morgue and emergency room to handle the Davidian dead and wounded. According to the Dallas Morning News, "Hillcrest expected that the Davidians were going to arrive after 2:30 pm on March 2. A triage area was set up outside the emergency room, and an area for a temporary morgue designated." Shortly before 1:00 pm, "agents arrived at the hospital in a large white truck and took up positions on rooftops surrounding the emergency room. They surveyed the area through binoculars and clutched assault rifles to their chests." (Dallas Morning News, March 3, 1993, pg. 14A.)

But the dead and wounded Davidians reportedly never arrived at Hillcrest. David Koresh's taped message was not aired on national radio, but aired on a local station. The FBI would later say that David Koresh simply broke his word on March 2 and refused to let anyone leave. They implied that the local radio airing of Koresh's taped message should have been good enough.

On the other hand, there could be an alternate explanation for the events of March 2. The FBI's Hostage Rescue Team had fully installed itself as the tactical unit in charge of the siege on that date (Treasury Report, pg. 118). Perhaps the "new management" decided against the release of the dead and the wounded. Surely there would be good reason to make the change.

The confirmation that a child or children had been killed in the February 28 raid would have surely had the gravest political consequences for the U.S. government. The raid had taken place just weeks after the new Democratic president, William Clinton, had been inaugurated. But the raid had obviously been planned months in advance--when the Republicans were in power. Simple political expediency would dictate that the news of a murdered child or children be suppressed.

The news reports of the death of a child or children abruptly stopped about March 3, and the news reports of the numbers of the dead Davidians also ceased. Occasionally there would be a reference to the wounded who were still inside.

On March 10, the Dallas Morning News reported: "'The children all spoke of seeing bullets flying through their windows in their quarters and seeing numerous wounded people in the compound,' said Joyce Sparks of the state Children's Protective Services office."

On March 15, the Dallas Morning News reported: "She acknowledged that other sect members were wounded and need medical attention." (Attorney Peterson, speaking for Kathy Schroeder, pg. 9A).

On March 22, the Dallas Morning News reported the remarks of FBI agent Dick Swensen: "Also, the wounded people and the conditions inside the compound add to the pressures on this to end this thing soon." (pg. 6A), and ...

Then, on April 21, the Chicago Tribune reported that: "FBI officials in Washington received information last week that sanitary and other conditions in the compound were deteriorating in ways that were especially threatening to the children. One FBI official said children who had left the compound recently reported the presence of dead bodies and buckets full of human waste." (Chicago Tribune, April 21, 1993, pg. 20). [Now tell me, who was it that created these unsanitary conditions by turning off the electrical power and denying these people water?]

"Presence of dead bodies." Perhaps these were the bodies of the Davidians who had been killed on February 28 and who had not been buried, or people who had died of their wounds? And what of the dead child, or children?

During the course of the siege the U.S. government continuously made accusations of child abuse against David Koresh. The FBI apparently persuaded Koresh to make a tape of the children inside the Mt. Carmel Center during the siege, ostensibly to show that they were

OK. A video tape was made showing David Koresh talking to children, who were responding to his questions and shyly smiling at the camera.

[I leave it up to you Mr. and Mrs. America, who was the real abuser of the children, David Koresh or the United States Government? And if we conclude that the United States Government engaged in reckless endangerment and harm to children, could Child Protective Services not file charges?]

Had the February 28 raid been a law enforcement action, there would have been no need for helicopters to strafe the women's and children's quarters. But the killing of women and children does fit in quite nicely with the purposes of war, which is to inflict the maximum horror and suffering on the opponents.

*****http://vader.com/war/page/w_o.html*****

As we read this next section we may ask the question: Who broke the laws of the United States?

Negotiations

Nor did the FBI act as if they were conducting negotiations. Few parties in a negotiation will cut off the opposite side's electricity, phone lines, blast them with noise night and day, throw grenades, and drive tanks around their home smashing automobiles and kids' toys. If these were "negotiations," the word has been redefined.

But the siege did provide an opportunity to use the residents of the Mt. Carmel Center as a national test-bed in which besieged civilians' reactions and resistance to military force was tested; the news coverage of the siege provided a test-bed for the gullibility of the American public. Just how much newspeak would America swallow?

Civilian Head of FBI Told to Take a Walk

On March 6, FBI director William Sessions intervened personally and offered to talk with Koresh directly to bring matters to a peaceful conclusion. It is significant that he was denied the opportunity by the tactical section of the FBI. (Justice Report, pg. 131). The excuse was that the move would "inject the FBI Director into the operational process and possibly impair needed objectivity." In other words, the military (HRT) core of the FBI was in control of the siege, not the head of the FBI's civilian facade.

First Amendment Canceled

HRT: An acronym for the FBI's **H**ostage **R**escue **T**eam

We have already seen that the Texas Rangers sealed off the Davidians' residence from the very beginning of hostilities (Treasury Report, pg. 79). By March 1, the FBI had cut all the Branch Davidians' telephone lines and replaced them with lines which connected them to the FBI (Treasury Report, pg. 28). The news services were kept three miles from the Mt.

Carmel site, in a location known as "satellite city." All communication from the Branch Davidians had to go through the FBI.

During the siege, "[the HRT maintained the inner perimeter, the SWAT teams maintained an outer perimeter, and various agencies, mainly the Texas Highway Patrol, manned various checkpoints on the roads leading to the compound.]" (Justice Report, pg. 150).

"Additionally, throughout the standoff, families and friends of those inside the compound appeared unannounced at checkpoints requesting to go inside. While those individuals turned out not to be security risks, the danger that a friend or relative might try to slip into the compound was always present." How would this be a danger, unless the friend or relative might learn some piece of the truth and talk? (Justice Report, pg. 153).

Davidians Imprisoned with Tanks, Grenades, and Concertina Wire

The FBI claimed during the siege that it wanted the Branch Davidians to get out from under David Koresh's "control" and to leave the Mt. Carmel Center. The most direct way to do this was of course to allow the Davidians free egress from the building. However, the FBI set up formidable barriers which made the Davidians prisoners in the Mt. Carmel Center.

Tanks

By March 1 the FBI had moved in armored vehicles "to help secure the inner perimeter." Yet, remember, the FBI claimed it wanted the Branch Davidians to come -- OUT.

Grenades:

On March 10, "numerous individuals came out of the compound, walked around, then went back inside. It appeared from these actions that they were attempting to test the resolve of the agents, since the FBI had warned people not to come outside without first obtaining permission." (Justice Report, pg. 62). And from whom were the Davidians to ask permission? Was there someone inside the Mt. Carmel Center who was directing releases, or otherwise acting as a liaison for the FBI? On what basis would such "permission" be granted?

"March 18. At 1:34 p.m., SSRA [FBI agent "negotiator" Brian] Sage began to speak to those inside the compound over the loudspeaker system in an attempt to communicate directly with everyone, to urge everyone to come out. Sage told them they would be treated fairly, that they were free to come out . . . " (Justice Report, pg. 73).

"Stay Inside!" - "Come Out!" The FBI was playing with the Branch Davidians as a cat plays with a mouse before the kill.

The Justice Report states that in April, "individuals inside the compound were exiting unannounced with ever-increasing frequency," and that they "only returned to the inside after being "flash-banged." (Justice Report, pg. 153). A "flash-bang" is a type of grenade

used by the ATF and the FBI during the initial assault and siege. Rather than being harmless as the agencies claimed, the devices have caused severe bodily injury, including dismemberment. The Branch Davidian attorneys called one such victim to the stand during the 1994 San Antonio trial of the Branch Davidians. The victim, Sandra Sawyer, a mother of four, was at a friend's house when it was raided by the police, who threw flash-bangs into the home. Ms. Sawyer's right ? was almost severed, and, at the time of the trial, she had undergone six reconstructive surgeries. [Transcript, pg. 6806-13].

There we have it. In order to keep them inside the building, the FBI threw explosive devices at the Branch Davidians. Flash bangs were thrown at the Davidians regularly throughout the siege. Psychiatrist Dr. Bruce D. Perry, who had interviewed the Davidian children who left the Mt. Carmel Center, wrote a memo to the FBI on March 11. He "described the children's 'many, many, many, allusions to explosions' and raised questions about whether the compound had booby traps or was wired to explode," (Dallas Morning News, May 4, 1993, pg. 13A). If Dr. Perry were to read the Justice Department report, he would perhaps understand to what the children were referring.

Another report published by the Department of Justice, the DOJ Dennis Report, also cites many instances of the Branch Davidians being flash-banged by the FBI in order to keep the Davidians from leaving the building.

On April 10, the FBI erected concertina (razor) wire around the building. (Justice Report, pgs. 102, 145).

Tanks, grenades, razor wire--all used to keep people inside a building. This was a strange way to encourage them to leave the building. It is obvious that the Davidians were hostages of the FBI, kept like fish in a barrel.

Electricity Turned Off

From March 9 the FBI began to turn the electricity off and then on again. On March 12 the electricity was turned off for good. Despite the presence of babies and children inside, FBI agent Jeff Jamar said that the electricity was turned off "because he wanted those inside the compound to experience the same wet and cold night as the tactical personnel outside . . ." (Justice Report, pg. 142). The Davidians complained "that the people were cold and freezing inside the compound." (Justice Report, pg. 68).

Radio, TV Signals Jammed

We have already seen that the U.S. government installed high-tech monitoring devices inside the Mt. Carmel Center, and that the ham radio tower was taken down before the February 28 raid. The government also engaged in other high tech electronic warfare against the Branch Davidians. Actions included jamming SOS signals being transmitted by the Davidians and jamming incoming radio and TV signals.

Jamming of radio and TV signals is strictly prohibited by U.S. law, and can be carried out only in extreme situations such as war or national security emergencies. President Clinton himself would have had to sign the order (Communications Act of 1934, 47 USC 706(a) and (c)).

The FBI jammed TV and radio signals as part of its psychological warfare against the Davidians (Dallas Morning News, April 17, 19, 1993). Signals were jammed almost completely during the day and night to prevent the Davidians from hearing news of support from other Americans. The only signals permitted into Mt. Carmel's airspace during the siege were those carrying FBI news conferences, in which David Koresh was held up to scorn and the religious views of the Davidians were ridiculed. Through listening devices, the FBI then studied the Branch Davidian responses to the briefings.

"You could hear them yelling and screaming about [FBI agent] Ricks and [BATF agent] Troy, yelling and screaming about [how] people were lying about them ... That came mostly from Schneider," an FBI official told the Dallas Morning News.

The jamming equipment was supplied by the Federal Communications Commission--the very body entrusted with enforcing the Federal Communications Act.

Morse Code Signals Jammed

On the night of March 14, 1993, and on the following night, Morse Code messages were flashed by Branch Davidians switching an overhead light on and off. The messages came from the fourth floor residential tower of the Mt. Carmel Center. The flashing lights were picked up by TV cameras, captured on video tape, and later analyzed.

Associated Press issued a report stating that it had analyzed the transmissions, that the message was this:

"SOS SOS SOS FBI BROKE NEGOTIATIONS. WANT NEGOTIATIONS FROM THE PRESS."

The Dallas Morning News, March 16, 1993 (pg 12) reported the same message, but said the message had been made with a flash light.

The Morse Code transmissions were also studied by George Zimmerlee, a Marietta, Georgia electronics expert who designs and builds prototype electronic equipment. He is an amateur radio operator, and holds an FCC General Radiotelephone (Operator) License. On the night the signal began, stadium lights were focused into the room from which the signals were being transmitted. The Morse Code signals were obscured by the much brighter stadium lights. The cameras also began panning back and forth so that viewing of the signal was interrupted during crucial transmission periods. Apparently the government was alerted to the Branch Davidian plans by listening devices planted inside Mt. Carmel. "Much of what the Branch Davidians transmitted has been lost," says Zimmerlee.

Interfering with SOS signals violates several international laws, including the International Telecommunications Convention of Atlantic City, 1947 (Article 44) and the UN International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Part III, Article 19. The SOS message met the International Telecommunication Union Rules (Article 37) definition of a distress signal.

Davidians Wayne Martin [a Harvard law school graduate] or Jeff Little, now both dead, probably sent the code, says Zimmerlee. Both were ham radio operators, knew Morse code, and had a proficiency of 20 words per minute. "They were sending coherent, very readable code--exquisitely good, it was very readable." says Zimmerlee.

"Communications in this military operation was a high priority target. The government has lied about the nature and purpose of the raid. Evidence of jamming shows that there was something extremely dangerous about permitting the Branch Davidians to communicate with the outside world," says Zimmerlee.

Mr. Zimmerlee has carried his objection all the way to Rep. Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.), Speaker of the House of Representatives in the US Congress. A letter of response from the FBI to Congressman Gingrich was returned to Zimmerlee (see page 1 and page 2 of that letter).

Mind Manipulation Experiments

The Waco siege was also a test bed for mind manipulation experiments. In mid-March, bright stadium lights were brought in to interfere with the Morse code the Davidians were sending (see above). These lights were retained and shone during the night to deprive the Davidians of sleep. Eyewitnesses say the noise level around Mt. Carmel was unbearable. Low flying helicopters continually hovered over the buildings and tanks circled the house.

The FBI brought in loudspeakers, and through the speakers came the high decibel sounds of laughter, birds squawking, sirens, rabbits being slaughtered, rock music, Tibetan chants, and recordings of "negotiation" sessions held between the Branch Davidians and the FBI (Justice Report, pgs. 69, 73, 79).


"March 22. The negotiators called Schneider at 9:03 a.m. Schneider was still angry about the loud music which had included Tibetan chants. The negotiators attempted to calm him by blaming the FBI tactical agents; however, Schneider remained angry . . ." (Justice Report, pg. 79).

On March 23, the Department of Justice report states that Davidian Steve Schneider, with whom the FBI was "negotiating" "had become very combative and argumentative" (Justice Report, pg. 81).

"March 24. After several attempts, the negotiators reached Steve Schneider at 9:52 a.m. Still angry over the loud music, Schneider refused to talk any further that day." (Justice

Report, pg. 83)

*****http://vader.com/war/page/w_p.html*****



Remains of a two year old Davidian child, Mt. Carmel Doe 51A, photographed on May 7, 1993, just 18 days after alleged date of death. The remains have never been identified.

I believe that even the most reluctant of we Americans can clearly see who is breaking the law and who is lying, but the law breaking and lying does not end here. By now we perhaps have a different picture of the Branch Davidians than we did by just listening to the main stream media. Do you think that it's possible that those in charge, along with some of their zealots, became angered when the Branch Davidians didn't collapse and crumble as expected under the psychological stress that had been placed upon them and decided for other tactics, more brutal in nature?

And so I answer the question, "Am I proud"? No! I'm ashamed to the core of my being of the behavior of our Federal Law enforcement personnel, the Texas Rangers who provided support and helped with coverup (who at one time had a reputation of integrity), and the Texas Highway Patrol who provided road blocks to any families. But mostly I'm also ashamed of myself because any power or authority that the government claims to have has been conferred upon it by me and the rest of the American people and neither I nor any other American can confer an authority or power that we do not possess and further, since the murdering that occurred at Waco was done in my name (and yours) by an out of control government while I sat by and did nothing to help my

fellow Americans, I hold myself in contempt. When the government uses powers and authorities that cannot have been conferred upon it by any American and I (we) allow this, then I (we) are not doing our jobs as responsible citizens, responsible Americans, responsible human beings and in this case, eighty plus people (many of them children) were murdered in a horrendous manner.

"Of all the forms of murder, none is more monstrous than that committed by a state against its own citizens . . .



This is a picture of Melissa Morrison before she was rescued by the FBI's Hostage Rescue Team at Mt. Carmel.

"The homicidal state shares one trait with the solitary killer--like all murderers, it trips on its own egoism and drops a trail of clues which, when properly collected, preserved, and analyzed are as damning as a signed confession left in the grave."

--Forensic anthropologist Clyde Snow, speaking before the May, 1984 meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He used his skills to expose the atrocities committed by governments. (Quoted by Christopher Joyce and Eric Stover in *Witnesses from the Grave*, Pg. 217).

Mt. Carmel





This is Mellisa Morrison after she had been rescued by the FBI's Hostage Rescue Team. Only her lower legs were found. [Take a good look people, this was done in your name! Don't be like the German people who didn't want to know what horrors were being committed by their government in WWII.]

From the evidence we have examined so far, we hypothesize that the story of the Waco Holocaust is a story of at least three crimes:

1. Mass murder
2. Destruction of evidence
3. Fabrication of evidence and perjury

The stories are simple in concept, but complex in details.

1. Mass Murder. The nation's top military and paramilitary agencies are involved in one of the most horrendous mass murders in the nation's history. These are: the Pentagon's Special Operations Command and the select forces that serve under its auspices; the Department of the Treasury's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF); and the Department of Justice's Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Among their victims are many mothers and children.

This is the stuff that could topple a government . . . How to hide Crime Number One?

2. Destruction of Evidence. The times, causes, and circumstances of death must be disguised. The mothers and children's bodies are burned, mutilated, and dismembered. Almost every technique in the book is used to "launder" these bodies, applied as if by the hands of experts. How to hide Crime Number Two?

Fabrication of Evidence and Perjury A cover story is invented. It runs, in part, as follows: The mothers and children sought shelter from the C/S gas in the concrete room, and the structure collapsed on them and killed them. The bodies are "laundered" to disguise the real causes, times, and circumstances of death, and the concrete room is slated for demolition.

Control of the crime scene and the bodies is given to incompetent and compliant local yokels. The locals can provide a plausible cover for the destruction of evidence already effected, and, through incompetence, effect even more destruction of evidence through their independent actions. FBI agents and other "helpers" are salted among the local yokels to ensure the results.

But some things go wrong along the way.

First, the demolition job fails: The concrete room does not collapse. Instead, only a two-foot hole is punched in the roof.

Second, the FBI panders to the news services, permitting photography from the air and the ground. The widely publicized pictures contradict the cover story. The photos show the concrete room in pretty good shape, thank you, except for the two-foot hole.

But it's too late to change the cover story.

Third, FBI personnel forget the old adage, "Loose lips sink ships." They talk too much, and reporters dutifully print their ramblings. Is it news when leading FBI agent Jeff Jamar speculates on the location of the bodies before they are found? Only when he is right. And he is.

The damaged roof is permitted to contaminate the remains. False information is placed in the Autopsy Reports, along with observations about the remains which provide evidence of crimes One and Two.

Some of the locals testify at the Davidians' trial. They variously tell the truth, or hedge, or commit perjury, but they do give away the show.

*****<http://vader.com/death/death.html>*****

I think at this point that I'm not going to include the intentional destruction and contamination of evidence. Those of you who have Internet access can view all material contained at <http://vader.com/> by simply requesting that of your Internet software. The fire was an intentional act, used to destroy evidence, but there is much more to the cover up and tainting of evidence than just the fire. I would certainly recommend that you follow up.

The net documents I've presented here were chosen because of their content. I have followed the events of Waco since it occurred and knew much of what I found at this web site, but this was the most complete presentation I've found and as such I recommend it to anyone who has interest in this event.

Ruby Ridge

But Waco is certainly not the only instance of government abuse around. I will present one more just briefly. This is the events of Ruby Ridge, Idaho. Randy Weaver, had been given the label 'white separatist' by the media in an effort to dehumanize the man. Randy is apparently a white person who wishes to live around other white people in an relatively isolated area. An activity that we allow in America the same as we would allow a black person to separate himself from white people and live in a black community or an Asian to separate himself from both black people and white people and live with other Asians with whom he may have common grounds. The difference is that the press wouldn't dream of calling these people a *black separatist* or an *oriental separatist* in an effort to de-humanize them (at least not yet).

Agencies of the Federal Government (namely Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms - BATF) felt that Randy had ties to some political group they were investigating. They approached Randy to become an undercover informant for them, but Randy declined for he evidently did not wish to spy on anyone. BATF then sent an undercover informant to Idaho, to make contact with Weaver and compromise him in a way that would give BATF the leverage needed to force Randy to become that undercover informant they wanted. After many months of knowing this man, Randy sold him two shotguns. At least one of the guns had the barrel sawed off too short to be legal and so a technical weapons charge was brought against Randy Weaver. In truth, it may have easily have been the undercover informant who sawed off the shot gun to an illegal length because of pressures to produce some results. Whichever was the case, the BATF felt that it now had the necessary leverage to force Randy to become an undercover informant.

Again Randy declined and charges were filed. Randy was then sent the wrong court date and when he appeared, his name was never called. And so he went back home. When his case did come up on a different date, he was, of course, not there. BATF, with the assistance of other agencies of the Federal Government, began surveillance of the Weaver home site. This include placement of two solar powered camera's that communicated to a central facility through a satellite link. There was also aerial reconnaissance.

One evening, after many months of surveillance, BATF agents got close enough to the Weaver home to alert the family dog. At this time Randy, Kevin Harris (a friend) and 14 year old Sammy Weaver exited the cabin. All were armed as would be prudent in the remote location of their cabin. Not seeing anything, they cut the dog loose and began to follow the dog. The dog took off and quickly caught up with a BATF agent in the near darkness. The agent shot the dog. Just as the agent is shooting the dog, 14 year old Sammy appears on the scene. The agent then shoots this 14 year old boy and almost takes his arm off. Randy is now calling Sammy and the boy turns around and shouts to his Dad that he's coming home, at which time the agent shoots this young boy in the back and blows the boy's heart out his chest.

May we ask why there was surveillance at all? That is why we have warrants, courts and due process of law. A bench warrant was certain to be issued when Weaver failed to appear for his hearing. In the United States, the practice has been to knock on the door, serve the warrant and make the arrest. I think that it is clear that someone did not want to operate lawfully.

A brief exchange of gun fire then takes place. Agent William Degan is killed. Since the agents were not grouped together in the darkness it would be difficult to know who shot agent Degan, but ultimately Kevin Harris is charged with murder in this incident. Harris and Weaver retrieve Sammy's body after the agents withdrew, and took Sammy back home and placed his body in a small shed beside the house.

The cabin was then surrounded by the FBI Hostage Rescue Team (HRT - the same guys that would later be in charge at WACO). The next day, Weaver and Harris exit the cabin and go around to the shed where Sammy's body is located. There, both men pray over the body of the boy. Upon returning to the home, both are ambushed by FBI snipers. Randy, who has not shot anyone nor shot at anyone, is wounded. FBI sniper Lon Horiuchi, sees Vicki Weaver (Randy's wife and the mother of four children) standing in the doorway of the cabin holding the door for her husband and their friend Kevin Harris. Vicki is not only holding the door, she is holding her eleven month old baby girl. From a position 150 yards out and slightly elevated, FBI agent Lon Horiuchi targets Vicki with a model 700 bolt action snipers rifle sporting a 10 power scope and matched loads (that is precisely matched bullets so that the shooter has extreme accuracy). Lon shoots Vicki in the face. The bullet rips away her lower jaw and severs her carotid artery. Her screams lasts perhaps 10 to 15 seconds. And then she too is dead. Kevin Harris is also wounded in this cowardly ambush. An ambush orchestrated and sanctioned by the U. S. government.

In the days that followed, the FBI Hostage Rescue Team has placed charges around the cabin with the intent of blowing it up to kill everyone inside. This would include the three remaining children. ***This is called hostage rescue!*** Fortunately, the efforts of Col. 'Bo' Gritz and Arizona Police Officer, Jack McLamb, are successful in convincing Randy to surrender. Randy stood trial for murder and was acquitted but was convicted on the minor weapons charge and sentence was set to time already served.

All of this for one quarter of an inch on a shotgun barrel! That's right ladies and gentlemen, the technical weapons charge against Randy resulting in the death of a 14 year old boy, a young mother and a BATF crook, was for selling a shotgun whose barrel was one quarter of an inch too short. So don't think for a moment that government, its agencies, agents and leadership are not out of control. All of this traceable directly to the Commander & Chief (what we call the President) and to the Congress (you know - those representatives in both the house and senate of the united States of America). And can you believe it, after this man had been jailed for months during his trial, had his son and wife shot and killed, been shot himself, the spineless jury of American people found him guilty on the one quarter inch shot gun barrel charge instead of setting him free with a not guilty verdict? UNEDUCATED SHEEPLE! They're dangerous.

April 23, 1997 - John Hirko

It was a spring evening on the 600 block of Christian Street in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. Sitting at his computer working away was twenty-two year old John D. Hirko, Jr. John didn't know it but an 'un-identified' informant had accused John of selling him heroin. [2008 - The *informant* has since been identified as John R. Neison IV, a Moravian College student.] The police, being conscientious, concluded that they should investigate this accusation and probably search John's

home. So, on this spring evening the police went to John's home dressed in black ninja suits (better than playing cowboys and Indians as a kid). The police had no intention of knocking on the door and serving a search warrant. Instead they announced their arrival by tossing one or more flash/bang grenades into the house (the same type used at Waco and described in that section). The grenade is designed to disorient, confuse and stun those present but can kill and dismember. Well, it did stun and confuse John, plus it set fire to John's home.

The police then burst in through windows and doors with their fully automatic weapons pointed at John. John, who is most certainly disoriented, confused, stunned and now fearful for his life, begins to go upstairs. This action causes the law abiding police to shoot John in the back, five, perhaps six times. [2008 - Actually John was shot eleven times.] John's girlfriend, who is upstairs, screams at the sight of her beloved being cut down. She then kicks out an upstairs window, goes through and drops into the arms of a man wearing a black ninja mask who then hand cuffs her and drags her to the curb never allowing her to see his face.

Back inside the burning building, the warriors don't seek medical attention for the wounded John nor do they drag wounded John outside the burning building. No, they leave wounded John inside to be burned. It takes fire fighters considerably longer to snuff out the fire than it took law abiding police to snuff out a life. It wasn't until the autopsy that anyone (outside the police who entered the house) knew that John had been shot several times.

When the fire is finally out, investigators enter to allegedly find marijuana seeds in a plastic bag. [2008 - The story now is that a gram of cocaine was found.] Strangely though, the bag is not even singed. As a matter of fact it is in pristine condition, not showing any heat or smoke damage. Nothing to be concerned about, just a coincidence. As if marijuana seeds [or even cocaine] were a valid rationale for this type of behavior. I would hope that the police of my community do not 'protect me' from my neighbors in this manner. And I hope like hell that if they do, I'm not visiting at the time of their arrival.

With the joking aside, how can any of us feel secure when our police, our warriors, who have sworn to protect and defend us, behave like murderous criminals? And if they have not been sworn to protect the people, then they and their Leadership need to go bye-bye.

Meanwhile, back at police head quarters, the law abiding warriors interrogate the girlfriend for eight hours. With no counsel present and no Miranda warning.

A search warrant, which was absent at the time of the search, appeared later. It appears that it was signed by a Judge after the events took place. Three months later the state attorney general has not released any information, including the official autopsy report in violation of state law. So there is no official explanation as to how this young man died, nor is there any investigation as to why he was killed. Authoritarians covering up for each other.

[I just performed a quick Internet search for this event and I found that the coroner ruled John's death a homicide but there was not any further information on the disposition. February 23,

2003]

The law abiding warriors, knowing the right thing to do, brought criminal charges against the girl friend.

Are we awake yet ladies and gentlemen, or do our heads still reside where there is no sunlight? If so, I might suggest that vision may be improved with the installation of a monocle in the belly button. If I sound angry, I am. Angry at myself and angry at all of us Sheeple, who have stood by so long and allowed this illness to manifest itself in government agencies. The very agencies that are supposed to protect we Americans and our constitutional rights. Rights that many Americans died to provide. Was John guilty of anything? We don't know, do we, and now we never will. Which one of us will be next? Will it be your father, mother, brother, husband, wife, or child? And so, again, we see that authoritarians are exceptionally dangerous. Remember, **they were only following orders.**

If you need more proof, you might do an Internet search for 'BATF Harry Limplugh'. Harry was a 60 year old gun show promoter who was raided by BATF. His story is typical of BATF actions. Should they call on you, I'm certain you'll find out.

If you were unprepared for this chapter, I'm certain that you are probably close to being in shock right now. The truth is that there are many such incidents and their frequency of occurrence is rising, meanwhile, the press, doing their job of keeping the public asleep, uneducated, unknowing and uninformed, have either not reported these events, confined the report to the locality, or reported them inaccurately. Yet, let a Federal Law enforcement officer be killed and it is nation wide coverage. Let us not forget the toast of John Swinton presented earlier.

Further, we should not forget the role of informant John R. Neison IV. It is because of his *authoritarian behavior* that this incident was set in motion. Mr. Neison IV is responsible for a needless death! But he was just following the rules... just doing the *right(?)* thing.

Returning from the tangent

As stated, just before I got off on this tangent, Authoritarians of this nature are exceptionally dangerous. But their existence couldn't continue without the millions of lesser authoritarians in the general population. The only cure for authoritarianism that I know, is education and a strong moral compass. But given the nature of the *authoritarian cult* and how they protect themselves, it is difficult.

Now that you have read this chapter, you can now see the very tip of the iceberg called New World Order / One World Government. Get ready, because 99% of it will stay under water until they can complete their takeover.

CHAPTER 4

LAW & IT'S PERVERSION

This is where it is at ladies and gentlemen. To enslave the American people, it is necessary to pervert the law, and at least as important, to persuade the large majority of American Citizens that perverted law is legitimate. The law must be made to work against its own foundations and principles. That is, instead of protecting *rights and property*, it must be made, or altered, to invade and take away *rights and property*.

To do this the masses must be convinced that unlawful activity and behavior on the part of government is acceptable and legitimate **when done in the name of law**. This, unfortunately, requires that the masses remain mostly uneducated, unable to think, and unable to analyze. Thus we have the Department of Education [*indoctrination*].

Slave. A slave is a person who has sufficient public education to perform menial, but useful tasks, but has insufficient education to understand his status and enslavement.

In America a slave is most likely a person who believes he (or she) is free. And they work hard at convincing themselves they are free, saying, “*we have more freedom than other countries.*” While that may be true in some cases, **our freedom** probably should not be compared with other countries, but instead be compared to our freedom in 1830 or 1900. If we make this comparison, we have very little freedom left. I know not about the rest of America, but I pay taxes to have my freedom’s maintained and enhanced. Not taken away at every turn and every event!

Law has an evolution and there have been many systems of law throughout history. From the beginnings of mans recorded history, there have been systems of law. It would seem obvious that there were laws before men had the ability to write them down. Some systems of law provide justice, and many provide for Totalitarian [absolute] Control.

Natural Law comes from God. As hard as man has tried, he has not been able to produce a system of laws that are more just and fair than those laid down by God and found in the Bible. And while this is not a sermon, we cannot avoid the fact that our country’s founders were religious Christians and their Christian beliefs found its way into the *law of the land*. Most Americans probably don’t know it, but the law of the Republic of the united States of America is the *Common Law*. The Constitution is a *Common Law* document. The roots of the *Common Law* is the Bible. In practice, the *Common Law* is biblical law applied. This is to say it is God’s law applied.

When man begins to make laws without the influence of a strong moral compass, he often becomes biased by his own greed and lust for *power and control*. In so many ways the majority of lawmakers are elitists who believe that only those in the class of lawmaker are sufficiently knowledgeable to know what is best for your life. They believe that the masses are simpletons

that serve as *Human Resources* to the *State*. Not Human Beings, not Citizens of the *united States of America*, but *Human Resources*. Does that sound familiar? More importantly, are they correct? If we American's are unwilling to accept the responsibility for our own creation (government), I'm certain they are correct. Remember, the American government is the creation of *we the people*.

"When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation." Declaration of Independence.

Natural Law [Based on the book "*The Law*" by Federick Bastiat

The development of 'Natural Law' or 'God's Law' if you prefer, has at least three requisites. First would be *life physical*. But *life physical* is not sufficient by itself. Enter *life intellectual*. Sufficient intelligence to develop language, and eventually, sufficiently intellectuality to develop the means to write the language. And lastly, the key ingredient to develop just law, *life moral*. Without morality in the creation of law, law would simply be a set of rules to benefit the law maker, having nothing to do with justice or fair application of the laws.

The distinction between 'right and wrong' is absolutely essential to the establishment and maintenance of a civilized society.

This concept is so important that I have placed it in large type and made it bold lettering. Without this concept in the creation and application of law, the society will not be civilized, and will behave as an un-civilized people. All the while the members of such a society will be trying to convince themselves, and others, how righteous their system is. If the legal system of any society loses the ability to distinguish between 'right and wrong', then citizens of that society will be abused by the legal system that is supposed to protect them. But this works only because the citizenry supports the injustice. The support comes from conditioning supplied by *public education*.

When citizens participate in the abuse of others, their moral compass takes a new heading and their logic and rationale become perverted. This becomes a necessity so that they can participate in the abuse [injury] of their fellow man and still 'feel good' about themselves. As examples I would offer two cases. That of welfare, where law provides that the property [money] of one citizen may be taken without permission and given to whom it does not belong. Remember that all actions accomplished *under law* are accomplished under a threat of force (law is force) or actual force (arrest, trial & imprisonment) if necessary.

As a second example, twenty women per thousand, in the age group of 19 to 35, aborted their babies this past year. I just heard this news item on the radio this past week (first week of December, 1998). If my calculations are correct, that means there were about three million murders last year of unborn children.

To rationalize these crimes we call ourselves needy or under privileged whereby this reasoning becomes the rationale used to take that which belongs to someone else. In the case of abortion we call the human being in

Clear exceptions would be rape, incest or any act in which a female did not become pregnant by virtue of her own choices and actions.

the womb an unviable tissue mass (just as you once were). This term was created for the lower intellect masses, so that they can feel good when they authorize the taking of a human life. We should all remember that life begins at the moment of conception and is in a different stage of development at six minutes, than it will be at six hours, than it will be at six days, than it will be at six weeks, than it will be at six months, than it will be at six years. But it is the same life, just in different stages of development. *Unviable tissue mass* indeed, are we not sad? In effect, when law becomes perverted, *we the people* can become very un-civilized. And believe me, I'm not interested in arguments over government financed welfare or government financed abortion. Wrong is wrong, even if it helps you ... period.

When you and I acquired life as a human being, we also acquired responsibilities to other human beings. A requirement that we think of someone other than ourselves. Just because many of us are ignoring these responsibilities does not mean that we do not have them. We have the responsibility to carry our own end of the stick and not place an un-necessary burden on our fellow man. Those responsibilities include not inflicting injury upon others, except in *defense* of our own lives and property, or the lives of our family. We have the responsibility to preserve, develop and perfect life as it exists in us and to the degree that our abilities allow.

Life cannot continue alone. Life physical cannot continue without maintenance. Thus, we have been placed in the midst of a wondrous variety of natural resources. Applying our talents, intellect and abilities, we discover, process and convert these natural resources (raw materials) into an assortment of products that we use to maintain and enhance our lives. It is through this process that life runs its naturally appointed course thus making this process absolutely essential to the development and maintenance of life and its cycle.

This process is the source of all property

Even if you repair air-conditioners for a living, it is only possible because some other human being mined the ore that was converted into the steel that allowed the construction of the air conditioners on which you work. Always remember that *the source of all wealth and property lies in the conversion of natural resources into products that enhance life.* This is why you cannot have a *services based economy*. If you do not convert raw materials into products, you produce no new wealth. No new wealth equals a dying economy. This becomes one of the ways to break

the back of a nation. Stop mining, stop timber harvesting, block agriculture as much as that is possible.

When you are compensated for your work, the substance of the compensation is yours. What you acquire in compensation for your work and labor is yours. It is your property, not the property of someone else. I'm attempting to make this point clear and drive it home because there are many cunning and artful political leaders that attempt, often successfully, to convince the people that the compensation for their work and labor (their property) may be taken under [corporate commercial] law, by force if necessary, and then distributed to 'others' to whom it does not belong. The 'others' may be welfare recipients or they may be the pockets of political leaders.

And for some reason we think this is lawful & legitimate. This means that the greed of lawmakers will manifest itself in the passage of laws that allow the taking of property from an individual and give that property to whom it does not belong. And if the individual citizen does not voluntarily subject himself to such a law, the government will then drag this individual into court and expect you as a jury member to find him guilty of not offering himself up to be fleeced. And because of our general indifference to humanity, and because of our ignorance of the foundations of the law of our Republic that so many American's died to provide, ***we will dutifully*** find this individual guilty, thus giving the government the green light to further injure and abuse him by a combination of possibly confiscating his remaining property, and/or assigning a severe fine, and/or sending him to prison, or a combination thereof. The truly tragic part is that we cannot participate in the injury of others without setting the stage for injury to ourselves in the same manner. Such is life for a people ***who chose*** to mostly remain uneducated and indifferent to their fellow man.

Our founders believed that our life, liberty and property are gifts from God to man. And please, don't get lost here in religious semantics for I'm not preaching. I am only putting forth the beliefs of those who provided for your freedom. If you are having trouble accepting that your life, liberty and property are from God, either because you don't believe in God, or perhaps because you do not accept this premise, then I would ask you, "Do you believe that your life, liberty and property came to you from government?" No? Then why are you behaving as though they were? The sentiment of America's founders is solidly put forth in our founding documents. America's founders believed in God and in his law as put forth in the Bible. They believed that God's law precedes all human legislation, and is superior to it. Our founders believe that what God has given to American's cannot be legislated away under our constitution. But as you will discover in another chapter, these gifts from God may be unknowingly and unwittingly contracted away by you.

Should we fall prey to accepting the premise that these gifts of life, liberty and property come from government, then we will be a slave owing to that government. It is the nature of government that whenever government provides a thing, it expects tribute in some form. To make certain the tribute is paid, men in government will pass laws that require certain specific performances. Because of conditioning and *psychological profiling*, through the media of news papers, magazines, television shows, movies and department of education, most of our

population believe that they could not exist without all that government does for them. For the most part, we American's never seem to grow up and assume responsibility for our own lives and existence. Have we become children for we certainly behave as children?

We Americans do not exist because of government, government exists because American's of 1776 put it all on the line, took a stand, fought a war, won the war and established our government. American's just like you. The American government is dependent upon its people for its existence not the other way around. But, with the assistance of the main stream media and department of education, government has done a great deal of psychological profiling to make certain you believe otherwise.

Do our lives, liberty, or property exist because men have made laws? No - of course not. Quite the opposite actually. It is a fact that life, liberty, and property existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place. Laws that respected life, liberty and property above all else.

Let's construct a definition of law. Take a moment and construct a definition for law that provides justice in all cases. Give this definition some thought. Write down your definition and refine it. Refining your definition allows you to give thought to all mankind. How would you like your loved ones treated by law? As responsible citizens we don't want our loved ones, or our fellow man, abused by law. But neither do we want them to go unpunished if they have caused injury. It is unfortunate, but law, as perverted law is now practiced in America, does not equal justice. More and more American families are becoming aware of this as they or loved ones become abused by the legal system. Our definition of law should equal justice.

Law Defined

law: The collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense.

Individual right

The foundation for law is individual right, not collective right, not group right, not majority right. This principle is the cornerstone to a system of law that provides justice. To understand our *right to lawful defense* we need to understand our rights under the laws of nature. For now we will start with the assertion that you have the right to defense of yourself from harm. It seems self explanatory that you would have a right to defend yourself from harm so I will develop no logical argument to that effect. This right to defend yourself against harm would also extend to your family since your family is an extension of yourself. It would also extend to your liberty and property since these are also a part of you. It is when we step outside the definition of law provided above that we pervert the law. ***It is when we are not defending ourselves that we become un-just.*** If we are using our force to *offend* (as opposed to *defend*), we enter the realm of injustice and abuse.

Lawful Defense

All that is living *defends* itself as equipped by nature. Leaving the legal text books behind, let's talk about what 'lawful defense' is all about. Every individual has a natural right from God (not from man) to defend his person (life physical), his liberty and his property. In a marriage under the laws of the Republic, the husband & wife are viewed as one flesh and the children are of that flesh. This extends a mans right to lawful defense to cover the entire family.

Defending our person seems to be self explanatory, but why do we have a 'natural right' to defend our liberty and property? It is because we cannot be free nor have free will without liberty and property. Liberty and property are essential to sustain and maintain our life without selling ourselves into servitude of another man or group of men [government]. Without our liberty and property we are either a 'slave' (dependent on someone else) or on our way to deaths door.

"Those who refuse to participate in politics are destined to be ruled by their inferiors." - Plato.

Yes, I know that we are all dependent on each other. The carpenter builds a house and the black smith makes his tools. But this is an 'interdependence' not to be confused with the dependent nature of child and parent. The latter is true dependence and many Americans now look upon government as their parent, taking care of them from cradle to grave, providing all that is necessary to live.

Liberty

"1. Freedom from an arbitrary or despotic government. 2. Freedom from external or foreign rule. 3. Freedom from captivity, confinement, etc. " - Random House Dictionary (ISBN 0-345-38705-8)

At Section 8, the Constitution states that "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..." From this *the District of Columbia* was created. What we know as Washington, District of Columbia. How many American's realize this creates a jurisdiction over which Congress has exclusive legislative authority? This was just set forth in the language of the Constitution, but did we understand it? If not, thank you *department of education*. And further, do we American's understand that this jurisdiction is not *inclusive*, that is, it is not *inside* the Republic of the united States of America, it is *EXCLUSIVE*, that is, *outside* the Republic of the united States of America. This means that the jurisdiction of *the District of Columbia* is a *FOREIGN* jurisdiction to that of the Republic of the united States of America. If it were an inclusive jurisdiction, the laws of the Republic and *constitutional limitations* would apply there, they do not. Further, *the District of Columbia* is a corporation, municipal in nature but still a corporation. It was incorporated in 1871 and I may, from time to time, refer to it as *the corporation of 1871*.

Therefore, *the District* law is *corporate*, and not constitutionally limited or restrained. This, of course, gives Congress a *dual character*. In one character Congress may make constitutional law(s) for the *Republic of the united States of America*, and in the other character Congress may

make any law it wishes for *the District*.

This clearly makes *the District of Columbia* is a foreign entity and not a part of the Republic of the United States of America? It is a completely separate jurisdiction and is governed by corporate law separate from the laws of the Republic. Now, while keeping that fact in mind, read the definition of Liberty again paying particular attention to #2.

A trip back in time

Can we take a trip back in time, perhaps several hundred years, to a time when you fed yourself and your family by hunting with a bow and arrow. Tell me, what would happen to you and your family if someone were to steal your bow(s) and all your arrows. Survival would suddenly become crucial would it not? To survive you may need to accept assistance from another man. Suppose that this man is the same man who robbed you of your bow and arrows. He may wish you to pay tribute to him for the help he provides. Yes, I realize that he engineered the scenario by which you now need his help, but that does not matter. What do you think Government Leadership does? He is powerful and in control. He has your weapons and means of survival. Unless you can find others to stand with you and help you to regain your property and what you need to survive, you will become the slave of the man who has stole your bow and now stands ready to provide you with all the help you need. All it will cost is your life, liberty and property (your freedom). But if you fight back we ignorant American's are going to find you guilty of not playing the commerce (fleece) game and send you to prison.

Today your property may be your real estate, your tools, books, computer or your money. Do you think that intelligent men in government service may be able to think up a method by which government could become the owner of all these things that you think belong to you? Well, they have, and it is contained in the corporate laws of the United States (*the District*). All it takes is for the government to make corporate laws that obligate you in one form or another, and we will see this much more closely in the chapter on *War & Emergency Powers*. If you are unable or unwilling to play the commerce (fleece) game and do not relinquish your property, the government will then confiscate (steal) all the things listed previously and you will be left with nothing. Nothing in the bank, nothing to drive, maybe nothing to eat. And if you have a job, they may even attach your pay check. And if this doesn't satisfy them, you may find yourself in prison. Exactly the things that the founders of the United States of America sacrificed their lives to abolish.

Going back to our scenario of several hundred years ago, imagine that you could not travel the roads and trails without permission of another man or group of men. It does not take the intellect of a rocket scientist to determine that to survive requires travel. Therefore, if you could not travel the roads of your country without the permission of someone else, in order to survive you would have to pay tribute to this man (or body of men). How many of us are sufficiently educated to understand that this is a violation of the Constitution in spirit and in substance and a violation of Natural Law. There is a reason our roads are called *public rights of way*. And should the day come when government begins to call them *public privileges of way*, it will be just another step in the psychological profiling of your mind.

We are conditioned to accept the concept that we must be licensed to travel in our cars, but do we really need to be licensed. Of course not. Just as we did not need to be licensed to operate our horse and carriage in another period. Did every person riding a horse gallop through town at full speed, raising dust, kicking horse manure on others, and placing lives at risk? Of course not. Oh, there has always been the juvenile who did this a couple of times before someone took him 'out back' and explained matters to him. But for the most part, people were careful because they were responsible. And when they were not responsible, we filed a complaint with the county sheriff.

A license, any license, is just a means for government to control your life. It does not guarantee competence, although we pretend that it does. If you think otherwise, look at what we license to drive. All that is necessary for careful driving, is responsibility.

If I am liable for you in the event that I injure you, I will be very careful to avoid causing you injury. In America, we practice *limited liability*. I am liable for a certain sum of money in the event that I injure you. And under this *law of limited liability*, we will generally behave in a manner consistent with this law. But if America were to operate under *Strict Liability*, then we will generally behave much differently. If my driving practices were to cripple you for life and I had to assume your role as bread earner in your family and provide food and shelter for them for the rest of my life or until you are healed sufficiently to assume this role again, I would now be very careful how I travel in my car as well as how I ride my horse. And believe me, horses are a lot more dangerous and unpredictable than cars.

And to cover myself in the event that I become injured by you and you do not have the capacity to feed and house my family, I can provide insurance on myself and file a complaint against you. Responsibility and accountability is the road to freedom, avoidance is the road to dependence and slavery.

The first tenant of freedom is that the individual must be responsible for themselves.

You must have your liberty to hunt or grow your vegetables or go to work and earn what you may. Life, liberty, and property, - these are the basic requirements of living a life of freedom and the preservation of any one of them is dependent upon the preservation of the other two - Defend these!

THE COLLECTIVE RIGHT & THE COMMON FORCE

We hear a great deal about our rights but do we have an understanding of these rights? In U.S. vs. JOHNSON (76 Fed, Supp. 538), Federal District Court Judge James Alger Fee ruled that...

"The privilege against self-incrimination is neither accorded to the passive resistant, nor to the person who is ignorant of his rights, nor to one indifferent thereto. It is a FIGHTING clause. It's benefits can be retained only by sustained COMBAT. It cannot be claimed by attorney or solicitor. It is valid only when insisted upon by a BELLIGERENT claimant in person." McAlister vs. Henkel, 201 U.S. 90, 26 S.Ct. 385, 50 L. Ed. 671; Commonwealth

vs. Shaw, 4 Cush. 594, 50 Am.Dec. 813; Orum vs. State, 38 Ohio App. 171, 175 N.E. 876. The one who is persuaded by honeyed words or moral suasion to testify or produce documents rather than make a last ditch stand, simply loses the protection. . . . He must refuse to answer or produce, and test the matter in contempt proceedings, or by habeas corpus."

This, as you may remember, is a constitutional right, guaranteed in the 5th Amendment. Judge Fee has clearly pointed out that if we are ignorant of our rights, we have none. Neither *law enforcement* nor the courts are obligated to help us secure our rights. According to Judge Fee, both the courts and law enforcement will engage us in a form of non-physical combat or fighting (what the legal profession calls *adversarial*) to see if we can be tricked or intimidated into giving up our rights. We also see that our rights cannot be claimed by an attorney. It is to be assumed that the *Combat* referenced by Judge Fee, would be the unwavering fight we put up to claim our rights, not only in court but in any situation that involves the administration of justice, whether it be the ordinary police, the FBI, the *Department of Justice*, or any other investigative government agency.

When the events of Waco, Texas were unfolding, many people said, "the government has the right to do what they did". Do they now? When government exercises a power or authority that is presented as a *right* or we American's believe to be a *right*, may I ask 'from where that *right* came?' Where do the rights that government exercises come from? We need to understand that to enforce law, any law, requires the threat to use force or if necessary, actual force. Otherwise law cannot be enforced. Therefore, law is force. What is the source of the force that is used in the enforcement of law (notice that I did not say "*in the administration of justice*". Sometimes *force* is used in the administration of justice, and sometimes it is used to enforce a statute - an injustice... there is a difference)? These are the matters we shall discover.

Since I, as an individual, have the right to defend the life, liberty and property of myself and my family, then you, being equal in the eyes of the law, have the same right. Cannot you and I join together and use our common force to defend our lives, liberty and property? Certainly we can. Cannot everyone in the community join us and use the common force that all of us together represent, to defend our lives, liberty and property? Yes we can. And the same is true for the entire country.

"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)] see also: 17 U.S. 316 and read down to page 403-404

It is in this manner that we have developed the *common force*. But what is the source of the collective right?

CONFERRING POWER & AUTHORITY

What does it mean when it is said that we have a government of the people, by the people and for the people? It means that in the United States, any authority or power the government claims to have is one that is been conferred upon it by *we the people*, clearly put forth in the box inset. This is the collective right. But since this collective right comes from individual Americans, it cannot exceed the right of any one individual. And so the development of the collective right comes with a warning.

A warning

WARNING: THIS CONCEPT OF COLLECTIVE RIGHT CONTAINS A DANGER THAT LIES IN ITS APPLICATION BY THE IGNORANT, THE UNEDUCATED AND THE AUTHORITARIAN.

YOU Cannot CONFER OR DELEGATE POWERS THAT YOU DO NOT POSSESS.

Above all else, we must understand this concept or the collective right will turn into a monster that will devour us all. Those in power are constantly reaching for powers and authorities that cannot possibly have been conferred on it by any American. And it does so with impunity because of our ignorance. Remember that those in power are within a corporation that you know under two names, “*the District of Columbia*”, and “*the United States*”. The Corporation of 1871 is one and the same under both of these names. I know it is confusing because we generally think of the *United States* as our Republic of the several states united, and this is part of the deception (psychological profiling) that has taken place. Formally, the Republic is known as the *united States of America*. Notice the lower case ‘u’ on united. When the ‘U’ is capitalized, it is a reference to the corporate *United States* and not to the Republic of the *united States of America*.

I would like to inject a cautionary note here. This discussion of the *United States* is not opinion, it is taken from case law of our country and this topic will surface again in this document and the legal cite will be included at that time. I am putting forth these facts now so that you have a little better understanding of what is being said and asserted.

There are three (3) “*United States*” defined in law, and those definitions, taken directly from Black’s Law Dictionary may be found [here](#).

When we think of the *collective right* and come to understand that it controls the *collective force*, then we understand that we must have a very tight reign on the *collective right* lest it unleash the

collective force on us all to the destruction of our great country. A full understanding of the *collective right* requires that we understand that its very reason for existing, its *lawfulness*, is based on *individual right*. If an individual does not have the *right* to a certain action or activity, then the *common force* does not have the *right* to engage in this activity either. The *common force* that this *collective right* controls, cannot, and I repeat **cannot**, logically or lawfully have any other mission or purpose than that for which it acts as a substitute. And that is **DEFENSE OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHT**.

Let's present an example and see if I have made my point clearly with regards to the *common right* and its control over the *common force*. For example, do I have the right to use force if necessary, go into your wallet or purse, take out a hundred dollars and give it to whom I feel is needy, or have I broken a law if I do so? Most of us can see that I've broken a law of course. I have no right nor lawful authority to go into your wallet or purse and take your property (money). If I do it stealthily (sneaky) without force the crime is called theft, whereas if I use force or the threat of force, the crime is called robbery. Now, since I don't have the right (lawful authority) to perform this act, then how can I confer this power or authority upon government? Answer: I cannot. Therefore, when government acts in this manner, it is using the *common force* against the foundational principles of law and has, in fact, perverted the law. It has turned *law* against itself. To determine if a law is perverted I need only ask myself if I will be arrested if I were to do the same thing that the law is permitting the government to do. If I would be arrested then the government is acting unlawfully or under *color of law* (which is another way of saying unlawfully).

In reality, it is government's position that you have contracted to have your property taken from you, by force if necessary. The contract is beyond the constitution if not in conflict with said constitution. And volunteering through contract to have your property (money) taken from you (by force if necessary), is not un-constitutional. What may be unconstitutional is a contract acquired under fraud & deception. You will learn more of this as you progress through the book. For now, it is sufficient to say that the government actions are deemed to be within the law by virtue of contracts you've unknowingly and unwittingly entered into. You can learn more about invisible contracts by clicking [here](#).

USE OF LAWFUL FORCE

Since an individual cannot lawfully use force, outside the realm of defense of his rights, then the common force, which is only a collection of individual forces, cannot lawfully be used to destroy or harm the person, liberty or property of another individual (or group) outside the realm of defense. To use force in such a manner is entirely contrary to our established premise, that of defense (justice); not offense (injustice). Consequently, we cannot confer any *right, authority or power* upon government that allows that government to use the common force unlawfully.

And so the constraint or restriction that we place on the use of the 'common force' is that it is to do only what an 'individual' has the 'natural and lawful right to do': To protect persons, liberties and properties; to maintain the right of each, and to cause justice to reign over us all.

HOLDING EACH OTHER ACCOUNTABLE

So how do we go about 'forcing' court appearance since this has the appearance of acting outside the realm of defense? The first requirement is that we have suffered an injury. The injury does not need to be physical. For example, your car is parked at the curb in front of your house and I run into it with my car causing substantial damage. You have just suffered a *financial injury*. You now have a *right* to be compensated for your injury and *made whole* again. If I refuse to be responsible for the loss I've caused you and simply leave, you would file a civil suit, and send me a summons. If I have committed a crime, a private person would file a written complaint with the sheriff alleging a crime. Once the complaint was filed it would be investigated and verified (verified complaint) by an officer of the law or a grand jury investigation. Once there is an '*indictment*', an arrest warrant would be issued for my apprehension. But this is all initiated by the individual American, which is how the country's founder's set it up.

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." - Article five, Constitution for the united States of America.

Taken from our Constitution this language establishes that we the people shall retain to ourselves the power and authority to hold each other accountable. That we did not give that power to government.

Under English rule, we Americans learned quite painfully that men in power are not *just* and further, regardless of the admirable & noble reasons under which a government is formed, ultimately all governments grow to become despotic and evil. Government moves to empower itself through repression and enslavement of its citizens. Government can only empower itself through the loss of the individual freedoms and powers of its citizens. That is why the founding fathers of America set up a ***representative republic*** as our form of government.

In such a government, the power is in the people, for one person who knows and understands the law and knows that no one should be punished or injured when they have harmed no one, can say "not guilty" and at that moment this person has more power than Congress, more power than the president and more power than the supreme court. It is a fact that a democracy provides for ***majority rule***. This is the foundation for ***might [numbers] makes right***. Because there are more people in my group who say it is O.K. for me to take your money or other property under 'our law', we will now do so. In our *representative republic* this is simply not possible for none of us has such a right and no one can confer this power upon government. The *representative republic* protects the right of the individual from the many, thus protecting us all. At least until the government takes over education, making certain that students (American's) are never taught these foundational principles. It is my hope that *teachers* will someday begin teaching again.

With this language within our constitution, our founders were establishing a system to prevent men of power from abusing the people. Unfortunately, our systems of education are so lacking, most Americans don't even know how to sit in judgement of another person. Most Americans today only know what the law says as given to them and interpreted by men in power. Consistent with being good *authoritarian sheep*, we Americans send many people to jail who have never harmed anyone. Which is to say they have committed no crime deserving of punishment. The whole time we pat ourselves on the back, deceiving ourselves into thinking we've been good citizens.

Ah, but with a verified complaint, a summons would be served on you by a law officer or process server who would notify the court that the summons had been served. You, having great respect for the law and the freedom it provides, know that it is now your responsibility to answer the lawful summons through court appearance. Acting dishonorably through a failure to do this will cause the court to issue a warrant for your arrest. The law enforcement officer will then use only the minimum force necessary to arrest you and deliver you to the court system. If you quietly go with the officer when he makes his appearance, there should be no cause to harm you. However, the officer must have, in his possession, a *fourth Amendment* warrant for your arrest, signed by a Magistrate in black ink. This is called 'due process of law'. Arresting officers have no authority to kick in doors and destroy property to effect an arrest unless you have refused or resisted arrest or contracted to be abused. I might add that you should not count on a policeman knowing due process of law as set forth in the constitution and the laws of the Republic. You will learn more about why as you read on in other chapters.

The whole concept of law is one in which the citizen respects the law of the Republic and the peace and freedom it brings. Freedom requires responsible behavior. If the American people are not willing to be responsible, they cannot be free. Therefore, in most cases it is assumed that the citizen is willing to abide by the law of the Republic and lawful process. And when he is not willing to abide by the law of the Republic, the *common force* will seek him out to deliver him to the court. The problem is that government has two characters. That of Republic and that of corporation. And the corporate laws created by government are not constitutional. This is where we begin to have problems, simply because our police officers are not educated any better than the rest of America. In most cases they do not know that they are enforcing *commercial law* only, which is not constitutional, but corporate. Thinking they are acting 'lawfully', they apply all kinds of force to *enforce* these *un-constitutional commercial corporate laws* and think they are doing right.

In the event that the citizen is not willing to abide by the process or in the event that the injury caused was intentional, such as in a robbery or murder, then there may be other process' necessary to bring the accused before the court.

If the crime were a serious one, such as robbing a bank or murder of another person, the scenario changes just a little. A victims family, witness or victim of a felony would file a complaint and describe the nature of the injury and, if possible, the person who injured them. An investigation then ensues and if there is evidence pointing to a suspect, he or she is arrested and a grand jury

indictment is handed down. Due process.

In a case where there appears to be a wanton felonious injury, the law enforcement will probably arrive in significant numbers, knock, identify themselves and demand that the suspect come out for arrest. Again the arresting officer must have a warrant in his possession and be willing to produce this warrant for the suspect's inspection. Since this is a crime where someone has been severely injured or killed by an apparent action of the suspect, failure to come forward when the demand is made will be like stirring up a hornets nest with the suspect tied to the tree. The police officers will do all kinds of unpleasant things to get the suspect to come forward.

By the way, murder, fraud and robbery are all *common law* crimes. That is, they are crimes under the laws of the Republic although they may be mirrored as commercial corporate law crimes also.

If an arresting officer does not have a warrant in his possession at the time of the arrest, he is acting unlawfully and without authority. This can be hazardous to the officer. Many officers realize this and so they are prepared to kill you and make up whatever story they feel will get them through an internal review and investigation. Our police are constantly acting outside the law of the Republic and many people die as a result.

Our legal system was originally set up for individual responsibility. If you failed to act responsibly there were 'default actions' that were set into motion. The concept of law was contained in our citizenship, and acting as responsible citizens, we had great respect for the law - that is law of the Republic. As you develop a greater understanding of the law and its perversion you will come to realize that the law of the Republic is just, commercial corporate law is generally not. Corporate law is to benefit those who control the corporation.

CORRUPTION OF THE COMMON FORCE

For those who wish global governance, the Republic of the United States of America presents a significant stumbling block... our Constitution. For those globalists who desire control of the world, they must control the world's most powerful nation and its people... the United States of America. To do this, they must set aside or negate our Constitution. Step by step this is exactly what they have been doing. The protections the Constitution provides are still there, to a degree, but only to those who know how to claim those protections. However, with the events of September 11, 2001, in which it is asserted that the World Trade Center was attacked by foreign terrorists, many of our constitutional freedoms have been set aside. We Americans have trusted, and continue to trust those we have elected to power. For the most part, we Americans have not been willing to see, nor accept, that these *officials* we have elected are working against our freedom and best interests. And so the *common force* must be corrupted. But with this review and update, I now see that there is a clear distrust beginning to surface.

With the attack on the *World Trade Center*, over 50% of the population in the United States believes that government officials knew of the attack before hand. A very clear indication of mis-trust. In addition to this, many in that group believe that it may have been engineered by

government officials for the purpose of yet declaring another *EMERGENCY* and taking away more freedoms, both of which we have now seen happen.

For my part, it is interesting to note that no one has claimed responsibility. The whole idea of terrorism is to identify yourself after committing an act of terror, so that the target population will be *terrified* and in fear of more terrorism. But no one has claimed responsibility. Just a coincidence, nothing to be worried about.

We have now defined the proper function of law. Law has, by no means, been confined to its proper functions. And it is not by accident that Law has fallen outside the realm of *what is just* or even *what is lawful*, it is by design. When this occurs, Law then acts in direct opposition to its true purpose. Law will then be used by those men (& women) in power to abuse the very people that is their job to protect, all for the benefit of those who control the law maker or politician behind the scenes. The Law then becomes a tool used to destroy its own objective, that is the very justice that it was to maintain. This then is the purpose of *commercial corporate law* and it is the reason that governments (Federal, State, County, City) have become corporations. Laws of the Republic must pass constitutional muster, corporate laws need not pass such constitutional restrictions. Commercial law is then employed to destroy the rights that the *common law* respected and defended. When this occurs, the *collective force* becomes the tool of the *commercial corporate law* which is then placed at the disposal of those who wish to exploit the citizen by virtue of reducing the Citizen's liberty, property and freedom, without risk to themselves and without lawful due process. Perverted Law then converts plunder into a privilege of the powerful in order to protect plunder while at the same time converts defense into a crime in order to punish *lawful defense* and prevent the ordinary citizen from protecting himself.

If we examine the collective force in civil matters, we, of course, see the police, but increasingly the collective force includes the military. The injection of the military in civil matters, virtually negates civil matters.

Congress shall have the power to... raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years... Constitution; Article I; Section 8 [Intended to prevent a prolonged military presence upon the land and in the several states]

Posse Comitatus.

These Latin words signify the power of the county. In this the sheriff has the authority to call the assistance of all with a few exceptions. It is this power of the sheriff with the support of the people, that allows the collective force to maintain order and peace without the intervention of the military. The intervention of a country's military in civil matters is highly undesirable and produces results that only benefit those in power who wish greater control.

Note: The first ten Amendments are part of the Organic Constitution and included because three States, New York, Rhode Island, North Carolina, withheld their ratification based on the debate and adoption of a bill of rights, protecting individual rights – (the first ten Amendments). Actually, there were twelve Amendments proposed, ten passed. Therefore the Constitution could not have been ratified without this debate and inclusion of the adopted Amendments, as such they are part of the organic constitution.

It is then rule by sheer force. We would all agree that the inclusion of our military produces an awesome collective force. However, when the law becomes perverted and the police officer is not sufficiently educated to understand this fact, or is corrupt enough not to care, this places the common force under the control of those who have perverted the law. You will notice in the inset above, that Congress was not to appropriate money for an Army for a period longer than two years. As we all know this constitutional requirement has been set aside. Do we think that it possible that our founders did not want the *maritime (commercial contract law) jurisdiction of the District*, turned inward upon the land via military force? Is it likely that the founders did not want the Federal government to have an Army at its disposal to turn upon the American people?

With the alteration (perversion) of the law, the stage is now set for abuse of the people. In effect the police officer becomes the enforcement arm of a commercial corporate (municipal) organization. This is an organization, which has declared itself corporate and has operated to extend that corporate jurisdiction in land upon the several States outside the constraints of the constitution.

It is a fact that in the united States of America, “law” cannot compel a specific performance. It cannot compel an individual to pay *income tax*, or to get *any license* to do a thing. Therefore, it is necessary to trick the American people into making *contracts* with government. In short, the *contracts* the American people have entered into with government has made their normal and regular activities into a *commercial activity*. As set forth in the *text box* and as we shall learn in the chapter on *War & Emergency Powers*, all of our *commercial activities* have become regulated, and are under the control of the government as long as the American people allow this. By controlling our education and educational curriculum, the American people have never been educated in these matters, so it is very easy to trick and deceive the American public into making contracts of which they are not even aware. It is by this fraud and deception that the “law” has been perverted and corrupted.

“The organizing principal of any society, Mr. Garrison, is for war. ***The authority of the State, over its people, resides in its war powers.***” - Donald Sutherland in the role of Mr. X, in the movie JFK.

These *municipal corporations* have no obligation to operate *constitutionally* in their dealings with *the people* under maritime contract law. The results of this have been John Hirko, Waco, Harry Limplugh, Vicki Weaver, Sammy Weaver, the Inslaw case, and thousands of other incidents across our country whereby perverted *contract* law predominates and the police do not follow the procedures known as due process of law. They follow procedures of *due process of commercial contract law*. If they have read the constitution, their actions suggest that most have little regard for this document or upholding it as the supreme law of the land.

There are two primary reasons that Law becomes perverted.

1. Greed & lust for power (the controlling global elite)
2. False or displaced compassion and/or philanthropy. (the uneducated)

Those in power constantly work to expand their power and control. Their interest is in controlling the destiny of not only a country, but all countries, all of mankind, all resources, all of everything within their grasp. In so many ways this is accomplished by making a population dependent, much like dependent children.

Making a population dependent can be accomplished in at least a couple of ways. In a simple form, the controlling elite and political structure knows that it can take the people's money from them through various frauds (called taxes) and then use their money to bribe and/or buy the support of the people who provide the money to start with. There are a number of requisites in this process, not the least of which is that the population must not be properly informed or educated. It is most difficult, if not impossible, to make an educated populace dependent, the primary means by which the government empowers itself.

"The individual is handicapped by coming face to face with a conspiracy so monstrous he cannot believe it exists." - J. Edgar Hoover (First head of the FBI)

A more pervasive method of creating dependency is to create a crisis. It can be a health crisis, an economic crisis, an external threat crisis, or any other crisis that can be manufactured and threatens the well-being of the people in general. In effect, the crisis is manufactured, or created, with the *solution* already refined and ready to implement as soon as *the people* demand that government *do something*. Once the people make the demand, the *solution* is implemented. The *solution*, of course, is generally a law, or series of laws that further erode and remove freedom from the people and provide the *global elite* with more control. Control of the *American people* is accomplished via the ***collective force***, which is concentrated in the police forces and military, and is financed by the labor of the people through taxes. And of course, the use of their bodies, to be sacrificed in the implementation of the ***collective force*** in any manner deemed desirable by the global elite.

Just as the law of currency states that bad money will always drive out good money so will bad education drive out good education. If for no other reason, this happens because under bad education less is expected. Water travels the easiest path and, so often, the same is true with human nature whereby many of us take the easy way and this has been especially true in education. For those responsible for our educational process this might be forgiven if one does not know better, but as soon as the deficiency is pointed out to these intellectuals and they continue on the same path, failing miserably to provide true and needed education for those whom they have accepted the responsibility to educate, then it is no longer forgivable.

Currently we are in a severely declining economy and educators are being *laid off* due to budget cuts. Should we feel compassion for them? Only for those who have truly tried to provide education that helps the student understand his status and his *commercial world*. There should be no compassion for teachers who will not take the time to educate themselves and then their students. If the *teaching profession* had been generally doing their jobs the American economy would not be in the current (2008) mess. And American's would not be engaged in murdering people of this world from at least the close of WWII to the present. These types of events are not

random, they are engineered by those we empower.

I have often wondered why such powerful empires have fallen. I have come to believe that in most cases it is because the people have become immoral themselves and fallen prey to greed that allows some to benefit at the expense of others. Because a majority of people have supported a government, which makes laws that allows the taking of one persons property (and one country's property) to be transferred to another person (or country) without just compensation paid to the rightful owner of the property, there is now a lot of *engineered dissent*, not only between American's (divide and conquer), but between America and the rest of the third world (again: divide and conquer). Pit the people within the country against each other. Pit the people of other countries against America while making the Americans feel self righteous.

There are those agents by which the *global elite* expand their power and control. The primary agent for this power expansion is the politicians and other elected officials whose tenure in office depend on campaigns financed by money that is controlled by the *global elite*. Let me be clear, the most dangerous criminals we have sit as CEO's and Board members of our largest corporations. Often these people are members of secret societies or organizations. The reality is that *money buys votes* and when it does not, there is always 'VoteScam' (ISBN 0-9634163-0-8). Perhaps the lives of the politicians have been compromised by behaviors that would destroy them politically and socially, and for which they desire that no one knows.

There is almost always a way to control a politician and when there is not, there is assassination.

There are about 545 people who determine policy and law in the United States. Not much money would be required to buy off a majority of these individuals to implement the policies of those who wish control. Those who wish to set aside our constitution and pervert our law. Perhaps that is why the Congress of the United States is known more and more as the best Congress that money can buy. Once the law and policy making process has been corrupted, it follows that the educational system, the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco & Firearms, the Central Intelligence Agency, the

Assasination: Why change what works?

John F. Kennedy - (lone assassin) Lee Harvey Oswald
Lee Harvey Oswald - (lone assassin) Jack Ruby (who died shortly thereafter of rapidly developing cancer)
Martin Luther King - (lone assassin) James Earl Ray
Robert Kennedy - (lone assassin) Sirhan Sirhan
President Ronald Reagan - (attempted assassination, lone assassin) John Hinckley, Jr.

Others who should probably be on this list:

Dorothy Kilgallen - a journalist who regularly appeared on the T. V. game show "What's my Line." She was the only journalist to have interviewed Jack Ruby, who (above) shot and killed Lee Harvey Oswald. See more about Dorothy at:

<http://www.jfkresearch.com/morningstar/killgallen.htm>

Danny Casolaro - An investigative journalist who died under very mysterious circumstances. See more about Danny at: <http://www.constitution.org/col/octocaso.htm>
Also see the INSLAW case at:

<http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/inlawcol.pdf>

Read [Transformation of America](#) and see if the activities and advances in *mind control* might shed a different light on these assassinations as well as the many random shootings throughout the United States, especially in schools.

National Security Agency, the Courts (through the appointment of judges), the Department of Health, Federal Emergency Management Agency and all the departments of corporate government will also be corrupted and placed under the control of the powerful.

Color of law

We have seen law come into effect that allows the government to take your property (cars, real estate, money, bank accounts) and transfer ownership to someone (or agency) to whom it does not belong. Robbery, theft and stealing is robbery theft and stealing, whether it be done under color of law by government, or not. This action makes the government a simple thief (of Grand Theft magnitude), and the receiver of *property taken by force*. And for the most part the uneducated sheeple cheer these actions and behaviors. Meanwhile our police seem oblivious to criminal activity committed by 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 state law." (Atkins v. Lanning, 415 F. Supp. 186, 188) - BLD sixth edition

I wonder how the average American would react when, after getting five traffic citations in three years, his car and home are confiscated because they provide the means and base of operations from which these crimes can be committed? Well, maybe that's a stretch and maybe it is not. The precedent has been set, has it not? Let us not forget the confiscation of a woman's car whose husband was caught having sex with a prostitute within. Do you support this? If so, do not whine when your property is taken from you in ever increasing amounts.

Detecting Perverted Law

We have seen law come into effect that puts us into prison when having to defend our self and our property. For example, your right to *bear arms*, a right which, according to the second amendment, *shall not be infringed*. Yet, *commercial law* is infringing upon this right everyday in America. What part of *shall not be infringed* do the police not understand. Oh, I'm forgetting that they are operating on *presumption*. A *presumption* that you have *contracted* to be abused. Therefore who cares about *defending and protecting the people*? Their job is to *protect and defend commercial activity*, not the people of America.

If you are caught protecting yourself with a gun, you will most likely have your gun confiscated, be arrested and quite possibly will go to prison. That, according to today's politicians, is ok. It's also ok if you are crippled, maimed or killed, it's just not ok to be prepared to defend yourself and family under any circumstance. Here we see the conversion of lawful defense preparation into a crime. Thus far there is not anyone harmed, no injury has occurred, but the government is willing to harm you based on your desire to be prepared to defend yourself. Yet, if our government did its job, especially in the *public education arena*, there would most generally not be a need to carry anything to defend ourselves. Government, by virtue of its policies and actions creates the danger in which we live. They create (engineer) the problem and then bill themselves

as the solution to the problem they've engineered. It would be a laughable joke if we Americans did not accept this premise as legitimate.

This also serves as an example to highlight the uneducated sheeple whereby we will generally send someone to prison who has harmed no one. Carrying a firearm to protect ones-self and family, harms no one. But the judge will instruct the jury that we have laws (completely ignoring the fact that these laws are corporate, commercial and un-constitutional) and that jury members are only to consider the *commercial corporate laws* of the State and no more. In reality, American law was set up so that the jury is to judge the accused and the law, not to be a rubber stamp of *criminal process*' dressed in official proceedings. Was the law applicable in this case? If not, juries could find the accused *not guilty*.

How easy sheeple are to herd where controllers want them to go. People may be easier to lead than sheep. Sheep require a shepherd, people can be taught (educated) to herd themselves. In so many cases, we Americans pretend to be Christians and then violate God's law ... did you know that it is a violation of God's law to cause harm or injury to someone who has harmed no one???

When you sit as a juror and find the accused guilty when the accused has harmed no one, you then participate in injury to the accused (allowing a fine or perhaps sending that individual to prison and depriving them of their liberty... this is a horrendous injury). In the eyes of a growing number of Americans, ***the jury*** becomes the criminal causing injury. ***Our ignorance is clearly dangerous to us.*** How the government loves un-educated sheeple who believe themselves to be responsible citizens and religious (pious authoritarians).

We have seen other laws that forbid you to cut your own trees, build your own home or even replace your toilet. All the while you are told how free you are by the controlled/controlling media, which includes many movies. Although in defense of movie producers, I have noticed a number of recent movies that cause one to reflect upon his own values and what he believes. Brave Heart for example. The courage of William Wallace was a source of inspiration for many to build upon. Great storms announce themselves in the gentle breeze.

To detect a *perverted law* is actually quite easy. Ask yourself this simple question: "Can I take this action as an individual without breaking the law?" For example, can you use force to take money from my wallet and give it to whomever you feel is needy without breaking the law? If you cannot, then you cannot confer this power upon government. Therefore, if government assumes this power under *color of law*, the law is perverted. It's that simple!

As you study the window titled Detecting Perverted Law, I am fully aware that there can be made all kinds of good & noble excuses for exceeding the powers and authorities that could be granted to government by we the people and they all pervert the law. The road to hell is paved with good intentions. ***It should be remembered that you cannot take freedom from another without giving up your own freedom and the freedom of those you purport to love (your children).***

Plunder

In its most basic form, you have what another person desires, wants or needs and through actions considered criminal, it is taken from you. When men of this mentality find their

way to the high office of *law maker*, they began introducing Law which satisfies the goal of those who control them, not of whom they are supposed to protect and represent. Once the *plunder laws* take effect, the ***collective force*** of the (*commercial*) law is at their disposal to enforce it. This is why it is imperative that those who might be considered the ***commercial guard*** (the police and administrators) are *dumbed down* (I know that *dumbed* is not a word, but the phrase *dumbed down* now has common usage in our language). Could this *dumbing down process* have the effect of corrupting the police officer, eroding his morals, lowering his ethics and destroying his integrity and honor?

"The penalty for not participating in government is to be governed by your inferiors." - Plato

In a proper environment, one which is just, we satisfy our wants and needs by labor. That is the application of our faculties to a job or activity that provides us with property (often in the form of money, but it could be chickens, beans or any other commodity which has value to us). This process is the origin of property.

Unfortunately it is also true that a man may also live and satisfy his wants by seizing the property of other productive people. This is the origin of plunder. And if plunder can be accomplished under '*color of law*' so much the better. In this case *the masses* will accept the seizure or taking as legitimate.

It may well be this very process that is the downfall of democracy and quite possibly why the American government was set up as a *Representative Republic* and not a *Democracy*. There is a substantial difference between a *Representative Republic*, as set up by the founders of the united States of America, and a *Democracy*, as those in power currently refer to the political structure of the united States of America. This *false assertion* is followed by parroting in the press, networks, magazines, schools, and other main stream sources. In our *republic*, all power emanates from the individual. This prevents the majority from causing harm to the individual, for the benefit of the majority. *Democracy* is easily explained as two wolves and one sheep sitting down to discuss what's for dinner. In a *Democracy* the *two wolves (the majority)* will vote to have the sheep for dinner and the *majority vote* carries the day... the sheep is eaten. However, under the law of the

Detection of Perverted Law. It is very simple to detect perverted law. Examine the law and ask yourself if you could do this as an individual without arrest. If you cannot then the law is perverted. For example, could you go into my wallet without my permission, take out a hundred dollars and give it to whomever you feel is needy, or have you broken the law if you do so? If you conclude you have broken a law then you cannot confer this power upon government for none of us can lawfully empower government to act criminally. And should government act to take money from us through force and without permission, then they must have a *contract* signed by you and be willing to produce this document as a step in its enforcement. To do otherwise is acting no different than a common criminal.

So the test is easy. Can you do it as an individual without breaking the law? If not, then, without contract, neither can government, which has only those powers conferred upon it by we the people.

Republic, the sheep is protected from the majority because the majority does not have a power or authority superior to the *individual* sheep. Under *Democracy*, majority rules. This is an extension of *might makes right*, and why a democracy will always collapse.

When plunder is easier than work there are many men of questionable caliber, who generally lack integrity and honor, who are more than willing to participate in the plundering set up by those who wish to expand their power and control. And unfortunately, there are many Gung-Ho police (mostly young and ready to impress superiors), who stand ready and willing to use whatever force is necessary to accomplish plunder on behalf of *their commercial authority*. It seems that men often love to exercise authority that allows them to break things and kill, but it seems that some men never mature and continue with this love into their thirty's, forty's and beyond. When this condition exists, neither religion nor morality can stop it (for they have neither). It only stops when Plunder becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor and lawful behavior.

Example of perverted law

Automobile insurance companies have lobbied to require all Californian's to have all their automobiles insured and such a *commercial law* has been created. May I ask if I can compel you to dig a fence post hole? Of course I cannot compel you to this action. So what makes us think that someone can compel us to purchase and acquire insurance on each automobile we (don't) own? First, it is not necessary. Why could I not buy one insurance package to cover myself, regardless of which car I am driving? I could, of course, but this would not put as much money in the insurance company's pocket and more crucial, they would not have as much money to put in the politicians pocket. But because of our ignorance, we American's have generally contracted for this abuse. Social Security, Drivers License, etc., are all contracts that place us under *commercial law*. That's why *Social Security* remains a **voluntary** action and **traveling** (not driving) is a protected unalienable right. If one were "*driving*" when they were behind the wheel of their carriage, they would need a *drivers license*, "*driving*" being a term in *commercial law*. And if the individual in control of the carriage has other seats in the carriage, they would not be "*passenger seats*", another *commercial law* term, they would be *guest seats*. As you can see, the subtleties in applying *commercial law* to our regular activities are many. And because we are not properly educated, it is easy to trick (deceive) us into a *commercial venue*. A *venue* where we can be fined and enrich others who have not earned the money we give them.

Thinking outside the box...

If I were to use force and/or violence to steal your car, it would be easy to see that I have committed a crime. If caught, I will be placed in a prison where, after a \$500,000 trial, it will cost over \$56,000 a year to maintain me. This five-hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars has to come from some place, does it not? Therefore the government turns around and commits the same crime of using force and/or violence to take California peoples property (money) from them over thirty-three million (33,000,000) times to pay for my prison. I stole a \$21,000 car and you are going to pay \$668,000 to convict and imprison me for three years. Do you think that maybe *commercial law* benefits someone beside you?

Under our *municipal corporate commercial laws*, we practice *limited liability*. These *commercial laws* require that I carry a minimum of \$300,000 liability insurance (a limit of liability) to make an injured person whole again. But suppose we practiced *strict liability*, whereby I am responsible for an injury I cause. Suppose I cripple someone and they are unable to work and provide for their family. Under *strict liability* I would be required to step up to the plate and be responsible (liable) for feeding, housing and caring for this person and any dependents until the injured party is well. Do you think I might drive differently under these circumstances than I do under *limited liability*? Well, some of us might not, but I'll bet that the vast majority of Americans would suddenly drive much more carefully and considerately under these conditions.

Why could I not purchase insurance on myself to cover my own losses, my own injuries, my own car, my own property, should I be in an accident? What you might refer to as *no fault insurance*. Under this type of insurance, it does not matter who was at fault. Of course we could have this type of insurance, but once again, there would not be as much money for the insurance companies and for the politicians.

In this case it is not necessary to pass perverted law to acquire the desired outcome, that of personal liability. The only reason for passing perverted law is to *fleece the sheep* out of more of their property (productivity). And so it is true with virtually all perverted laws.

The proper function of law

The proper function of Law is to use the power of its collective force to stop plunder. To make plunder more painful and dangerous than a person would generally be willing to accept. All measures of the law should be brought to bear on the task of protecting property and punishing plunder - both types of plunder. Legal plunder, as in taking of ones property under a contract, fraudulently obtained by deception and control of our nations educational process, and outright criminal plunder, as in robbery or burglary. They are both the same. Taking something that does not belong to you is taking something that does not belong to you whether it is done under *color of law*, or otherwise. Since most *men of law* participate in the plunder process, who are you going to turn to for help? "When lawmen break the law, there is no law, only a fight for survival." - Clint Eastwood (I believe in the role of Josie Whales)

Law, and all the force it represents, is entrusted to those who make the laws. But when the class of men and women who make the laws are no longer representing the people who elected them, but is instead representing those who control the purse strings and re-election to office, we have set the stage of legal plunder and should not be surprised when it occurs.

The fatal flaw of greed & lust for power that exists in the hearts of so many men (and now women), explains the almost universal *perversion of the law*. Thus Law, instead of being the instrument and champion of checking injustice, becomes the *invincible weapon of injustice*.

And so it is easy for us to understand and see why the law is used, by the *legislator of law*, to destroy, in varying degrees among the rest of the people, their personal independence by

dependence (slavery), their liberty by oppression, and their property by plunder. This is done for the benefit of the person who makes the law as well as those who control him, and in proportion to the power that law maker is perceived (*Perceptions*) to hold.

Take the Congress of the United States of America for example. They make law concerning *Equal Opportunity Employment* and then exempt themselves from the same law. They know unjust law when they legislate it. At the time of this writing, there appears to be an effort to reverse this particular action and make Congress subject to the same laws as is the rest of the Nation. But this should not be regarded as an improvement. Unjust law is still bad law regardless of whether or not Congress is subjecting itself to it. Remember, they only have to take more of your money to address any bad laws to which they subject themselves.

Destructive change

"There is probably no other change that can be introduced in society that can be a greater evil than the conversion of law into an instrument of plunder." - Fredrick Bastiat, from the book *The Law*

When this is the case, there is a dire consequence:

"IT ERASES FROM EVERYONE'S CONSCIENCE THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN JUSTICE AND INJUSTICE."
Fredrick Bastiat, from the book *The Law*

The perception of Law

In the minds of most people the perception of law is to maintain justice. This perception is so prevalent, so ingrained and so strong that in the minds of most people they equate law to justice. The general belief is that *law* and *justice* are one and the same thing. There is, in virtually all of us Americans, a strong belief that anything defined or sanctioned by law is also legitimate and moral. This belief leads many people to the false conclusion that matters are *just* because they are *the law*. Well - things can be *just* because they are law but many times they are not. That is why it is important to recognize unjust law (perverted law) and reject it and reject those *lawmakers* who propose and vote for it, regardless of what level you may find them.

It is very important to understand what is to be learned here. Suppose a law is made that provides for time in a penitentiary because a person did not fill out a piece of paper, sign it and send it to a particular agency or *entity*. And further suppose that you are sitting on a jury in which this fact has been established and the accused is now facing possible time in prison. Yet, you can see that there is no injured party. No one has been harmed or hurt. The judge and legal system demand that you find the individual guilty, yet morality clearly demands that you find this person *not guilty*. What are you going to do?

When law and morality contradict each other, we have the cruel alternative of either losing our morals, or losing our respect for the law. For most it is a difficult choice. Of these two choices it is difficult for most people to choose. If we retain our morals and disregard the law, we will most likely find ourselves in conflict with *our peers*, the other jurors. It takes a maturity and a backbone to stand on the principle of *right and wrong*. It is not easy. On the other hand, if we abide by the law, then we have abandoned our principles and moral foundations. This destroys and corrupts a part of us. We are now less than we were.

You may have recognized the situation presented as the requirement to fill out our *1040 forms* and send them to the *Internal Revenue Service, Incorporated*. That's right, the IRS is a private corporation and not part of government. More about this later.

Our government is very good at presenting small steps for you to abandon your morality and the freedom of your children. Take for example the confiscation of a suspected drug dealer's automobile. Its ok because he may have used the automobile to perform his criminal activity. Does it matter that he has not yet been convicted of anything? No! Does it matter that the automobile may have been a gift? No! Does it matter that he may have a job and have actually earned the money to buy the automobile. No! All that matters is that he is suspected or accused.

But how would you feel if you installed a new hot water heater, without getting the required permit to do so, and had your car confiscated because you had used the car in the commission of the illegal activity of installing a hot water heater without a permit. And further, utilized your car to transport the hot water heater? A far reach? Maybe. Remember, we are so far down this track that we sit idly by while *commercial law* extorts billions of dollars from tobacco firms. A legal product. A product that put America on her feet. A product that paid many of the bills of this country. If government lawmakers can do it to one company, why not auto manufacturers, motorcycle manufacturers, boat manufacturers, ski equipment manufacturers, and any other legitimate company or home owner. Much of what you purchase has caused crippling or debilitating injury to many people.

The answer to why not, is that they can, and in time probably will. They went after tobacco first because the uneducated sheeple would support the attack and now sheeple, you have a legal precedent. A precedent established in law that can be used to guide the courts. Thank you American Sheeple and thank you public education.

No, I don't smoke or use any tobacco products - never have.

This is not to sanction disregard for the law at every turn, but it is to say that we should know the difference between right and wrong (just and unjust- and it is doubtful that we do). We should not allow our self to be intimidated into doing wrong, even if it is the law. This also means that as a juror, you should not become a rubber stamp of unlawful actions of the *commercial lawmakers and enforcers*. There will be times when you will have to *suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune* to stand up for what you know to be right in the face of much opposition and ridicule from peers. This is one of the more difficult parts of maturing and

becoming a man or woman of substance, no longer wishing to remain a herd animal. Remember, those Germans who placed Jews in the ovens and cooked them to death were only doing as they were instructed.

Allowing yourself to be corrupted

Whenever you allow yourself to be corrupted, you become a lesser and more devalued human being, especially in your own eyes. You have less substance and as such, are easier to further devalue, corrupt and control. It has been my experience that most people have allowed themselves to become corrupted and they feel uncomfortable when they are in the presence of someone with ethics, morals, and honor. In the work place I have seen honorable, ethical people *stabbed in the back, covertly setup for failure, and not supported* by corrupted co-workers. It is just the *nature of the beast*.

The Jury

There is a difference between a '*trial by a jury of your peers*' and a 'jury trial'. The American system of law was set up so that the jury is empowered to judge not only the guilt or innocence of the accused, but also to judge the validity of the law under the circumstances. Thus, in the language of the courts, *the jury was empowered to judge the facts and the law*. This leaves the final judgement and power with the people.

"The jury has the right to judge both the law as well as the fact in controversy". - U. S. Supreme Court Justice John Jay, Georgia v. Brailsford, 1794

Today however, the Judges instruct the jury that they are only to consider the facts as presented during the trial and that they will receive instructions on matters of the law from the Judge. The jury is then to make their determination (judgement) based on these constraints. What this does, of course, is to provide a court system in which the *juries are boxed in* so that they are required to rubber stamp the *commercial laws*. To the uninformed and uneducated public the trial has the appearance of legitimacy. The jurors leave thinking they've been good citizens and done their job when in reality they are just dupes. If you are ever called to jury duty you should attend and if you should be asked if you feel that you are empowered to judge the law, you should lie and say 'NO' or you will be rejected. Once behind closed doors you can then begin the process of educating other jurors. It is time for a few Americans with backbones to surface and assert themselves. However, I should probably advise you that almost every jury has one person that can be *gotten to* (and has) by the district attorney.

Thus, in order to make plunder appear '*just*' to the masses, it is only necessary for 'the law' to decree and sanction it.

If you don't get anything else from this writing, get this: We are all on this ship called '**united States of America**' together, and we either learn to sail together or we sink together. And the only logical, rational and just method of law is: Nobody plunders anybody!

Politicians, and much of the minority leadership in this country, love to pit one group against another so that all are weak and under the control of others. They pit the rich against the poor, the females against the males, the blacks against the whites, one minority against another minority. As long as the masses allow themselves to be herded down this path, others will remain in control of their destiny, their lives, their freedom. It is when we begin to assert our individual rights and *respect the rights of others* that we have broken free and entered upon the correct path.

Methods of Legal Plunder

"Now, legal plunder can be committed in an infinite number of ways. Thus we have an infinite number of plans for organizing it: tariffs, protection, benefits, subsidies, encouragements, progressive taxation, public schools, guaranteed jobs, guaranteed profits, minimum wages, a right to relief, a right to the tools of labor, free credit, grants... All these plans as a whole - with their common aim of legal plunder - constitute socialism." - Fredrick Bastiat, from the book *The Law* (written in 1850)

Can you identify those government programs that allow plunder (low income housing loans or welfare would be examples)? *Legalized theft*. By uses of the term *legal theft*, I am suggesting that a crime is being committed under the *color of law*. Let us tie a specific definition to the term *legal theft*.

Legal Theft Defined

LEGAL THEFT: Legal Theft occurs when a portion of property (which includes but is not limited to: Currency, money, wages, income, vehicle, real estate or any other property, is transferred, by force if necessary, without the owners consent and without just compensation, from the person who owns it, to anyone (or any agency or entity) who does not own it.

So, how are those of us who know right from wrong going to fight 'legal plunder'. You say that the fight should be in harmony with law, honor, and justice? Those of you who say this are in a circle. For it is the law on which legalized theft relies. Those in control (global elitists) want to engage in legal theft, not illegal theft. Theft that is sanctioned by the law, and does not fear the courts. However, it may call upon the courts for help when one or another American decides that he does not wish to be the victim of *legal theft*.

[THIS SPACE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

So where does the solution lie. It lies in Americans learning that they have subjected themselves to *commercial law*, acquired mostly through *contracts* accomplished through *fraud & deceit*. It requires (re-)learning, living and applying the law of the Republic. In other words, it starts with true education, not indoctrination. It starts with developing a knowledge of our Constitution which states that you are to be treated to *due process of law*. This does not mean Civil Law, International Merchants Law, Statutory Law, Public Policy Law, Administrative Law, or Admiralty/Maritime Law. It refers to the Law of the Republic. It also lies in removing people from elected office who engage in supporting, proposing or voting for *commercial laws* that pervert the law, causing it to work against its own foundations.

Common law. The body of rules, principles and forms of judicial proceedings which, while not enacted in statutes, have been immemorially recognized and enforced by the courts of England and by the courts of those countries which inherited their systems of jurisprudence from England. Thus it is distinguished from "statute law" or enactments of Parliament or state legislatures.

The common law is frequently used to mean English law, as distinguished from Roman or "civil law," which was revived and put into force on the continent of Europe at the beginning of the Renaissance period. In England, by reason of the king's courts, the common law at that time was making such progress as successfully to hold the field against the Roman law revival. - *The Lincoln Library of Essential Information*; published by *The Frontier Press Company, Buffalo, New York, 1941, p. 1471*

Bodies of Law

As we can see, there are many *bodies of law*. The law of the republic of the united States of America is the *common law*. It is a law that evolved in England and is based in custom and previous decisions. It is because of this that business flourishes. Business and all citizens could know the *decision of law* because it never changed, unlike the commercial court proceedings of today. In one case its this way, and in a similar case its that way. No one, or business, can actually know what the *rule* is going to be ahead of time, because *the rule* varies with each case, even though it is similar to previous cases.

The *common law* is for people of common belief and values. It is based in biblical law and can be construed as biblical law applied. Read the constitution and you will see that it contains provisions to protect your religious beliefs regardless of your religious persuasion, even atheist. But, biblical law does not allow for homosexuality and many other deviant life styles that degrade humanity.

Who's responsible?

When we Americans want to know who is responsible for all that is wrong in our country, when we want to know who is responsible for perversion of its laws, when we want to know who is responsible for the deterioration of society, all we have to do is look in the mirror and we will see the

"WE THE PEOPLE of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." - Constitution for the united States of America

responsible party. It is *we the people*. It is us who has become greedy and willing to sanction the taking from our neighbor (plunder) for our own benefit. It is we who place people in office who take my neighbors money to provide me with a *low income house*. It is we who keep corrupt officials in office when they prove themselves to be dishonest, untrustworthy, controlling thieves. We are so determined to plunder our neighbor that we have been returning these corrupt public officials to office at a 92% return rate. It is we the sheeple who fail to properly educate ourselves, our children, our family and our friends. Why is that? Is it because we are unwilling to stop the plunder of our neighbor for our own benefit? Are we children who cannot be responsible for ourselves and need a government parent to take care of us in our daily lives? If we are tired of government involvement in almost every aspect of our lives, we can only change that if we are willing to be responsible for ourselves. It's time that we Americans accept responsibility for our own abuse. As time marches on, and if we are unable to stand as a responsible people, the abuse of all Americans is going to escalate and that includes the abuse of our children and grand- children.

The person that should occupy elective office, not only will refrain from voting for laws that stifle, dominate, destroy liberty and amount to legalized plunder, he or she will also begin working on rescinding those types of laws already in existence. They will work, not only to return government to its proper role of protecting our borders, restoring the Constitutional limitations on government, helping states coordinate major projects (such as our nations highways or major water projects as examples), returning Federal properties back to the States when they are not used for forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful Buildings, preventing monopolies, and other traditional roles of the national government as detailed in the Constitution for the united States of America.

Politics is a process of engineering problems to get more money to not solve them!

In short, the people in elected office, should be those who not only allow us to be responsible for ourselves but insist on it. They will not allow government to control and manipulate events that lead to business failures and economic collapse as they have been doing for so long. Government engineers the problems in our society and then utilizes the problems to expand their control and power.

As we see in America today, when law is utilized to enforce legalized theft, then law has turned might against right. Which is to say that law has been turned against justice. When we, including judges, do wrong because it is the law, we are no different than those Germans who put human beings in ovens and cooked them to death. Wrongfully causing an injury to someone may be the law, but it is almost certainly against God's Law, if that means anything to those who purport to be Christian or believe in God. If it be the position of the court to cause wrongful injury, then don't defile the Bible by producing it in court.

Whenever we utilize law (force and/or violence) to organize human activity (in any area; including education, art, religion, charity, labor, business, agriculture, etc.), then force

What product or service should be provided at the end of a gun barrel (through force and/or violence)?

and violence is being used against your liberty and against justice. Thus, law has been turned to act against its proper purpose. Its proper purpose being *organized justice*.

So what is it about so many of us that we have allowed our legal system to become so perverted? Well ... for many of us it is not sufficient that the law should be simply just; it must also be philanthropic, benevolent, charitable, even generous. How have we come to believe that the law should be all these things? Answer: it is sold to us by those who want control. And the marketing institution is the *churches of America*, the *main stream media* along with *public education*. I ask you public educators, "do you think it possible to turn this situation around and begin to educate again instead of indoctrinate?" And when I say educate, I mean to teach students to think and analyze, not parrot.

"As long as it is admitted that the law may be diverted from its true purpose - that it may violate property instead of protecting it - then everyone will want to participate in making the law, either to protect himself against plunder or to use it for plunder. Political questions will always be prejudicial, dominant, and all-absorbing. There will be fighting at the door of the Legislative Palace, and the struggle within will be no less furious. To know this, it is hardly necessary to examine what transpires in the French and English legislatures; merely to understand the issue is to know the answer.

Is there any need to offer proof that this odious perversion of the law is a perpetual source of hatred and discord, that it tends to destroy society itself? If such proof is needed, look at the United States [in 1850]. There is no country in the world where the law is kept more within its proper domain: the protection of every person's liberty and property. As a consequence of this, there appears to be no country in the world where the social order rests on a firmer foundation. But even in the United States, there are two issues, and only two, that have always endangered the public peace." - Fredrick Bastiat, from the book *The Law*

The Law, authored by Fredrick Bastiat, was published in 1850, thus the reference to "1850". So here we see that the united States of America, in 1850, was a country where law was kept within its proper domain. Is that true today? Well, if you have not been asleep for the past 40 to 50 years, you know that it is not true today. Therefore, the *odious perversion* of our country's law has become a perpetual source of hatred and discord. It is being used to destroy society through 'social engineering'. Now that we know this, we can begin the work of changing it.

SOCIALISM: Legalized Plunder; Legalized Theft; Enslavement.

This is where socialism fails. With all its compassion, and desire to help the less fortunate, socialism must, through the threat of force and violence or with actual force and violence, take what belongs to one person and give it to whom it does not belong. It is simple robbery, condoned by law.

"Every citizen may freely speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right; and no law shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press. In all criminal prosecutions on indictments for libels, the truth may be given in evidence to the jury; and if it shall appear to the jury that the matter charged as libelous is true, and was published with good motives and for justifiable ends, the party shall be acquitted: and the jury shall have the right to determine the law and the fact." 1849 California Constitution

Were you aware that California has two constitutions? One written in 1849 when California was admitted to the union, and another written in the 1870's. Was California admitted twice to the Union? No? I wonder what the reason there might be for California to have two constitutions? By asking this question it is my hope that one will pursue a greater knowledge.

"...the jury shall have the right to determine the law and the fact."

This is a common law maxim. This empowers *we the people* as jury members, to reject law that amounts to tyranny. This prevents *lawmakers* from making unconstitutional law and holding citizens subject to that unconstitutional law. Since the populace was better educated in times past, they knew that they had to look out for each other when it came to government. They knew their history and were aware of the abuse government heaps upon its citizens. It was through jury nullification (also called jury lawlessness), that prohibition was ended. Citizens of that era refused to find guilty those who made various alcoholic beverages and sold them since there was no injured party because of that action. If you attempt to apply the logic that people are killed in car accidents because of this sale and for that reason it should be outlawed, I would submit to you that people are killed in car crashes in which no alcohol was involved and using your logic, car sales should be made illegal and punished with time in prison. The argument here is also a deception as we shall learn in the chapter on *War & Emergency Powers*.

You now see the problem in applying the law selectively. This could be extended to any product by which a person or persons have been killed. How about baseball bats. Because some people use them to kill others, should their sale and ownership be outlawed?

Juries of the 1800's knew that there had to be an injured party to justify an action and further, that the government does not qualify as an injured party. *Government* is a **legal fiction**. A **legal fiction** can be defined as a creation of *man's mind*. Government, like any corporation, does not exist in the real world like a tree does. The tree exists with or without the mind of man, but government and a corporation do not. This qualify's them both as a *legal fiction* (which is a legal term if you

It is probably worthy of note that back in the 1800's, corporations were given very limited life and cause for existence. For example, a corporation might be formed to build a bridge, and as soon as the bridge was built, the corporation was dissolved. During its existence, it could not own other real estate, nor other corporations or businesses. But after the passage of the 14th Amendment, lawyers begin lobbying and filing cases to get corporations recognized as **a person** in court. Once this was accomplished, the life of the corporation became infinite, and the corporation, **now being a person**, could own property and other corporations. Thus a monster was created.

wish to look it up). Now, who among us wants to cause harm to a real *flesh and blood human being* in the name of a *legal fiction* that exists only in our minds?

Being redundant we once again present one of the most important safeguards built into the system and contained in the Constitution for the United States of America.

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger"

In this language we the people retained to ourselves, the power and authority to hold each other accountable, that we were not conferring that power to government. Thus, the Grand Jury had to agree that a particular person should be held to answer for a particular accusation. Grand Juries provide a buffer between the average citizen and the awesome power of government and were free to pursue their own investigation and call forth such witnesses as they thought necessary. Today, Grand Juries are controlled by government attorneys, who decide what information the Grand Jury is to have, and what witnesses should be brought forth. Grand jurors, for the most part, do not have sufficient understanding of the role of the Grand Jury in our *representative Republic* and what latitude is given to the Grand Jury to proceed with its own investigation. Thus, the Grand Jury, whose job it was to protect citizens from government abuse, have now become just another rubber stamp in the abusive legal process.

As mentioned previously, corruption of the juries by government has gone so far that the government prosecutor will have an informant (someone whom can be 'gotten to') on the Juries of today so that his office is fully informed of jury activity and because of the interaction with the informant, the D.A., to a large degree, is in control of the jury as they deliberate their decision.

This became very evident in the bombing of the Oklahoma City federal building where one member of the Grand Jury went public with the controlling abuse of government attorneys, whereby the government attorneys prevented the Grand Jury from questioning witnesses that they felt needed to be examined. This action and other evidence led to an effort to empanel an independent Grand Jury - (independent of government attorneys and other agents of the government). This effort, spearheaded by Oklahoma State Representative Charles Key, meant resistance at every turn but ultimately was given the go ahead by the courts. I have not followed this activity and so I do not know the ultimate outcome.

Juries have a most important job to do in America and you should not run from the job of holding a fellow citizen accountable, or, if there is no injured party, you should not run from the job of freeing the individual. How easy are we to corrupt? Government education, along with Main Stream Journalism has done well indoctrinating us. Time will tell.

ATTORNEY & CLIENT

"His [the attorney's] first duty is to the courts and the public, not to the client and whenever the duties to his client conflict with those he owes as an officer of the court in the administration of justice, the former must yield to the latter." 7 C.J.S Section 4

It should be understood that the job of the Attorney is to protect his clients rights, not to prove his clients innocence.

Protect his clients rights? What does this mean when translated? It means that if the attorney has done his job and protected your rights during the proceedings, then once you are convicted, there are no issues on which to appeal and your conviction stands. If you think this is a joke, take into consideration that attorneys, on a nation wide average in criminal proceedings, win only six cases in a hundred. That means that prosecutors win 94 cases in a hundred.

Represent yourself?

Have you ever heard the old saying: "Anyone representing himself has a fool for a client." Take this into consideration. Those people who reject representation by an attorney and represent themselves, knowing nothing of the law or court room procedure, will win 16 times out of a hundred. That's right, you can go into court knowing nothing about the law, represent yourself and change six wins in a hundred when represented by an attorney, to sixteen when representing yourself.

Whenever we get into trouble, the first thing we are told by friends and relatives, is that "you need a good attorney". Yet the chief justice of the Supreme Court, Warren Burger, had this to say in a speech to the American Bar Association in Las Vega, Nevada:

"Ninety percent of the trial attorneys in the United States are incompetent."

Now, if 90% of the trial attorneys are incompetent, how are you going to pick a *good attorney* to represent you? It looks to me as though the chances are 9 out of 10 that your going to pick an incompetent attorney.

Attorney Considerations

"It is a fact that a student can graduate from this, the fourth largest law school in the United States, without ever having written a pleading, a contract, a will, a promissory note or a deed. Its worse than that. It is a fact that most students graduate from this law school without ever having seen a real honest to god pleading, contract, will, promissory note, or deed. A student can graduate without ever having set foot in a court room. Or without ever having spoken to or on behalf of a person in need of counsel or advice. A student can graduate without once being exposed to operation of the rules of court. Whatever else can be said of this license issued by the State Bar, let it be said that for these students and their clients, it is a cruel hoax." - Professor James Neilsen; Hastains School of Law

The United States provides its citizens with 2.67 lawyers for every 1000 people while Japan provides 0.1 lawyers for 1000 people. That is one lawyer for every 374 people in the U.S. and one lawyer for every 10,000 people in Japan. And what have these lawyers done to help us?

Let us not forget the recent attempt by government under the Clinton Administration to completely take over the medical industry and make it a crime for you to take vitamins without a prescription from a doctor, licensed by and under control of the government. Had this become law and you engaged in the *unlawful taking* or selling of vitamins, or even giving them to your children without the prescription, you too could be one of those political prisoners in our nation's prisons and jails. Let's always keep in mind that we only have each other to watch one another's backs, and if we are a jury member the question is, who is injured (government doesn't qualify) and if no one is injured, then the government is attempting to acquire another political prisoner and needs you to rubber stamp the process.

Growth Industries

There are a number of industries associated with enforcing the *commercial laws* of the U. S. that are now growth industries. There are now new world order corporations that are taking over the incarceration (prison) systems and turning them into what appears to be slave labor operations. There is the medical field involved with the diagnosis and treatment of many of the criminals. There is the police industry and last but not least, the court and attorney system that needs support. To accommodate these growth industries, Washington D.C. provides this country with 47 pages of new laws every day. California, in 1994, passed 1600 new laws for that year. In 25 to 35 years, perhaps less, 50% of all males are going to have to spend some time in prison to support these industries.

Vermin - by Paul Harvey

If there is a stain on the record of our forefathers, a dark hour in the earliest history of the American colonies, it would be the hanging of the so-called "witches" at Salem. But that was a pinpoint in place and time - a brief lapse into hysteria. For the most part, our seventeenth-century colonists were scrupulously fair, even in fear.

There was one group of people they feared, with reason. A society, you might say, whose often insidious craft had claimed a multitude of victims, ever since the Middle Ages in Europe. One group of people were hated and feared from Massachusetts Bay to Virginia. The magistrates would not burn them at the stake, although a great many colonists might have recommended such a solution. Our forefathers were baffled by them.

In the first place, where did they come from? Of all who sailed from England to Plymouth in 1620, not one of these two-legged vermin was aboard. "Vermin." That's what the colonists called them. Parasites who fed on human misery, spreading sorrow and confusion wherever they went. "Destructive," they were called. And still they were permitted existence with the colonists. For a while, anyway. Of course, there were colonial laws

prohibiting the practice of their infamous craft. Somehow a way was always found around those laws.

In 1641, Massachusetts Bay colony took a novel approach to the problem, The governors attempted to starve those 'devils' out of existence through economic exclusion. They were denied wages, and thereby it was hoped that they would perish. Four years later, Virginia followed the example of Massachusetts Bay, and for a while it seemed that the dilemma had been resolved. It had not. Somehow, the parasites managed to survive, and the mere nearness of them made the colonists' skin crawl.

In 1658 in Virginia, the final solution: Banishment. Exile. The 'treacherous ones' were cast out of the colony. At last, after decades of enduring the psychological gloom, the sun came out and the birds sang and all was right with the world. And the elation continued for a generation. I'm not sure why the Virginians eventually allowed the outcasts to return, but they did. In 1680, after years, the despised ones were readmitted to the colony on the condition that they be subjected to the strictest surveillance.

How soon we forget! For indeed, over the next half-century or so, the imposed restrictions were slowly, quietly swept away. And those whose treachery had been feared since the Middle Ages ultimately took their place in society. You see, the 'vermin' that once infested colonial America, the parasites who preyed on the misfortune of their neighbors until finally they were officially banished from Virginia, those dreaded, despised, outcast masters of confusion were Lawyers." - From Paul Harvey's The Rest of the Story

Michael H. Brown

The following text is from the book '*Erwin Rommel School of Law*' by Michael H. Brown. For those of you who are motivated by the words of Michael H. Brown, the book is available from: Michael H. Brown, P.O. Box 4884, Springfield, Mo. 65808. The book cost at the time of this research (approx. 2001) is \$100.00 and this price includes shipping. Phone (417) 890-8636. You might make contact to get current pricing.

* * * * *

"The Law is the Weapon, the Courtroom the Battlefield, the Judge is your Enemy and your Lawyer is an Enemy Spy" - Erwin Rommel School of Law by Michael H. Brown

It was the late 6th century B.C. Etruscan soldiers, holding their small round parrying shields with a spike in the middle on one arm and their short swords in the other, neared the Sublican bridge crossing the Tiber in Rome. Behind them came Lars Porsena and the entire Etruscan army. Once the Etruscans crossed the bridge, Rome was theirs.

The Romans needed time to cut down the bridge. Unless the Etruscans could be stopped before they crossed it Rome was lost.

Three volunteers stepped forward. They walked halfway across the bridge. Etruscan soldiers collided with them on the bridge, a structure so narrow that only one or two men could cross abreast at the same time. Horatio, the leader of the three, finally told his two companions to jump into the Tiber and swim to safety. He fought on. Finally the bridge was down. Horatio jumped into the Tiber and swam to safety. One man had single-handedly, for a time, stopped the entire Etruscan army dead in its tracks.

Just as one man (or woman) can stop the entire United States federal government or any state government from depriving an American citizen facing criminal charges in corrupt court proceedings from having his rights, his hopes, his dreams, his aspirations, his future, and his family torn away from him by an uncaring and unjust system.

And only one man. Or one woman.

Let me tell you why. And show you how.

Watch them when they're brought into the courtroom. They look around timidly, impressed by the power and grandeur of their surroundings. Most of them are afraid. Two of them are obviously addicts. The lack of intelligence among their class is obvious. Any three of them look like they don't have two brain cells to rub together. Their complexion is sallow and unhealthy looking, from being indoors too long. One trembles visibly.

I scan the group carefully. The one I am looking for is hard to spot. I think I recognize him, including his look of selfish and evil malevolence.

There are twelve of them. One of them may be Horatio. Ten of them are the stupid, flabby, cowardly cretins that in monarchies and military dictatorships would be hewers of word and drawers of water. Selfish cowards. And one of them is a Judas.

The jury has just been seated. Two of them have the stained fingers and yellow teeth of tobacco addicts.

The American farce known as trial by jury is about to begin.

Before I explain how jury trials really work, let me address "jury nullification"; the right of a jury to acquit both in the face of the evidence and the law, with special thanks to Godfrey Lehman for his work on this subject.

HOW JURY NULLIFICATION STARTED

Religious liberty was at stake! The judges were furious and William Penn faced life imprisonment! Hungry, thirsty, dirty, the gentlemen of the jury decided to sit until death!

A corps of turnkeys spread over the streets of London on orders of the King, sending luckier citizens scurrying from sight, and taking into custody the unfortunates who were too surprised to move.

Clerks were pulled from their stools, carriages were stopped and passengers forcibly requisitioned. Sixty or seventy Englishmen were collared in swift order and brought to the Central Criminal court of London for examination.

They had committed no crime. The King's men were "selecting" them for an unwelcome task - jury duty. Despite the Magna Carta's 450-year old guarantee to trial "by one's equals," English juries were expected to behave like judicial puppets - parroting the Courts' wishes. Not only did Courts dictate verdicts, but juries were given no food or water, or access to the most elementary form of plumbing, until the expected verdicts were delivered. In a few cases where juries did defy the courts, defendants might be freed, but the jurors were themselves heavily fined and imprisoned.

Understandably, few jurors had the stamina to stick by Magna Carta. The date of the juror roundup was Wednesday, August 31, 1670. By day's end all but 12 luckless Londoners had been released. Those remaining, however, were to find themselves unwilling participants in a trial that would set a legal precedent and shake the throne itself.

QUAKERS ON TRIAL

On September 3, the trial of a 25-year old Quaker, William Penn, and an older colleague, William Mead, began in the Central Criminal Court. Penn and Mead had been arrested and confined in the dreaded Newgate Prison on August 14, when a group of three or four hundred Quakers assembled for worship at the Gracechurch Street meetinghouse. There they confronted a phalanx of Redcoats, each of whom nervously gripped a cocked carbine.

Stepping forward, the troops' lieutenant pleaded with Penn that the group not hold a religious service that Sunday morning because their Quaker worship violated the law. He read them the pertinent provisions of the elaborate Conventicle Act which established one legal church, the Church of England. Penn responded that there was a higher law, a law that permitted every man and woman to worship God or not worship according to the dictates of his own conscience.

Denied entrance to the meetinghouse, Penn began his worship service in the street. He and Mead were arrested and indicted for "leading a conventicle, conducting an unlawful and tumultuous assembly...to the disturbance of the peace," and "conspiring and abetting together" to do the same. The King, the Parliament, and the Central Criminal court united for a trial designed both to silence Penn forever and to put an end to the despised Quakers and other dissidents who defied the established Church.

Although the Court assembled on Thursday, September 1, and the indictment was read and the pleas of "not guilty" recorded, the trial itself did not begin until Saturday, September 3.

The 12 jurors had been confined to the Sessions House, also known as Old Bailey, for two days.

A parade of carefully coached military witnesses testified to the guilt of both prisoners. Neither Penn nor Mead was given opportunity for cross-examination or allowed to present witnesses or arguments in their own defense. They did not deny the "holding of a Conventicle," but they asserted their right to religious freedom under the Magna Carta. They had assembled peaceably, the only disturbance being caused by the soldiers.

GUILTY?

By late afternoon it had become "clear and manifest" that they had violated the law. All that was left was for the jury to go through the motions of returning the guilty verdict, as the Court directed. The defendants would be convicted, perhaps never to be released from prison.

From 7 a.m. until late afternoon the 12 jurors had been sitting on rough benches. Now they were told that as soon as they had convicted the prisoners they would be permitted relief and treated to a sumptuous Court-hosted banquet.

Following precedent, the Court granted the jurors one-quarter of an hour to agree to the guilt of both prisoners. The quarter-hour passed, and the jurors did not return. Twenty minutes. Half an hour. An hour. No jurors. Finally after an hour and a half, eight jurors returned and the Court ordered the bailiffs to draw forth the other four.

NO VERDICT!

"We have no verdict," the jurors told the Court.

The judges raged. Such defiance of the authoritarian powers of King, Parliament and venal Court! Still, there would be no convictions without the jury acceding.

Back the jury went for another half hour, and then they returned to the Sessions House. The clerk asked for the verdict and the foreman arose. Penn: "Guilty of speaking in Gracechurch Street." Mead: "Not guilty of the indictment."

The court was incredulous. There was no law against "speaking." The verdict meant nothing. "Is that all?", asked the recorder. "That is all I have in my commission," responded the stoical foreman.

"You have as good as said nothing," a Judge roared at them. The presiding "Justice," the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Samuel Starling pounded his desk, and demanded to know why the jurors would not obey the directive of the Court.

WE WILL NEVER YIELD OUR RIGHTS!

One Edward Bushell rose to respond. "The Court has no power in Magna Carta to dictate the jury's verdict."

"This Court has any power it chooses!" the Mayor shouted back. "To disobey it is to bring disgrace upon the Court as well as upon yourselves."

"We do follow our consciences, which is to bring honor to this court, and we can do no other. If this be not honor, then we charge this Court has no honor."

"Your insolence is beyond endurance. It is the direct order of this Court that you bring in 'guilty' against both prisoners."

"No, my Lord," said Bushell, unyieldingly. "This the jury will never do, for we will not betray the liberties of this country. We know our rights in Magna Carta."

The Court: "These rights will starve you."

Bushell: "So it be, my Lord, but on this point we will not equivocate. We will never yield our rights as Englishmen."

Old Daily went wild. The 500 spectators cheered for minutes. Never had a Court of Law been so successfully put down. Never had the entire government been so effectively overpowered by a handful of conscientious common people - "bumbleheads" as the Mayor described them.

Frustrated, the Justices refused to accept the verdict. They commanded the bailiffs to lock up the hungry jurors over night, still without food, water, or even a chamber pot [historical note - for those not familiar with the term chamber pot, it is a reference to a portable toilet in which people of that time relieved them-selves]. As a concession, the Mayor agreed to convene the Court on Sunday, "in the interests of the health of the jurors."

The 12 spent a fitful night on the floor of the badly equipped jury room, receiving limited rations from the sympathetic public, who sent up packages through the windows until driven away by the soldiers.

Bedraggled, aching, filth-ridden, the jurors returned to the Sessions House Sunday morning. Back and forth between jury and courtroom the 12 were shuttled, but their verdict remained: For Penn, "Guilty of speaking in Gracechurch Street." For Mead: "Not guilty of the indictment."

NOT GUILTY!!

The Jurors knew there was a higher law; that they should obey God, not man.

Nor would the Court give in. By mid-afternoon the disgusted Justices locked up the jurors, again without food, for the night. The jurors survived on the meager emotional succor of citizens shouting their encouragement from a distance.

When the Court assembled on Monday morning, the jurors were soaked with urine and feces. The Mayor asked for the verdict, and the weakened foreman, barely able to stand, delivered a new and unexpected response. "Not guilty," to the question for each prisoner.

The shocked Court forced each juror to stand in turn and "take responsibility" for this more decisive verdict. Twenty-four times the words rang out - "Not guilty."

Led by Edward Bushell, the jury had acquitted because "every man has a right to worship God according to his own conscience." The 12 had determined to sit until death on the principle. Yield at this point, Bushell had impressed upon his colleagues, and their families and all England would be enslaved. No one but the jurors stood between religious liberty and thought control.

On September 5, 1670 the Justices capitulated. The Magna Carta and 12 stout men had struck a decisive blow for freedom. The Conventicle Act fell. Penn and Mead were freed, never to be brought to trial again.

MY LIBERTY IS NOT FOR SALE!!

Nevertheless the Court was going to have its revenge. For "going against the clear and manifest evidence," the Jurors were fined 40 marks - equivalent to perhaps a half year's earnings. Eight paid, but four again led by the stalwart Bushell, refused. Although Edward Bushell was a man of great wealth and commanded an international shipping enterprise, and although payment of 40 marks, or even 480 marks for the entire jury, was a pittance for him, and a far smaller loss for him than continued absence from his business, he would not pay.

"My liberty is not for sale," he said.

To pay would emasculate the victory. It would be a form of apologizing for acting in good conscience. Thus, he and three others - John Bailey, Charles Mison, and John Hammond - were imprisoned in the same "hell above ground" from which their courageous action had freed Penn and Mead.

In Newgate they were subjected to degrading brutality from sadistic jailers. They appealed through the distinguished Sir Richard Newdigate, a retired Chief Justice under Cromwell and a lifelong champion of the people's liberties. Sir Richard came out of retirement to argue the case before the Court of Common Pleas, a Civil Court which actually did not have jurisdiction to hear a criminal appeal. The Court of King's Bench handles criminal appeals of the Crown, but Newdigate cleverly managed to convince the not-reluctant Chief Justice of Common Pleas, Sir John Vaughan, to accept the appeal.

ACQUITTAL BY JURY - ABSOLUTE

It took nine painful weeks for the legal maneuvering, the hearing and finally the Court to write its lengthy opinion, the jurors all the while suffering the rigors of Newgate.

Sir John had been more or less predisposed to his decision, but it was necessary to cite many cases to build a foundation for a precedent. On November 9 he took "the clearest position I have ever taken: both for the law and for reason. The power of the jury to determine its verdict, free and untrammelled, is supreme. No Court can dictate a verdict. The evidence could not be 'clear and manifest' for it did not appear so to the jury. Acquittal by jury is absolute."

Bushell was released on habeas corpus - the first such writ issued by the Court of Common Pleas. And since the Quaker congregation had been meeting in an orderly fashion, the jury also established the right of peaceful assembly and freedom of speech. And, by its courageous stand it demonstrated that one of the strongest powers in government is in the jury room.

Up until Bushell's case, as it later became known, punishment of jurors for returning verdicts manifestly against the evidence was a common occurrence. Such conduct was authorized by statute, such as 26 Hen. VIII. C.4 (1534), and was not without precedent.

For example, the London jurors who acquitted Sir Nicholas Throckmartin in 1554 of high treason were fined five hundred pounds (a fortune in those days) each and sent to prison.

The reasoning of Bushell's case has been precedent for our Republic since its inception. *State of Georgia v Brailsford*, 3 Dallas 1 (1794).

HOW JURY TRIAL ORIGINATED

Prior to the introduction of the jury system, private cases, such as when a private person brought a criminal charge against another, was trial by battle. It was deadly. If the defeated defendant was not slain outright he was immediately hanged on the gallows which stood ready. Civil cases were fought by "champions" from each side. When the government was involved, trial by ordeal, such as hot iron, cold water, etc. was the prevailing practice. In the 16th century, placing a board on a man's chest and then piling rocks on it until he either confessed or suffocated was a particularly effective method. This was finally abolished in 1772. Today prosecutors merely keep adding more charges until a criminal defendant confesses or decides to spend the rest of his life in prison.

Trial by ordeal came to a temporary screeching halt in England in 1215 a.d. when Pope Innocent III forbade his clergy from performing any religious ceremonies or connections with ordeals.

In 1219 Henry III then sent out a writ to his judges that they could proceed entirely by suspicion. Eventually the judges themselves came up with the idea of trial by jury. Which

people at the time recognized as merely another form of ordeal. No one at the time expected members of a jury to be any more rational than hot iron or cold water.

TODAY'S JURY

Today's jury is no more rational than its predecessor, but for different reasons.

After John Gotti's 1992 federal trial, two of the jurors came forward and informed both the court and the news media that they had been told, "vote guilty or the government will retaliate against you."

They could only have been told that by another juror. Anyone else would have to explain himself to the news media for jury tampering.

All federal and state prosecutors are aware of, and most participate in, this type of jury tampering. It's a procedure known to those "on the inside" as "the Judas trick." It works like this:

Almost all juries will contain someone who can be "gotten to" by the prosecutor. Federal and state employees are particularly susceptible to pressure from their superiors, who in turn are susceptible to pressure from "the government" (federal or state).

That is, almost all federal and state trial juries will have a "Judas" planted in them who is "in the prosecutor's pocket" and whose sole function is to hammer, sway, or cajole the other 11 jurors into a guilty verdict. A Horatio is a rarity. Ten or eleven jurors of such weak moral character and low intelligence that they will convict despite perjury, bribed witnesses, little or no evidence, and a judge biased in favor of the prosecution, are almost a certainty.

As the 19th century proverb goes, "many a poor wretch has been hanged because the jury was in a hurry to get home to supper."

How do you cope with such obviously criminal behavior on the part of those paid and sworn to uphold and enforce the law? There are several ways. The first, and most obvious, is to buy extra copies of this book and see that the information disseminated herein is crammed down the throat of every person you know who will hold still for it. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. My publisher will appreciate it, I will hold you in high esteem for your efforts, and my agent will probably flip-out (an avalanche of sales allows him to negotiate a fat advance for a sequel and, of course, skim a healthy agent's fee). Only in America!!

Second, be aware of the case law concerning jury procedure and the judge's instruction so that you can "set the record" for appeal and eventually wriggle loose if you find yourself on the wrong end of a criminal prosecution. The biggest problem you will have is when, at the

close of the government's case, the judge tells the jury, "you are here to determine the facts, you must apply the law as I gave it to you."

(The "Judas Trick" is not unknown to the courts. See e.g. *Sizemore v Fletcher*, 921 F.2d 667, 672 (6th Cir. 1990). For a particularly flagrant example, see *U.S. v Widgery*, 636 F.2d 200 (9th Cir. 1980) (male juror blowing kisses and winking at female prosecutor). Federal Judge Scott O. Wright saw nothing wrong with such behavior.) ...

THE GREAT SANHEDRIN

Unfortunately for this particular institution, it has gotten a lot of bad press down through the centuries. This was the judicial body responsible for the conviction and crucifixion of Jesus Christ. I say "unfortunately" because the institution was not at fault. The people running it were.

Just as today our court system is actually workable, provided we remove a lot of the individuals causing the problems.

The "Great Sanhedrin", or the judges of Israel referred to in the Mosaic Code, had two presiding officers, a religious chamber of 23 priests, a law chamber of 23 scribes, and a popular chamber of 23 elders. It was the duty of the Sanhedrin to defend the accused, and a sentence, without such a defense, was invalid. This "defense" or "shield" function is today supposed to be found in our modern 23-member grand jury, addressed in the following chapter.

23 x 3 and 2 presiding officers makes 71, the number of books that we are to be judged by (see the chapter on the Mosaic Code) in the Bible. 71 is the number given by the Arab scholar Ibn Khaldun in his 1377 A.D. classic, "*The Muqaddimah*". There are only 66 books in the King James version.

In short:

1. My personal preference would be to be judged by 23 or 71 people who know what they're doing as opposed to the cretinous imbeciles most juries are stuffed with.
2. Even assuming the present system was the equivalent of a legal guided missile cruiser, it still wouldn't work.

The politicians have stuffed the judge's chairs with mental chimpanzees.

Complaints that juries were packed, bribed, intimidated and partial are nothing new. There was an avalanche of these complaints in the fifteenth century. *Concise History of the Common Law*, by Plucknett, p. 178.

Nor do our modern politicians have much worse taste in judges than those of former times. The Salem Witchcraft Trials, in which people were hanged for "Covenanting with the Devil," were presided over by judges, not backwards farmers. All the executions took place in 1692.

Thirty-one people were tried for witchcraft in 1693. Twenty-eight were acquitted by juries. Our modern version of the witchcraft trials, such as "conspiracy", federal gun laws, drug laws, and tax laws will not cease until the people -- not the judges and politicians -- ordain it so.

Hopefully those of us in the next century will be able to look back on 1992 as Robert Payne, grand jury foreman who refused to indict Johanna Tyler in 1692, did and inscribe on the documents of this era in a later hand: "The folly of former times."

This concludes the words of Michael H. Brown from his book '*The Erwin Rommel School of Law*'. There is so much more to be learned within his book and I recommend that you obtain a copy and read it. As I've said previously, this writing is only a primer and it is my hope that it opens your eyes enough to want to know more.

I have a book that was sent to me by the State Assemblyman representing the District in which I live. This book was published by the California Senate, 1993-1994. The title of this book is: "The Constitution of the UNITED STATES and the Constitution of the STATE OF CALIFORNIA and Related Documents." The first document in this book is the Magna Carta.

Magna Carta

In 1215 the English had revolted against King John and forced his signature to the Magna Carta. Essentially they told the King that he was going to sign the document or at nightfall the land would be without a king. King John wisely decided to sign. This document, which may have been the first of its kind, secured certain liberties and rights to the average citizen. If you read the Magna Carta you may observe that the English were telling John that God was their King.

The reason that the Magna Carta appears as the first document in this book printed by the STATE OF CALIFORNIA is due to the fact that it is one of the foundations of our law. That, in a great part, is due the great number of English people who were among the settlers of America.

MAGNA CHARTA. The great charter. The name of an instrument granted by King John, June 19, 1215, which secured to the English people many liberties which had before been invaded, and provided against many abuses which before rendered liberty a mere name. - Bouvier Law Dictionary
--

". . . here is a law which is above the King and which even he must not break. This reaffirmation of a supreme law and its expression in a general charter is the great work of

Magna Carta; and this alone justifies the respect in which men have held it. " – Winston Churchill, 1956

INFORMATION FROM THE WEB - CITE BELOW

King John of England agreed, in 1215, to the demands of his barons and authorized that handwritten copies of Magna Carta be prepared on parchment, affixed with his seal, and publicly read throughout the realm. Thus he bound not only himself but his "heirs, forever" to grant "to all freemen of our kingdom" the rights and liberties the great charter described. With Magna Carta, King John placed himself and England's future sovereigns and magistrates within the rule of law.

When Englishmen left their homeland to establish colonies in the New World, they brought with them charters guaranteeing that they and their heirs would "have and enjoy all liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects." Scant generations later, when these American colonists raised arms against their mother country, they were fighting not for new freedoms but to preserve liberties that dated to the 13th century.

When representatives of the young republic of the United States gathered to draft a constitution, they turned to the legal system they knew and admired--English common law as evolved from Magna Carta. The conceptual debt to the great charter is particularly obvious: the American Constitution is "the Supreme Law of the Land," just as the rights granted by Magna Carta were not to be arbitrarily canceled by subsequent English laws.

This heritage is most clearly apparent in our Bill of Rights. The fifth amendment guarantees

No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law and the sixth states. . . the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury.

Written 575 years earlier, Magna Carta declares No freeman shall be taken, imprisoned, or in any other way destroyed, except by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land. To no one will we sell, to none will we deny or delay, right or justice.

Original URL: <http://www.nara.gov/exhall/charters/magnacarta/magmain.html>

The Constitution *for* (not of) the united States of America is a common law document. When this Constitution refers to 'Law' **it means the common law**. When it says that you are to be accorded due process of law, it means the common law. An "*at law*" action, means at the common law.

Summary

In conclusion the law and legal system of the United States has been altered, and continues to be altered, by the declaration of ***war & emergency powers***. This will be covered in greater detail in the chapter on War & Emergency Powers. It is by virtue of ***war and declared emergencies*** that constitutional limitations are set aside in the making of law. And so we have:

1. The *war on the present and acute economic emergency*. (Roosevelt, 1933)
2. The *war on poverty*. (Johnson, 1964)
3. The *war on drugs*. (Reagan, 1984)
4. The *war on terrorism*. (Bush, 2001)
5. The *war in Afghanistan*.
6. The *war in Iraq*.
7. The upcoming *war with Iran*.

It is by virtue of ***declared emergencies*** and the following ***war on...*** that has altered our system of law, taken away our freedoms and altered our government. The *law, freedom and government* that so many American's died to provide for us.

Once more...

“When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.” - (Declaration of Independence)

Natures law = God's law = Common law = Biblical Law applied = God's law applied. And this is the ultimate terror to those who have unethical or corrupted souls.

CHAPTER 5

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Most children, which at one time included us, had a sense of inner-direction. Then children are put into public schools where they somehow lose this most important quality. If you ask a school administrator, "What is the philosophy of education at this school?", you will get an answer similar to:

We at this particular school encourage the full *self* development and individual *self* actualization of each child we attempt to educate. We want to provide curricular interventions which will give the individual development and specific *self* actualization goals to each child that comes through our door.

And that is so much nonsense. It is unfortunate but this philosophy of education is one of the biggest lies our school system has to offer. Our public school system will hardly tolerate young people who display the qualities of inner-direction and the sparks of individuality. When inner-direction and individuality appear, the school system is likely to respond with a suggestion of administering behavioral drugs. And because the parents are a product of the same educational system, there is a good chance that they will authorize the drugs. The primary mission of our schools is mold (profile) children to fit into the group (the herd). Everyone wants a *team player*, yet we know that great advances are generally the result of *individualists*, people who are internally (not externally) motivated and directed. Schools are not interested in individual excellence or individual achievement, nor self actualization and most certainly not inner-direction.

John Dewey

John Dewey was an *EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHER* who managed to establish himself at *COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY* as the dominant figure and most influential man in American education at the time. His influence may be measured by the fact that at one point (and perhaps still today) 20% of all American School Superintendents and 40% of all *Teacher College* heads received advanced degrees from Columbia University.

In 1897 Dewey published one of his works titled "My Pedagogic Creed". ***In this work Dewey saw the destruction of a child's individualistic traits as the primary goal of education.*** [Does that sound like teaching? Does it sound like *self actualization*? Or does it sound like *domination* and *indoctrination*?] In Dewey's view, once this was accomplished the youngster would conform or adjust to whatever society he finds himself within.

The prime measuring stick of a child's progress then becomes his ability to 'meld into, and get

Pedagogic. Taken from the work *pedagogy*.

Pedagogy. The art, or science, of being a teacher.

along with the group [herd]'. And take a look at where we are at today! A big thanks is due to all you teachers, principles and superintendents who have made John Dewey's dream a reality!

Young minds are primary targets of '*the controlling global elite*' but minds of all ages have the potential to be profiled (molded to a particular way of thinking). If the controllers can mold a young mind to a particular way of thinking then, as that mind becomes older, this becomes their 'mind set' or basic beliefs. Probably one of the most formidable weapons use against people is *their own ignorance*. *Our inability to analyze* complex issues coupled with our inability to understand what is being done to us, and how they are accomplishing it, is doing their work for them.

If we believe that the educational system of America is doing its job, try discussing the material in this book with your adult family, friends and associates and see how well you do. I believe that you will find that most are not prepared to deal with the content and material presented herein, and participate in a substantive discussion. I say this because the majority of teachers that I've engaged in discussion surrounding this material are not equipped academically nor intellectually to participate substantively. The best most of them can do is listen politely and then politely excuse themselves. Which is disheartening at best.

Although at the time of this update, 2008, I am beginning to see signs that teachers may be becoming more aware. My hat is off to those teachers. It is not that teachers, or anyone for that matter, should believe anything they read here, but the teachers, by virtue of their chosen profession, should be willing to research and verify/dispel the information contained herein.

Because of our ignorance, I'm certain that those in a position of setting policy have many a good laugh at our expense. And so, slowly but surely our enslavement, through the lack of knowledge and general apathy, becomes a reality. This is a fact for which we must accept responsibility. If it is our choice to remain lazy and ignorant, to remain *children* who must be *taken care of*, there is a consequence, a price to be paid for this action that we must accept.

Our educational system has so many problems it is difficult to know where to start. For a long time the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores have been dropping. Our students, when compared with other industrialized countries, are pitiful in comparison.

Meanwhile our schools are becoming progressively more violent, while at the same time we have been lowering achievement standards and expecting less. There appears to be no accountability, least of all to the parents. The inmates appear to be running the asylum and no one seems to accept responsibility. [I understand that just recently (now a while back) the educational community has *norm adjusted* the *Scholastic Aptitude Test* scoring and lowered performance standards so that it appears students are doing a better job. A friend, who is a teacher, has made me aware that the policies of *public education* are driven by the ADA (*Average Daily Attendance*), on which the school receives money from the government. It's all commercial!]

In the teachers defense, I know that their curriculum is tightly controlled, and the measurement of student performance, on which the teachers performance is measured, is also tightly controlled. The control is such that teachers, if they truly want to teach, have to find ways to inject useful knowledge and education into a very controlled environment. To those teachers who are now working to actually provide useful knowledge and truly teach, my hat is in my hand and I thank you.

Ask educators what it will take to solve the problem and every year it's the same: Public Education needs more money. I disagree. The more money we have thrown at the educational system, the worse has been its performance.

At one time in this country, teachers were hired by we the people at a local level, and were answerable to the parents who paid them for their services. Now the school teacher and administrators are hired and paid by government. By virtue of their attitude, Public school teachers and administrators seem to view parents as ineffective, ignorant dolts, completely forgetting that these parents are the product of their educational philosophy. It always surprises me that someone who isn't doing their job has contempt for those whose money pay their wages.

ABSOLUTE EDUCATION versus RELATIVE EDUCATION

In Absolute Education the measurement of your knowledge of a subject is Absolute. You either know the subject material or you do not. In Relative Education your knowledge of a subject is measured relative to the other students in the class.

In making a relative measurement of a students knowledge, a student could be mediocre or poor in actual knowledge of a subject and yet receive a good grade if they are in a class of non-achieving students. Conversely, in a whole class full of students functioning at a high academic level of achievement, some of these bright student's will have receive 'C' grades using a relative measurement system when the overall performance of the school is well below the abilities of these bright students receiving C's. The grade, any grade, when based on the curve method of grading, is relevant only to that class. Students are often not stupid and know that they have a great deal more knowledge and ability than some other dolt in another class that is receiving a higher grade.

Probably the most significant aspect of this system is that if the Educational Institution (and teacher) is doing a poor job of educating students, that fact can be hidden through relative measurement of performance. By using relative measurement of performance the educators can control how many students, if any, fail. Thus they can look good no matter how poorly they are doing. However, Mom & Dad may begin to wonder about their 'A' student who is about to graduate from High School and cannot find Kansas on the map nor spell it correctly.

Look up the term 'CURVE' in Webster's Collegiate Dictionary and you will see:

“A distribution indicating the relative performance of individuals measured against each other that is used in assigning good, medium, or poor grades to predetermined

proportions of students rather than in assigning grades based on predetermined standards of achievement.”

So here we see that 'educators' determine ahead of time how many are going to receive good, medium and poor grades in a particular class. This determination is made as a political and funding (commercial) expediency without regard for the actual education of the young people for whom they pretend to care so much.

Absolute measurement tests with **predetermined standards of achievement** would benefit the student and America. It would target educational institution performance and give the parents and the public a *report card* of how well the teachers and public schools are doing their jobs of educating.

These types of grading systems lead to another deception. In this particular scenario the school makes you, the parent, a part of the deception played on the child.

In this scenario the school provides the parent with a bumper sticker stating that “MY CHILD IS ON THE HONOR ROLE AT USA HIGH SCHOOL”, or some similar such statement. The child can't read or spell. His math ability is so poor that he can't provide correct answers for a 12x12 multiplication table. He has no science understanding, his computer skills are limited to playing games, he has never read a book cover to cover, he has no ability in public speaking, his knowledge of history, especially American history, is virtually non existent, his political understanding is zero, he has no understanding of the Constitution for the united States of America nor the bill of rights nor the Magna Carta, all the documents that are in place to protect him, an no exposure to status or law. Yet, Mom and Dad proudly display the bumper sticker.

Of all the subjects taught in schools, none is more important than reading and writing which includes an understanding of grammar and spelling. Without these two foundational skills we will be considerably limited in our education. The ability to read and understand what has been presented is absolutely necessary along with the skill to write and make ourselves understood. A spoken word is ok, but the ability to make ourselves understood on paper is so much more powerful and reaches many more people unless we become a radio or television personality. It is an absolutely necessary skill if we are ever required to represent ourselves in a legal proceeding.

Following reading and writing, history is our next most important topic. For this is the telling of a story of where we (mankind) have been and our experiences. On a more selective basis, it is the telling of the story of our heritage. The path our forefathers followed and what they learned. A true un-revised history provides us with an understanding of the protection provided by the knowledge our forefathers can share with us. But when history is revised by our educators, as is the case in America today, it is done in a manner whereby we have no **connection** to the past and those who have made so

“History. Thousands of years of wisdom, all written down and recorded. Yet, we fail to listen to ourselves.” - Michael C. Keehn

many sacrifices for us. For to do so would *bond* us to those who made the sacrifice for our benefit.

So what happens to students who are deceived into thinking they are educated? I'm certain that when they are unable to secure a good job or keep a job they will have some image problems. More and more, I see adults in their 20's and beyond, still dependent on Mom and Dad. Instead of exiting school with skills and abilities that can be put to work, the student's focus has been concentrated on feeling good, no matter how poor their performance. Unfortunately, *industry* is not overly concerned with how we feel about ourselves, they seem to be more interested in whether or not we have skills and abilities we can put to work for them. Consequently we often end up in dead end un-challenging jobs that pay poorly, or we end up on welfare (a burden to those working), and so our image suffers even more. All that touchy, feel good education will not suffice in the real world. All the while teenage suicides are increasing.

There have been other methods of hiding poor performance on the part of our Educational Institutions such as no grades, or simply pass/fail. So how do we bring accountability back into the Public School System?

If we are going to hold the schools accountable, what should the accountability entail? I think that most of us could agree that education should be centered around the teaching of fundamentals (Reading, Grammar, History and Mathematics. These keystone abilities allow us to branch into areas of physics, chemistry, biology, medicine, business management, law, the arts and all the other admirable disciplines that comprise our society.

Education is one of America's largest *commercial industries*. The end product of this *government industry* is our children and their future. Today (late 1990's), in California, our educational spending is around \$6000.00 per student per year. This amounts to \$180,000 per classroom (based on 30 children in the class). If the current teachers' salary is \$40,000 and the class room operation and maintenance are another \$30,000 then where is the other \$110,000 (per class room) going? Those in power have learned your weakness and know that all they have to do to get more of your money is to say they need it for your child's education.

Question: Why does the Department of Education need 127 non-teaching personnel for every 100 teachers while the private schools have 16 non-teaching personnel for every 100 teachers?

In business there exists a system of checks and balances that include quality control. In American Public Education the quality control systems have failed. For a number of years there has been an acceptance of declining performance in Scholastic Aptitude Tests (SAT) by our public educators as well as the public in general. While, at the same time as much as 40% of their product, our children, are so defectively educated that they drop out of school before obtaining a High School Diploma; many of them ending up in jail. I know of no business, which is not government supported, subsidized or operated, that could survive with 40% of its product ending up in the junk bin.

To solve this problem educators have asked for and received an endless stream of dollars. Has this solved the problem? NO - NO - NO and NO!!!

Obviously the giving of money is not the answer, therefore, do we want to continue funding a failing educational strategy? If we are un-educated the answer is probably YES! But for the educated, the answer is NO (have you noticed that *educated* people send their children to *private schools*?). Why would we want to reward failure? However, with our increased education funding every year, that is exactly what we have been doing - rewarding failure. If we can agree that the current education system fails too many of our children, then how do we go about turning it around to achieve quality and excellence?

An excellent source of information is the [Underground History of American Education](#)

Accountability

Accountability always begins with *we the people* being accountable for ourselves and our own actions (or in some cases, lack of action). Bringing back *accountability* in the schools and in our lives is where we start. If we are going to spend upwards of six thousands dollars per year for each students education, I believe that we, the suppliers of the money, have the right to expect a certain level of return (student achievement) for our payment. I have spoke with teachers about this problem and they relate that even if they provide appropriate instruction, there are often times problems within the home that prevent a student from achieving. Homework not done, improper nourishment, drug addict parents, domestic violence ... you name it.

Well teachers, I'm still going to hold you responsible. Those parents were in "*your*" schools at one time and either you or your predecessors did not teach skills, abilities or values that would serve the student in life. And now they are a parent. You failed to teach that *acts have consequences*. They were not taught that government programs are not the path to independence and freedom. Drug addiction is a sign of the failure of *public education*.

By virtue of being a teacher, you, of all Americans, should be teaching all of us how to effect change in the political landscape by doing the necessary campaigning to recapture control of your class rooms, curriculum and schools. Why not stop chasing dollars, stop teaching sensitivity, stop teaching alternate life styles acceptance or participation, stop teaching young girls how to get an abortion without the knowledge of Mom and Dad, stop teaching the male students how to put on a condom and go back to teaching the basics of success in life.

Bring laws into force and effect that deny welfare to any family whose children are capable but are not doing their part in school and getting passing grades. Expel the students who constantly disrupt the education of others. This *no child left behind* policy is a recipe for failure. In this policy the teacher must hold up the education of the rest of the class because one student is not up to *academic parr*. With this the entire class is brought down to the level of the lowest student. And, not only you, but the rest of us parents, are expected to embrace this lunacy as enlightened. It is absolutely unrealistic and unworkable, but what do we expect from a *commercial enterprise*

as opposed to a true school? As a teacher do you want to teach, or do you just want to talk about teaching so that you can *feel good*? By virtue of what I described above, all that you are doing is to teach us how to make excuses, whine and ultimately fail in life.

The Voucher

There has been an on again - off again public debate in our nation concerning, what is most commonly called, the voucher. A voucher would be an instrument (probably paper) containing the authorization for funding of a child's education. The basic idea is that a voucher be given to parents for the education of each child. The parents, in turn, take their child and voucher to an educational institution (school) of their choice.

The voucher has a value in dollars. At the end of the school year, the voucher may be redeemed by the school, which possesses it. The parent would have marginal control since it would be they to whom the voucher is sent. The parent could then take their child and the voucher to whichever *public school* the parent preferred. This has the effect of placing schools in competition with each other to produce the highest quality product, which in this case is an educated student. It also places the parent marginally back in control of the child's education (a situation that the Department of Education & government wish to avoid - they don't want you in control of anything).

All voucher ideas, that I've heard about in the main stream media, (and I probably haven't heard them all) set the voucher value at less than we are spending on each student (usually by a long shot). Therefore to provide the best education through competition for the funds the voucher represents, the entire funding for the child's education should be contained in the voucher.

That adds a little accountability. Now we will add more by controlling redemption of the voucher. For a school to redeem the voucher at full value the child would have to pass a **standardized test with predetermined standards of achievement** for the current grade level of the student.

If the child fails, the Teacher has failed and the institution has failed. Their failure should not be rewarded as has been the practice for some years now. Instead, the VOUCHER would lose value when the institution fails to adequately educate a child. How about 50% of voucher value for a 'D' and 25% of voucher value for failing performance. In doing this we have penalized failure. Should we not also reward excellence? To this extent the voucher could be redeemed at 110% face value for a score of 92% or higher.

In addition to this, if any student is physically attacked by more than one student (i.e., a gang), then the entire administrative and teaching staff of the school would lose 1% of their base wage for the entire school year. This would apply to each case individually so the next incident would produce another 1% reduction in wages. **Acts have consequences**. In this, the *no child left behind* policy would be discarded and the teacher, along with the school, would have the right to expel any student they wished. In this process the school would weigh the loss of income by

virtue of losing one student, against the loss of income by virtue of the general poor performance of the other students being affected by the behavior of a *bad apple*.

Tightening the thumb screws

Let us twist the thumb screws a little tighter and add even more accountability. This would be accomplished by placing private schools in competition with public schools under the same requirements for redemption of the voucher. Private schools and teachers would not be licensed (corrupted) by the government. Americans, we care if someone can do the job, not that they are licensed. A license is just another governmental means of control and exclusion, which, when translated, simply means that the teachers are trained to use the government method with little or no room for their own originality, ability, imagination, inventiveness, ideas, etc. The elite thinkers of the Department of Education believe that they have the best and only method by which to teach and that the psychologically profiled, authoritarian robot, government trained teachers are the only way to accomplish proper education. Well, **Bravo Sierra**.

Both public educated students and privately educated students would test at the same time taking the same test. This will serve to put public and private educational institutions into competition with each other.

These standardized tests will have no section testing little Johnny's ability to properly use a condom or little Suzie's ability to remember all the steps required to obtain an abortion without the knowledge of Mom and Dad. The test would be kept strictly to core academic subjects: Reading; Grammar; History; Math; Science; Geography; Literature; etc.

Home Education

Another on and off debate in America has surrounded the importance of having a parent at home. Most parents who really love their children recognize the merit of this. To that end and to recognize the merit of home education, why not make the same offer to parents who wish to stay home and educate their children. The same offer that we have made to the public and private schools. The parent could keep the voucher and educate their own children. The criteria for redemption for the voucher would be the same. *Everyone is equal in the eyes of the law* (sounds like a good idea, I wonder if it will ever occur?). Additionally, I, as a parent, may have a high regard for the values and principles of my neighbor who is *home educating* her children. She is principled, moral, runs a tight ship, is fair, not afraid to discipline when necessary, not afraid to hold a child when necessary, takes the time to do a good job. Perhaps she would not mind including my child/children in her educational agenda. I might find the environment better than the public school. I might not have to worry about my child being beaten or brutalized by other students that public schools now allow to run amuck. In such a case I would take my voucher to her and when my children took the standardized test, she could redeem it.

I would be willing to assert that if any of these ideas see a possibility of becoming a reality, the *Department of Education* is going to scream bloody murder. What might happen to *their commercial enterprise* if it were discovered that private schools and home schooling could do a

better job? There is certainly a fear of *accountability for performance* in the educational community, as such, how can they expect accountability for performance from their students? Accountability for performance is not a concept with which the Department of Education and schools have had to deal seriously. However, it becomes very serious when funding is tied to performance. But for parents there are few things more serious than the future of our children.

In a side issue, I know a teacher who, after acquiring the requisite credentials, landed a teaching job. After three years the teacher had developed a fairly good plan and method of teaching the required material. But then the teacher was given a new assignment, to teach the students who were not achieving the expected (required) levels of performance. This required the teacher to develop a new plan and method of educating these low functioning students, as opposed to the *normal* students. In addition to this, teachers are often pulled from their class rooms during the school year to attend training, which can be for multiple days. A *substitute teacher* is brought in, and the class simply becomes a *baby sitting* operation until the regular teacher returns to take up where they left off. I can relate many more stories on how the public schools defeat their teachers and the stated goal of *teaching*. It's like public education is being run by Larry, Moe and Curly.

If accountability becomes a serious issue in public education, we can expect the educational bureaucracy to throw up an endless series of objections as to why this will not work or is unfeasible and discriminatory. God forbid that we parents should learn to discriminate between good education and bad. After all, educators know we aren't sufficiently competent to make educational decisions, they educated us. The amount of money the Teachers Union and Government will spend defeating this idea (if it should ever gain any public support) will be enormous. They will most certainly try the scare tactics that have been so successful in the past (remember - scare tactics are for sheeple), in an effort to frighten you. You probably know them:

Example: A private school may teach witch craft (while the public school promotes acceptance of alternate life styles).

Example 2: *Your child may not qualify for a private school*, which may be true enough. The private school may not want your child if they are not given the latitude to control him/her and make the environment safe and conducive to learning for all students. At the same time you will have a great deal less worry as to whether your child will be shot, stabbed, controlled and corrupted by a gang, or otherwise injured while at school. I have noticed that business now conducts training for the supervisors and managers in what might be termed *in the work place terrorism*. Some workers exercise a degree of control by making others fearful. I believe they call these people *terrorist cells*. The same takes place in schools. Some students exercise control over others by harming other students or making them fearful. Teachers, like managers and supervisors in business, need the latitude to control these *terrorists cells* in the schools or if necessary, to remove the *terrorist cell* from the school environment.

Example 3: *Public schools proclaim that only they can provide untainted education, free from racial and religious bias*. That is an outright lie! Public education is biased. It is filled with bias

against the family and against religious beliefs. Far from being required to pray or worship, students are not even allowed to openly do so if they choose. Yet you can curse the teacher. So don't try to sell me that public schools are free from bias.

A REMINDER

“Unfortunately we find systems of education today which have departed so far from the plain truth, that they now teach us to be proud of what we know and ashamed of ignorance. This is doubly corrupt. It is corrupt not only because pride is in itself a mortal sin, but also because *to teach pride in knowledge is to put up an effective barrier against any advance upon what is already known, since it makes one ashamed to look beyond the bonds imposed by one's ignorance.*” - G. Spencer Brown. LAWS OF FORM (1969)

ACTS HAVE NO CONSEQUENCES

The single biggest message that is taught in our Public School System today is that 'ACTS HAVE NO CONSEQUENCES'. A student can attend a public school and be rude, caustic, disruptive, antagonistic, sell drugs and other controlled substances to other students, bring weapons to school and fail every class he takes while someone who works for the Public School System will make excuses for him. Well, when that was written back in the 1990's, it was fairly accurate. But schools are now less tolerant than they were back then. But the actual level of intolerance depends on the school.

However, there is still a general perception that *acts have no consequences* among many students! Students have figured out that the school *needs their attendance* for the money. Children love to behave as though *acts have no consequences*. This behavior has become so accepted in our nation's schools that we now have a society in which *acts have no consequences*, or at least that is how many of us behave. By the time there is a consequence, it is far too late to reclaim the human being that was once there and so our jails fill up and human beings become *human garbage*. To be specific, I am saying that the school system has failed in its job, and because of this our jails fill with people who respond to the concepts of *no morality, no values, acts have no consequences*, assembly line approach to education. Inmates, by virtue of the power over the *purse strings*, run the asylum.

[I have no current knowledge that what is set forth in this paragraph is still current (2008) policy in the schools of our nation, but I am leaving it because it was a practice at one time.] Examine the school ... no, examine the teacher or other school employee who instructs your child how to have an abortion without your knowledge. What have they done? Have they not taught the child to be sneaky (a weasel), to do something of which Mom and Dad have no knowledge and may not approve? What has the child learned? That it is ok to conduct her life in secret and possibly outside the requirements of her mother and father. In so many ways school teachers and other school officials behave as though they see themselves as God and know better than the parents what is best for the child. And quite often the parents are so well indoctrinated by their tour with

the public school system, they allow themselves to be relegated to the position of a joke in the eyes of their own child.

Has it occurred to anyone that the public educational system has endangered the child's well being, both physically and psychologically as well as undermining the parent. The child may not immediately realize it but has lost her self respect, dignity, and credibility. She is now without her own rudder and can be steered by others. When someone has done a great wrong, they seek an authority figure that condones their corrupted conduct. And since the school engineers it, they will be the first to support the child. The child now has a new benevolent benefactor and protector and it is not the parent. What is going to happen someday in the future when her maturity allows her to understand that she participated in fraud and deception of the worst kind? When she finds herself in great depression because of having *aborted a life*, where will the school system be in her life at that time? At that point, she is a long forgotten memory. Her teachers and other facility friends have moved on to other jobs at other schools. The only ones left are Mom and Dad.

Parents have become so conditioned to being idiots in the eyes of those in public education that they actually allow the school systems to drug their children. I am very glad that I did not have a parent so foolish. And as you can probably see by my writing, I was probably a challenge to many teachers. But my recollections are mostly fond toward the teachers in my life, and I thank them for allowing me to be *who I am* (self actualized).

Public schools are not color blind. They are, as they put it, *sensitive* to various ethnic groups. Another way of saying biased. So much for untainted, unbiased public education!

Probably no institution is free of bias but we are paying for academic performance in core basics and it should be demonstrated academic performance on which the VOUCHER is redeemed, whether from a Public School, a Private School or Home Education. We should leave the question of institutional bias to the parent.

Dr. George Counts

Dr. George Counts, a prominent figure in the structuring of American Education, wrote a monograph in 1932 titled "*Dare the School Build a new Social Order?*" Could this be another way of saying "New World Order". In this monograph Counts writes:

"That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction."

Right there is the controller's mentality..."*REACH FOR POWER*". Power and Control is the opium of the controller's mind, not wealth (they usually have that already), not fame, not recognition, not material goods. It is Power and Control over others that they seek. They view themselves as *great social engineers*.

In the mind of the controller mentality, they feel that they have now learned how to think (superior to the rest of us) and are now prepared to do *the thinking for everyone*, our family, our country, nature, even for God. They know how to think better than any other sentient or intelligent being in the universe!

REACH FOR THAT POWER

To achieve these goals the *Department of Education* has grown into a monster and acquired power that gives them control of the young minds of America. Power that allows the molding of these young American minds for some time now. Even today (1998) we have a radio commercial that contains these very words. It is, of course, a commercial to solicit people to become a teacher. The commercial contains examples of how teachers can make a difference. One example has a teacher saving a child from drowning. Another teacher saves a child from a burning building. It goes on to say that '*teachers have the POWER to make a difference, REACH FOR THAT POWER*'. And so they aim the commercial at those of us who are more interested in POWER & CONTROL than we are in teaching. POWER & CONTROL that will be exercised over young minds in a manner that is detrimental to them.

Teachers, I hold you accountable. If anyone should understand what has transpired and begin implementing correction, it should be you by virtue of your role and position in society. It is time for teachers to figure out a way to bring morality back into the schools, teach our founding principles, quit being a spy on parents, teach us all through example to be responsible, productive and self reliant (instead of Government dependent). Teach us the drawbacks of welfare and that when we accept it we are becoming dependent and controlled. Teach us how to be free, and that *government is not our friend*. It is time that you teach instead of parrot. Are you up to the job?

An Educational Question:

Before the question may be asked the stage must be set to put the question into perspective.

If I were to encounter you on the street and put a gun to your head, I am putting your life in peril or at risk. And if I then use this peril that I hold over your life to take your money (property) from you, you would conclude that I have committed a crime, in this case a robbery. And if you were to sit upon a jury in which these actions are to be judged, you would find me guilty of robbery. It would not matter what I did with the money (property) that I took from you, I am guilty of robbery. I could have used it to help under privileged families, or the sick, or the needy and regardless of my noble intents, the crime still remains robbery. If for some reason you don't quite get it, go stick up a bank and distribute the money as described above and see if that noble action will set aside the criminal act of robbery.

With all the noble or selfish excuses stripped away, robbery is using a threat of *force and violence* to put your life at risk in order to take your property.

Is it not the same crime to threaten *force and violence* through law, to place your body in prison where your body will be brutalized and raped on a regular basis by other more powerful and

aggressive prisoners, to deprive you of your liberty and ability to provide for yourself and your family, all to take your property from you? Law is *force and violence*, period. And when that *force and violence* is used to place your life at risk as a means to take your property from you and give it to whom it does not belong, a crime of robbery has been committed. This is called *perversion of law*.

The difficult task is getting the populace to accept this criminal practice as legitimate. But once the populace has been indoctrinated to this practice they will exonerate the government for the same criminal practice for which they would put a *street criminal* in prison. I suspect that the primary reason that they will exonerate government is because this criminal behavior has the potential to benefit the populace to some small degree. And so the average citizen gets *his piece of the action* by sanctioning this criminal behavior.

Returning now to a focus on education.

If you and I had lived in 1885 and we wished to have our children *formally* educated, you and I and other parents with children went together and hired a teacher whom we paid for his or her services. Education was a privilege, not a right, not a legislated specific performance. We did not expect our neighbor, who has no children, or maybe no children in the school, to pay for the education that our child was receiving. We certainly could have held a gun to our neighbors head and took his money to pay for our child's education but someone might have called that robbery and put us in prison. And even though not every one could pay in money, there were commodities that could be traded for the educational services provided by the teacher. Eggs, chickens, meats, nuts, berries, many things could be traded to the teacher for his services. And although they might not be able to utilize them all, they could take some of them to the general store and sell them there for cash money. And sometimes teachers took in students without payment simply because they were teachers and the student *wanted* to learn.

Children generally worked hard because their parents were paying for them to be in school and learn. The children knew their parents were sacrificing their hard earned money and so the children generally did their best to take advantage of what was being offered.

The teacher had a good environment for he or she was teaching people who mostly wanted to learn. Students who were enthusiastic and working hard. The teacher would use the more advanced students to teach (help) the struggling students and by providing this student instruction those advanced students became even more knowledgeable by teaching various subject material. Because no one was under any sort of *specific performance threat* from government, their attitudes were a reflection of this freedom from punishment and intrusion by that government.

But then we created the *Department of Education* and made commercial laws that require children to be in school. The children are now essentially a prisoner with this *specific performance requirement*. And in some cases, mostly in older children, their attitudes reflect this status. Often they resist learning, resist the school's efforts to indoctrinate them, resist the authority the school exercises over them. The result is that many schools in our country are now

a dangerous place to be. The teachers are now faced with a different student attitude from those of 1885 and are trying to teach young people who, in many cases, don't want to learn. Because of this there has, for many years, been a continual lowering of acceptable standards on achievement tests. This whole scenario is frustrating to teachers and so their attitude also changes. Less and less teaching seems to be taking place along with less and less learning.

And this whole thing is funded by the ***force & violence of commercial law*** to take property (money) from people. In effect, we hold a *lawful gun* to our neighbors head to make him pay for the education of our child. Through this process we put our neighbors life at *risk* to take his property. The *risk* to his life is his tax assessment and requirement to pay it. If he does not, ***force & violence*** will be used to arrest, convict and imprison my neighbor. While at the same time taking his property from his bank account or anywhere else he might have property. But that is ok because we see that even though this is a criminal activity, we will receive *our piece of the action* through payment for our child's education. And let that be a warning to all the other people who don't want to pay for the education my child receives.

And now we get to the educational question: "How can we have an educational environment funded by a criminal activity?"

The answer, of course, is that we cannot have true education when it is based upon, and funded by criminal behavior that is so *politically charged*. You cannot have an educational system based on an immoral premise, all you can have is immoral indoctrination. You cannot teach freedom funded by ***force & violence*** (slavery). By doing so we teach our children that it is ok to plunder and pillage their neighbor through perversion of law when it is to their benefit.

But then, of course, we whine when we are pillaged and plundered by the same government for the benefit of someone else who will receive our property (money) as a farm subsidy, or receive our property as a welfare payment, or receive our money as part of the payment on a low income home, or receive our money as an educational grant.

Public School now has a policy of: "No child left behind." And in implementing this policy the school system is willing to drag down every achieving, advanced and highly academic student to the level of the lowest student so that he will not be left behind! It's a wonderful policy, well thought out and consistent with making certain that the majority of students will remain un-educated!

And after we've taught our children to participate and benefit from criminal behavior, we tell everyone how much we love them. Perhaps we should teach our children that:

"Wrong is wrong... even if it helps you"

Remember, school is a *commercial activity* governed by *commercial (contract) law*.

CHAPTER 6

WAR & EMERGENCY POWERS

Let me begin this chapter in recognition of Dr. Eugene Schroder and those associated with his efforts to bring this information to light. Much of this chapter is based in the work of Dr. Schroder and it is information that should be understood by every American and perhaps a requirement for graduation from High School.

War & Emergency Powers in a nutshell

On March 9, 1933 (five days after the inauguration of Franklin Roosevelt), the *Banking Relief Act* was passed. This act contained language of the *Trading with the Enemy Act* of October 6, 1917, a War Powers Act. In 1917, the United States of America was preparing to go into World War I. It was recognized that there were probably enemies of this country operating within our borders and so the *Trading With the Enemy* act was passed, giving the president total authoritarian control over *enemies of the United States* and their every commercial activity in our country. Bear in mind that this Act is an *Act of War* or, if you prefer, a *War Powers Act*, giving the President of the United States *total authoritarian control* over the identified enemy and his *commercial activity* in the United States. But the act of October 6, 1917 contained some *exclusionary language*. Language that excluded some commercial activities and some people from the operation of this law. One piece of exclusionary language reads:

"Transfers of credit in any form (other than credits relating solely to transactions to be executed wholly within the United States);"

The fact that transactions to be executed *wholly within the United States* was exempted from the operation of the law was recognition that when we American's go to the hardware store and buy a lawn mower (a transaction executed wholly within the United States), this is not an enemy transaction and is not subject to the operation of the law. Another piece of exclusionary language was found at Section 2, Subdivision (c):

"other than citizens of the United States."

This exclusionary language recognizes that *a citizen of the United States is not an enemy of the United States* and not subject to the operation of this law.

But when the language of this *Trading with the Enemy Act* was brought forward and made part of the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933, the exclusionary language was amended and became:

“by any person within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof”

This *amended language* has the effect of making the United States citizen indistinguishable from any other enemy of the United States relative to this law. If this law recognizes no difference between the United States citizen and any other enemy of the United States, it follows that **the United States citizen is an enemy of the United States**. And you have wondered why you’re treated that way?

It is because this War Powers Act governs the **commercial activity** of those to whom it is applied (*the enemy*) that government is able to regulate you in almost everything you do. With this, it was only necessary to convert our regular and normal activities into a *commercial activity*. This would include the *wet lands regulations* that have put some of our farmers in jail. This would include regulation of the Northwest timber industry that resulted in the closing of lumber mills, putting many people out of work. This would also include regulation of our industries forcing them to close their operations in America and go to other countries. For full details and a much fuller understanding of what it means to be an enemy of the United States, read the rest of this chapter.

The Big Picture

It seems to be a difficult *bridge* for many Americans to understand that there are those people who desire control of everything. I know, it was for me. There are those Judas' among us who seek their own power and control. We find them in many places: *City Councils, Planning Commissions, department heads, planning departments, Boards of Supervisors...* the Judas goat is everywhere. It is participating in the unhealthy and unlawful regulation that is robbing this country of its productivity, of its agricultural and industrial might and crippling our economy. But those weasels among us who participate are the minority. Most Americans have no inclination of this sort. And because most of us are not motivated by power and control, it is difficult to think in these terms or ascribe this type of mentality to others. But, to some, obtaining as much power and control as is humanly possible, is their opium. As much addictive as any cocaine derivative. And just like the common drug addict, power addicts conduct their lives to obtain as much of their addiction as possible.

Power addiction can be found at many levels. Many are in government service as regulatory and judicial officers, department heads, elected officials and other positions of authority and power. However, the real danger lies in those whose wealth is not understandable by the average person. It is these wealthy people and families who purchase (buy off and control) our elected officials and by virtue of this, they control the law and policies of our country. Because of their wealth, the influence and power they command is more than the president of the United States and more enduring. These people determine and control who will be a Presidential candidate, as such they determine who will be the next President of the United States. These are people who can have a President assassinated with immunity. Kid yourself not, these wealthy people control the news agencies, the news papers, the television programming content, the news magazines, education,

foreign policy, treaties, national policies, and they have done so for many years. The control they exercise over your sources of information are the primary tools to control your perception and view of events and issues. We are very visual people, and through television that tool is fully utilized in our psychological profiling. As you read this chapter ask yourself if the material presented within is not an issue that the press should be pursuing, or should have pursued in a time now gone by. Ask yourself if this material is not something that should be part of our basic education in understanding our status and relation to government. Who I am identifying here is the ***global elite***. Those that are working to implement ***one world government under their control!***

I would hope that our education provides us with the understanding that the Constitution for the united States of America (including the Bill of Rights), contains many provisions for protecting the ordinary American citizen from the arbitrary power of government. If this is not known and understood, then you need to stop here and take the time to read the constitution and develop an understanding of those protections and limitations.

The reader should keep in mind that those who have worked in concert to bring us to serfdom have done so over a very long period of time, realizing that if they were to move too swiftly, they may awaken we the people and that may stampede the herd. Drop a frog in a boiling pot and he will jump out and live, but place the frog in tepid water, raising the temperature very slowly and the frog will cook before he realizes what is occurring. Does it seem a little warm to you? The time this process has taken has required that *bloodlines* be maintained. And if you look into this aspect, you will find that those at the top of the pyramid are all generally *blood relatives*. Those who make it into positions of power, are helped into positions of power and control.

CONSPIRACY?

To suggest that those who have worked in concert to bring us to serfdom, have done so over a very long period of time, is to suggest a conspiracy.

Conspire. To act or work together toward the same goal. (Random House dictionary)

There are many who will not even consider this as a possibility. It is to these people that I address the following, in the area between the {} 'braces'.

{ If I were to give you a deck of playing cards and instructed you pick out the hearts, you would feel that you've been given an easy job. You know the hearts are red and that alone eliminates half the deck. And so there you are, picking out those red hearts. But suppose I have slipped in a black heart. Will you see it? If you do not consider it a possibility, then probably not. And so it is with a conspiracy. If you are unwilling to acknowledge that conspiracy may be a possibility, you will not see it, even when it presents itself.

"Single acts of tyranny may be ascribed to the accidental opinion of a day. But a series of oppression's, begun at a distinguished period, and pursued unalterably

through every change of ministers [Presidential Administrations], too plainly proves a deliberate systematic plan of reducing us to slavery."

Thomas Jefferson

Do not forget that history is ripe with conspiring. Plots within plots. It is what those in power and control do ... every single day. Why do you think that so much of what *they do is done in secret?*

Those who have herded us into slavery have allowed the slaves to think they were free. OK, so I'm free. What am I free to do? Can I travel alone in my car? No. Can I work without a *card and number?* No. Can I drill a *water well* without a permit? No. Can I put a *new roof* on my home without a permit? No. Can I install a new toilet or hot water heater without a permit? No. Can I pour a sidewalk without a permit? No. Can I build myself a dwelling to keep my family and I warm and safe without a permit? No. I'm having a hard time thinking of anything of any importance, that I do that is not a ***commercial activity and regulated through license or permit!*** Oh, I know, I can play tennis without a license or permit. At least for the time being. Yeah, I'm free alright. And if I'll buy that someone probably has some *ocean-front property* in Arizona they want to sell me.

Let us not forget the *Health Care Task Force* put together by Mrs. Clinton. No one knew their affiliations, who they were, what they stood for nor anything about them. Everything was being done in secrecy. But we don't believe in conspiracy? Nothing in the political and governmental arena happens in a vacuum. If something occurs in this arena, it is by design. }

War & Emergency Powers in depth!

Let's start down the road to understanding where our freedom has gone by examining a quotation from Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Hughes who, in 1920, said:

"We may well wonder in view of the precedents now established, whether constitutional government, as heretofore maintained in this great republic, could survive another great war, even victoriously waged."

This is a very revealing statement, for Justice Hugh's is saying that if we were to fight another great war (a World War) and even though we won that war, Constitutional Government may not survive. We should probably take into consideration that Justice Hugh's was in a position to know things that the general populace did not. What did this man know or understand that escapes the rest of us? Perhaps we will find a clue in the quotation's continuation. Speaking of World War I, Justice Hugh's said:

"The conflict known as the world war ended as far as military hostilities were concerned, but was not yet officially terminated. Most of the war statutes are still in effect and many of the *emergency* organizations are still in operation."

The term "*emergency*" is italicized above because it is the declaration of an **EMERGENCY** that becomes the catalyst for the passage of un-constitutional laws to *deal with the emergency*. It is the *rule of necessity*.

EMERGENCY

On March 9, 1933 an Act was passed. The Act is generally known as the *Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933*. From its name a person wouldn't immediately feel apprehension. Yet, this Act contained powers and measures that caused our whole system of law to change and placed the united States of America under a form of *military rule*. At first the changes were made slowly but, more recently they have been gathering momentum as more and more of the right people have been placed in key positions. I suspect there may also be an urgency because the people of the United States are beginning to *wake up*.

The *emergency powers* provided by this act, when examined, are extraordinary and have the potential to be dangerous for they place almost unlimited powers in the hands of one man. How did a *Banking Relief Act* become a **source of EMERGENCY POWERS** that placed America under military rule? Let us look at a little of the history ... it's interesting and informative, and it gives us the back ground we need to understand what occurred and why. As events begin to unfold, Herbert Hoover is President of the United States.

THE HOOVER PAPERS

Upon examining the Hoover papers we find that President Hoover has sent a letter to the Federal Reserve Board of New York asking what might be done about the *current crises* in banking. The Federal Reserve Board responds by saying:

It is assumed that the reader knows that the "Federal Reserve" is the Central Bank of the United States. Chartered by Congress in 1913. However, it is not a government institution, it is a privately owned bank.

"Whereas in the opinion of the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the continued and increasing withdrawal of currency and gold from the banks of the country has now created a national emergency."

Here we see the Federal Reserve Board setting the stage for the declaration of an Emergency. In addition to stating that a national emergency has been created, the *Federal Reserve Board* has proposed an Executive Order, to be issued by the President, which says:

"Whereas it is provided in Section (5)(b) of the Act of October 6, 1917 as amended, the President may investigate, regulate, prohibit, under such rule and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of license or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange, export or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, or currency, * * * "

The asterisk, asterisk, asterisk, is not laziness on my part. That is as it was sent to Hoover by the Federal Reserve Board. This proposed executive order was adopted as a *resolution* by the Federal Reserve Board of New York. Remember the term "*resolution*." President Hoover refuses to issue the Executive Order saying that it is neither necessary nor appropriate. This is how matters stood on March 3, 1933.

Roosevelt's Inaugural Speech

It is now March 4, 1933 and Franklin D. Roosevelt is being inaugurated as President of the United States. Standing in attendance of that inauguration we hear the president say:

"I am prepared under my Constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken nation in the midst of a stricken world may require. These measures, or such other measures as Congress may build out of its experience and wisdom, I shall seek, within my Constitutional Authority, to bring to speedy adoption. But in the event that Congress shall fail to take one of these two courses, and in the event that the **national emergency** is still critical, I shall not evade the clear course of duty that will then confront me. I shall ask Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crises - **broad executive power to wage a war against the Emergency. As great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.**"

"Stricken nation in the midst of a stricken world"? The nation was suffering an economic depression that we now know was caused by the Federal Reserve's contraction of the M1 money supply. It was an engineered depression and was used to manipulate Congress and the rest of the nation.

"M1 includes funds that are readily accessible for spending." - Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis

Also note the use of the phrase *wage a war*. Sound familiar? Such as the "waging a war on drugs" or the "war on poverty". **War** is the means to implement un-constitutional law. It worked before and those who manipulate us remember what works. But its not working as well as it did at one time. Thank God for those among us who are doubtful and ask questions.

In President Roosevelt's inaugural address we see that, based on this banking crisis, the President is setting the stage to ask Congress for **WAR POWERS (Emergency Powers)**. But where is the war, where is the revolt, where is the invasion, who is the enemy? We shall find out.

On March 5, 1933, in Presidential proclamation 2038, Roosevelt asked for a *Special Session of Congress*. That special session of Congress was called for March 9, 1933.

Governors Conference

The date is now March 6, 1933, two days into the Roosevelt Presidency. President Roosevelt attends a *Governors Conference* and persuades them to pass a *resolution* pledging support for giving him *emergency war powers*. The Governors of the various states really have no choice. If they oppose the resolution they will be demonized as wanting the United States to remain in misery and suffering. In the end they capitulate of course and agree to support Roosevelt's bid for acquisition of *Emergency powers*. On the same day we see a Presidential Proclamation titled 2039 (A Bank Holiday) which says in part:

"Whereas there has been a heavy and *unwarranted* withdrawal of gold and currency from our banking institutions for the purpose of hoarding ..."

Note that because the American People (the owners and depositors of the money) wanted to withdraw portions (or all) of the gold they had deposited so that they could survive, the President of the United States now declares them to be hoarders as if retrieving your clothing from the cleaners and putting it in the closet were a criminal activity. Perhaps there was good reason the people (depositors) did not trust the banks. Does the action of *demonizing a group* sound familiar (does anyone remember Waco)? The fact is that because some Americans wished to have their money, they were now being portrayed as some sort of Demon. I would suppose that the implication is that these Americans, who had been doing this, are somehow responsible for the depression that is causing so much suffering. Ask yourself why the President is tainting the American people? NOTE (November 3, 2017 prediction): An economic failure is coming again, and you, and President Trump are going to be blamed in the Mainstream Misleadia, but not the Banking Elite who brought it about!

You will, of course, have ample opportunity to form your own opinions and conclusions. Continuing with presidential proclamation 2039, we read:

"Whereas it is provided in Section (5)(b) of the Act of October 6, 1917, (40 Stat. L. 411) as amended, that the President may investigate, regulate, or prohibit, under such rule and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of license or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange, export or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, or currency, * * * "

The Executive Order, exactly as it was proposed to President Hoover by the Federal Reserve Board prior to March 3, 1933, all the way down to the ' * * * ' (asterisk, asterisk, asterisk) at the end. Further, we take notice that the authority comes from the World War I *Trading With the Enemy Act*. A war powers act still in place and active because, as Justice Hughes put it:

"The conflict known as the world war ended as far as military hostilities were concerned, but was not yet officially terminated. *Most of the war statutes are still in effect* and many of the 'emergency' organizations are still in operation."

So there are benefits to never declaring a war to be terminated.

Asterisk, Asterisk, Asterisk ***

At this point we need to investigate the act of October 6, 1917 and find out what it says at the place where the “ * * * ” (asterisk, asterisk, asterisk) is located.

The Act of October 6, 1917 is specified as an Act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy and for other purposes. It is known as the 'Trading with the Enemy Act'. Going into World War I it was recognized that there were probably enemies of the United States commercially operating within our borders and so the *Trading With the Enemy* act gave the President total authoritarian control over the commercial activities and transactions of an identified enemy within our borders. And at the ' * * * ' (asterisk, asterisk, asterisk) we read:

"Transfers of credit in any form (other than credits relating solely to transactions to be executed wholly within the United States);"

This is a **key** piece to our puzzle of understanding. Understanding its importance cannot be overrated or overstated. This language **excludes** our *domestic transactions*. Therefore, when one of us goes to the hardware store and buys a lawnmower, a transaction executed wholly within the United States, it would be an *exempt transaction* and not subject to regulation by this law. This is important to understand because when this language of this Act is brought forth into the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933, the Congressional lawmakers are going to delete this piece of exclusionary language and it will not appear in the Banking Relief Act.

The fact that 'transactions to be executed wholly within the United States' were exempted from the operation of the law is recognition that when the American people engage in *domestic transactions*, that is transaction's executed wholly within the united States, they are not an enemy transaction and as such not subject to the operation of the law. And so the Act of October 6, 1917 excluded our domestic transactions from the operation of the law because they were not enemy transactions.

Other *exclusionary language* is found at Section 2, Subdivision (c):

"other than citizens of the United States."

Here, the Congress of 1917 is recognizing that the citizen of the United States is not an enemy of the United States and ***not subject to the operation of the law (The Trading with the Enemy Act)***. That the American citizen should not be subjected to an Act of War by its own government. This piece of exclusionary language was also ommitted from the *Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933*, and along with the previous exclusions of *domestic transactions* will be replaced with other language.

Once it became clear to the Federal Reserve Board that they were going to get the support of the elected officials within our government, they immediately took action to get back much of the gold they had been returning to the American people. On March 8, 1933, the Federal Reserve Board asked the banks to prepare a list of people who had recently withdrawn gold or gold certificates and who had not re-deposited them by March 13 (the date was later extended). It was then announced that this list of names would be made public and published. The chicanery (blackmail) is clear, return the gold or have your name published as one of those responsible for the current financial demise of America.

Could you imagine what you might feel like if your bank were to publish that you had withdrawn \$25,000 this week? Talk about conspiracy and extortion. Again, do you recognize the ***demonizing process*** being applied against the American people? This process is often used to psychologically profile the American mind (at least the stupid American minds). The most recent example might be the *Branch Dividians* at WACO, Texas. It is assumed that the people on this *bank list* would be held up to some form of criticism, ridicule or blame for a worsening economic crisis and ultimate embarrassment.

So here we have the Federal Reserve Bank obtaining private withdrawal information from various other banks and at least is unethical and at most is perhaps unlawful in its determination to make this information public. By now we should begin to understand, that those in power have no regard nor concern for the law or lawful activity. If it suits their purpose, you could face similar disparity in today's banks. When you deal with a bank, your financial business is not your own, it is public if they choose it to be.

The Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933

The date is now March 9, 1933 and Congress passes its first act under the Roosevelt Administration. And we read:

“An ACT

To provide relief in the existing ***national emergency*** in banking, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby declares that a serious emergency exists and that it is imperatively ***necessary*** speedily to put into effect remedies of uniform national application.”

This enabling clause contains some assertions that need to be discussed. First is the declaration that a serious emergency exists. We all need to understand what takes place when Congress declares an ***emergency*** exists. It may best be put into perspective by a comment by Congressman Beck in debate over this measure:

"I think that of all the damnable heresies that have ever been suggested in connection with the constitution, the ***doctrine of emergency*** is the worst. ***It means that when***

Congress declares an emergency, there is no Constitution. This means its death. It is the doctrine that the German Chancellor is invoking today in the dying hours of the Parliamentary Body of the German Republic. Namely that because of an emergency, it should grant to the German Chancellor the power to pass any law, even though that law contradicts the Constitution of the German Republic. Chancellor Hitler is at least frank about it. We pay the constitution lip service but the result is the same."

Here we see that when Congress declares an emergency, then the Constitution (our protection from Government) may be suspended. Perhaps the best way to put it is to say that if there is a desire to operate *un-constitutionally* (that is *un-lawfully*), then it is only necessary to **declare that an emergency exists** in order to remove all *constitutional restrictions, limitations and barriers*. I think that the most inept among us can see that if a Congressional declaration of an **emergency** can suspend the Constitution, there is a major shift taking place in government. A shift away from a *government of the people, by the people and for the people* (what we would term **lawful civil authority**). With the declaration of an **emergency** government becomes **war & emergency powers authority**. The shift is toward a centralized power base, a centralized government that controls all aspects of life in the United States and, of course we all can now know this *desire to control* includes the world.

The second assertion within the enabling clause that we need to examine is the **rule of necessity**. "Congress hereby declares that ... it is imperatively **necessary** speedily to put into effect remedies of uniform national application."

Rule of necessity

The rule of necessity is a paramount rule of law and simply put, necessity knows no law. For example, *necessity* is the rule of self defense. We know that it is against the law to intentionally kill a person but if a killing was done in defense of our lives and we can prove that, then it was done as a necessity and we are found not guilty of any crime. As you can see, a *necessity* changes the way the law is applied. Whenever Congress uses the **rule of necessity** in the *enabling clause* of some act, proposed legislation or other measure, it is an indication that the legislation is unlawful (that is to say un-constitutional with the declaration of **necessity**). Therefore, to operate our country *un-constitutionally* it is only necessary to find (**engineer**) an **emergency** that **necessitates immediate action**.

Once an un-constitutional measure has been passed under the **rule of necessity** and is in place, such as the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933, the Congressional lawmakers are then able to pass layer upon layer of additional

The Rule of Necessity

Necessitas non habet legem.

This latin legal term translates into *Necessity knows no law.*

"The conflict known as the world war ended as far as military hostilities were concerned, but was not yet officially terminated. Most of the war statutes are still in effect and many of the 'emergency' organizations are still in operation." - Supreme Court Justice Charles E. Hughes

un-constitutional law all pursuant to and deriving its authority from the original un-constitutional Act. However, all this un-Constitutional law can only stand so long as the emergency continues. Returning to Justice Hugh's comment it now becomes clear why *World War I* was not officially terminated, leaving *emergency powers (and statutes)* in operation. Once the emergency was declared at an end all the law attached to particular emergency legislative act is not longer operational.

With those two items made clear we continue with the language of the *Banking Relief Act* itself.

TITLE I

“Section 1. The actions, regulations, rules, licenses, orders and proclamations heretofore or hereafter taken, promulgated, made, or issued by the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury since March 4, 1933 pursuant to the authority conferred by subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, are hereby approved and confirmed.” - Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933

Of whom are we talking?

When we read the laws we need to pay attention to the subtlety of the wording. In the language above there is a subtle reference made of which we should all take note. They go out of their way to identify the *President* as the *President of the United States*, but then use the phrase Secretary of the Treasury and **NOT** the *Secretary of the Treasury of the United States*. There is a reason for this of course, and the reason is that they are not referring to the *Secretary of the Treasury of the United States*. They are referring to the Secretary of Treasury of Puerto Rico. But they make this reference covertly, first by identifying the President as the President of the United States, thus, leaving the reader to believe that the reference to the Secretary of Treasury is a reference to the Secretary of Treasury of the United States when that is not the case. But, we don't believe in conspiracies, do we?

“Secretary of the Treasury” of Puerto Rico was appointed as RECEIVER over the bankrupt United States in reorganization plan #26, in 1950. Title 5, section 903, Public Law 94-564: *The Secretary of Treasury of Puerto Rico*, title 27, code of federal regulations, section 251.11, the title “Secretary of the Treasury” is a euphemistic abbreviation of the actual title “Secretary of the Treasury of Puerto Rico.” – <http://www.rense.com/general92/myth1.htm>

If you dig into this a bit, you will find that the Secretary of Treasury of Puerto Rico was designated, by the Banking Elite, as the RECEIVER in the bankruptcy of the United States, declared by Franklin Roosevelt in 1933, and still in effect. The measures they took to keep the Government afloat, and take all your money and property, has ran its course. The economy is about to crash, and the Banking Elite are looking for anyone other than themselves to assign the blame. When the Bank Elite decides who they are going to blame, the Mainstream Misleadia will parrot them.

A Dictator?

It is March 9, 1933 and in Title I, we see Congress giving retroactive approval to all executive orders and/or proclamations issued by the President since March 4, 1933, the day of his inauguration, but more important (ominous), Congress is giving approval to future *executive orders or proclamations* that the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury (of Puerto Rico) may issue without knowing what they will be. By virtue of this language, **Congress has just made a dictator of the President of the United States.** The President may now rule the nation by *executive order & proclamation*. Anything he proclaims, any law he wishes to make, has already been approved. This same power is being conferred on the Secretary of the Treasury (of Puerto Rico). So much for *separation of powers*. Little by little we begin to understand the need for a *police state, for military involvement in civilian matters, for foreign troops (now numbering in the many thousands) stationed in what are now closed military bases.*

In 1973, the Senate held hearings titled as follows:

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE
TERMINATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

These hearings resulted in a report titled:

REPORT
OF THE
SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE
TERMINATION OF THE
NATIONAL EMERGENCY
UNITED STATES SENATE

When I first became aware of this report and begin reading excerpts from it, the author referred to this report as Senate Report 93-549 and although my copy designates it as report 93-000, that may be because it was not yet assigned a number when my version was printed. Therefore, I have retained the reference of 93-549 throughout this document.

Delegated Powers

Page iii of this report, which is actually the first page of the forward, has a warning to all of us in paragraph 3. The *statutes* to which this refers are the *Banking Relief Act* and those passed pursuant to the *Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933* remembering that this act and all *statutes* which derive their authority from this act, can only be maintained so long as the **emergency** continues. Here is paragraph 3:

"Under the powers delegated by these statutes the President may seize property, organize and control the means of production, seize commodities, assign military

forces abroad, institute martial law, seize and control all transportation and communication, regulate the operation of private enterprise, restrict travel, and in a plethora of particular ways control the lives of all American citizens." - Senate Report 93-549:

We all need to understand that Congress empowered *the President* as a Dictator by virtue of their approval of every *Proclamation* or *Executive Order* that ***any President***, whomever he or she might be, may make in the future? The power conferred is virtually limitless and negates our entire system of checks on balances. ***With this act there is no longer a separation of powers.*** Becoming *personal* for just a moment, do you think that you should ask yourself why it is not the public school system nor the main stream media (the journalism profession) of America, nor from your church (*another commercial entity*) from which you are learning this information? Seems to me like it might be important information.

Plethora. Extreme excess

Continuing on with the language of the Banking Relief Act:

"Section 2. Subdivision (b) of section 5 of the Act of October 6, 1917 "(b) During time of war or during any other period of national emergency declared by the President, the President may, through any agency that he may designate, or otherwise, investigate, regulate, or prohibit, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers of credit between or payments by banking institutions as defined by the President, and export, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion or currency, ***by any person within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof***;"

Subjection. The obligation of one or more persons to act at the discretion, or according to the judgment and will of others. Subjection is either private or public. By the former is meant that subjection to the authority of private persons; as, of children to their parents, of apprentices to their masters, and the like. By the latter is understood the subjection to the authority of public persons. Rutherford. Inst. B. 2, c. 8. - Bouvier Law Dictionary

Remember the asterisk, asterisk, asterisk (***) in the recommended Executive Order from the Federal Reserve Board of New York and taken from the Act of October 6, 1917 where it said:

"Transfers of credit in any form (other than credits relating solely to transactions to be executed wholly within the United States);"

Language which excluded our domestic transactions and exempted the American Citizen from the operation of this *1917 War Powers Act*? Now it says:

by any person within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

Enemy

With this amended language, the *United States citizen* has been identified as an enemy of the United States with the same status as any other *enemy* of the United States within this law. The American people have (unknownly) had an Act of War applied against them. The act of October 6, 1917 is strictly a ***war powers measure*** and is the source of language for the Banking Relief Act. What we have not realized is that we are being ***subjugated***. You and your loved ones are having your political status as *citizen* being slyly and covertly altered, making us ***enemy/subject/slaves*** through fraud and deception. Unfortunately, many American's, when given the opportunity to know this information will go out and drink some more beer, have a few more martinis, watch some more ball games, buy some more fast cars, make some more babies and refuse to take any action that might help others to understand.. Many American's will sit idly by and allow their children to be enslaved while these same parents are telling everyone how much they love their children and grand children.

SUBJECT. persons, government, is an individual member of a nation, who is submitted to the laws; this term is used in contradistinction to citizen, which is applied to the same individual when considering his political rights. - Bouvier's Law Dictionary

The process of enslaving us does not end here however. Returning to the Banking Act of March 9, 1933 we read:

"Whenever in the Judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury such action is necessary to protect the currency system of the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury in his discretion, may require any or all ***individuals***, partnerships, associations or corporations ***to pay and deliver*** to the Treasurer of the United States any or all Gold Coin, Gold Bullion, and Gold Certificates owned by such individuals, partnerships, associations or corporations. And whoever shall not comply with the provisions of this act shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or if a ***natural person*** may in addition to such fine be imprisoned for a year not exceeding ten years."

This portion of the Banking Relief Act says that the Government can steal your gold and if you don't comply, that is you don't wish to become a victim of this criminal behavior, they can fine you \$10,000.00. ***This is why we needed to understand perverted law!***

This section of the Act certainly took care of ***the emergency*** created by ***we the people*** going to the bank to withdraw our gold (***our property***) we had previously earned and deposited for safe keeping. We might be well advised to take notice of how safe it is to deal with banks.

There is a very important term to notice in the above language. That is the reference to ***natural person***. It is in *contrast* to an *artificial person*. An example of an *artificial person* would be a corporation or *corporate franchise* (the act of being *enfranchised*). As matters turn out, it is quite

likely that very few of us are a *natural person* in court or the eyes of the law. This will be made clear in the chapter on *State Citizenship*.

The plot thickens... Since they have now confiscated all your money, they now have to come up with something (of no value) to replace it, something that the uninformed sheeple will accept.

The New Currency

From Roosevelt's Papers we read:

"During this *banking holiday* it was at first believed that some form of script or emergency currency would be necessary for the conduct of ordinary business. We knew that it would be essential when the banks reopened to have an adequate supply of currency to meet all possible demands of the depositors. Consideration was given by Government officials and various local agencies to the advisability of issuing *Clearing House Certificates* or some similar form of local emergency currency. On March 7, 1933, the Secretary of the Treasury issued regulations authorizing Clearing Houses to issue *Demand Certificates* against sound assets of the banking institutions. But this authority was not to become effective until March 10, 1933. In many cities, the printing of these certificates was actually begun. But after the Passage of the Emergency Banking Act of March 9, 1933 at 48 statute 1, it became evident that they would not be needed, because the Act made possible the issue of the necessary amount of **emergency currency** in the form of *Federal Reserve Bank Notes*, which could be based on any sound assets owned by the bank." – [President Franklin D.] Roosevelt Papers

First let's clarify. In 1933, there was a clear distinction between *Federal Reserve Notes*, the currency in circulation **before** the passage of the Banking Relief Act, and *Federal Reserve Bank Notes*, the new currency authorized with the passage of the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933. *Federal Reserve Notes* were essentially a warehouse receipt for the gold deposited by a banking customer. If the customer presented the Federal Reserve Note at any Federal Reserve Bank, the Bank would return their gold. The new currency authorized, the *Federal Reserve Bank Note* is not a receipt for gold or anything of substance. In the language above we see that the issuance of these *Federal Reserve Bank Notes* will be backed by *any sound assets owned by the bank*. Now what assets does the bank own? Why *contractual loan obligations* of course. They own indebtedness. They own debt. In the time since 1933, these *Federal Reserve Bank Notes* have evolved to again be called *Federal Reserve Notes*, but they are no longer representative of a 'gold deposit' and they remain the **emergency currency** noted in Roosevelt's papers.

[THIS SPACE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

The new WAR currency authorization

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 *emergency legislation* was read from the clerk's desk since the Congressmen did not have a copy. When *global elitest's* are trying to stampede Congress, they certainly would not want them to have a copy of 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.

Reading the Congressional Record we find them discussing this measure. Let's examine a few comments from the Congressional record to see what we may learn about this legislation. First is a comment by Congressman McFadden:

"I regret that the membership of the House has had no opportunity to consider or even read this bill. The first opportunity I had to know what this legislation is was when it was read from the Clerks' desk. It is an important banking bill, *it is a dictatorship over finance in the United States, it is complete control over the banking system in the United States...* It is difficult under the circumstances to discuss this bill. The first section of this bill, as I grasp it, is practically the *war powers* that were given back in 1917... I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this is a plan to change the holding of the security back of the Federal Reserve Note to the Treasury of the United States rather than the Federal Reserve Agent? "

Being a bit confused, Congressman McFadden is asking if this is a measure to take the securities backing the currency away from the Federal Reserve agent and place those securities back in the treasury of the United States. Chairman Steagall responds to Congressman McFadden's question:

"This provision is for the issuance of *Federal Reserve Bank Notes* and not *Federal Reserve Notes*. And the security back of it is obligations, notes, drafts, bills of exchange **[debt]** outlined in the section to which the gentleman has referred."

Obligations, notes, drafts, bills of exchange = DEBT.

Another Congressman makes comment. This time it's Congressman Britten:

"From my observations of the bill as it was read to the House, ***it would appear that the amount of bank notes that might be issued by the Federal Reserve System is not limited.*** That will depend entirely upon the amount of collateral that is presented from time to time for exchange for bank notes. Is that not correct?"

How should I explain this and not make it confusing? The Federal Reserve Note in existence in March of 1933 was backed by gold or silver deposits, and this limited their issuance to the amount of gold and silver deposited. But now Congress is authorizing Federal Reserve Bank Notes which are issued upon the *deposit of debt* and so we can give an 'A' to Congressman Britten for being correct. Since the new currency is backed by DEBT and because there is no limit to the amount of debt that can be created, then the amount of currency that can be issued is virtually limitless. It is because of this monetary trap that you, your children, your grand children and all future generations are enslaved. It is an economic trap from which you cannot escape until the present system has ended. And we were wondering how so much inflation has occurred over the years.

The Money Trap and how it works

In simple form you buy a piece of Real Estate for \$200,000 and put \$50,000 down, then sign a contract for \$150,000. When this contract (private debt - *a sound asset owned by the bank*) is placed on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, the Federal Reserve agent is then authorized to issue an amount of currency (Federal Reserve Bank Notes) formulated from the \$150,000 contractual debt. In four years you have landscaped, poured a concrete driveway and patio, and installed a couple larger windows. You then sell this property for \$300,000. The buyer puts \$50,000 down and signs a contract for \$250,000. When this contract is placed on deposit with the Treasurer of the United States, the Federal Reserve is again authorized to issue an additional amount of currency while retiring the currency from the first contract on the same piece of property. Over and over again this occurs and through inflation (the *depleting purchasing power of the federal reserve note the property value continually increases, adding more debt currency*). Have you ever wondered why it is so easy to get credit? Credit creates DEBT and increases the *assets owned by the bank*.

Public Debt

In the case of *public debt* the government issues bonds which are purchased by the *Federal Reserve Bank*. When this *public debt* is placed on deposit with the *Treasurer of the United States*, the Federal Reserve Bank is authorized to issue currency in that amount as described in the law above. The interest on this debt is the reason for the *income tax*. It is to service the *interest on the national debt*. And remember, *the United States* never pays the *principal* on the borrowed money, *only the interest*. Therefore the principal grows and grows and grows, and taxes continue to grow larger, and larger, and larger. A very profound means to enslave the people of a nation.

It does not take a rocket scientist to see that in a relatively short period of time, it is possible to accumulate a debt that exceeds the value of all the property and holdings in the United States of America and this has been the situation for some time now. This currency that we call *Federal Reserve Notes* is private commercial paper. It is owned by the *Federal Reserve Banking System*. ***It is not our money!*** As private commercial paper, there is a usury charge that we peons call interest. Yet, the only investment the Federal Reserve Bank has in this currency is ink and paper. Now, Mr. and Mrs. American, Mr. Politician, Mr. Policeman, Mr. Military-man, if this is not racketeering, then what is?

For this investment of ink and paper, they were able to confiscate virtually all the gold and silver (real money). For a time this worked well enough, especially for Congress. Congress has a spending addiction that cannot be satisfied. To feed their addiction they sell *Treasury Notes* and *Treasury Bonds*, a Federal obligation to pay (debt), making them available for the public to buy. We buy a few of them but we cannot begin to buy enough to satisfy their addiction. Enter the Federal Reserve Bank which buys as many as Congress wishes to sell. Buys them with *Federal Reserve Bank Notes* of which there is an endless supply, thus increasing the National Debt you are obligated to pay.

As time goes on the Federal Reserve owns more and more *Treasury Bonds* upon which the Federal government *slaves* must pay interest. To some extent they pay interest by selling more *Treasury Bonds*, creating more debt. Ultimately the Federal Reserve Bank calls in its debt by demanding payment on these bonds and the United States quietly enters receivership. When the Federal government is unable to pay what do you suppose happens? A new government appears (FEMA - *Federal Emergency Management Agency*. Everything is an ***emergency***).

The United States has been bankrupt since 1933. At some point the bankers will wish to collect their collateral, all the property and other holdings within the United States. Not too fast, that will alarm the sheeple. A little

at a time. Are you beginning to understand where New World Order/One World Government is coming from? With debt, comes more currency, a currency that will destroy the American economy and ultimately our Constitution. The currency will place all the property of the United States of America in the hands of the international bankers (New World Order).

Returning to the Congressional record we get the big picture from Congressman Patman who, with this statement, answers all our questions:

"Under the new law the money is issued to the banks in return for Government obligations, bills of exchange, drafts, notes, trade acceptances, and banker's acceptances. The money will be worth 100 cents on the dollar, because it is backed by

For a more in depth understanding of the bankruptcy of the United States, see [5 USCA 903, etc.]

"Money. In the usual and ordinary acceptation 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.

the credit of the Nation. **It will represent a mortgage on all the homes and other property of all the people in the Nation.**" - Congressional record, March 9, 1933, House, Congressman Patman, 73rd Congress, Special Session, Volume 77, part 1, page 83

There you have it. Generally unknown to the American people and still unreported by the **main stream media**, still not taught in our **public education** institutions, still not presented by **our clergy (church)**, all the property, holdings and other belongings of all citizens of the United States have been mortgaged, by Congress, to the privately owned Federal Reserve Bank, for ink on paper. Congress (generally the representatives of the **global elite**) has made the Federal Reserve Bank the owners of every piece of real estate and personal property in the United States. **But we still do not believe in conspiracy.** We are perfectly willing to attribute these events to the *accidental opinion of the day?*

This paper currency, currently called Federal Reserve Note's, is not money, it is private commercial paper (currency) which has a usury charge associated with it. From the definition of money we can conclude with certainty that Federal Reserve Notes are not money for they contain evidence of debt (debt currency) and are a note. However, we find that the definition for the term **money** has changed from Black's Sixth Edition to Black's Seventh Edition. So I am now required to update my presentation.

Money Caveat (2008 addition)

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*

Whenever a definition for a term goes from a few words to many, or is many words out of the starting gate, it is almost a certainty that somebody is trying to trick somebody. 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 within its jurisdiction (*the District of Columbia*). 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 dutifully 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*

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 (municipal) corporate governments can make and change **corporate laws** as they see fit to achieve their control and enslavement goals. But when

Congress passes laws for our *representative republic* known as *these united States of America*, those laws must pass constitutional muster. As you will learn in chapter seven on *State Citizenship*, you get to make a choice whether you wish to subject yourself to 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 it's your ox that gets gored. You get the whole package. You don't pick and choose. End of *Money Caveat*.

With credit so readily available you are encouraged to go into debt and spend, spend, spend. As the debt grows larger and larger, more and more currency (Federal Reserve Notes) can be printed and circulated. This hastens the economic collapse of your country, the destruction of your Constitution, and the implementation of New World Order.

And we got all of this after they stole the gold, the real money and wealth of this nation. *We the people* never truly own anything because of this legislation. Are we educated well enough to understand that we cannot discharge a debt with a debt (Federal Reserve Notes being a debt). Now we have a better understanding why the Federal Government has identified you as ***an enemy of the United States*** and is ready to put you in jail or kill you if you are not paying taxes. It is absolutely necessary to tap into the productivity of the sheeple. It is so that the interest is paid on the debt Congress has created and maintains on your behalf. In reality it is just a means of controlling you (of *subjecting* you).

In the area where I live there is a popular radio talk show personality who asserts that if he earns a dollar and pays that dollar for the hamburger, that the burger is his and that he may consume it. Therefore, why should he care whether it is called Federal Reserve Note? Although many have tried to elevate his understanding as to why he should care, he never seems to get it. First off, he did not earn a dollar in order buy the burger that costs a dollar! In his logic he has totally ignored that he is taxed on his productivity? To continue our examination we will assume this

talk show host is an average income earner. In America, all the income the average income earner works from January 1st to around May 7th (1998) to pay his taxes [this was a 1998 estimate]. When we calculate this out we learn that we have earn \$1.53 to have \$1.00 to spend. Of that \$1.53 we paid \$0.53 to the government in taxes leaving us with \$1.00. Therefore, the talk show host earned \$1.53 to have a dollar with which to buy his burger. In the near future, he his grandchildren will have to earn \$2.00 to buy his \$1.00 burger. Yes, he may consume the hamburger, but he cannot consume his house or car or real estate. If he paid \$100,000 for the home, he had to earn \$153,000 and give \$53,000 to the government to have \$100,000 left to pay cash for the home. And then he won't own it. If he thinks he does, quit paying the property taxes

DOLLAR. Money. A silver coin of the United States of the value of one hundred cents, or tenth part of an eagle. 2. It weighs four hundred and twelve and a half grains. Of one thousand parts, nine hundred are of pure silver and one hundred are of alloy. - Bouvier Law dictionary

EAGLE. Money. A gold coin of the United States, of the value of ten dollars. It weighs two hundred and fifty-eight grains. Of one thousand parts, nine hundred are of pure gold, and one hundred of alloy. - Bouvier Law dictionary

on it and see how long he retains ownership of it. Even the hamburger has a tax placed on it before you can consume it. Stop registering your car and see if you own it. In the chapter on *State Citizenship* we will learn that there are Americans who **do** own their property.

I've said that you don't own any property and I'm certain that has made a few of you think that I've lost it. If the Government has in fact seized our property and mortgaged it to the Federal Reserve for the *emergency currency*, we should be able to find evidence of that seizure in further Government documentation. In Senate Document No. 43, Under Contracts Payable in Gold, 1933, we read:

“The ultimate ownership of all property is in the state, individual so called ownership is only by virtue of Government. i.e. Law, amounting to mere user. And use must be in accordance with law and subordinate to the necessities of the State.”

Orchestration (a conspiracy?)

From Roosevelt's papers:

"This conference of fifty farm leaders met on March 10, 1933. They agreed on recommendations for a bill which was presented to me at the White House on March 11, by a committee of the Conference, *who requested me to call upon the Congress for the same broad power to meet the emergency in agriculture as I had requested in solving the Banking Crises.*"

Does this stink of orchestration? One day after the passage of the Banking Relief Act, the Agricultural Community is so enamored with its success that they meet with the President and request of him to ask Congress for the *same broad power* to meet the *emergency* in Agriculture. And on the next day they present the President with their own bill. It would appear to me that there was a great deal of coordination, even before the election, to stampede Congress, whereby there could be put into effect a large measure of questionable law before anyone could think about it or the American People could become aware of it. Does not this practice continue today?

Has anyone yet asked of themselves, "who has the power and financial resources to effect the orchestration that is so obvious?" We might give this some thought.

Agricultural Adjustment Act

Obviously the 'BROAD POWER' being requested is the *War and Emergency Powers*.

From the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933:

"The present acute economic *emergency*, being in part the consequence of a severe and increasing disparity between the prices of Agriculture and other commodities, which disparity has largely destroyed the purchasing power of the farmers for industrial products, has broken down the orderly exchange of commodities *and has*

seriously impaired the agricultural assets supporting the national credit structure.

It is hereby declared that these conditions in the basic industry of agriculture has affected transactions in agricultural commodities with a *national public interest*, have burdened and obstructed normal currents of commerce in such commodities and has rendered imperative the immediate enactment of Title 1 of this act."

Notice that the *emergency* has broadened and expanded to now include agriculture. The language above is paving the way to place this nations agricultural property into assets that can be included in the declared bankruptcy. All those agricultural assets necessary to support the *national credit structure* of the corporate United States (**the District** of Columbia). All those millions of acres of farm lands, now also mortgaged, which provide the necessary backing (security) for the *Federal Reserve Bank Notes*, the Emergency War Currency (the same *currency* you use today). Also note that Agriculture now has a *national public interest* and as such it was *placed into public service*. With this act Congress mortgaged virtually every square inch of our country to corrupt bankers (controllers). In debate over this bill, Congressman Beck had this to say:

"But the Constitution of the United States, as a restraining influence in keeping the United States Government within the carefully prescribed channels of power, is moribund, if not dead. We are witnessing its death agonies, for when this bill becomes a law, if unhappily it becomes a law, there is no longer any workable Constitution to keep the Federal Government within the limits of its constitutional powers."

Democracy: Two Wolves and one Sheep sitting down to discuss what's for dinner.

"No longer any workable Constitution to keep the Federal Government within the limits of its constitutional powers." The result is a now out of control Government that murders its own citizens with immunity.

POLICY OF CONGRESS v. LAW

Continuing with analysis of the language of the act:

"It is hereby declared to be *the policy of Congress...*"

As you see, we are no longer operating this country according to law (our Constitution), we are now operating according to *policy of Congress*.

THE SUPREME COURT

ON THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT:

Let's take a look at what the Supreme Court had to say about the *Agricultural Adjustment Act*? In United States v. Butler, the court said:

“A tax in the general understanding and in the strict constitutional sense is an exaction for the support of government. ***This term does not connote the expropriation of money from one group to be expended for another as a necessary means in a plan of regulation***, such as the plan for regulating agricultural production set up in the Agricultural Adjustment Act ... The regulation of the Farmers Activities under the statute, though in form subject to his own will is in fact coercion through economic pressure. His right of choice is illusory. Even if the farmers consent were purely voluntary, the Act would stand no better. At best it is a scheme for purchasing, with Federal Funds, submission to Federal Regulation of the subject reserved to the States....

If the novel view of the general welfare clause, now advanced in support of the tax, were accepted, that clause would not only allow Congress to supplant the states in the regulation of agriculture and all other industries as well, but would furnish the means whereby all the other provisions of the constitution, sedulously framed to limit the powers of the United States and preserve the powers of the States, could be broken down. The independence of the individual States obliterated and the United States converted into a central government exercising uncontrolled police power throughout the Union, superseding all local controls over local concerns.”

Using extraordinarily good judgment, the Supreme Court struck down the Emergency Powers. But if we examine our history we see that President Roosevelt went to work to ***stack the court***. Through death and resignation, by 1937, the court was stacked! And shortly thereafter these cases were reversed and ***emergency powers*** were again re-established. Welcome to ***commercial law***, not to be confused with law of the republic of the united States of America.

The Court now says:

"The existence of war and the restoration of peace are to be determined by the ***political*** department of the Government, and such determination is binding and conclusive upon the courts, and deprives the courts of the power of hearing proof and determining, as a question of fact, either that war exists or has ceased to exist."

So here we have the Supreme Court saying, *It's not our problem*. Are we yet figuring out the name of the game? Continuing with the opinion of the Supreme Court:

"When the sovereign authority shall choose to bring it into operation [referring to the Emergency Powers] the Judicial Department must give effect to its will, ***but until that will shall be expressed***, no power of condemnation can exist in the courts."

From Senate Report 93-549

"Just how effective, on crises action, this makes the Court is hard to say. In light of the recent war [Vietnam], the court today would seem to be a fairly harmless observer of the ***emergency activities*** of the president and Congress. ***It is highly unlikely that the separation of powers and the Tenth Amendment will be called upon again to***

hamstring the efforts of the [Federal] government to deal resolutely with a serious national emergency. Organizationally in dealing with the depression it was Roosevelt's general policy to assign new emergency functions to newly *created emergency agencies* rather than the already existing departments."

Thus we have seen the ballooning of the Federal Government to rule by statute in all cases whatsoever. The constitution suspended and no limitations on its power. It has in fact become a central government of uncontrolled police power.

One document that our forefathers wrote to the parliament and King of England on October 14, 1774, two years before the signing of the Declaration of independence, was an expression of grievances. Remember, the Magna Carta had established the Common Law as the *law of the land* under which the English were to be tried. The Common Law is not statutory. In this document we read:

"Whereas, since the close of the last war, the British Parliament claiming a power of Right to bind the people of America by statute in all cases whatsoever, hath in some cases excessively imposed taxes on them and in others under various pretenses, but in fact for the purpose of raising a revenue hath imposed rates and duties payable in these colonies, established a board of commissioners with unconstitutional powers and extended the jurisdiction of the courts of Admiralty, not only for the collecting of the said duties, but for the trial of causes merely arising within the body of a county."

We've come full circle haven't we?

Charges by Congressman McFadden

Lewis T. McFadden, Chairman of the House Banking Commission and Member of Congress, speaking about the international financial conspirators during the very time they were taking over monetary control of America:

"We have in this country one of the most corrupt institutions the world has ever known. I refer to the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Reserve Banks, hereinafter called the Fed. ***They are not government institutions. They are private monopolies which prey upon the people of the United States for the benefit of themselves and their foreign and domestic swindlers; rich and predatory moneylenders.***"



Congressman Louis T. McFadden

May 23, 1933: On the House floor, Congressman McFadden brought impeachment charges against many of the federal reserve board members, federal reserve agents of many States, comptroller of the currency, and several secretaries of the United States Treasury for high crimes and misdemeanors, including the theft of eighty billion dollars from the United States

Government and with committing the same thefts in 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932 and 1933 and in the years previous to 1928, amounting to billions of dollars. These charges were remanded to the judiciary committee for investigation, a place where these charges were effectively buried and until this day has never been answered. [See Congressional Record pp.4055-4058 May 23, 1933]. Where is the *independent press*, the *journalists* and the *main stream media*?

Let's not forget Lewis T. McFadden who died mysteriously in 1936 after two previous attempts on his life. I feel certain that Lewis T. McFadden was a victim of the Banking Elite and gave his life on behalf of *we the people*, as so many have, and was one of the very few Congressmen who truly represented the best interests of the republic of the united States of America and the American people. You can bet that the Banking Elite was also responsible for the death of President John F. Kennedy. But because the American people are armed, it was made to look like the work of lone-nut gunman, Lee Harvey Oswald. Oswald was exactly what he said he was, *a patsy*.

FRB ORIGINS

In the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933 we see that Congress declared an *emergency* but did not quite explain the source or cause of the *emergency*.

To fully understand the treachery, fraud and treason which is being presented for your examination, it is necessary to know the origins of the Federal Reserve Bank in its current form is by virtue of an act passed by Congress. In the passage of this act, Congress did not provide for any audit of the Federal Reserve Bank, so the private owners of this bank have been able to operate in secrete since its creation.

Once again, there is nothing *federal* about the Federal Reserve Bank. It is simply the name of a privately owned corporation, just like *Federal Express*. I believe you will find that controlling stock is held by seven people (1998). Six European bankers and one American (global elite). The significance of this becomes more apparent as we continue. And as we continue, keep in mind that the current power and form of the Federal Reserve Bank is the creation of Congress.

Going back and reviewing the response issued to President Hoover by the Federal Reserve Board of New York, we read:

"... the continued and increasing withdrawal of currency and gold from the banks of the country has now created a national emergency."

Notice that because *we the people* have come to the bank to withdraw some (or maybe all) of our gold, which we had deposited for safe keeping, there has been created a *national emergency* as stated by the Federal Reserve Board. Dare we ask, how did withdrawing our money (gold) become a *NATIONAL EMERGENCY*? Think about that. To ask for and expect the return of our property has created a *national emergency*.

SOURCE OF THE EMERGENCY

Here we have a hint as to the source of the emergency. We have another clue when President Roosevelt issued proclamation 2039 which said in part;

"Whereas there has been a heavy and unwarranted withdrawal of gold and currency from our banking institutions for the purpose of hoarding ..."

Did you know that withdrawing some of your savings (property) to survive a depression is unwarranted? It's a clue!

The actual source of the emergency occurred as a result of the Federal Reserve Bank moving the great majority of deposited gold... somewhere, evidently out of the hands of the bank, perhaps out of the country, who knows, it has never been audited and until it is, we will never know where the gold and wealth of the American people has gone. Thus, the bank was short of the needed gold to meet the depositors demands.

We do not know if the gold was used to prop up failing European banks or if the gold was put in the pockets of those who engineered its disappearance... probably the latter. We only know what *they* tell us. This is the way Congress set it up on behalf of the American People. How is it that we can know that the Federal Reserve had taken the wealth of this nation and had no intention of returning it? By their declaration to President Hoover.

"Whereas in the opinion of the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the continued and increasing withdrawal of currency and gold from the banks of the country ***has now created a national emergency.***"

We also have evidence in the charges of Congressman McFadden that were buried in the *judicial committee* and have never been answered to this day. If there were no chicanery, then why not investigate and set the charges aside in the light of day. If the Federal Reserve had not stolen the wealth of this nation, with the approval and assistance of Congress, the Federal Reserve would not have had to declare that "the continued and increasing withdrawal of currency and gold from the banks of the country has now created a national emergency." Even with all the song and dance of those involved, it does not take a rocket scientist to conclude that the Federal Reserve has engaged in fraud and conspiracy to deprive the American people of their true wealth and ultimately enslave them. Thank you Congress. Both of 1933 and of today. And a special thanks to all the main stream journalists whose job it is to keep the American people informed

Deductive logic. When we throw an object into the air and it stops, then reverses direction we may conclude (deduce) that a force (in this case gravity) is acting on the object. The same logic applies here. If journalists do not properly report, nor report at all, an important event, there are forces at work that are not visible. If schools fail to instruct and teach of such important events, there are forces at work to prevent our education. If the churches don't inform their flock, it is by design, for I will guarantee you that church scholars know and understand what is transpiring.

and through their words enlighten the American people to the importance and significance of laws passed, both then and today. The fact that journalists did not then, nor have they since, reported these events should tell all of us something about the control exercised over the profession. When someone is standing in the path of an oncoming bus, it is as dishonest to say nothing as it is to tell a lie.

This is probably a good place to replicate the words of John Swinton so that we remember the job of the journalist.

“There is no such thing, at this date of the world's history, in America, as an independent press. You know it and I know it.

There is not one of you who dares to write your honest opinions, and if you did, you know beforehand that it would never appear in print. I am paid weekly for keeping my honest opinion out of the paper I am connected with. Others of you are paid similar salaries for similar things, and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job. If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone.

The business of the journalist is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread. You know it and I know it, and what folly is this toasting an independent press?

We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. We are intellectual prostitutes.” - John Swinton, Chief of Staff, New York Times.

As the 1930's depression worsened, the American people began to make gold withdrawals so as to make ends meet. But because their gold had mostly disappeared out of the bank, there was very little gold left to give them. With little or no gold left to return to the owners and depositors, the Federal Reserve Bank and the United States government were in a most serious position, a crises (*a national emergency*). Something would have to be done. Once the American people learned that they had been robbed, they may rebel or at a minimum, hang everyone in the Federal Reserve and perhaps Congress. Most certainly there would be law suits which would follow and would have led straight to the top levels of government.

Congress has the Constitutional responsibility to *coin the money and regulate the value thereof* - (notice that the Constitution does authorize Congress to issue money). The *money* already exists in the form of gold and silver. It only needs to be coined into standard weights and known purity for convenience in trades and purchases. To those who wish ever greater control, this monetary system has severe limitations in that it protects the American people from having their monetary

system *debased*. It protects Americans from evil men within government and private men of power who wish to control virtually all aspects of America and the world. This monetary system of gold and silver coin does not provide the means to rob the American people of their wealth and land. Does not provide for control (economic enslavement).

Between 1913 when it was created and 1933, this private banking corporation, known as the *Federal Reserve Bank*, stole the money (*gold*) of the American people, creating a ***national emergency***. I think that most of us could agree that when you have stolen the wealth of a nation and you are on the verge of being discovered, you have ***an emergency***. But the controlling elite of the Federal Reserve were smart. They were able to dupe Congress into being part of the scam. I say “*dupe*”, but in reality they were probably able to purchase (buy off) a majority of Congressmen.

Taking a look at the situation of the *Federal Reserve Bank* and the people who control its policy and activities as all of this is happening, what do you suppose they need? Congress does not have the authority to ***issue money or currency***, it has the authority to:

“coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures...” - Constitution for the united States of America

Both Congress and the Federal Reserve lacked the authority to issue money, yet desperately needing currency to meet the demands of depositors.

“We knew that it would be essential when the banks reopened to have an adequate supply of currency ***to meet all possible demands of the depositors...***” - Roosevelt papers

It appears that they have at least a couple of concerns. First is the uncertainty of how the American people might react to having their gold and wealth stolen. Is it possible that the American people may pick up arms and deal with the crooks? If the wrath of the American people can be survived or if the American people can be duped with the help of the press and there is no reaction, the second concern would be the method by which the *Federal Reserve Banking Corporation* (the *rich and predatory money lenders* as Congressman McFadden referred to them) may continue their plunder of America. To be on the safe side, ***military protection*** will be needed. And since it was Congress who created, abetted, aided and assisted this private corporation in the fleecing of the American people of their wealth, may we ask, “*what does Congress need?*” Answer: A way out of accountability for their irresponsible and unconstitutional (unlawful) conduct.

Enter the *Banking Relief Act* of March 9, 1933. With the ***declaration of an emergency*** and passage of the *Banking Relief Act*, United States citizens were *identified* as an enemy of the United States in this law. This, by virtue of the fact that they had the language of the *War Powers Act of 1917* applied against them and thus they became indistinguishable from any other enemy of the United States. Now that American citizens have a status no different than any other enemy, military protection may be provided to the Federal Reserve and Congress if necessary, to protect them from an ***identified enemy*** of the United States. And certainly, Congress has no accountability to an ***identified enemy*** of the United States.

Because of the *Bankruptcy of the United States*, Judges of today are instructed to take *silent judicial notice* that America is a bankrupt nation and these judges are administering the *commercial laws* of that bankruptcy. As such, it is not operating under Constitutional Law but instead operating under certain *public bankruptcy policies*, the very existence of which is not to be made general public knowledge [see 5 USCA 903, etc.].

To administer the bankruptcy of the United States, we have a *United States District Court* as opposed to a *District Court of the United States*. The *United States District Court* venue is *commercial law* relative to the bankruptcy.

Now what was it that Congressman Beck had to say;

"I think that of all the damnable heresies that have ever been suggested in connection with the constitution, the doctrine of 'EMERGENCY' is the worst. **It means that when Congress declares an emergency, there is no Constitution.**"

I agree with Congressman Beck. The doctrine of Emergency may very well be the worst. By declarations of **EMERGENCY**, the government operates without constitutional restraint. That is, it operates without the protections that the constitution provides to the American people. And if we Americans continue to allow those people, who represent us in government, to get away with this behavior, then we deserve what we will all get. Remember, that you have the power to reverse unlawful government behavior and action. The process starts through education as you are now fulfilling. Then by educating others. Then by open discussion. Then by sharing ideas. But always by education. If freedom has value then we should all remember that... ***WE Cannot BE FREE AND STUPID AT THE SAME TIME.***

SENATE HEARINGS

As related earlier, the Senate conducted hearings in 1973. *The Special Committee on the Termination of the National Emergency of the United States Senate - Ninety Third Congress* conducted these hearings relating to the termination of the National Emergency created by the passage of the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933. In opening the hearings Senator Church has this to say:

"The Senate special Committee on the Termination of the National Emergency begins today, the first of a series of hearings on emergency power statutes, a subject of fundamental importance to the continued functioning of our democratic system of Government. **At issue is the question whether it is possible for a democratic government such as ours to exist under its present Constitution and system of three separate branches equal in power under a continued state of emergency.**

Seems like this *might have been news worthy* considering that it is being contemplated whether government such as ours can continue to exist. Let us look at some additional material from the

report to see what they may have learned. Let's read the first sentence from Senate Report 93-549:

"Since March 9, 1933, the United States has been in a state of declared national emergency."

Since Senate Report 93-549 was written in 1973, we may recognize the reference to the emergency being kept alive for 40 years providing for 40 years of powers that allow Emergency Rule.

"They are quite careful and restrictive on the power, but the power to suspend is specifically contemplated by the Constitution in the Writ of Habeas Corpus." (Senate report 93-549, prepared in 1973)

Here we see that it has been interpreted that if the signers of the Constitution gave their permission to suspend one portion, it can be construed that other portions and even the entire Constitution can be suspended. Although they may have been quite careful and restrictive on the power in 1973, in today's United States policy makers are out of control.

Whether we Americans feel that the Constitution can be lawfully suspend, it is apparent from Senate Report 93-549 that those people in control of Government feel that they are authorized and empowered to do so. Therefore we must deal with what is.

Below is the language that excluded domestic transactions in the original war powers act of 1917, and it is this language that is amended in the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933. Amended in a way that includes the **commercial activities** of the American people. Here is the original language before it is amended.

"Transfers of credit in any form (other than credits relating solely to transactions to be executed wholly within the United States);"

Does the Emergency Continue Today?

Since Senate report 93-549 was written in 1973 and it is now 2008, are we still in a state of declared national emergency from 1933 and the Banking Relief Act? If we are, we should be able to find evidence of that in current law. At Title 12 U.S.C., 48 Statute 1, Sec 95b, we read:

"The actions, regulations, rules, license, orders or proclamations heretofore or hereafter taken, promulgate, made or issued by the President of the United States or the Secretary of the Treasury since March 4, 1933 pursuant to the authority of section '95a' of this title, are hereby approved and confirmed." Chapter 1, Title 1, 48 Statute 1, March 9, 1933

This is the current law today - look it up if you like. Are you wondering if your current Senators and Representatives are aware of this law? Considering that this is an open Senate report there

certainly is no reason that they could not, and should not, be aware. And I'm certain that the vast majority are fully aware. Reading from Senate Report 93-549:

"At 48 Statute 1 *the exclusion of domestic transactions formerly found in the act was deleted from section '5b' at that time.*"

Here the Senate Report quite accurately reveals that the *commercial transactions* of the American people, which were formerly excluded from the 1917 Act of War, are no longer excluded but instead are included, thus fully applying an Act of War against the American people. Yes, they know it.

Our representatives have been engaged in deceiving us, *pretending to be maintaining freedom and a 'Republican' form of government that is operating constitutionally under lawful civil authority*, while in actuality they are operating with constitutional limitations and requirements set aside under War and Emergency Powers Authority. This exists by virtue of their own declaration and beginning with an *emergency* that was engineered. Do we feel that we the people should begin to ask questions about ending all *emergencies* in progress and restoring lawful civil authority to our country, returning governmental procedures and practices to those authorized by the constitution. *Should we the people make ending war & emergency powers and restoring lawful civil authority (peace) a campaign issue for every representative we elect from the cities and counties, all the way to the federal government?*

Here's the amended language. Language that includes the American people under an ACT OF WAR, applied against them by their own government and giving that government the authority to regulate them in their every commercial activity.

"by any person within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction thereof"

The New Rules

Now that the government and courts no longer differentiate the American people from any other enemy of the United States, there must be a new set of rules. Let's do a little research and see if we might determine to what we may be subjected.

In the Memorandum of Laws of American cases and recent English cases of Laws that Govern *'trading with the enemy'*, we find further understanding of our situation and status. As we review these Memorandum's of Law, keep in mind that any reference to *enemy* is a reference to us as Americans.

The Rapid:

"Every species of intercourse with the enemy is illegal. The prohibition is not limited to mere commercial intercourse."

This means that virtually anything you do may be regulated by the government. Every private purchase you make is subject to the action of the law. Any repair or improvement that you make on your home or property may be regulated by the government if so desired. Once again read section 2 of the Act of March 9, 1933 and notice that the President may *regulate, or prohibit under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of licenses or otherwise any transactions in foreign exchange*. Federal Reserve Notes are foreign exchange. They are not authorized within the Constitution which establishes gold and silver as the medium of exchange in the united States.

The Julia:

"No contract is considered as valid between enemies, at least as so far as to give them remedies in the courts of either government, and they have, in the language of the civil law, *no ability to sustain a persona standi in judicio* [personal standing in the judiciary or courts]"

Here we see, in the Memorandum of Laws that Govern Trading with the Enemy, that contracts between enemies are not valid. Therefore, it would follow that since the United States and the *American people* are now enemies, there should be some action to abrogate the contract *we the people* had with the Federal Reserve Bank to redeem our gold. Congress will certainly want to protect its thief. And so we read:

HUR 192, June 5, 1933: "Every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency or an amount of **money** of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against the public policy. And no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred."

Remember when you read this language that "money" is considered to be gold and silver at this time.

By virtue of the action of those who *represent us* [???], the thief of the American people's wealth is now protected from having to live up to their agreement with the people of this country. Notice also the reference to public policy. It is worth while noting that their *declaration* was that it is *against public policy*, and not that it is against *the law*, or that it is against *the constitution*. *Public Policy*, which is not determined by *the public*, but is determined by those in control, is used as a means to avoid operating the country lawfully and in accordance with our Constitution and due process of law. Congress calls it public policy so that it has the character of being demanded by the public, when in reality, it's just another perversion of the law by Congress.

ALLODIUM, estates, signifies as absolute estate of inheritance in contradistinction to a feud. In this country the title to land is essentially allodial, and every tenant in fee simple has an absolute and perfect title, yet in technical language his estate is called an estate in fee simple, and the tenure free and common socage. 3 Kent, Com. 390.

The Sally:

"By the general law of prize, property obtained in illegal intercourse with the

enemy is deemed enemy property. It is of no consequence whether it belongs to an ally or to a citizen; the illegal traffic stamps it with the hostile character, and attaches to it all the penal consequences of *enemy* ownership.

Remembering that you are an enemy of the United States in statutory law, your property is enemy property, thus preventing you from owning the property in *allodium*.

The Rapid:

"The *LAW OF PRIZE* is part of the *LAW OF NATIONS*. In it a hostile character is attached to trade, independently of the character of the TRADER who pursues it or directs it. Condemnation to the use of the captor is equally the fate of the property of the belligerent and of the property found in the *ANTI-NEUTRAL TRADE*. But a citizen or an ally may be engaged in a hostile trade, and thereby involve his property in the fate of those in whose cause he embarks."

Notice again that the property is the target and that your government is subjecting you to the Law of Nations and not to your founding law.

Another Case from *The Rapid*:

"The produce of the soil of the hostile [enemy] territory as well as other property engaged in the commerce of the hostile [enemy] power as the source of its wealth and strength are always regarded as legitimate prize."

So here we see that the resources of the American People, after acquiring status of enemy, are also regarded as *Prize* under the laws respected and adhered to by our government. This means that if we are a farmer, the government claims as prize, anything you produce whether it be wheat, rice, vegetables, beef, eggs, poultry or anything else. What you produce is not yours as an enemy of the United States and is subject to their *commercial regulatory policies*.

The William Bagaley:

"In general, during war, contracts with or powers of attorney or agency from the enemy after the outbreak of the war are illegal and void. Contracts entered into prior to the war are suspended or absolutely terminated. Partnerships with the enemy are dissolved. Powers of attorney with the enemy, with certain exceptions, lapse."

Here we see that contracts in force at the *outbreak of the war* [Emergency] are held as illegal and void except in certain cases.

Below we see that all intercourse is illegal and that, we, the United States Citizens, come under the absolute domination of the Federal Government. Reading from Senate report 93-549, Sec 2:

"The *trade or commerce regulated* or prohibited is defined in subsections (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of page 4. *And this trade covers almost every imaginable transaction*

and is forbidden and made unlawful except when allowed under the form of license issued by the Secretary of Commerce. This authorization of trading under license constitutes the principal modification of the rule of international law forbidding trade between the citizens of belligerents, for the power to grant such license and therefore exemption from the operation of the law is given by the bill."

Since all intercourse is illegal, the only way the United States Citizens (the identified enemy) may conduct business is under the form of license. Such is the life of an enemy of the United States. And we thought we were free. Please note that I use the term *United States Citizens* instead of *American People*. That is because there is a difference between *State Citizen* (the original citizen of the Republic) and *United States citizen* (citizen of **the District** of Columbia... the laws do not apply equally and we will learn more about this in the chapter on State Citizenship).

THE PUBLIC GOOD

Another excerpt from the Memorandum of Law:

"But it is necessary always to bear in mind that a war cannot be carried on without hurting somebody, even, at time, our own citizens. The public good, however, must prevail over private gain. As it was said in *Bishop vs. Jones* (28 Texas 294), *there cannot be a war for arms and a peace for commerce*. One of the most important features of the bill is that which provides for the temporary taking over of the enemy property.

"The public good, however, must prevail over private gain." This is a false assertion to the utmost. There cannot be public good without individual good. Public good, as defined by the government and politicians of today, is the taking (stealing) of property from whom it belongs and giving it to whom it does not belong. Such are the principles of a criminal organization.

This is one of the most important features of the *Trading with the Enemy Act*. The temporary taking over of enemy property. The fact that it is *temporary* reveals an important point. That this *Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933* is an Act declared under an *Emergency*, and that it can only continue so long as the *Emergency* is kept alive. That is only so long as the emergency is not declared

Temporary indeed, now 75 years in 2008. Corporations, before the passage of the fourteenth amendment, had a very limited life and were formed for a single task or purpose, such as building a bridge. In this limited capacity, the corporation could not own property or other corporations and was dissolved when the task, for which it was created, was finished. But after the passage of the 14th amendment, lawyers begin to file law suits and lobby in order to get corporations recognized as a person in court. Once this was established the *corporation* became an *artificial person* in court with the same legal standing of any other person. This then gave the *corporation* an unlimited life, the ability to own property and the ability to own other corporations. Understanding this might be beneficial to understanding the reasoning behind government becoming a corporation, municipal in nature, but still a corporation. Thus we have the corporate CITY OF YOUNAMEIT, COUNTY OF YOUNAMEIT, STATE OF YOUNAMEIT, and the UNITED STATES.

to be over or ended. Once the *emergency* terminates, the statues passed pursuant to the *emergency* become inoperative. If all emergencies are terminated, the United States returns to lawful civil authority. At which time the property and rights taken must be returned to the people. Are we beginning to understand the need (maybe necessity) to demand that our elected officials terminate all emergencies in progress? It's time for the American people to begin asking questions of their elected officials. It is time for the American people to have peace and again be free.

Supreme Court

What did the Supreme Court have to say about the Trading with the Enemy Act?

In *Stoehr vs. Wallace*, 255 U.S. 239, 1921, the Supreme Court said:

"The *Trading with the Enemy Act* originally and as amended is strictly a war measure and finds its sanctions in the provisions empowering Congress to declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal and make rules regarding captures on the land and the water."

Notice that the Supreme Court had judged that the Trading With the Enemy Act is strictly a war measure. This was Judged as such in 1921, and on March 9, 1933 at Title 1, 48 Statute 1, those War Powers were applied against we the people and remain in force to this day (2008), now 75 years later. Do we the people believe that this emergency has continued for this long, or do we believe that this emergency has been kept alive so that we can be governed outside constitutional limitations and requirements?

"I HAVE SEEN THE ENEMY, AND HE IS US"... POGO

OTHER HISTORICAL FACTS OF INTEREST

After the *civil war* the United States was bankrupt. The *international bankers* (global elite) made attempts to loan money to the United States. However...

APRIL 14, 1865: A short time after President Lincoln orders the Lincoln greenbacks to be printed; an action which deprived the central banks and international bankers from charging interest on the money they would have printed and loaned to the United States (same scam used by the privately owned Federal Reserve Bank today), President Lincoln was assassinated by John Wilkes Booth. It's been proven this was a conspiracy because of the other four men who were involved in the assassination. It has also been established that at least one of these men was on the payroll of the Rothschild's, whom you may recognize as one of the major banking dynasties in the world and most likely one of the owners of the Federal Reserve Bank.

1963: In June of 1963, prior to President John F. Kennedy's assassination, he issued an executive order instructing the Treasury to begin the printing of United States Treasury Notes to be used as legal tender and as an ultimate replacement of *Federal Reserve Notes*. A limited amount were printed, but then Kennedy was assassinated in November of 1963. This action, if it had been

allowed to continue, would have put the Federal Reserve out of business as a creditor to this country and would have eventually removed the financial and political control the international bankers have over America.

THE CHANGE IN OUR LEGAL SYSTEM

The bankruptcy of the United States caused a change in our legal system and system of laws by virtue of the *Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933* and laws passed pursuant to this act and the *declared emergency*. Courts administering a commercial bankruptcy under *emergency law* do not honor earlier Supreme Courts decisions based on the laws of the republic of the united States of America. These courts, of a legislative nature, were created by the municipal *corporate government* of *the District* to administer the bankruptcy of *the District* (what we know as *the United States* - corporate) on behalf of the municipal corporate government's creditors. In this case, the Federal Reserve Bank.

Could this be the reason why United States District Court Judges, who act on behalf of the District of Columbia, are immune from civil torts? That is, wrongs or breaches of duty imposed by law, because under bankruptcy they are members of an *independent judiciary*.

Could this be the reason that these same Judges are paid by the International Monetary Fund controlled Treasury Department?

“I want the record to show, Mr. Director, that the U.S. Marshals no longer take the *oath* prescribed under 5 USCA 3331 and are not *officers of the United States*. [Hedrick v. U.S.] The fact is that these U.S. Marshals, according to the U. S. Government Manual, under Department of Justice, are members of the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL), headquartered in France. They are an international organization of the United Nations (22 USCA 263a). When they make military "hits" within the United States, as with a number of unusual recent cases including Waco, they are operating under a foreign constitution and do not take directives from any nation or state. [See the Constitution and General Regulations (INTERPOL), Article 30, Clause 1.] They have been improperly using certain bankruptcy and emergency powers, such as the International Economic Emergencies Act, (1976) Title 50, USCA 1701 - 1706, against a number of political dissenters, ..."
- Nord Davis Jr.

Could this be the reason that these same Judges no longer take the Civil Service Commission Loyalty Oath? Secure a copy of the oath of a Judge and see if it conforms to 5 U.S.C.A. 3331.

The constitution recognizes two kinds of taxes - Direct & Indirect. In the matter of Direct taxes the constitution stipulates that they shall be uniform. Therefore, if I paid \$300 then every other citizen of the republic also paid \$300. In the matter of indirect taxes, the constitution stipulates that they shall be apportioned. That is a tax is levied upon the several States of the Union according to its population (by census) and the State would pay the tax from the State's treasury

and by various lawful means collect the tax from the citizens of that state. But these constitutional taxes had to be paid *at law*. That means they had to be paid in *lawful money in the account of the united States*. In other words the taxes had to be paid in gold and silver. The taxes could not be paid in private commercial paper (Federal Reserve Notes, Bonds, etc.).

The District (of Columbia) uses and accept checks, Federal Reserve Notes and other private commercial paper? Is there any consequence to dealing in *private commercial paper* as opposed to lawful money (gold & silver)? The answer to this question lies in a Supreme Court decision known as the Clearfield Doctrine.

Clearfield Doctrine

The *Clearfield* decision consists of previous case law and those referenced cases must be read and understood to understand the *Clearfield Doctrine*.

Franconia Associates v. United States, 536 U. S. 129

A waiver of the sovereign immunity of the United States "cannot be implied but must be unequivocally expressed." United States v. King, 395 U.S. 1, (1969). That requirement is satisfied here. Once the United States waives its immunity and does business with its citizens, it does so much as a party never cloaked with immunity. Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States, 318 U.S. 363, 369 (1943) ("The United States does business on business terms."

When the United States enters into contract relations, its rights and duties therein are governed generally by the law applicable to contracts between private individuals.

United States v. Winstar Corp., 518 U. S. 839

(quoting United States v. National Exchange Bank of Baltimore, 270 U.S. 527, 534 (1926)); Perry v. United States, supra at 352 (1935) ("**When the United States, with constitutional authority, makes contracts, it has rights and incurs responsibilities similar to those of individuals who are parties to such instruments. There is no difference . . .** except that the United States cannot be sued without its consent") United States v. Bostwick, 94 U.S. 53, 66 (1877) ("**The United States, when they contract with their citizens, are controlled by the same laws that govern the citizen in that behalf**"); Cooke v. United States, 91 U.S. 389, 398 (1875) ("**explaining that when the United States comes down from its position of sovereignty, and enters the domain of commerce, it submits itself to the same laws that govern individuals there**").

Cooke v. United States, 91 U. S. 389

It was conceded in the argument that when the United States become parties to commercial paper, they incur all the responsibilities of private persons under the same circumstances. This is in accordance with the decisions of this Court. *The Floyd Acceptances*, 7 Wall. 557; *United States v. Bank of Metropolis*, 15 Pet. 377. As was well said in the last case,

From the daily and unavoidable use of commercial paper by the United States, they are as much interested as the community at large can be in maintaining these principles.

Laches is not imputable to the government, in its character as sovereign, by those subject to its dominion. *United States v. Kilpatrick*, 9 Wheat. 735; *Gibbons v. United States*, 8 Wall. 269. **Still a government may suffer loss through the negligence of its officers. If it comes down from its position of sovereignty, and enters the domain of commerce, it submits itself to the same laws that govern individuals there.** Thus, if it becomes the holder of a bill of exchange, it must use the same diligence to charge the drawers and endorsers that is required of individuals, and if it fails in this, its claim upon the parties is lost. *United States v. Barker*, 12 Wheat. 559. Generally, in respect to all the commercial business of the government, if an officer specially charged with the performance of any duty and authorized to represent the government in that behalf, neglects that duty and loss ensues, the government must bear the consequences of his neglect. But this cannot happen until the officer specially charged with the duty, if there be one, has acted or ought to have acted. As the government can only act through its officers, it may select for its work whomsoever it will, but it must have some representative authorized to act in all the emergencies of its commercial transactions. If it fail in this, it fails in the performance of its own duties and must be charged with the consequences that follow such omissions in the commercial world.

United States v. Seckinger, 397 U. S. 203
(Dissenting opinion)

Even in the domain of private contract law, the author of a standard-form agreement is required to state its terms with clarity and candor. {GO>8} Surely no less is required [397 U.S. 222] of the United States of America when it does business with its citizens.

There is more so do your homework.

Therefore:

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 is used by corporate government, then Government has entered into commerce with its citizen(s) and in doing so loses its sovereignty status, becoming no different than a private individual or corporation. As such, government then becomes bound by the rules and laws that govern private corporations. This, in turn, means that if they intend to compel an individual to some specific performance based upon *their private 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... *only if the individual is smart enough to make such a demand and sticks to his guns!* Do not forget the words of Federal Judge James Alger Fee.

Therefore, in order to tax the people out of their private commercial paper the Internal Revenue Service, Inc. had to be created as a private corporation and not an agency of the federal government. In days gone by you did not find the phone book listing for the IRS in with other government agencies but now that people are beginning to catch on, the phone listing of the IRS is now in with agencies of the U.S. Government. However, U. S. Government mail is sent out under a *franking privilege* where they do not pay for their postage. If you have to pay for your postage, you are not part of the United States Government! Check the postage on mail received from the IRS and compare it with mail received from the U. S. Government.

However, I suspect that if the law and supreme court decisions impede total control of our lives, it will become necessary to somehow set aside *our law* and *Supreme Court decisions*, in a manner similar to setting aside the Supreme Court decision on the *Agricultural Adjustment Act* previously mentioned.

A little more enlightenment...

If you have ever written a check to the Internal Revenue Service, Inc., you will notice that it has not been endorsed over to the United States Treasury, as it would have been had it been collected on behalf of the United States Government. It has been endorsed over to the Federal Reserve Bank. That is because the mission of the Internal Revenue Service, Inc., is to operate on behalf of the creditor (Federal Reserve Bank) of the (corporate) United States. Not one penny you pay in income taxes goes to the United States treasury. It all goes to the Federal Reserve Bank. Every year the government must borrow (from the Federal Reserve Bank) the funds necessary to meet the budget and conduct business.

Are you being attacked by the IRS?

At one time I was of the opinion that the authority to enforce income tax law comes from the 16th Amendment. However, it has *evidently* been proven that an insufficient number of states ratified this proposed amendment for it to become part of the constitution. Martin J. "Red" Beckman, an American, acquired *certified voting records* from enough states (of the Union) to prove that the 16th amendment was never ratified. Secretary of State, Philander C. Knox, simply declared the amendment ratified on February 25, 1913. Philander(???), an appropriate name.

But in truth it does not matter if we have **contracted** to pay such a tax. Have we **contracted?** Do we have a social security card and number? If so, we have a **contract** with a *Federal Municipal Insurance Corporation*. Remember, *law cannot compel a specific performance*, meaning that law cannot compel us to have a social security card and number. We must volunteer, and most of us do volunteer.

For more information on the failed ratification of the 16th Amendment, read the book "The Law That Never Was" by Martin Beckman and co-author Bill Benson.

Terminating the EMERGENCY

How is all this unlawful action stopped? What is the key? There are a couple of ways to restore lawful civil authority. We find one way contained in language similar to that in the Agricultural Act:

"This Title shall cease to be in effect whenever the President finds and proclaims that the **national economic emergency** in relation to Agriculture has been ended."

As we go through these acts we find that they terminate by Presidential Proclamation.

Congress is fully aware of this in Senate Report 93-549, remembering that this report was upon the Senate Special Committee on the Termination of the National Emergency :

"Furthermore it [terminating the Emergency] would be a largely futile task unless we have the Presidents active corroboration and support. **Having delegated this authority to the President in ways that permit him to determine how long it should continue, simply through the device of keeping emergency declarations alive**, we now find ourselves in a position where we cannot reclaim the power without the Presidents' acquiescence. We are unable to terminate these declarations without the Presidents' signature, and we need a large measure of Presidential cooperation."

As we can see, it is by **Presidential proclamation** that the **emergencies** in progress are terminated. Therefore we the people must make this a campaign issue at all levels. If we do not, then we can expect to be ruled by **war & emergency powers authority**, and to remain an **identified enemy of the United States**, for years beyond our life.

In this language Congress is saying that without the cooperation of the President, they do not believe they have the power to terminate the declared Emergency. If the American people begin to demand that ***all emergencies*** be ended and elect a President who will do so, then this provides one solution to terminate Emergency Rule and return to lawful civil authority. It is probably necessary for government to keep our military personnel ignorant of these facts for they may yet be needed should the American people rebel, having been made an enemy by their government.

Senator Church

Senator Church speaking with reference to the War & Emergency Powers:

"These powers, if exercised, would confer upon the President, total authority to do anything he pleases ... Like a loaded gun lying around the house, the plethora of delegated authority, in institutions, to meet almost every kind of conceivable crises stand ready for use for purposes other than their original intention... Nor is it sufficient that this power be conferred upon good men, for men are frail and easily corrupted, and in a short time, he that is absolute may easily corrupt the people."

Department of Justice

"As a consequence, a national emergency is a practical necessity in order to carry out what has become the regular and normal methods of governmental action. What were intended by Congress as delegations of power to be used in only the most extreme situations and for the most limited duration, have become everyday powers and a state of emergency has become a permanent condition."

How have these powers been used?

The President used this War and Emergency Powers authority and placed the *price freeze* and *grain embargo* over agriculture. And it was by these actions that literally hundreds of thousands of farmers were eliminated from the land paving the way for multinational corporate takeover of agriculture. This is only one example. Where now is your industrial might? The steel mills are mostly closed, the timber industry severely crippled, agriculture is under severe attack and in some areas confiscation of agricultural water rights is taking place in the name of saving a fish.

America doesn't make any television sets, VCR's, Radios, camcorders, very few computers, virtually no computer printers, virtually no photo copiers, virtually no typewriters, ... I know that we have all been sufficiently educated in the public schools so that we know and understand that we cannot have a services-based economy! That is like giving yourself a blood transfusion with a leaky hose. For an economy to grow we must be able to convert raw materials into usable products. We must convert ore to steel, trees to lumber, seeds to vegetables, and so on to have a growing healthy economy.

Occupation of the Land

Under emergency powers there must be an active and visible occupation of the land by armed troops of the entity that declares emergency powers. This is called "*open and notorious, armed and hostile, occupation of the land.*" Under the guise of ***emergency***, the police, firemen, highway patrol, state marshals, and county sheriffs have been placed under control of the National Guard. And since 1972 the National Guard has been federalized. You therefore have "*open and notorious, armed and hostile, occupation of the land.*" Even the Park Rangers now carry weapons. You also have deductive knowledge as to why active duty Federal forces are stationed in all National Guard Armories. (That is to sustain the emergency power's control of the states and counties by the Federal government thus maintaining martial rule in the hands of the President as Commander and Chief of all Armed Forces).

Senate report 93-549:

"The majority of American Citizens have lived all their lives under ***emergency rule***. For forty years, freedoms and governmental procedures guaranteed by the constitution have in varying degrees been abridged by laws brought into FORCE by states of national emergency. And in the United States action taken by the government in times of great crises have, from at least the civil war, in important ways shaped the present phenomenon of a permanent state of national emergency."

Now we are beginning to understand where the freedom of ourselves and our children has gone? Well, there is always more to learn.

Emergency Powers Conclusion

I have, at many points along the way, presented the main points within this chapter to people in conversation. It is a most difficult subject to broach, for to simply tell someone that they are an identified enemy of the United States in law will draw various reactions, most of them are of non-belief. People will sometimes laugh nervously as if you are making some off the wall joke, others will simply assign the term radical to you in their mind, or perhaps openly.

However, when we consider that the language of the act of October 6, 1917 (the *Trading with the Enemy Act*) was brought into the banking relief act and applied against the American people, we can clearly see that our status becomes no different than any other enemy of the United States. With the passage of this Act, Congress had no accountability to the American people (*the Enemy*) in the matter of the gold and wealth removed from our country by the privately owned Federal Reserve Bank (remembering the lack of gold to meet the demands of the depositors was what the Federal Reserve Board termed the *Banking Emergency*). Nor does Congress have any accountability to an ***enemy*** regarding laws pertaining to his every *commercial activity*.

Given our status as an enemy of the UNITED STATES, military protection could then be authorized against that enemy in the event the American people should wake up enough to see they had been robbed. And of course, because our military is ***indoctrinated*** in the same Public School System as the rest of us, in which the curriculum is tightly controlled by government, our

military personnel are probably not sufficiently educated to see that it is not the American people who are in the wrong and committing acts of fraud. Therefore our sons, and now daughters, are likely to use military force against the American people. It is not a joke and it should not be taken lightly.

Birth Certification Bond: In order to understand the reference to a “*a bond that was issued on that person*” in a following paragraph, some information must be provided. As previously presented, the UNITED STATES has been bankrupt since 1933. To continue operating in bankruptcy, there must be a means to *support the credit structure of the UNITED STATES*. For reference, you may return to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of May 12, 1933 in which it was stated:

"The present acute economic emergency, being in part the consequence of a severe and increasing disparity between the prices of Agriculture and other commodities, which disparity has largely destroyed the purchasing power of the farmers for industrial products, has broken down the orderly exchange of commodities and has seriously impaired the agricultural assets *supporting the NATIONAL CREDIT STRUCTURE.*"

And there are many such mechanisms to support the *credit structure*, but our focus here is on one such means that involves the *birth certification*. In short, the government issues a birth certificate and *registers* it with the *Department of Vital Statistics* (most states... the agency may vary in some states). Note that it is *registered, not recorded*. *Registration* places the named object (the baby in this case) into international commerce. Once the baby is in international commerce, a bond is issued upon the *registered object* (that which is named on the *Birth Certification*). The bond, \$630,000 several years ago (current date is: September 15, 2008), is sold on a securities and exchange where it is always purchased by the same entity, the *Federal Reserve Bank*. The bond is then held in trust for the *Federal Reserve* at the *Depository Trust Corporation* at 55 Water Street in New York City, about two blocks down the street from the Federal Reserve. It is a high-rise office building and the sign in front reads: “The Tower of Power.” This is just one of many mechanisms used to support the *credit structure of the UNITED STATES*. To learn more about this issue, see: <http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/TradeNameBinder.pdf>

"The individual is handicapped by coming face to face with a conspiracy so monstrous he cannot believe it exists." - J. Edgar Hoover [First head of the FBI]

It is most difficult to find evidence of the *bond issued on the birth certification*. Probably the best evidence you will find is the *bond tracking number* on your birth certificate. Note: A friend recently got a *certified copy* of his Birth Certificate and compared it with the *original birth certificate*. The copy did not have the bond tracking number. So if you intend to confirm this, you will probably need to see the original. The *birth certification* opens the account, the *death certification* closes the account. You are not dead until *certified* as dead.

Returning our focus to the *Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933*, we will note this act, as all acts passed under a declaration of an **emergency**, have enormous potential to control us in all aspects of our lives making us an unsuspecting slave. In applying the language of the *Trading with the Enemy Act* against the American people, we became subject to having our every **commercial activity** regulated. Therefore, it was only necessary to convert our regular and normal activities into a commercial activity (non-positive law -- which is commercial law). And the law of the United States, which began as the *common law*, has now become the *Uniform Commercial Code*. All law is commercial. Since the government issues a bond on a birth certificate to finance itself in bankruptcy, even the taking of a human life is commercial since it terminates the payoff of the bond that was issued on that “*person*.” This results in a *commercial* financial loss. The only law you can break today is **impeding commerce**.

“It is a fact that people will not revolt if they can be deceived into believing that they are free.” - Cheryl Jarvis

You may wonder why there is little concern with the loss of life in military actions, such as what is currently going on in Iraq. The answer is simple. The *corporate UNITED STATES* is attempting to take over the resources (OIL) of Iraq, and so there is many times more money to be made in the acquisition (pirating) of this resource than will be lost in bonds attached to dead soldiers. Therefore, who cares about a few dead soldiers **if** it provides **the controlling elite** with **wealth and control?** Certainly no one in **the controlling elite** or profit making group will be concerned in the least. Military involvement is almost always the same... pirating the resources of another country. But there are always phony reasons to invade (*weapons of mass destruction... weapons of mass destruction... weapons of mass destruction... weapons of mass destruction...*). Over and over and over we heard this. And we found none. I’m truly surprised we didn’t plant some. So, we *the sheeple* become psychologically profiled to accept the invasion as necessary. With our foolish acceptance, many thousands of innocent people die in that country, all because we choose to remain ignorant and uninformed. Then we call ourselves Christian.

And if you oppose such pirating, you’re labeled un-patriotic. A means of silencing the thinking people who have taken the time to become informed. If murdering other people of this world to take possession and control of **their natural resources** makes me an un-patriotic individual who does not support the action of *our troops* (actually the troops of the **new world order global elite**), then I’m not patriotic. If being a patriot were defined as respecting other people of this world, and **their ownership of the natural resources within their country** and helping them to be free of the will and control of the *global elite*, then *I am patriotic*. **WRONG IS WRONG, EVEN IF IT HELPS YOU!**

It is a fact that WWII was financed by *Wall Street*. Look up Prescott Bush (father to George Bush senior) on this matter of finance of enemies of the United States. The *global elite* (international bankers) finance both sides of conflicts. It has been a fact that the peoples of this world have been pitted against each other by the *global elite*, whose influence allows them to create conflicts and distrust. Not only between people of different countries, but between peoples of the same country, peoples of different religions, peoples of different color, etc. **All our conflicts are**

engineered and the sooner *we the people of this world* understand this principle, the safer we are all going to be.

In the arena of the currency, we have seen that it is issued on the *deposit of debt* with the Treasurer of the UNITED STATES. This is the same scheme the global elite (international bankers) are attempting to install in every country of this world. In this scheme, the investment of the bankers is *ink on paper* in making a federal reserve note (and now we have electronic currency eliminating the paper, ink and printing cost). In effect your life and labor has been obligated to the bank for *ink on paper*. Pretty good scam, is it not? And by virtue of the bankers' control over inflation, homes and property have continually gone up.

And speaking of *electronic currency*, it will enslave us once it becomes the only currency. If we are a dissenter, our card (or *implanted micro-chip*) will be *turned off*. And we will have no means to engage in commerce. We will then have to depend on someone else to survive. **Control, control, control**, and we can't wait to embrace our own enslavement as well as the enslavement of the children we purport to love. We are deceiving ourselves at the price of those we love.

When I was in high school in the early 1960's, gold was \$32.00 an ounce, that is 32 *one dollar federal reserve notes*. Gold was recently \$960.00 an ounce. Doing the math, today's *one dollar federal reserve note* has the purchasing power of 3.2 penny's compared to when I was in high school. Therefore, if a home today costs \$300,000, its value when I was in highschool would be \$9600. Because the purchasing power of the *one dollar federal reserve note* has descended to only 3.2 cents of what it was in 1962, we have not gained anything. In actuality we have lost.

If we consider 6% interest on \$9,600 over 10 years (the typical home loan period when I was in high school) compared to 6% interest on \$300,000 over 30 years, we can clearly see that we have been placed in economic enslavement. In the case of borrowing \$9,600, the interest paid over 10 years at 6% is \$3,189.56. Whereas the interest paid on \$300,000 at 6% over 30 years is \$347,514.57, more than the loan itself. Therefore, when borrowing \$9,600 dollars, we would have paid back \$12,789.56, and when borrowing \$300,000, we would have paid back \$647,514.57. Do you think that your life has not been plundered, pillaged and robbed? We have become enslaved, but publically educated in a way in which we cannot see our enslavement.

In 1962 an average American may have been making \$2.25 an hour at a menial job. If his wages had kept par with inflation, he would be making \$67.50 an hour today... in a menial job, like bagging groceries and stocking shelves at the supermarket. Instead, he is making somewhere between 12 and 15 dollars an hour. Consequently it takes him, and his wife, many, many more working hours to pay the highly inflated price of the home and \$347,514.57 interest. There is truly a price to pay for ignorance and this is only one of them.

As such, virtually everything we do is commercial. Working to feed yourself and your family, replacing the roof on your home so that you and your family can be dry, changing your hot water heater, changing your toilet, putting new siding on your home, drilling a well for water, traveling

in your car, fishing, boating, hunting, pouring a concrete sidewalk or patio, public school, military service... the list goes on and on. All of these *activities* now require a *permit* or *license*. Now, even a *bake sale* (in which women of the community volunteer their time and talent to baking some confection to be sold at a church or club) is off limits unless the baking takes place in a *licensed kitchen*. It is all commercial. Even police agencies (city, state, federal) are commercial, including *forest service* and *Fish and Game*. Along with the courts. If you doubt this, you can look up your local court, local police, or even the FBI, and find them listed on *Dun and Bradstreet* as **commercially traded**. And since they are *commercially traded*, they must return a profit!

No, it is not a joke, it's as serious as a heart attack and should be taken as such. If we examine this carefully, we will see that **War & Emergency Powers Authority** is the source of unconstitutional law and plight. But you still cannot just walk up to someone who is uninformed in these matters and relate to them that they are an ***ENEMY*** of the United States in law. It won't fly and it will generally alienate the person with whom you are trying to communicate. Although I am beginning to see a general awakening taking place.

CHAPTER 7

STATE CITIZEN

It was the concepts put forth in this chapter that were most difficult for me to bridge in acceptance and understanding. Back in 1993, at 46 years old, I attended an informal gathering of ordinary citizens. The gathering was one of education. Its focus centered on understanding application of law and understanding ones own status. One of topics concerned citizenship as it relates to status. The speaker of this topic related that there were two legal status' of American citizenship and that these two citizens were not subject to the same body of laws. My initial reaction was, "what a crock of B-S this is, what am I doing wasting my time listening to this crap?" But listen I did. I listened very carefully, looking for cracks, fissures, gaps in the presentation upon which I could take this *con-artist* to task for trying to dupe the people who were there for honest education. But, as I listened, I found no gaping holes and at the end he provided a legal cite for those who wish to know more about this issue. As I left the meeting, I can remember thinking, "turkey, I'm going to look at your legal cite and when you see me again, you had better be ready for I will have no mercy."

The legal cite he provided suggested that he was absolutely correct, there were two classes of citizenship in the *united States of America*, and they certainly appeared to be subject to different laws. This legal cite became the *fishing lure* and I swallowed it (just as the man who provided it would have hoped). For the next two years of my life, virtually all of my spare time went into independent research on citizenship. It was this initial pursuit and the many avenues of research it took me into that ultimately led to this document that I loosely call a book. I learned a great deal, not only about citizenship, but about *War and Emergency powers* as well as the many other topics covered herein.

By the time two and a half years had gone by, I had came to understand that the man was correct. There are two legal status' of American citizenship and these two citizens are not subject to the same body of law. It (the two citizenship classes) had always been right in front of me, but I was not sufficiently educated to understand the difference, or even that they were different.

I also came to realize that what I had learned in my research is (or was) virtually unknown by the vast majority of Americans. Thus the idea was born to write down this collection of information so that it might be viewed in one location rather than trying to read multitudes of court decisions and legal findings as I had done. And so this book was started.

The assertion of two classes of citizenship became solid when I acquired a two volume set of constitutional law. From this legal reference we read, under the section on *Citizenship and Alienage*:

"The distinction between state citizenship and national citizenship is recognized and perpetuated in the Fourteenth Amendment and cases adjudicated thereunder." Modern Constitutional Law (The volume on *The Individual and the Government*), p652, Chester J. Antieau

There are many ways to control (enslave) us and no avenue is left un-traveled. As can be seen, we have a *State Citizen* and a *National citizen* in America. Which are you? One, the other, or both? Your citizenship will determine the law(s) to which you will be subject.

Understanding the evolvement of American Citizenship

From history we may remember that American's declared their independence from Great Britain and began fighting the Revolutionary War in 1776 and won the same. A few of us know that this was not the beginning of the republic of the *united States of America*. The beginning of our *Constitutional Republic* began with signing and ratification by the States, of the *Constitution for the united States of America*. Notice that it is not "**OF** the *united States of America*". The constitutional convention was held in 1787, eleven years after we fought the Revolutionary War.

During this eleven year period, the several States functioned as *independent nations*. Each State being very jealous of their *independent nation status* and not willing to sign or ratify anything that took their *independent nation status* from them. This included any Constitution that would take away their *independent nation status*. The delegates to the Constitutional convention knew full well the sentiments of the various state legislatures. Consequently the Constitution for the united States of America does not create a country, it forms a ***Union of several independent nation States***. This is why we have had an occasional *State of the Union* message from the President in times past. Therefore, the original citizen at the formation of the republic of the united States of America was the State citizen by virtue of the *independent nation* status of the State.

The Constitution provided that:

"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; and..." U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8.

Here we see the creation of the *seat of government* not to exceed 10 miles square (100 square miles). Eventually to be known as, *Washington, District of Columbia (the District)*. The seat of the Federal government. We also take note that Congress has the power to "*exercise exclusive legislative authority over the District*."

Exclusive Legislative Authority

It is important to understand what this means. Under this *Constitutional authority*, Congress can make laws for **the District** without regards for constitutionality or constitutional limitations. Congress may pass any law they wish to make in this jurisdiction. This same legislative authority applies to any property **the District** owns, such as Guam, Wake, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, not to mention military bases, Federal buildings, and any other property to which the Federal government holds the title. But perhaps the most important aspect of this *law making authority*, is that Congress may make any law it wishes for anyone whose citizenship is attached to the jurisdiction of **the District** of Columbia regardless of where these **District** of Columbia citizens may live.

The Dual Character of Congress

With this legislative power, Congress can tax and control **District** citizens in any manner they wish. However, at the birth of the Republic, there were not many who had their citizenship *attached* to **the District**. It is important to understand that Congress is marked with a dual character. In one capacity they have the authority and power to make laws for the Republic of the united States of America, within constitutional limitations, as legislative representatives of the Republic, and in the other capacity, to make laws for **the District**, unrestrained by constitutional limitations.

Note on jurisdiction: As we read this material it is important for us to understand that the jurisdiction of *the District of Columbia* is not within the Republic of the united States, it is outside the Republic. That is to say, it is not *inclusive*, it is *exclusive*. It is a jurisdiction onto itself, controlled only by those we elect to Congress and although created by the constitution, it is not restrained by the constitution. Remember the words *exclusive legislative authority*.

From the birth of our Republic in 1787, we move forward nearly 80 years, to the 1860's and the Civil War. It was during this time that President Lincoln issued the *Emancipation Proclamation* to free the slaves. I believe that research will show he did this, not out of compassion for the slaves, but to keep the French from coming into the war on the side of the Southern States.

The *Emancipation Proclamation* was ultimately declared un-Constitutional by the Supreme Court (a fact that my public school educators have failed to mention). This in turn caused the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment. The Thirteenth Amendment freed the slaves where the Emancipation Proclamation had failed.

In *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, the Federal courts held that a Negro could not become a citizen of a State. This had the legal effect that a Negro had *no persona standi in judicio*. No personal standing in the courts. This meant that a freed slave could be defrauded out of everything he had worked for all his life and he could not go to court for recourse and remedy for he had no standing to do so for lack of citizenship. The *Dred Scott* decision was a prejudicial decision, probably based in racial bias, and probably one of the worst decisions of the court. But in

politics we often get what others pay for, and when this occurs it can take a long time to correct it.

In an effort to remedy this, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1865. But constitutional challenge was also being mounted against this measure. This caused the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment in July of 1868. The first sentence in Section 1 is of interest here.

Section 1. 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.

“*Are citizens of the United States*”, and there you have the ***national citizen*** referred to by Chester J. Antieau in his book *Modern Constitutional Law*. When the term “*United States citizen*” is used, it refers to this ***national citizen***. Now, if there were no differences between *United States citizenship* and *State Citizenship*, we would not have distinguished between the two in the fourteenth amendment. This term, “*United States citizen*” sounds innocuous but its effects are most debilitating.

What has not been made clear is that this “*United States citizenship*” is attached to the jurisdiction of ***the District of Columbia*** were it was created and upon which it is dependent. It is not a Citizen of the Republic. I know, you are probably thinking that, “*what difference does that make, the language of the fourteenth amendment also made the freed slave a citizen of the State*”. A couple of things. There are probably many differences, but first is that a citizenship attachment to the jurisdiction of **the District** would subject one to the laws of that jurisdiction, laws which are not constitutionally restrained or limited. And secondly, the supreme court has ruled that *United States Citizenship* places limitations on certain capacities of freedom, such as the right to *freely engage in commerce*. See the [Slaughter House Cases](#).

Secondly, you might notice the term “*reside*”, rather than *live* or *living*. Our public school education has left most of us believing that the term “*reside*” means *where we live*. That is not correct. ***Reside*** is a legal term with far reaching implications. We *reside* when we live in a jurisdiction or area that is not the home of our citizenship. For example, if a Frenchman is living in

Dual Citizenship. Citizenship in two different countries. Status of citizens of United States who reside within a state; i.e., persons who are born or naturalized in the U.S. are citizens of the U.S. and the state wherein they reside. - Blacks Law Dictionary (sixth edition)

California, he ***resides***, because California is not the home of his citizenship, France is. Thus, by declaring that the freed slave has citizenship in the State in which he currently resides, we have evidence that he has citizenship elsewhere, and that *elsewhere* is **the District**. It is the place where *United States citizenship* because of the *foreign jurisdictional nature* of **the District**. You may have noticed that the Fourteenth Amendment provided that a freed slave has citizenship of the State in which he *resides*, as well as being a citizen of the United States. Thus he has *dual citizenship*.

So we see that Congress, rather than pass an amendment providing the same citizenship for the freed slave that the rest of Americans had, has instead provided a class of citizenship which makes this individual a citizen/subject of **the District** and all the *corporate laws* of that jurisdiction. A place where the authority of Congress extends to make any law they so choose, without regard to the limitations of the Constitution.

Note: I have been intentionally making bold the term “**the District**” so that the reader begins to think in terms of a different jurisdiction than that of the Republic. It is to make the reader aware that the laws of **the District** are not the *law of the Republic* and not constitutionally restrained or limited.

Therefore, in 1868, **the District** gained a jurisdiction over the freed slaves that they did not have (and do not have) over the individual who has State Citizen status only. If Congress is going to legislate (make laws) for the State citizen, they must do so in accordance within Constitutional limitations. We are now, perhaps, beginning to understand the importance of our citizenship (status).

With the passage of the fourteenth Amendment, the citizenship population of **the District** was beginning to grow but there was not much wealth that could be extracted from these former slave citizens in the 1860's. What was really needed was the means to include the State Citizens of the republic and bring them into the jurisdiction of **the District**. Events of this magnitude happen slowly, but by virtue of apathy and ignorance, they do continue to move in the direction of their agenda.

Note: I have said that **the District** does not have jurisdiction over the individual who holds only State Citizenship status. This is not exactly true since jurisdiction can be gained over anyone with force & violence. The same force & violence we have been using against people of this world through invented (engineered) excuses as well as against the American people. If I have a gun and you do not, the law is whatever I say it is!

In 1871, Congress passed an Act that has developed into something that muddy's the waters of understanding. We spoke briefly about it in the previous chapter.

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

CHAPTER 62, 1871

16 United States Statutes at Large 419

FORTY FIRST CONGRESS SESSION III.

CHAPTER 62, 1871
CHAP. LXII. --

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.

The language of this act provides that the government of **the District** (the Federal Government) is a corporation, municipal in nature but still a corporation. Furthermore, **District** citizens (United States citizens - U.S. citizens) will now be subject to ***corporation law*** as well as law of the Republic.

Corporate law is private law even though the corporation is municipal. Generally we are led to believe that these corporate laws are laws of the people of the united States of America because they have come from Congress... they are not, they are private laws and can only be applied by contract. Therefore, you must contract to place yourself in this jurisdiction.

United States defined

“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 to that of other sovereigns in a family of nations." This defines the *several states of the Union*. Remember that at the signing of the constitution (1787), the colonies had been ***independent nation states*** since 1776. Additionally, the constitution did not create a country, ***it formed a Union***. The constitution did not take away the *independent nation status* of the individual states. Thus was

created a *Union* of several independent nation states. Each state a *sovereign* in its own right, *analogous* (equal) to the sovereignty of the other *union states*.

"it may designate territory over which sovereignty of United States extends", defines the *corporate United States*.

"it may be collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution", defines the *republic of the united States of America*.

The importance of this is that the corporate *United States* and the republic of the *united States* of America are two different entities and it is this factual difference that muddy's the waters of understanding, for when we read law which says, "*any person living within the United States or subject to the jurisdiction there of, shall...*", we generally do not understand that this most likely refers to the *corporate United States* and not to the Republic of the *united States of America*. In law they are not one and the same, they are separate and different jurisdictions.

The plot thickens. The corporate laws Congress often makes for the [corporate] United States (**the District**) jurisdiction are called *Statutes*.

Now, when all of this was happening, where were our journalists who pride themselves on being elite intellects, whose job includes safeguarding our freedoms and keeping us informed? Where were our church leadership whose job it is to preserve a country that is *one nation under GOD*? Here are the beginnings of *one nation under corporation* (which has no heart, soul or compassion) and the church leadership not only does not confront it head on and educate its flocks, it participates by becoming a ***501(c)(3) tax exempt corporation*** itself so that it too can worship and garner the *big buck*. Is there anyone who would like to explain how a ***corporation*** can represent God when it has chosen to abandon God's Law, the common law of the republic of the united States of America? It seems to me that when a church elects to subject itself to corporate law and by virtue of this action abandon the *common law* of the republic, which we have learned in another chapter is *God's law applied*, then this church can no longer represent God. It can only pretend to do so as a means of getting more *big bucks*.

Keep in mind that this is not a conspiracy because it is done in the *light of day* right in front of *we the uneducated sheeple* (too much trust). Which provides an opportunity to make a point... *We cannot be stupid and free at the same time*. It does not matter that those who implemented this knew that not one person in 100,000 would ever figure it out. It does not matter if someone did figure it out for how would they communicate such knowledge without the ***media***? It does not matter that the main stream media didn't do their job and educate us on the significance of these Acts. Added to this category would be the churches, for they are not doing their job either. More about the Church later.

Enfranchisement

Shortly after incorporating, the United States municipal corporation enfranchised its citizens.

“Enfranchisement. The act of making free (as from slavery); giving a franchise or freedom to; investiture with privileges or capacities of freedom, or municipal or political liberty. Conferring the privilege of voting upon classes of persons who have not previously possessed such. See also Franchise.” - [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

“Franchise. A special privilege to do certain things conferred by government on individual or corporation, and which does not belong to citizens generally of common right;” - [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

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

Inalienable rights. “Rights which can never be abridged because they are so fundamental.” - [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

Alien or aliene. “To transfer or make over to another; to convey or transfer the property of a thing from one person to another; to alienate.” [BLD- sixth ed.]

Notice that the Enfranchised citizen is granted **municipal liberty**. Not *liberty* as it was known and practiced in the republic, but *liberty as defined by the municipal*

corporation. What Congress has done here, is to create a second class citizen, which they can control. Yet, it was freedom from government control on which American’s fought the revolutionary war to establish our republic (**not Democracy**). Congress now has a citizen whom they have full authority to abuse and control.

A citizen that they can tax un-constitutionally, one that they can jail without due process of law, one whom they can control in every aspect of their lives. A citizen to whom they may subject to the whims of Congress as put forth in corporate law.

United States (*District of Columbia*) citizens are **enfranchised**. A *corporate franchise*, making them an *artificial person* in court.

You may have civil rights as part of a political plan, or you may have unalienable rights as part of a heavenly plan. The choice is yours... you choose. If you are an authoritarian who cannot be responsible for him/herself and need direction, you will probably choose civil rights. Those who are interested in personal freedom will probably chose unalienable rights.

Did you notice in the definition of “*franchise*”, that privileges granted by *franchise* do not belong to a citizen of common right? *Citizens of common right*, are not franchised. They do not need a privilege conferred upon them for they already have it as an unalienable right. If you were to have a **right** and you become franchised, then the **right** becomes replaced with a privilege conferred upon you by *corporate law*, or the liberty provided by the **right** disappears completely. State Citizens are citizens of

common right and their law is the law of the republic ... the Common Law. Privileges are for citizens who do not possess unalienable rights as Congress provided for the freed slave rather than give this group full *unalienable rights*. That is why the fourteenth amendment is loaded with a lot of the language found in the fourth, fifth and sixth amendments, amendments which apply to *citizens of the Republic (State citizens)*. This language, which appears repetitive in the fourteenth amendment, is necessary because it confers *privileges* (called *civil rights*, which are not true unalienable rights) to those citizens who are *franchised* and are corporate citizens. Returning to a previous quote from *Modern Constitutional Law* and taking note of the reference to the *Fourteenth Amendment*.

"The distinction between state citizenship and national citizenship is recognized and perpetuated in the Fourteenth Amendment and cases adjudicated thereunder." *Modern Constitutional Law (The volume on The Individual and the Government)*, p652, Chester J. Antieau

As set forth in the previous *text box*, you may have *civil rights* granted by **the District**, regulated by **the District** and altered or taken away by **the District**, or you may have *unalienable rights* granted by God, which **the District** cannot *lawfully* touch. Anything can be touched unlawfully, but generally you contract your rights aside. Social Security contract, Drivers License contract, Birth Certificate Registration, Teaching Credential, Doctor License, etc. It's not much different than joining the military. When you join the military you contract aside your unalienable rights and subject yourself to the UCMJ (Uniform Code of Military Justice). Well, when you contract with Government, you contract aside your unalienable rights and willingly subject yourself to unconstitutional corporate law. YES, I know the contract is not valid, and if you do, then you know how to proceed!

The Buck Act

In a nut shell, the Buck Act paved the way for the several States to become corporations (municipal in nature) under **District** law. And so here in California we have a corporation known as the STATE OF CALIFORNIA. It is typically spelled in all capital letters as are the rest of the corporate States. Irregular capitalization identify's a corporation [Look at your name on your *drivers license*. Are you a *natural individual* or are you a *corporation*?]. The county in which I live is Glenn, and so we have a corporation known as the COUNTY OF GLENN. Again spelled in all capital letters. Near here is Yuba City which is also a corporation known as the CITY OF YUBA CITY. Again spelled in all capital letters. Layer upon layer of corporations, all gaining their existence in laws traceable to **the District**. Consequently, each of these corporations owe their existence to **the District** of Columbia and are entities of that jurisdiction.

What this did was to give the legislators of the several States the power and authority to control and abuse corporate citizens. That is those citizens who are a corporate franchise of the corporation of 1871 (*the District*). Many Californians have wondered why they pay taxes to the CALIFORNIA FRANCHISE TAX BOARD. Perhaps those who have so wondered now have a better understanding.

It was necessary to have a basic understanding of the Buck Act and the corporate layers as a foundation upon which we can build an even greater understanding.

The name of the game is to control as many people as possible and in as many activities as possible. First on the agenda for **the District** is to increase the number of United States citizens, especially those with either wealth or earning power that will produce wealth that can be extracted (that is *taken away*) under the laws of **the District** and other *municipal corporations* (the corporate States).

The problem that **the District** faces in doing this is colossal in nature. Under the *law of the republic, law cannot compel specific performance* upon an individual who holds *State Citizen* solely. This blocks **the District**, and government in general, from compelling any type of specific performance without a contract with the individual. For example, law cannot compel you to obtain a drivers license to travel in your carriage (car, conveyance, personal property) upon the *public rights of way*. Cannot compel you to give up between 35% and 50% of your *equal exchange* (what is legally termed *earnings* or *wages*) or more in the form of income tax. To be compelled to such specific performances, you must contract with **the District**.

This was accomplished in the 1930's with the advent of Social Security. Because of *public education* most of us believe that we cannot obtain employment without a social security card. Unfortunately, many *employers* believe this also. This is a truthful ruse, a truthful deception. We all tend to think of employment as *working for someone*. But the term employment, employee, employer, all have very specific meanings in the *the laws of the internal revenue code*, that is statutory law. Meanings that the courts understand and you do not.

You may work for almost anyone without a Social Security card and be compensated for that work. Just because you work for someone does not mean you are an *employee*. The term employee is a legal term and to be an *employee* you must have a Social Security

Freeman. A person in the possession and enjoyment of all the civil and political rights accorded to the people under a free government. - [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

Card. When you work for someone without a Social Security Card, you are simply a hired hand, worker, laborer or similar such term. As a pure Citizen of the union State, you are a freeman (another legal term). Free to contract and make an agreement with another person in writing or orally, to do certain work and be compensated in a manner that you both agree.

W8

Therefore, if you are going to be an employee, you need a Social Security card. If you are going to work for someone and not be an employee then you would normally file a [W8](#) with the people for whom you work. The W8 is a certificate of '*FOREIGN STATUS*' and may be obtained from the Internal Revenue Service, Inc. You may download this form from their web site. However, I have noticed that as the American people become more educated to the deceptions of government, they change things. So do not be surprised if this form has been altered and now

appears under a different reference and no longer as a *W8*. Always keep this tactic in mind as you research anything under control of government.

Explaining the W8

It is not particularly difficult to understand the *certificate of foreign status* (the W8). We only need to remember a few things.

1. That most businesses are licensed by a *City, County, State*.
2. That virtually all *city's, county's, and state's* are a *municipal corporation* under the laws of ***the District of Columbia***, thus owing their existence to this jurisdiction.
3. That the jurisdiction of ***the District*** is foreign to the republic, thus making a *licensed business* an entity of that jurisdiction.
4. That a *licensed business* is required to *withhold* a portion of the wages of those working for the business and pay that *withholding* to the IRS, or show cause why such *withholding* is not occurring with a certain individual.

Therefore, the individual who holds only the status of *State Citizen*, is not required to give up part of his *equal exchange* (work for compensation of some type), yet the business still has the responsibility (to the IRS) to *withhold* or *show cause* why there is no *withholding* for a certain individual. Enter the W8. If the W8 was not available, then there would be no *recourse or remedy* for the State Citizen to pursue happiness, which is generally identified as *laboring and enjoying the fruits of that labor*. Therefore, there must be a means for the Citizen of the republic, the *Union State Citizen*, to pursue happiness or the government has failed in its mandate to provide a *republican form of government* as set forth in the constitution.

Thus an individual how holds only *Union State Citizen* status has no income (as that term is used in the internal revenue code) and is not subject to the corporate law governing income tax unless their income is derived from a *Federal Enclave*. How do I know this? I'll explain in a bit, but first let's develop a little more understanding.

If you are a United States citizen and were compensated in lawful money in the account of the united States of America (that is gold and silver) you too would not have any taxable income. Income tax comes about because you are compensated in private commercial paper (Federal Reserve Notes and Checks - which involves a usury charge that we call interest).
--

How we Change Our Citizenship Status

Most of us were born Citizens of the republic and not of the United States. We were not *naturalized* as that term applies to immigration. But we are educated, or psychologically profiled, to think we need a Social Security card to work for anyone in a regular job. As such we trot ourselves down to the Social Security Administration and fill out the form to obtain the card or we have one assigned to us at birth by our un-educated parents. On the [form](#) to join Social Security there are several boxes we can check with regards to our status: *ALIEN*; *OTHER*; *UNITED STATES CITIZEN*, etc. Being educated in the Public School System we have

absolutely no knowledge of our citizenship status and even if we knew there were two classes of citizenship, I seriously doubt that we would have any understanding of their meaning and significance. Consequently it never occurs to us to check 'OTHER' and write in 'Common Law Citizen of the California Republic' or 'Common Law Citizen of the Common Wealth of Massachusetts' or *Citizen of the Union State Nevada*. Not knowing any better we check the box titled *U. S. Citizen* and sign this document under penalty of perjury.

With our signature we have now made a *declaration at law* in which we have declared ourselves to be a United States Citizen subject to the jurisdiction of **the District** of Columbia whereby we will now be subject to *corporate law*. Through our ignorance we have just contracted to be abused.

Specific Performance

What Congress has done, is to trick us into using one of our unalienable rights to their benefit. That is our *right to contract*. Have we noticed that public schools do not educate us on contracts, their power and effects in our lives? Especially contracts with government! ***Your application for and acceptance of a Social Security card is a contract with a 'Federal Municipal Insurance Corporation' called SOCIAL SECURITY. It is our contractual nexus. It is us volunteering to do something we did not have to do! Income tax is voluntary,*** thank you for volunteering.

In joining Social Security you are publically declaring yourself incompetent and inept, unable to take care of yourself, unable to be responsible for yourself, and are petitioning ***the District*** to take care of you from cradle to grave. They are willing to do that, but you must subject yourself to their corporate law. It is a great ruse, is it not? We are all expected to know the law, and that we are contracting. That is why ***ignorance of the law is no excuse!*** GOT IT?

As explained earlier, *law of the republic* cannot compel a specific performance and that you must contract to be compelled to a specific performance. Your Social Security participation is a contract and forms the *contractual nexus* that subjects you to the *corporate law* of **the District**. Another example of this occurs when one joins the military. Whosoever does so has contracted aside all unalienable rights and agreed to subject themselves to the *Uniform Code of Military Justice* (the UCMJ). It's the same process, except that the military is much less deceitful about the whole thing. Those who join the military no longer have access to due process of law because the military only recognizes 'Municipal Law'. Similarly, your contract with Social Security is an agreement to subject yourself to the municipal corporate law of **the District** and all the specific performance requirements put forth in that law. Remember the *Clearfield Doctrine* from the previous chapter? There were some comments about specific performance in the *Clearfield Doctrine* that will now have a much greater meaning. And be it known that an individual who has *State Citizen Status* only, is not subject to the *military draft*. Remember, ***it is all commercial.***

U.S. TITLES

As mentioned earlier, Congress may make law for the jurisdiction of **the District** without constitutional limitations, and they may make law for the republic where they would be constrained by constitutional limitations unless they declare an *emergency*. Whenever Congress passes a statutory law, it ultimately finds its way into one of the fifty titles of United States code. The following is a listing of the 50 U.S. Titles by name.

* This title has been enacted as positive law.

** Subtitles, I, II, and IV of this title have been enacted as positive law.

^ This title has been superseded by the enactment of Title 10 as positive law.

^^ This title has been superseded by the enactment of Title 31 as positive law.

Titles of the United States Code which have been enacted into positive law are legal evidence of the general and permanent laws, while non-positive law titles only establish prima facie the laws of the United States (1 USCS Sec. 204(a)).

- | | |
|---|--|
| * 1. General provisions | 27. Intoxicating Liquors |
| 2. The Congress | * 28. Judiciary and Judicial Procedure |
| * 3. The President | 29. Labor |
| • 4. Flag and Seal, Seat of Government and the states | 30. Mineral Lands and Mining |
| * 5. Government Organization and Employees | * 31. Money and Finance |
| ^^ 6. [Surety Bonds] | * 32. National Guard |
| 7. Agriculture | 33. Navigation and Navigable Waters |
| 8. Aliens and Nationality | ^ 34. [Navy] |
| * 9. Arbitration | * 35. Patents |
| * 10. Armed Forces | 36. Patriotic Societies and Observances |
| * 11. Bankruptcy | * 37. Pay and Allowances of the Uniformed Services |
| 12. Banks and Banking | * 38. Veterans' Benefits |
| * 13. Census | * 39. Postal Service |
| * 14. Coast Guard | 40. Public Buildings, Property, and Works |
| 15. Commerce and Trade | 41. Public Contracts |
| 16. Conservation | 42. The Public Health and Welfare |
| * 17. Copyrights | 43. Public Lands |
| * 18. Crimes and Criminal Procedure | * 44. Public Printing and Documents |
| 19. Customs Duties | 45. Railroads |
| 20. Education | ^^^ 46. Shipping; and Appendix |
| 21. Food and Drugs | 47. Telegraphs, Telephones, and Radiotelegraphs |
| 22. Foreign Relations and Intercourse | 48. Territories and Insular Possessions |
| * 23. Highways | ** 49. Transportation |
| 24. Hospitals and Asylums | 50. War and National Defense; and Appendix |
| 25. Indians | |
| 26. Internal Revenue Code | |

As noted there are 50 U.S. Titles. As you can see, titles with a single asterisk (*) are positive law titles and others are not or are a combination of *Positive Law* and *non-Positive Law*. You may confirm this for yourself by going to any law library and picking up a book of United States code printed by the government printing office and not Bancroft Whitney, West or one of the other law book publishers.

Positive law. Law actually and specifically enacted or adopted by proper authority for the government of an organized jural society. [Blacks Law Dictionary - sixth Ed.]

Positive Law

Positive Law, it's defined in the text box above, but what does it actually mean. “*Organized jural society*”... this is the organization of our republic (another small tidbit public education has failed to reveal – but ***ignorance of the law is no excuse***). *Positive Laws* are passed in accordance with Constitutional limitations and are Constitutional in nature. These Positive Law titles apply to both Citizens of the republic and citizens of **the District**. Those titles that are not positive law are not passed in accordance with constitutional limitations and are not constitutional in nature. These statutory measures are *corporate commercial law of the District* and the exclusive legislative authority which Congress exercises over **the District**. Those statutes which are non-positive law apply only to *franchised* (United States) citizens and not to those who hold the status of *Union State Citizen* only. It is these non-positive law statutes that form the basis for the *specific performance* for which *franchised* citizens have contracted.

You may have noticed that when Congress is debating a statutory measure or some legislative act, it has an identifier. For example the bill might be identified as *HR1234* for the House of Representatives, and perhaps *SR5678* for the Senate. Does anyone know what the ‘R’ stands for? It stands for “*resolution*”. A *resolution* is *corporate commercial law* that applies only to *franchised United States* citizens. ***If*** the measure under debate is law for the republic, the identifier will contain an ‘H’ only for the House of Representatives, i.e. H1234, and an ‘S’ only for the Senate, i.e. S5678, as do the acts that comprise Title 18. (At least that was the case when I originally took a look a few years back). I’ve noticed that as the American people begin to figure things out, all kinds of changes take place in an attempt to trick or confuse us. For example, the term *United States* is found and defined, as presented previously, in my sixth edition of Blacks Law Dictionary, but the seventh edition has that term removed, as if it no longer exists. (Somebody’s tricking somebody).

Now that we know this I can explain why the purely State Citizen has no *taxable income*. Going back to the listing of U.S. Titles you will notice that Title 26, all of the *internal revenue* codes, is not *positive law*. The individual who only holds the status of State Citizen is not subject to this corporate law. He is not a tax resistor, he is not a tax protestor, the law simply does not apply. That does not mean that **the District** or the IRS would not take a donation from this individual, if he volunteers to make one, but it must be a lawful donation and not accepted under a fraud or deception.

Before I became knowledgeable in these matters, I had an opportunity to meet, in 1993, a young man named Doug Olsen and become acquainted with the story of his pure State Citizenship. As a young boy Doug and his family held some strong religious beliefs. Periodically, the family would study the Bible and one day they were studying the section that relates to the *number of the beast*. Doug's parents were struggling how to explain this concept to the young boy and so, to get the point across they told Doug that accepting the *number of the beast* would be like divorce with God.

Of course this troubled Doug for he did not want to be divorced from God. He gave this matter some serious thought and came up with his own plan. He decided that he wouldn't take any number and then he would not have to worry which one it might be. And so Doug grew up without a social security card (or number). Around seventeen years old Doug went to work. His boss said; "hey Doug, you gotta get a social security card". Doug politely said, "OK, where does it say 'gotta'. And his boss said, "You just have to do it". And Doug would politely respond, "OK, where does it say *have to*." He would politely ask the question.

No one was ever able to show Doug where it said "gotta" and "have to". Ultimately Doug wrote a letter to the *commissioner of Social Security* and was able to get a letter from the office of the commissioner of Social Security stating that SOCIAL SECURITY was indeed

Social Security is voluntary because under the laws of the Republic, law cannot compel specific performance. Such as a requirement to join Social Security... that would be a specific performance.

a voluntary program but if you do not have the number then you would not be eligible for any of the other programs that use that number as a control number. Well, Doug wasn't interested in participating in *socialism* and so that did not bother him and he fully understood its meaning. The letter went on to say, '*and furthermore, you will have no taxable income*'. Doug wasn't quite certain he fully understood this part and so when it came time to pay taxes, Doug filled out his tax return and mailed it to the IRS along with the taxes due. But of course it had no *Social Security number*.

Without the *social security number*, the IRS was unable to accept it (that would amount to a *fraud & deception*). This went on for three years or so and then one day the IRS asked Doug to make an appearance. When he arrived Doug was seated in an interrogation chair, the overhead lights were turned off and one of those interrogation lights was shined in his face. According to Doug it was everything except the rubber hose. There were raised voices, accusations of criminal wrong doing, good cop - bad cop, trick questions, the whole entourage. Doug, still a young man, answered their questions as best he could within the understanding that he possessed at the time.

After three hours they flipped the overhead lights back on, satisfied that Doug was genuine. They then informed Doug they would need a Social Security Number in order to accept his payment of taxes. And Doug, still remembering the number of the beast, related that he wasn't going to do anything until he figured out what was going on. At this point Doug periodically began visiting a law library and with some study, learned that he was a purely State Citizen, that he was not franchised and that the corporate commercial law relating to income taxes did not

apply to him. Nor did any of the other corporate commercial laws. Such as *Selective Service draft* laws, most gun laws, corporate traffic laws, and a host of others. Doug travels about 50,000 miles a year and there is no *state issued license plate* on his car. He also has no *state issued drivers license*. Why? Because these are corporate commercial laws that relate to specific performances to which Doug has not contracted.

A side issue

This bridge to understanding *no drivers license* and *no vehicle registration* is a difficult one for many to cross (especially authoritarians that need laws and rules for everything). Many people are so controlled, and so controlling, that they cannot see how our society could function without the likes of *traffic laws*. But we American's were able to function quite well without these corporate laws for a long time. All we need to function that way again is education.

I'll guarantee you that I can go to any country and quickly adapt to their traffic/traveling practices and not need a license nor government law telling me what to do. Freedom requires responsible behavior. If you cannot behave responsibly, you cannot be free... period! I drive as I do, not because of traffic laws, but because I do not wish to harm my fellow man. Putting it to writing, I've now driven 48 years and during all those years I've ridden large street motorcycles. I've not yet been involved in an injury accident.

But you think that cars are dangerous and should require a license to operate. Do we remember that at one time we rode horses in towns. Did we gallop through town at full speed, raising a huge dust cloud as we went, causing horse manure to be splattered on pedestrians? No, of course not. If someone did, one or more of the men would provide an attitude adjustment if the local sheriff or town marshal did not. There is this thing call rights. Remember those. Under the laws of the republic you are not allowed to infringe upon the rights of others. Which means that I should not be required to jump from the middle of the street to the sidewalk to keep from being run over by you, whether you're on a horse or in a car. And if you do such a thing, that is an infringement upon my right to travel and I file a complaint. The complaint is investigated and verified and then you are called to court to answer to this question. If you are found guilty, a fine or punishment will be applied. If you continue to be a menace to society and towns people, you will go to jail. This is where we put people who cannot conduct themselves responsibly.

Those in love with *corporate commercial law* should also understand that this law has created a cavalier attitude in drivers by limiting their liability. In America we practice ***limited liability*** as set forth in our corporate commercial laws. Under ***strict liability*** we could conduct ourselves differently. For example, if I had to be responsible for your maintenance and the maintenance of your family, along with your losses, if I were to injure you, I would be very careful not to injure anyone. But when I have a liability limit of \$300,000, and that is paid by my insurance company, thus protecting me from any significant loss, I really don't have a motivation to be careful with your life. So you can thank *commercial law* for the careless carefree drivers of today.

Returning from the side issue

Returning to Doug's story, Doug 'travels' as a matter of un-alienable right, not as a privilege under the form of license. This is one difference between *State Citizenship* and *United States citizenship*. Corporate commercial laws apply only by contract. That does not mean that if Doug were to conduct himself irresponsibly he would not be arrested. It means that when he is conducting himself reasonably and responsibly the government lacks the authority (jurisdiction) to injure Doug through *cash register law*, which is most traffic laws.

You may notice that I said that Doug *travels* and I did not say he *drives*. *Driving* is a legal term within the meanings of corporate laws and if Doug was *driving* he would need a *Drivers License*. So when Doug is behind the steering wheel of his car, he is *traveling*. A protected right. And his car is not a *vehicle*, for if it was he would be required to have current registration. Therefore, the car might be referred to as a *conveyance of the day, carriage* or perhaps *private property*. And the additional seating in the car, both on the right and in the rear are not *passenger seats*. *Passenger* refers to someone who is paying for a ride and thus you would be engaged in commerce upon the highway if you had a *passenger seat*. These additional seats are *guest seats*. The government corporations go some distance to entrap us into their jurisdiction through their *language of law* (what is termed *words of art*). Be very careful what you claim and assert in court.

Remember, only *United States (franchised)* citizens must be licensed to engage in commerce. Purely *State Citizens* may do so as a matter of common right. Any *common law occupation* may be engaged in without any infringement by government. And most occupations are common law. Restaurant (cooking and serving meals), mechanic, builder, farming, timber falling, milling, operating a hardware store, pottery, manufacturing... almost everything. It is only because most businesses have become corporations or licensed that the government can interfere with their operations.

If one intended to return his status to that of *State Citizen* only, he would probably be well advised to contact a [state citizenship support center](#).

"In the Slaughter-House Cases of 1873, a five-to-four decision, the [Supreme] Court ruled that freedom of enterprise (specifically freedom from monopolies in trade) was not a Fourteenth Amendment Privilege or Immunity. It indicated that such basic and fundamental rights that do not owe their existence to the federal government are not privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States... The four dissenters in the Slaughter-House Cases, Chief Justice Chase, Justices Bradley, Field and Swayne, all urged that the Fourteenth Amendment privileges and immunities clause protected a person in all the fundamental rights, privileges, and immunities which belong to him as a free man and a free citizen." Modern Constitutional Law by Chester J. Antieau, p.663 of the volume titled *The Individual and the Government*.

From this language it should be clear that a United States [corporate] citizen is not a free man nor a free citizen.

We all need to remember that our case is made out of court, not in court. The case is *presented* in court, but it is made by communications with *administrating agencies*. We must generate our

evidence before going to court so that they really do not want to take us to court. If you do go to court, consider representing yourself.

Natural Person

The Emergency Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933 that we discussed in the previous chapter is found in Title 12, 48 Statute 1, a non-positive law statute. From that section you may remember this extraction:

“And whoever shall not comply with the provisions of this act shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or if a natural person may in addition to such fine be imprisoned for a year not exceeding ten years.”

An individual holding only State Citizen status is a natural person. Now, Title 12 is not Positive Law, and so you ask, "How can this apply to the purely State Citizen?" The answer is that if it is properly challenged, it cannot lawfully stand, however, the one thing we cannot predict is: "*how criminal they are going to be.*" It is difficult to predict organized crime. It is also difficult to predict the outcome of a stupid jury. Much of the outcome will depend upon your ability to create your evidence before going to court and your ability to present your evidence in court. This is difficult for many and when this is the case, they may as well get used to being abused. It is sad that the founding American's sacrificed so much including their lives, and so many of us are so cowardly that we cringe at the prospect of preserving our freedom and making our own case in court. But I'm certain that there are some out there that will stand and they will show others how to do the same.

So, (now referring to the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933) what our representatives in government have done is to declare an *Emergency*. From there they then pass un-constitutional law under the *rule of necessity*. This is followed by passing layer upon layer of additional laws, all pursuant to and deriving authority from an otherwise unconstitutional act. Then maintain the emergency active, now for 75 years. This is all done to enslave the American people and take their productivity and their country (including the prized natural resources). Property and freedoms for which our forefathers died to provide are being taken from the American people without their understanding, the whole time they think they are abiding by the law and being *good citizens*. That combined with a change of our citizenship to subject us to private corporate commercial law is what allows the government to charge so many with criminal offenses (many of which are political crimes in reality), try them in court and with the help of uneducated sheep on the juries, put many Americans in jail who have harmed no one.

Those of you who are caught up in land use violations now know that Government has created un-constitutional law to abuse you. Others of you may be caught up in second amendment offenses and you now know that you have contracted to be abused. And what did the constitution say about Congress having authority to exercise *exclusive legislation* in all cases whatsoever? Jurisdiction is an important issue and it ties directly to your status (citizenship).

Unalienable Rights

Now we can discuss unalienable rights in a brighter light of understanding and we may ask who has them. First, we should discover the source of our unalienable rights. Our founding fathers believed that true *Rights* come from God and not man. One man cannot confer a *Right* upon another man, only a privilege. Now why is that? It is because it is an American belief that ***all men are created equal***. That means that no other man can have any right that I do not also have since we are *equals*. This premise was clearly put forth in the Declaration of Independence:

“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.”

Since every man is created equal in the eyes of God and the law, I would be unable to confer a right upon anyone for we already possess every right that every other man has. That our unalienable rights come from God creates a dilemma for those among us who do not believe in God. For it follows that if you do not believe in God then you certainly cannot possess unalienable rights conferred by a God in which you do not believe. In this case, U. S. citizenship is your best option and you can enjoy the *civil rights* handouts given to you by your controllers. I believe this action, by our founding fathers, may be a means of maintaining a recognition of God as the supreme sovereign in America and the blessing he conferred upon the people with the founding of this great *union*. One nation, ***under God***, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Not one nation under a foreign jurisdiction, not one nation under the United Nations or some ruling class of men.

The only *Rights* available to the Godless individual are those conferred by other men in government. It is what we call *Civil Rights*, which really are not rights in the true sense of the word for these *Civil Rights* may be altered and even taken away. They are only privileges that may be allowed by those who control ***the District***. This makes the Godless dependent upon Government and that dependency provides control. But that is probably the way they want it. God does not revoke or alter rights.

We have previously defined unalienable but we repeat it here.

Reading the definition of the term “unalienable” from Black’s Law Dictionary, we see that we cannot lose our rights. But if we are ignorant of our rights, or we do not know how to claim them we may as well not have them at all. Although we cannot lose them, through our lack of knowledge we may contract them aside by making ourselves subject to corporate law.

Unalienable. Inalienable; incapable of being alienated, that is sold and transferred. [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]
--

Artificial Person

The *artificial person* is a creation of law. Probably the most common and visible example of an *artificial person* is a corporation or *corporate franchise*. When we voluntarily join Social Security and declare ourselves to be a U.S. Citizen, we have declared ourselves to be a person created by law. By virtue of this we are no longer **natural**. *U.S. citizen* is the creation of **the District**. Remembering that U.S. citizens are a corporate franchise making this individual an artificial person in court.

"Artificial persons. Persons created and devised by human laws for the purposes of society and government, as distinguished from natural persons." [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition.]

In the definition of an *artificial person* did you notice the reference to natural persons? All corporations are *artificial persons*. When the district enfranchised its citizens back in 1871, the District citizens became a corporate franchise. Therefore, United States Citizens, as that term is defined in the Fourteenth Amendment, are *artificial persons* in court. This will deny the United States citizen access to the protections provided by the Organic Constitution and Bill of Rights because the Constitution is for a living natural individual, not an Artificial Person who is *legally dead*.

We have been taught to think of a person as a human being. But through corporate law the meaning has been greatly expanded. From Black's Law Dictionary, sixth edition, here is the definition of person.

Begin of PERSON definition

Person. In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers. See e.g. National Labor Relations Act, Sec. 2(1), 29 U.S.C.A. sec. 152; Uniform Partnership Act, Sec. 2. Scope and delineation of term is necessary for determining those to whom Fourteenth Amendment of Constitution affords protection since this Amendment expressly applies to "person."

Aliens. Aliens are "persons" within meaning of Fourteenth Amendment and are thus protected by equal protection clause against discriminatory state action. *Foley v. Connelie*, D.C.N.Y., 419 F.Supp. 889, 891.

Bankruptcy Code. "Person" includes individual, partnership, and corporation, but not governmental unit. 11 U.S.C.A. Sec. 101

Commercial law. An individual or organization. U.C.C. § 1-201(30)

Corporation. A corporation is a "person" within meaning of Fourteenth Amendment equal protections and due process provisions of United States Constitution. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. V. Ward, Ala., 470 U.S. 869, 105 S.Ct. 1676, 1683, 84 L.Ed.2d 751. The term "persons" in statute relating to conspiracy to commit offense against United States, or to defraud United States, or any agency, includes corporation. Alamo Fence Co. Of Houston v. U.S., C.A.Tex., 240 F.2d 179,181

In corporate law, "person" includes individual and entity. Rev.Model Bus.Corp.Act, § 1.40.

Foreign governments. Foreign governments otherwise eligible to sue in U.S. courts are "persons" entitled to bring treble-damage suit for alleged antitrust violations under Clayton Act, section 4. Pfizer, Inc. v. Government of India, C.A.Minn., 550 F.2d 396.

Illegitimate child. Illegitimate children are "persons" within the meaning of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Levy v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 68, 88 S.Ct. 1509, 1511, 20 L.Ed.2d. 436; and scope of wrongful death statute, Jordan v. Delta Drilling Co., Wyo., 541 P.2d 39, 48.

Interested person. Includes heirs, devisees, children, spouses, creditors, beneficiaries and any others having a property right in or claim against a trust estate or the estate of a decedent, ward or protected person which may be affected by the proceeding. It also includes persons having priority for appointment as personal representative, and other fiduciaries representing interested persons. The meaning as it relates to particular persons may vary from time to time and must be determined according to the particular purposes of, and matter involved in, any proceeding. Uniform Probate Code, Sec. 1-210(20).

Labor unions. Labor unions are "persons" under the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, Casey v. F.T.C., C.A.Wash., 578 F.2d 793,797, and also under Bankruptcy Code, highway and City Freight Drivers, Dockmen and Helpers, Local Union No. 600 v. Gordon Transports, Inc., C.A.Mo., 576 F.2d 1285, 1287.

Minors. Minors are "persons" under the United States Constitution, possessed of rights that governments must respect. In re Scrott K., 24 C.3d 395, 155 Cal.rptr. 671, 674, 595 P.2d 105.

Municipalities. Municipalities and other government units are "persons" within the meaning of 42 U.S.C.A. sec 1983. Local government officials sued in the official capacities are "persons" for the purposes of Section 1983 in those cases in which a local government would be suable in its own name. Monell v. N. Y. City Department of Social Services, 436 U.S. 658, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 2035, 56 L.Ed.2d. 611. See Color of Law.

Definitions of "person" or "persons" covered by antitrust laws includes cities, whether as municipal utility operators suing as plaintiffs seeking damages for antitrust violations or as operators being sued as defendants. City of Lafayette, La. V. Louisiana Power & Light Co., La., 435, U.S. 389, 98 S.Ct. 1123, 1128, 55 L.Ed.2d 364.

Protected person. One for whom a conservator has been appointed or other protective order has been made. Uniform Probate Code, Sec. 5-103(18).

Resident Alien. A resident alien is a "person" within the meaning of the due process and equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. *C. D. R. Enterprises, Ltd. v. Board of Ed. Of City of New York*, D.C.N.Y. 412 F.Supp. 1164, 1168.

Unborn Child. Word "person" as used in the Fourteenth Amendment does not include the unborn. *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 93 S.Ct. 705, 729, 35 L.Ed.2d 147. Unborn child is a "person" for purpose of remedies given for personal injuries, and child may sue after his birth. *Weaks v. Mounter*, 88 Nev. 118, 493 P.2d 1307, 1309. In some jurisdictions a viable fetus is considered a person within the meaning of the state's wrongful death statute, e.g. *Comm. v. Cass*, 392 Mass. 799, 467 N.E.2d 1324. See also *Child*; *Children (Rights of unborn child)*; *Unborn child*; *Viable child*.

University. A state university is a "person" within meaning of sec 1983. 42 U.S.C.A. Sec. 1983. *Uberoi v. university of Colorado, Colo.*, 713 P.2d 894, 900

End of *PERSON* definition

There you have it, the legal definition of a person. This provides a good example of why you need to be very careful what you go into court claiming. Claiming to be a *person* could be very detrimental to your case and argument.

There is no general usage in municipal corporate laws. Therefore, the meaning of the term "person" is controlled by statute. Whenever "person" is applied to you as an individual it is most likely a reference to your status as a *corporate franchise* and not as a natural person. If you are a state citizen I would not recommend that you go into court claiming you are a person. When the law states "any person required shall ...", it is referring to a corporate person. An artificial person. Question: "*Is there any evidence you are a person?*" If not, then you would not be subject to any law which says "*person*" or "*any person*."

All of this is part of, what has come to be known as, *words of art*. These are often ordinary words that most of us assign ordinary meaning. But no avenue is left untraveled by those who wish to control us and so the meanings of many ordinary words are redefined in law to mean things other than their ordinary usage.

In the definition of *person*, you may notice the reference to bankruptcy code and to the fourteenth amendment. Because of your knowledge from previous pages in this book, you know that the United States declared bankruptcy in 1993 and have knowledge as to the significance of this reference to bankruptcy code. And because you now have an expanded knowledge of the *fourteenth amendment*, you have an understanding of its repeated significance in the definition of "person".

Law of Contracts

Because we are being held subject to corporate law by virtue of our contract(s) with the federal government and government in general, it would be wise to know the requirements that make a valid contract.

From the book *Law of Contracts* by John Calamari and Joseph Perillo, we find that a contract must contain at least six crucial elements or the Contract Is Void.

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.

If you were to return your status to that of State citizen, it will be necessary to conclude your contract with Social Security and any other contract(s) with government in general. Once you do so, you will not be eligible for any government program that uses the Social Security number as a control number.

In a traffic stop example the dialog might go something like this:

Officer: May I see your drivers license.

You: If I had such a document could it be used in court against me? [What you are doing here is to secure your Constitutional right not to be compelled to incriminate yourself or to become a witness against yourself¹]

Officer: I just need it for identification.

You: That's fine. Then you won't mind signing a statement that anything I provide you will not be used against me in court?

Officer: I don't have to sign anything. [at this point the officer's authority has been challenged and he is now a little ticked off]

¹ "We start here, as we did in *Escobedo*, with the premise that our holding is not an innovation in our jurisprudence, but is an application of principles long recognized and applied in other settings. We have undertaken a thorough re-examination of the *Escobedo* decision and the principles it announced, and we reaffirm it. That case was but an explication of basic rights that are enshrined in our Constitution - that "No person . . . shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself," and that "the accused shall . . . have the Assistance of Counsel" - rights which were put in jeopardy in that case through official overbearing. These precious rights were fixed in our Constitution only after centuries of persecution and struggle. And in the words of Chief Justice Marshall, they were secured "for ages to come, and . . . designed to approach immortality as nearly as human institutions can approach it," *Cohens v. Virginia*, 6 *Wheat.* 264, 387 (1821)." **MIRANDA v. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)**

You: Officer, I'm not suggesting that you have to sign anything and I'm not trying to be antagonistic, I'm just trying to secure my rights under the constitution. Specifically my right not to be compelled to incriminate myself or to become a witness against myself in any action that government or one of its agents may take against me. [notice that you have not refused to provide the license the officer is seeking, you are just trying to secure your rights before providing any license you might have so that it cannot be used against you in court. However, if you are not a corporate United States citizen, it is unlikely that you can get a *drivers license*. Without this license the officer has no case and no authority to act and so it is important that he acquire it without granting immunity so that he can abuse you within his authority]

"(b) The privilege against self-incrimination, which has had a long and expansive historical development, is the essential mainstay of our adversary system of law and guarantees to the individual the "right to remain silent unless he chooses to speak in the unfettered exercise of his own will," during a period of custodial interrogation [384 U.S. 436, 437] as well as in the courts or during the course of other official investigations. Pp. 458-465." MIRANDA v. ARIZONA, 384 U.S. 436 (1966)

Officer: As I explained, I'm not required to sign anything. Now, may I see your license!

You: If I had such a document, could it be used in a court of law? Officer, if you have read the entire text of the Miranda ruling, you are fully aware that I do not even need to talk with you. That I may remain totally silent and by doing so have not broke any law. [when the *red light* on the police car comes on, we are under arrest. We are detained and not free to go our way. We are in custody].

If the officer has no understanding of the law and constitution, which will probably be the case, you will ultimately be arrested as I was. But, as soon as you are out of jail you might write a letter to the appropriate agency for whom the officer is an employee. The letter might look like this...

* * * * *

I would suggest that you are polite and not caustic with the officer. Do not be arrogant. He is simply doing his job as he understands it and you are simply attempting to secure your rights. It is only [commercial] business in our adversarial system of law.

Prevailing in court is not necessarily easy, but with a little study and preparation there is a good chance you will succeed. Not every judge or prosecutor is honorable, but many are and even if they are not, you can appeal the decision. By simply making them prosecute you, you are costing them more than they are going to make by virtue of a traffic fine. If you prevail and your car was impounded when you were arrested, you may file a claim against the agency who acted without authority and recover your losses.

Concession of a King's rights

In the Treaty of Paris, the King of England conceded all of his sovereign rights, in America.

"People of a State are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative." *Lansing v. Smith*, (1829) 4 Wend. 9, 20

As you can see our rights as the sovereign citizen of the Republic are many, but keep in mind that a *United States citizen* does not possess *sovereign* capacities. Think about what a King may lawfully do in his own country and then apply that to yourself. We have become so accustomed to being enslaved that it is quite difficult to think in these terms but give it careful consideration. The restraints placed upon you within the common law are that you do not infringe upon others exercising the same rights, and that you keep all contracts that you knowingly and intentionally enter into. Really simple, is it not? Well, that is the way that it was set up by the founding fathers. It was set up so that you did not have to know a great deal of law. Common sense would keep you out of trouble and you needed nothing more. And if you should accidentally injure someone, then you accepted the liability of that injury. And if you committed a crime, that is an intentional injury of someone, you were punished accordingly. Remember, a crime is an intentional injury of someone.

A Little History

I think it may not only be interesting, but, appropriate to examine a bit of the historical events and documents of our country's beginning.

Let's begin with another Trick Question...

The *Declaration of Independence* was a document written at a time when we were still subjects of the King of England and technically under English rule. Therefore, does this document have any standing at law?

The Declaration of Independence established that we have unalienable rights but how were these Rights to be secured? We read:

"That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, ***deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,***"

Here we see that the proper function of Government is to secure our unalienable rights, not to find ways to deprive the people of their rights at every opportunity. Also notice that the *just powers* of governments come from the consent of the governed. We should understand that we give our consent through our silence and through our uneducated jury vote. The jury vote is probably the most important vote we make. Most juries of today allow the government to cower and intimidate them, *in which case these juries will find someone guilty when no one was injured.*

Our ignorance is doing their job for them. Our juries of today participate in the injury of fellow Americans when there is no injured party (remembering that government, without a clear contract, cannot qualify as an injured party).

Under the law of the republic, the common law, there is no crime or claim if there is no injured party. In all crimes under the common law, there is an injured party. Government, in its *representative republican form* does not qualify as an injured party under the common law. The government as a corporate structure may qualify, but to do so it must be the holder in due course of a contract or other commercial agreement requiring the specific performance on which it is basing its claim to be injured. Furthermore, this contract or other commercial agreement must meet the requirements of a valid contract and not be obtained through fraud and deception.

This is an important point and needs additional comment. Since the government derives its *just* powers from the consent of the governed, this means that any authority or power that the Government claims to have, is an authority or power conferred upon it by we the people. The important point we need to remember here is that we cannot confer upon government any authority or power we do not possess. Let me illustrate this point. If I do not have the authority to go into your wallet, take out a hundred dollars and give it to whom I feel is needy, then I cannot confer this authority on Government for I do not possess it. For government to perform such an act, they would need to be the holder in due course of a contract with the individual. Another illustration: If I do not have the authority to target your wife, who has injured no one, who is not armed, who is holding a ten-month old infant while standing in the door way of her cabin, and shoot her in the face with a rifle, then I cannot confer this authority upon Government. (I will not forget your fate Vicki Weaver nor the fact that your murder was committed in my name).

Source of United States authority

"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)]

Continuing with the Declaration of Independence, we read:

“That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness.”

Here we read that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, which is of securing our unalienable rights, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it. Essentially our founding fathers are telling the King of England that when his government becomes destructive to the rights of life, liberty, happiness, and all the rest of the unwritten unalienable rights, then it is time for the people to throw off that government.

But by virtue of control of the *International Monetary Fund*, which is controlled by the *global elite*, of which the Royal family of England is part, and by virtue of the Royal family's control [ownership] of Social Security, England is still in control of these colonies to a great degree. It is just necessary to allow the controlled to think they are free and in control of their destiny when they are not.

Let's try to get a feel for the seriousness of what is being said in the *Declaration of Independence*. Let's do that by putting ourselves in a similar position. Suppose that we and much of the population are of the opinion that the Government of the United States (the Federal Government) is out of control. That the Federal Government is taking lands unlawfully, using our money to acquire and take over the forests and block our use of this land for camping and recreation, blocking rivers so that we cannot access the waterways without paying a fee, imposing land use rules that make the land worthless in many cases, imprisoning people unjustly, murdering citizens (Waco and Ruby Ridge) and economically enslaving people to satisfy their lust for total global control. Would we sign a document to abolish the Federal Government and declare ourselves free of their tyranny? What do you think would be the consequences if we did sign such a document? That we are going to declare ourselves free of their unconstitutional rules and regulations. That we are going to do with our land as you see fit. That we are going to do what we want so long as we do not injure another natural person or deny them their unalienable rights. Not a fantasy injury fabricated from someone's imagination like '*cutting of that tree is going to cause society a problem in the year 2050 and for that you are going to jail*'. Not this type of imaginary injury. What kind of consequences would we suffer? What consequences do we suppose that some or most of the fifty-six signers of the Declaration of Independence may have suffered?

Fifty six men of courage. *Fifty six men who did more than flap their mouths at the local bar or club and pretend to be macho.* Fifty six men who didn't sit around the bar trying to convince each other and the women present that they were tough guys. Fifty six men who didn't have to belong to a gang for they were able to stand on their own. Fifty six men of means who had made it and were doing well but wanted freedom for themselves, their families and their fellow man more than material possessions.

The following is from an old printing.

"Five signers were captured by the British as traitors, and tortured before they died. Twelve had their homes ransacked and burned. Two lost their sons in the Revolutionary Army, another had two sons captured. Nine of the 56 fought and died from wounds or the hardships of the Revolutionary War.

They signed and they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

What kind of men were they? Twenty-four were lawyers and jurists. Eleven were merchants, nine were farmers and large plantation owners, men of means, well educated. But they signed the Declaration of Independence knowing full well that the penalty would be death if they were captured.

Carter Braxton of Virginia, a wealthy planter and trader, saw his ships swept from the seas by the British navy. He sold his home and properties to pay his debts, and died in rags.

Thomas McKean was so hounded by the British that he was forced to move his family almost constantly. He served in the Congress without pay, and his family was kept in hiding. His possessions were taken from him, and poverty was his reward.

Vandals or soldiers or both, looted the properties of Ellery, Clymer, Hall, Walton, Gwinnett, Heyward, Rutledge, and Middleton. At the Battle of Yorktown, Thomas Nelson, Jr., noted that the British General Cornwallis, had taken over the Nelson home for his headquarters. The owner quietly urged General George Washington to open fire. The home was destroyed, and Nelson died bankrupt.

Francis Lewis had his home and properties destroyed. The enemy jailed his wife, and she died within a few months.

John Hart was driven from his wife's bedside as she was dying. Their 13 children fled for their lives. His fields and his grist mill were laid waste. For more than a year he lived in forests and caves, returning home to find his wife dead and his children vanished. A few weeks later he died from exhaustion and a broken heart.

Norris and Livingston suffered similar fates.

Such were the stories and sacrifices of the American Revolution. These were no wild-eyed, rabble-rousing ruffians. They were soft spoken men of means and education. They had security, but they valued their liberty more. Standing tall, straight and unwavering, they pledged:

"For the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of the Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other, our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

John Hancock is the first signature on the Declaration of Independence. Is it within you to be the first to sign such a document? There are a lot of loud mouths and people who pretend to be leaders of men. Which peace officer, who stands so ready to abuse his fellow American, would have the courage to sign such a document. Which of us who read this would write a document that embraces all people as deserving the same rights, justice, equality and declares all to be free of the unjust rules, regulations and Laws of the District of Columbia, and be the first to sign it knowing that the full force of United States Law will come searching for them? Who would stand with their 'hunting rifles' and face a modern military as our founding fathers did? As it was then, only will it ever be. It will be those men who cherish their freedom more than life itself. ***It will be those who can think of someone other than themselves.*** There are American's who will defend the constitution for the republic of the united States of America against all enemies, both foreign and domestic.

Right now the battle is to become educated, knowledgeable and develop understandings. My personal belief is that those whose power and wealth allow them to control the political landscape will engineer ***the District*** into provoking confrontation with the American people as history has shown it will do. It will continue to 'mis-educate' us through its *Department of Education*. Those military leaders who take seriously their oath to support the constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, will be weeded out. ***The District*** will then seek out military leaders and high court justices who will support its unconstitutional behavior.

"We have become the new American Slaves. But there is a revolution coming. It is a revolution of individual liberty. It will free us without violence. It will begin with the self. It will spread to the work place. It will turn our corporate masters into our servants. It will free us of governments' tyranny. The revolution will spread to all corners of the nation and at last, we shall be free." From the book *Give Me Liberty* by Gerry Spence.

Where on the face of this earth and in the history of man has any religion other than the Christians, who are the primary founders of this country, made laws that respect all religions so that we can worship as we choose? The government they formed even gives us the latitude to be an Atheist if we so choose. Yet, many of the people who populate this country and are in positions of power within our government as judges and politicians can hardly stand a reference to the Christian God. What was given to them in freedom, they are not willing to return. So, to those Christians of times past who put their lives, their families lives and their fortunes on the line, my hat is in my hands as I say thank you. And to the Christians of today who bravely stand up in opposition to a Government out of control and make their feelings known about the current state of affairs in this country, my hat is also off as I say thank you.

The Make Believe Christian

But there is another group of people, who believe themselves to be Christians, but are a big disappointment. How a nation thinks in a theological sense will also determine to a great extent, how they think politically as well as how they view the law that governs their lives. It is well understood that people want to feel secure in their lives. Knowing this, it is not a difficult task for Government to engineer a society where the people feel insecure and in fear while at the same time setting itself up as the only hope the people have for any security at all in their lives. Those people who believe the government is their only hope for peace and security have turned their backs on God and are not believers. True security and peace comes from God's law.

Those people that believe in their God and have the faith and trust our founding fathers had, already have security in their lives. Those people who have not yet acquired this will look to the State (their true god), not our heavenly Father, to care for them. These people could care less if government plunders their neighbors, and takes every cent that their neighbors earn, to provide for their beloved security. Look at the support given to property seizures. Most recently the Supreme Court upheld that the police were within their rights when they seized the car of a woman whose husband was caught having sex with a prostitute in the car. In every way possible the government defines itself as a criminal organization and sadly, many police go along with this criminal structure.

District Churches

If we pursue the term 'sovereign' we will find that a sovereign is a law maker or a law giver. This country, being one nation under God, made God the sovereign and the provider of law.

To recap a little of what we've learned... We have learned that the law of the Republic is the common law. That the common law is biblical law applied. That is to say, it is God's law applied. As individuals we have a choice of living as a pure State citizen under the God's law applied or we may choose *corporate commercial law* from a different sovereign. When we choose a different set of laws from a different sovereign, we are abandoning the law of our father in heaven, opting to choose a different God. In most cases it is *the District* of Columbia God who will provide us with an alternate set of laws. This abandonment of God might be excused when you operate through ignorance (a curable disability). But when we abandon God knowingly, it is not excusable and we should not claim to be Christian.

Everything that I've presented thus far is known by the scholars of all major denominations, whether it be the Catholics, the Protestants, the Baptists and all the rest. They also know that the church has the same option that we do as individuals. That the church may be a common law entity of the republic, existing under God's law, exempt from the corporate laws. Or the church may be a *501(c)(3)* corporate entity of the corporate United States and be subject to its laws. Most likely our church has abandoned God by becoming a corporation itself, clearly establishing that it is not a *house of God*. But they are very good at convincing their flock that they are a legitimate representative of God.

The primary function of a corporation is to amass as much wealth as possible ... to garner the big bucks. When a church becomes a 501(c)(3) tax exempt entity under District law, it is not operating on God's behalf and it will not properly teach God's law. For those of you who go to church, when the last time you heard a pastor or priest openly preach about God's law related to homosexuality, sodomy, trans-sexual behavior, same sex marriage, or any of the other deviant life styles embraced by municipal corporate law? These churches will participate with their corporate master to keep the flock unknowing, un-educated, docile, cooperative and enslaved.

Which of you has ever been in a church that informed you that the carnage that took place at Waco and on Ruby Ridge (Bonner's Ferry, Idaho) was the act of an out of control government whose actions are ones for which we are responsible and that we need to band together and take responsibility?

In practice, these are *District* churches since they exist under the laws of *the District* and they will provide you with a new God while increasing their coffers at the same time.

Most church members don't even want to be on a jury because the church does not educate them on the importance of this task. Yet, all we have to stand between us and the power of government is each other.

Answer to *trick question*:

"Does the Declaration of Independence have any standing in law since it was written when were still under English rule?" Yes, the Declaration of Independence does have standing at law, but this leads to *trick question #2*: If we were indeed under English rule at the time of the writing of the Declaration of Independence, then how did the Declaration of Independence gain standing in law?

More Declaration of Independence insights

Returning from a bit of a tangent and continuing with some more insights of the Declaration of independence.

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed." - Declaration of Independence

Here we see our founding fathers acknowledging that once we have become accustomed to being a slave and being abused by Government, we are more likely to continue than end it. I once read a 'Calvin and Hobbs' cartoon that a dear friend sent me. This cartoon said a lot about the nature of man. I wish I had permission to reprint it here but I do not. So I'll paraphrase it as best as memory allows. Calvin and Hobbs have taken their little wagon to the top of the hill and as the cartoon begins Calvin is already in the wagon and Hobbs gives it a push to get it started down the

path on the hill and then jumps in himself. As they travel down the hill the dialog goes something like this:

Calvin: "It's true Hobbs, Ignorance is bliss. Once you know things you start seeing problems everywhere. And once you see problems, you feel like you ought to try and fix them. And fixing problems always seems to require self sacrifice, personal change and doing things that aren't fun. I say phooey to that. But... If you're willfully stupid, you don't know any better so you can keep doing whatever you like. The secret to happiness is stupid short term self interest."

They have now gotten quite some ways down the trail on the hill and...

Hobbs: "WE'RE HEADING FOR THAT CLIFF!"

Calvin (covering his eyes): "I DON'T WANT TO KNOW ABOUT IT."

And off the cliff they go, crashing in a pile at the bottom. Both are lying there injured and...

Hobbs: "I'm not certain I can stand so much bliss."

Calvin: "Careful, we don't want to learn anything from this."

Unfortunately, I think this to be the caliber of many Americans but I would be pleased to find that I am wrong. Reading on in the Declaration of Independence:

“But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them [the people] under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.” - Declaration of Independence

And so they made plain that they were separating themselves from England and the Kings rule! If we were to replace 'present King of Great Britain' with 'current Government of the United States' it would read "The history of the current Government of the United States is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these States." Would this be an accurate statement?

Answer to *trick question #2* :

“If we were indeed under English rule at the time of the writing of the Declaration of Independence, then how did the Declaration of Independence gain standing in law?” The

Declaration of Independence gained standing in law under a *test of arms*. We said it and then we picked up our guns and made it stick.

What were some of the facts that supported the assertions set forth in the *Declaration of Independence*? Comment will be contained in '[' and are not part of the Declaration of Independence. "He", is a reference to the king of England.

He has refused his assent to laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good. [Here in America, our law has been perverted and we are expected as well as profiled to rubber stamp it.]

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers. [Those who have dealt with the court system recently know that the courts do not adhere to *due process of law*, remembering that corporation law is not law of the republic which our forefathers fought and died to provide.]

He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries. [Amen - In the Inslaw case a Federal Judge lost his tenure when he passed judgment in opposition to the Government's position in this case.]

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance. [Sound familiar?]

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies without the Consent of our legislature. [Do not be concerned about the military, we only want to protect you ... See Marine Questionnaire in this chapter.]

He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power. [In America they are making the police into a military. Witness the War on Drugs. Review the events of Waco and see the military hardware that was used to murder Americans.]

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation: [The corporate law of the District and becoming more prevalent, the law of the United Nations... another corporation.]

For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us: [How many of you remember the hiring of Royal Hong Kong police? Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force (MJTF); Federal Emergency Management Administration (who has the authority to mobilize the Military against civilians) not to mention the one million foreign troops on American soil.]

For protecting them, by a mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these States: [In WACO and in the case of the murder of

Vicky Weaver and 14 year old Sammy Weaver, there has not even been a 'mock trial', only a mock Congressional hearing.]

For imposing taxes on us without our consent: [Does this one need comment?]

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of trial by jury: [Now an everyday occurrence in America.]

For transporting us beyond seas to be tried for pretended offenses: [Although I know of no cases in which American citizens have been transported beyond the seas, we have certainly transported men from other countries to America to stand trial here without any process. Manuel Noriega for example. In this abduction America broke more laws, national and international getting him here that we have been able to prove he has broken. I believe that the bottom line to his case may be that he was not playing ball with the *global elite bankers*.]

For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government, and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies:

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws, and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments: [Where is the Law of the Republic and where are its courts?]

For suspending our own legislature, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever. [So that you are bound by *Corporate Statute's* in all cases whatsoever.]

He has abdicated government here, by declaring us out of his protection and waging war against us. [“I shall ask Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crises - broad executive power to wage a war against the Emergency. As great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.” - Franklin D. Roosevelt. And we all now know that *we the people* are the Emergency and at law, the enemy against who the United States Municipal Corporation has waged war. (see the previous chapter on War and Emergency Powers)]

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people. [In the Inslaw case, a case against the government, there are more than ninety people dead. In so many ways, that which negatively occurs in our society and against we the people, has been engineered by our government, its laws and its social engineering.]

He is at this time transporting large armies of foreign mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of cruelty and perfidy

scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the head of a civilized nation.

In every stage of these oppression's we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

I think this to be as far as I wish to go with our historical review. You may find it quite beneficial to read and understand the Common Law, Constitution for the united States of America, the Declaration of Independence, the Magna Carta, the Declaration of Rights, the Articles of Confederation, and the Mayflower Compact. All those important documents that should have been covered, reviewed and brought up again and again in school so that you would know and understand the origins and foundational principles of our country. By not teaching true history we have no (or very little) connection to those who sacrificed for our freedom and *republican form of government*. I doubt that you can even find an overview of *republican form of government* in school texts, as that form existed here at the birth of the *united States of America*.

TRAPS

Before I begin a discussion of traps I need to put forth a premise. I will do so by example. Suppose I managed to get a (*commercial*) law passed that made you financially responsible for my children. That you would be required to see to their medical needs and if crippled, it would be your responsibility to see to their care and maintenance, all of their lives. If such a law existed, would you not demand to have the final say in their activities and lives? Of course you would. If you have to pay the bill, then you would want *control* of what they can and cannot do, and at what age, if any, they will be allowed to do certain things.

This is exactly what you have done by participating in Social Security. By virtue of this voluntary participation, you have made the Federal Government responsible for you from cradle to grave. In your mind, you believe that you have participated in a form of insurance policy that leaves you with your freedom, but this is not the case. You are participating in a corporate government entitlement program. In this agreement with Social Security you have made the *corporate* Federal government responsible for you. In their acceptance of this responsibility they have a set of rules and regulations (laws, commercial in nature) that restrict you since you have entered into an agreement in which *they* have become responsible for you. Now, as I say this, I realize that this *corporate government* structure fails to properly inform you of the consequences and alternatives (i.e. - there was no *full disclosure* in this contract). I know that they accomplish this totalitarian control through fraud and deception.

If we American's find that we don't like being told what to do or whether we can do it at all, then we need to grow up and not make corporate government responsible for us. Those American's

who hold the status of State Citizens of the Republic only, are not subject to the following corporate statutes, whether they be Federal or State:

1. Selective service draft laws.
2. Most licensing requirements (driving, vehicle registration, most business activities can be entered without license, marriage, etc.)
3. Gun laws
4. Chemical laws
5. Tobacco laws
6. Alcohol laws
7. Traffic laws and a host of others
8. Most income tax laws (if you are a State Citizen only, and receive earnings that come from within a 'Federal Zone' you will be required to pay, I believe, a flat 30%... you need to check on this to confirm, it may change.)
9. Any law which is commercial in which no contract exists.

Number 7 seems to worry people. If a person were not subject to *traffic law*, would we not all be endangered? ***NO!*** When we American's got around on horse's and wagon's, do you think that everyone galloped their horse through town, raising a cloud of dust and causing horse manure to be slung upon the pedestrians, or causing the pedestrians to jump from the middle of the street to the wooden side walks to keep from being run down? No, of course not. Generally, everyone operated their horse and wagons in a manner so as to not cause the objection or injury of others.

But every now and then there is always the individual who has complete disregard for others or is a showoff and operates his horse inconsiderately and/or dangerously. Thus infringing on the rights of others. And I'm certain this would happen in an automobile as well, and we see it all the time even under the current commercial law. But there are laws of the republic to handle these matters. The first would be infringing upon the *rights of others*. Second would be *reckless endangerment*, which is infringing on a right. Then might come *public nuisance*, which is also infringing on a right not to be annoyed in public when you've taken reasonable action to avoid such annoyance. The point is that the law of the republic provides the means to deal with all that is a true injury or crime, it just take responsibility on our part. We must be adult enough to file a complaint and *hold each other accountable* for our actions. The corporate rules, regulations and statutes are mostly meant to *ring the cash register* (commercial law) and that is all.

Murder is a common law crime, but it has become a *commercial crime* by virtue of the bonding of the birth certificate. As mentioned in the previous chapter, a government issued birth certificate is *registered* with the *Department of Vital Statistics*. Once registered, the *name object* of the *registration* is placed into *international commerce*. In this case the *named object* is the baby. Once *registered* a bond is issued on the *birth certificate* in an amount of several hundred thousand dollars. The last figure I was able to acquire was \$630,000 and that figure is now (2008) several years old. It is probably now over a million. The bond is sold on a *securities and exchange* and is always purchased by the *Federal Reserve Bank*. Most likely you will find a

bond tracking number on the original birth certificate. If you get a *certified copy* of your birth certificate, the *bond tracking number* will most likely **not appear**.

This is only one of the mechanisms by which government supports the credit structure of the United States and finances itself in bankruptcy. Thus, if one individual kills another, murder or not, the killing terminates the *payoff* on the bond and considerable money is lost. The *birth certificate* opens the account, the *death certificate* closes the account. Therefore, even the taking of a life has become commercial. As I have previously stated, the only law you can break under the U.C.C. (Uniform Commercial Code), is impeding commerce.

Fraud is a common law crime, but it is also a commercial crime. Robbery, burglary, are common law crimes as well as commercial crimes. Most anything that involves true injury will be found to be a common law crime and there is the means within the common law to deal with it. So don't think for a second that just because an individual is not subject to a *commercial statute* there is no recourse against such an individual. The requirement is that we file a complaint. That we take responsibility for ourselves. That we don't remain children forever with mommy and daddy government there to wipe our bottom. However, even though one may not be subject to *corporate commercial law* it does not prevent the sheriff or one of his deputies from detaining you if that sheriff or deputy has observed a sovereign State Citizen endangering or infringing upon the rights of others. The county sheriff or his deputy's can certainly detain an individual while they talk to those affected to see if anyone would like to file a complaint.

If someone injures you, physically or financially, or if someone infringes upon your *rights*, then you file a complaint with the sheriff. The complaint is investigated and it then becomes a verified complaint. And according to the constitution:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury...

Therefore the complaint and investigation evidence is presented to a *grand jury* who either hands down an indictment or not. If an indictment is handed down, then a summons is issued to answer the question of liability. Or if a serious felony, like murder, an arrest warrant may be issued. This is *we the people* holding each other accountable and being responsible for ourselves as adults.

Now let's get down to you attempting to assert your rights and regain your freedom. Up front, this may upset government and many of those within who are either control freaks or simply uneducated... these two categories will cover most of them. Unfortunately there are very few honorable people in positions of *power & authority* within government. As such, the Government provides many traps to snare us in our quest to claim our rights and return our status to Sovereign State Citizen in pure form. Here are a few of them.

"reside... A foreign business corporation, for venue purposes..."]Blacks Law Dictionary], Sixth Edition

“Reside” is a strange word. I believe I can safely say that the vast majority of American’s would assign “where you live” to the term reside, but we would be wrong. **Reside** is what an individual does when he is living in a jurisdiction that is not the home of his citizenship. For example, if a Frenchman were to come to California to live, he would reside since the home of his citizenship is France and not California. The same is true for us. If we hold the status of *United States* citizen and are living in California, we would *reside* since **the District of Columbia** is the home of our citizenship as a United States citizen (*person*). It might be interesting to note that *we the people* have never given government the authority to regulate us, only commercial activity and **residents**.

"corporation. An artificial person or legal entity created by or under the authority of the laws of a state." [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

Remember that all United States citizens are *enfranchised* and as such they are a *franchise* of the corporation of 1871. That corporation, of course, is the United States corporate government in which **the District of Columbia** is its home. This makes you an *artificial person* in court. And, of course, an *artificial person* has no access to the Constitution or Bill of Rights, for these documents apply to a natural individual, not an *artificial person*.

"venue. Venue does not refer to jurisdiction at all. 'Jurisdiction' of the court means the inherent power to decide a case, whereas 'venue' designates the particular county or city in which a court with jurisdiction may hear and determine the case." [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

State Citizens, when in court on traffic matters, never admit to **driving** when they were behind the steering wheel of their car. If they were **driving** they would need a **drivers license**. Therefore, they were *traveling*, not *driving*. *Driving* is a legal term. Get used to it, there are many traps for you to fall in. And a *sovereign State Citizen* would not admit to having a **passenger** in the car. Passengers pay for their transportation, therefore if you had a passenger with you, then you were on the *public right of way* for profit and gain which is a *commercially licensed activity*. *Sovereign State Citizens* have guest seats in their car and if occupied, then a *guest* was also in the car, not a passenger. Now you better understand the need to control our education.

A State Citizen will not admit nor refer to his car as a *vehicle*. If it were a *vehicle*, it would need to be *currently registered and properly licensed*. Another way for a criminal organization to extract money from you. He refers to it as a *carriage*, or perhaps *car*, *private property*, *carriage*, or even *the conveyance of the day*, but never a *vehicle*.

The hippies were on the right track but even they didn’t understand what was occurring.

ODDS AND ENDS

What other things do I need to clean up? Oh, remember the Fourteenth Amendment which said in part:

Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof..."

Notice that the reference to **the** United States is singular... **the**. This is reference to the corporate United States. If it were a reference to the republic of the united States of America, the reference would be plural... **these united States**. And typically the letter 'U' in the corporate reference is capitalized and in reference to the republic the letter 'u' is lower case since the word "*united*" is an adjective.

Believe me, I know... the more an individual delves into this stuff, the more angry we get at the deception.

Remember that if you are born in the Republic, you are NOT subject to the jurisdiction of the corporate United States unless you **contract** to be so subjected. A **sovereign citizen** is not subject to the *jurisdiction thereof*. Consequently, he/she is not a United States citizen, but instead is a Citizen of one of the union States... the republic of the united States of America and is not **artificial**. Not until you declare yourself to be, or your parents declared you to be, by allowing the assignment of a Social Security Number. If you are wondering how to prevent the assignment of the SS# at birth, see: [No Birth Certificate, no Social Security number births](http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/births.pdf). The actual link is: <http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/births.pdf>

When we get a *birth certificate/social security number* for our new born we are publically declaring that we cannot be responsible for our child and are petitioning **the District** to be responsible. With their acceptance we have relegated ourselves to the position of baby sitter and made the government the parent. The *government parent* will then begin making decisions for **its asset** without any input or control from its natural parents. **It is thus we give away control of our children while telling everyone how much we love them.**

On the other hand, if we don't want to be responsible for our baby, it will be best to allow the *birth certificate* and *Social Security* number assignment. Then we are no longer the parent, the government is.

Also remember that Social Security is voluntary and you cannot be forced to get a card, not even if required to serve in the military (notice I said required and not volunteered). Selective Service is not constitutional. The constitution provides the means to provide an Army and Navy and Selective Service is not the method. *Selective Service is commercial*.

The Selective Service requirement is for U.S. citizens not *sovereign state citizens*. Without a social security number we also will not receive any educational grants nor any other government

hand outs. Freedom means being responsible for ourselves. It also means that we are not responsible for everyone else, for a *sovereign State Citizen* has no income tax liability at law. Remember that *sovereign State Citizens* are subject to the *positive laws* of the United States of America, not the non-positive commercial laws mentioned in a previous chapter.

In the end, you must **contract** your freedom and rights aside. And even if you do not, if you choose to remain ignorant and uninformed, the result will be the same. Social Security is your contractual nexus. You may remember Hilary Clinton's *Health Care Plan*. The idea was to *Federalize* health care and deny it to anyone not part of that corporate structure. And we keep trying to think that they are not a criminal organization and there is no conspiracy. How far we go to deceive ourselves.

If our children have no social security attachment or birth certifications, then *Child Protective Service* has no jurisdiction over the children with such status. In such a case *CPS* can only act criminally and ***kidnap the child***. Which has the potential to get them *justifiably shot*. Otherwise, the government parent does have jurisdiction and the government parent will decide what they want done with *their asset* without any input from the natural parent. If *Child Protective Service* officers attempt to take your children into custody without jurisdiction, this is kidnaping and as the lawful parent and guardian of those children, you may lawfully use what ever force ***is necessary*** to protect your family. And I already know this statement is going to upset some government officials or agents. But the same rule applies to all of us. If we don't want to be injured, then don't break the law. Breaking the law and kidnaping a child because you may be an agent of government does not set aside the act of kidnaping and the trauma that causes the child. If we assert to the common man that ***ignorance of the law is no excuse***, then the same applies to agents of the government.

For those of you who truly care about your children, I would suggest that you research the Internet and see how many children are abused, molested and disappear when taken into government custody. Before using any force, know your rights and status in the matter for you will be the one responsible, not me. I only know what I would do and I would not pretend for a moment to know what you should do. If there is anything to learn from this whole document, it is that you are responsible for you. You are responsible for your actions. The trick is to hold others accountable for their actions in an ***unjust legal system***.

The Constitution recognizes two types of tax, direct and indirect. A direct tax must be uniform. That is it cannot be different in different times and different places. That means that if you pay \$300.00 in tax, then so do I and every other male sovereign Citizen. One of the best tricks the Government has pulled off so far is to convince the female population that Government will be responsible in the same manner as males. Under the common law, the man and wife were of *one flesh*. Therefore, one tax. It now looks as though the ladies were ignorant enough to buy all the commercial law, all the way up to being ready for combat assignment, or so I'm told.

If the women are truly equal, then let's give the ladies their own Air Craft Carrier complete with a full complement of planes and female pilots. No males on board. Be EQUAL. Let's give the

ladies their own ballistic missile submarine, remembering that of the twenty-four Trident missile's on board, one of them has more energy release than all weapons discharged in World War II on all sides of the conflict. That is more energy release than all the bullets fired, all the hand grenades exploded, all the artillery discharged, all the bombs dropped (including Nagasaki and Hiroshima), on all sides and by all military forces involved. That is just one Trident nuclear missile. Be EQUAL ladies. Let's have fully ready female combat battalions.

As a matter of fact, I'm willing to allow the women to defend the United States of America for the next 200 years, the men did so for the first 200. I know I'm being absurd, hopefully I've made my point to anyone who can think. I think that females have a great deal of ability but they should not expect to be placed in *harms way* or to cause harm to others or to function in the same capacity as men. I recognize this female equality and independence agenda as a means of *divide & conquer* control that is destroying the natural bond that exists between men and women and replacing it with an un-natural role for both sexes. It really doesn't take a genius to see it, just an open mind and a willingness to look at reality. Nature, not me nor the male population, has intended women to be nurturers and care givers or care providers, not hard nosed thugs ready to beat out someone's brains in combat. Nature did not intend for females to push a button and launch a missile that will kill literally millions of people. I'm not even certain nature intended that for males.

Lady's, I'm fully aware of just how brilliant you can be. I know of the brilliance of women like Madam Curie (hope I spelled that correctly) in her development of radium. I know of her sacrifice and how her life ended. I know full well what brilliant women have contributed and I would not for one moment, lessen that contribution. But you are not men. And that, in my eyes, is good. You're not supposed to be. Some of you need to quit trying.

In the matter of indirect taxes, the Constitution provides that these must be apportioned. This means that the Federal government would levy a tax upon the States based on the census of population and the State would be required to pay the Federal government (not the private citizen) and then the state would raise the revenue from its citizens.

However, Congress has an insatiable need to spend and Constitutional taxation does not lend itself to this type of spending. To finance itself, the Federal government will issue *Treasury Bonds* and *Treasury Notes* to be purchased. We American's purchase some of them, but the vast majority are purchased by the privately owned *Federal Reserve Bank*. This is how Congress bankrupted the Federal Government to the world bankers. The United States (corporate) borrows the money it needs annually to run the federal government. It never pays on the *principal* so the debt continues to grow and grow. ***This practice will destroy these united States of America as well as the United States.*** This is the means by which the *new world order / one world government* will evolve. These bankers don't shut down the Federal Government, they just take it over and dictate its actions. We have the best Congress money can buy. And it has been bought.

President John F. Kennedy issued an executive order to begin the issuance of *Treasury Notes* as a replacement for the *Federal Reserve Note*. This would have had the effect of freeing the nation from the grasp of the *privately owned Federal Reserve Bank*. Issued in June of 1963, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated in November of the same year. Vice President Johnson was sworn into the presidency and one of his first acts was to rescind this executive order. But we are much too sophisticated to believe in conspiracy, right?

As a result we have a fiat currency (Federal Reserve Notes) and a financial system that holds the American people, and much of the world, as economic slaves.

Alcohol, tobacco and firearms were regulatory items given the Federal government by the Constitution as a means to finance the Federal government's legitimate functions, but not given to the federal government to limit access or ownership to these items, or limit use in any manner.

The Internal Revenue Service, Inc. is a privately owned corporation, created to collect revenues on behalf of the creditor of the Federal Government... the *Federal Reserve Bank*. If you should write a check for taxes, when you get it back from the bank you might notice that it has not been endorsed over to the Treasury of the United States as it would have been if it had been collected on behalf of the United States. It has been endorsed over to the *Federal Reserve Bank*.

Lawfully, the Internal Revenue Service, Inc., cannot collect taxes from a person who does not hold a Social Security Card or derive compensation from within a *Federal zone*, who is not a member of that Governmental Insurance Program, does not possess a Federal Identification Number nor is a United States Citizen. You must place yourself under the District's jurisdiction for the IRS to have lawful authority over you.

Many of our laws, rules and regulations are called 'code'. There are a couple of things I would like to say about 'code'. First, a "*code*" is language always written in such a way that average ordinary citizens who do not know the encryption and special meanings of the words cannot understand what they have read or been told. Secondly, *code* is not the law. A corporate law is the act passed by the legislative body and the *code* is the administrating agency's interpretation of the corporate law, written as a code. Such as a *vehicle code*. Codes are generally approved by the legislative body which passed the law but I doubt that even one legislator read the *Vehicle Code* before he voted to approve it. If the *vehicle code* was legislatively approved without a full reading of it, is it valid?

Additional information

The two dominant political parties (Republicans & Democrats) are trains on different tracks headed for the same destination - *New World Order / One World Government*. I refer to them as 'the current leadership'.

The current leadership of America is intent on turning this country over to 'New World Order / One World Government' of the United Nations. To accomplish this, three things had to happen.

First, Christianity had to be altered, abolished, diminished, compromised and set aside. Second, the common law had to be altered, abolished, diminished, compromised and set aside. Thirdly, the restrictions (chains) of the Constitution had to be altered, abolished, diminished, compromised and set aside.

John Calvin said that '*we must bind down the civil power with chains of the strongest possible steel*'. And so we have the Constitution for the united States of America. But, somehow, we have all but lost our Constitution, lost the law of our founding fathers and lost our faith and belief. The house is not ours, the real estate is not ours any longer, the children are not ours, the law is not ours, the currency is not ours. Now, why did this happen?

To understand what happened we need to understand that the Royal Family of England is every bit as treacherous as presented in the movie 'Brave Heart'. A fact from the Revolutionary war and not presented in the history books of public schools where we do most of our educating in America, is that during the Revolutionary War when a minister or pastor of one of the Christian Churches was captured by the British, he was summarily shot to death on the spot. Thus, the kind and understanding British (one of the most powerful promoters of New World Order / One World Government) chopped off the intellectual head of Christian America.

America was to begin paying the price for this less than one generation later. The first one hundred fifty one universities in America were founded by Christians for the purpose of training Christian leaders. But because of the above stated fact, it was not long before these universities were being turned over to 'enlightened thinkers' who promptly undermined and sabotaged schools of Christian theologies.

We now understand that the Common Law is biblical law applied. Since it comes from the Bible, it is God's law. Common Law incorporates or embodies rights inviolate to protect the people from the power of the State (this means Government in general). It is the people's protection from tyranny. And so the Common Law had to be set aside for the 'New World Order'. Since the backbone of the common law was the Christian church, these churches would also have to be corrupted and diminished.

When the churches and their respective leadership recognized what was happening, they failed to repent and forge a return to God's law. They were providing the excuse that the Lord is soon returning, it is not the responsibility of the Church, and so let the Lord take care of it. As the church leadership became corrupted, it lost its' backbone, became weakened and this resulted in the Church losing its power and influence. Without the backbone and ever watchful eye of the Church, its scholars and its Leadership, the Common Law began to fade away and along with it the Constitution has been diminished. Today's church is a 501(c)(3) tax exempt corporation trying to pretend it is a house of God.

Now, what should the Church have done then and what should they do now? They should repent, purge the church of corruption and weak leadership, and begin educating the people in doctrines of God's Law. They should become pro-active politically. They should un-incorporate

and become houses of God under the laws of the republic. Church scholars should monitor every action by Government and every measure passed by Congress. The fact that they did not do it then is at least partially responsible for the situation we have today.

Whether the Christian Church resurfaces as a major influence on behalf of God, in God's country (*one nation under God*), is yet to be determined. So far I've not seen much from the major Christian Religions except a willingness to become a part of the *Council of Churches* in the New World Order United Nations. We should all remember that there is often a difference between what the church says it represents and what it truly represents. And as the church well knows, *you cannot serve two masters.*

I've often been reminded that we are to give to Caesar what is Caesar's. To those who use this as an excuse for inaction I would remind all of you that this is **ONE NATION UNDER GOD**, and all that belongs to Caesar is clearly spelled out in the Constitution. Men of God laid down their lives and some were lost to provide a nation that is God's nation on earth, and so when we are encouraged to give to Caesar those things which clearly are not Caesar's, then these words of giving to Caesar are the words of cowards who know not how to stand up for God and it remains to be seen if God will be impressed with them. For me, I would rather be one man in a nation of MEN than to be a leader in a nation of sheep.

By 1868, the politicians were no longer afraid of the Church. Oh, they didn't bed down with every cutie that came along, as does much of our current leadership, for that would have been discovered soon enough by the Church and would cause an end to an otherwise promising political career. But for the most part, the Church was not of concern. So much so that in 1868, the fourteenth amendment was passed that created a class of citizenship by privilege rather than citizenship by birth right and the Church never made a sound.

Well that was then and this is now. Are there any churches NOW, TODAY, who wish to assert that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights? Are there any churches TODAY, that will assert that the creation of a class of citizenship which deny's to some Americans the God given unalienable rights that our founding documents state are to belong to all men, is in opposition to God's law and must be changed immediately? When you answer these two questions about your religion, you will have a much clearer understanding of your church.

We then come to the 1930's and things really began to change. The United States, along with one hundred sixty other nations, declared bankruptcy while at the same time asserting binding validity of International Merchants Law. Nineteen hundred thirty-three saw the passage of the 'Negotiable Instrument Law'. In 1934 Congress gave the Supreme Court the authority to set its own rules of procedure to become effective in 1938 when Roosevelt finished 'stacking the court' with political hacks instead of men of Law. The Court then merges LAW and EQUITY, the two basic platforms or tables of law in the United States, into something that is neither LAW nor EQUITY.

Our lower courts can no longer hear an 'at LAW' argument and as such, cannot make an 'at LAW' adjudication. And what the courts cannot hear and determine, Congress cannot pass. Therefore, Congress does not pass law. It implements PUBLIC POLICY or CIVIL LAW. That is why we have measures like HR666, the infamous crime bill of 1995. HR meaning House Resolution. If Congress was passing a LAW, it would have been designated H666.

Since Congress cannot pass law, and the courts cannot determine law, we now know why there is so much LAWLESSNESS.

Marriage and Children

Review the definition of license in the box at right:

This definition apply's to all licenses, including the *marriage license*. By applying for the *license* to marry, you are admitting that you do not have ***the right*** to marry the person you intend. By virtue of the *license*, you are entering into an ***illegal*** activity. How do we know it is ***illegal***? Read the definition... *permission to do what is illegal*.

License. The permission by competent authority to do an act which, without such permission, would be illegal, a trespass, a tort, or otherwise not allowable.

[People v. Henderson, 391 Mich. 612, 218 N.W.2d 2, 4 - Blacks Law Dictionary, sixth edition]

When you obtain a *marriage license* and then marry, you are entering into a three party criminal partnership. In this partnership there is you, your spouse and the corporate government who is the *competent authority* that issued the license. It is the job of you and your spouse to collect and accrue assets in this partnership and it is the job of the government to make the rules and regulations related to this corporate ***licensed*** activity. You and your spouse are to discover the rules and adhere to them as best as possible, being appropriately abused when you fail to do so.

Men, if they don't know it going in, will often discover that corporate divorce proceedings are structured to disproportionately abuse the men to the benefit of the women. For the most part, women are not held accountable in the relationship. Most, if not all, assets will be awarded to the female and the male will be required to pay alimony and child support for years to come. The court will not take into consideration that the female may have, and quite often does, engineer the failure of the marriage. Most men are divorced a long time before the female makes a formal filing with the court. The process is set up so that a woman can briefly marry, have a couple of kids and then divorce, leaving her with no marital responsibility. Free to do whatever she likes so long as the children are cared for. But if they are not, the government will take them over. However this is most likely to leave her without income so she generally provides for the children, at least enough to keep government from taking them.

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

By going to the State and asking for permission to marry, couples are acknowledging that they do not have any right to get married under God's Law, a marriage over which God is Sovereign. By virtue of applying for a *license* they are asking for a marriage under the commercial laws of the corporate State in which the application for license was submitted and over which the State is sovereign. After all, if the couple had the right to get married under God's Law, why would they go to the State and ask for permission? Possession of a license is the prima facie evidence that the holder of the license is engaged in a privileged (and illegal) regulated activity, with no inherent right to engage in such activity.

Unknown to many, you can marry without a *marriage license*. It is a marriage under the law of the republic, the common law and is termed a *common law marriage*. There has been much effort to demonize this marriage by government in general. I remember well how the public school system teachers condemned the *common law marriage* when I was young and in school. Yet it is a marriage in the eyes of God, not a corporation. The *common law marriage* may be formalized through ceremony, or it may be as simple as a man and woman agreeing to be man and wife, writing it in the family Bible and then cohabiting as man and wife. Births and deaths are also recorded in the family Bible and this is a *legal record*.

But this type of marriage places a much larger burden of responsibility on the woman than does the *corporate licensed* marriage. In the *common law marriage*, she must be responsible for her choice. There are no unfair corporate laws to abuse the male in this marriage. She needs to find a man of good character who truly loves her and then she must conduct herself in a manner to maintain that love and devotion, which means that her responsibilities are different and greater than under a corporate licensed marriage. In a corporate licensed marriage the female can put forth very little effort in maintaining the love and devotion of her husband, and if the male doesn't like it, she can divorce him and viciously use the laws of the corporate structure in her revenge against this *animal*. I suspect that the vicious and vindictive nature that most (not all) women possess may be one of the reasons that they were not originally given the right to vote,

"The family court system and the current policies of the United States Government, in conjunction with individual and collective States' policies, have led the charge to criminalize men and create a series of debtor's prisons out of the current prison system, all as a result of unfair and illegal child support awards and collection practices.

In a country where the family court system is blatantly gender biased, what else can one expect. Custody is awarded to the Mother 96% of the time, based on the Census Bureau's latest figures. Fathers only receive custody 4% of the time. Yet in the 4% of cases where the mother does not have custody, 94% of the time it is the women who are behind in child support. There are even a number of cases where the father was awarded custody, but no child support liability was foisted by the Court upon the non-custodial mother. Fathers are behind in child support in a much smaller percentage. And the non-custodial Fathers are not only rewarded by the Court with a child support obligation, other costs also become the Father's liability, such as the ex-wife's legal fees. All this in a country where divorce filings are almost unilaterally done by women, 94% of divorce filings are initiated by women." - Acquired from an Internet search

and it may also be the reason that those who wish control have successfully endeavored to secure the right to vote for women. This is an opinion of course, not fact.

For the man, his responsibilities within the marriage mostly remain the same. He still has to earn a living for the family, provide insurance and medical coverage, provide a home, food, heat, provide for the physical existence of the family. But now he has a partner. The difference for the male comes when 94% of the women file for divorce. She is without the laws of the corporate structure to vindictively abuse the male she is leaving.

Question: Do you think it might be possible that divorce filings by men in *common law* marriages might be significantly lower by virtue of the fact that women must work at maintaining the love and devotion of their men and that the men would respond by filing for divorce much less often? I mean, they only file 4% of the time in a corporate licensed marriage and I would be willing to bet it would drop to under 1% in common law marriages. I'll bet the same would be true for filings by women, that they too would drop dramatically in *common law marriages*.

If a woman did not want to marry without a *corporate license*, I would walk away from the relationship for there is no commitment. In a committed relationship, the couple is dependent and fully trusting upon each other, not a corporation and if either does not have that trust and commitment, then the other person (generally the male) is simply a commodity to be used and discarded at a later date. Remember ladies, 90% plus divorce filings are by women. The *commercial laws related to marriage* support the concept that women are a victim. And all wise males should avoid a victim mentality, it will snake bite you!

By virtue of the societal engineering accomplished by the structure of corporate laws, the American woman has become the 'I quit' woman as soon as things are not going the way she would like. Ladies, why don't you become truly equal and be responsible for your choices? If you no longer wish to be married, that's fine. Leave and take care of yourself. If you can't provide for your children then leave them with your ex-husband, or with your parents, or with his parents, or with a friend. The fact that you are so un-educated, un-skilled, un-desirable that no other male wishes to provide for you and your children, is of your own doing.

Being equal means being responsible for your choices. Your choice to not be educated, to not be skilled, to not be of sufficient quality that another male of substance would find you attractive. **You have not failed until the day you stop being responsible for your choices and all that occurs in your life and begin to blame others.** Then you have failed. I'm sorry to say it, but by all appearances that begins for most (not all) women at a very early age.

Ladies, it is time to set aside your *victim status* and be feminine. Time to make your man feel that he is your hero. That's all they truly want from the woman they love. To feel as her protector and hero. Men are so simple. Try to manipulate and argue with him and he will go the wrong way, knowing it's the wrong way. On the other hand, rub your lithe soft sexy body against him, tell him what a hero he is and hint that your charms are waiting for him after the lights go out, and he will move mountains to make you happy. Try to *bulldog* him and you will

lose every time unless he has given up his testicles, and then you probably will not want him or at least you will have no respect for him.

Being totally committed to each other is not what current government leadership desires, for it lessens their control greatly. Giving un-equal power to one gender in divorces is a means of societal engineering. It destroys the natural bond that develops when two people are dependent upon each other. A similar tactic is used by giving children the power to call in *child protective services* to abuse the evil mommy and daddy. Many times now I have seen parents quit their parenting job rather than go head to head with this all powerful government agency. Again, it is societal engineering. If the parents fail to do as required by the agency, the children are taken away and placed in foster homes for which mommy and daddy must pay. The whole thing is a *controlling commercial racket*, no different than any organized crime operation.

Misc

In American common law, citizenship is entirely different in that the citizens are collectively sovereign as well as individually sovereign.

State Citizens are subject to the Common Law, not commercial law and not statutory law that is non-positive law. That is, until they contract. The contract is a very powerful tool and our educational process' do not adequately train us in its power and uses. The government, since they control our education, know that we have virtually no knowledge of this and they use it to their advantage as discussed thus far in this document.

The People, as in *we the people*, have never given the legislature the authority to regulate them, only the authority to regulate residents and commercial activities.

Slaughter House Cases

The following indented text is taken from Modern Constitutional Law by Chester Antieau.

Particular 'rights, privileges, and immunities'.

In the Slaughter House cases of 1873, the court [Supreme] ruled that freedom of enterprise was not a Fourteenth Amendment Privilege or Immunity. Such basic and fundamental rights that do not owe their existence to the Federal Government are not privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. It then went on to rule that only rights owing their existence to the United States government would henceforth be treated as privileges or immunities "of citizens of the United States". Notwithstanding the negative ruling, the opinion of the majority of the Court clearly establishes that rights will be Fourteenth Amendment privileges and immunities when they "owe their existence to the Federal government, its national character, its Constitution or its laws." It illustrated such privileges and immunities by reference to its previous holding in *Crandall v. Nevada* which was now said to recognize that freedom to travel to the capital of the United States

and, indeed, throughout the United States, is a privilege or immunity of national citizenship. The four dissenters in the Slaughter-House Cases, Chief Justice Chase, Justices Bradley, Field and Swayne, all urged that the Fourteenth Amendment privileges and immunities clause protected a person in all "the fundamental rights, privileges, and immunities which belong to him as a free man and a free citizen."

Eventually, of course, the "fundamental rights" were to be protected against state negation by the vehicle of the due process clause - rather than the privileges and immunities clause - of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The limitative interpretation of the Slaughter-House Cases majority has prevailed in defining Fourteenth Amendment privileges and immunities. Since it has been concluded that the following did not owe their existence to the federal government (either because they long antedated in time the existence of that government or because they belonged to man qua man), it has been held that they were **not rights, privileges or immunities of national citizenship**:

- (a) the right to assemble generally,
- (b) the right of trial by jury in civil cases in state courts,
- (c) the right to a grand jury indictment in state criminal prosecutions,
- (d) the right to bear arms, and
- (e) the right to vote in state elections.

Previous to the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment later the same year, the United States Supreme Court in 1868 had ruled that the right of travel throughout the United States was a right, privilege or immunity of national citizenship. It went on to rule that it could not be interfered with by a State seeking to impose upon all travelers a capitation tax of one dollar.

This right of travel within the country has ever since been accepted as a most important right of national citizenship.

In 1959, over the dissents of Justices Black and Douglas, the Supreme Court upheld a uniform act for the extradition of witnesses in state criminal proceedings. The Florida Court had held the act violative of the right to ingress and egress - the privilege of national citizenship. The Supreme Court explained:

"However, even if broad scope be given to such a privilege, there is no violation of that privilege by the Florida statute. Florida undoubtedly could have held respondent within Florida if he had been a material witness in a criminal proceeding within that State. And yet this would not have been less of a limitation on his claim of the right of ingress and egress than is an order to attend and testify in New York.

There are restrictions on the exercise of the claimed constitutional right. One such restriction derives from obligation to give testimony."

Justices Black and Douglas said in dissent:

"The right of free ingress and egress within the country and even beyond the borders is a basic constitutional right It has often been called a right or privilege of national citizenship as such it is protected against state action by the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment (There is) no power on the part of a State to pick a citizen up and forcibly remove him from its boundaries where there is no basis of extradition."

The O'Neill Case is the first ruling by the Court indicating that this right, privilege and immunity is subject to some controls by the states. Conceivably there will be other reasonable restraints, such as necessitated by the protection of the public health which will be upheld.

The right to travel around the world does not owe its existence to the federal government and international travel certainly antedated the existence of the national government. This right, then, under the Slaughter-House orthodoxy, cannot be called a right, privilege or immunity of national citizenship. It has been referred to, rather, by the courts as a due process right, and a natural right.

On the other hand, the right to a United States passport would not exist but for the federal government and this may properly be referred to as a right, privilege or immunity of national citizenship. As the case law referred to earlier in the chapter on the right to travel indicates, the right is not deemed absolute and can be subjected to reasonable controls by the federal government.

The right to vote in a federal election is a privilege and immunity of national citizenship for, obviously, unless there was a federal government there would be no federal elections and no right for any one to vote in such elections. So, too, the right to be secure in the custody of a federal marshal is a Fourteenth Amendment privilege and immunity for the same reason. Another such right is the privilege of informing federal officers of violations of federal laws. The right to assemble to petition federal officials or to discuss national laws and policies is also a right, privilege, or immunity of national citizenship.

A court of appeals has ruled that the right to sit on a federal jury is so characterized the right. Another federal court of appeals has held that a school board under federal court order to desegregate had "a federal right to be free from direct and deliberate interference with the performance of the constitutionally imposed duty." The court added: "The right arises by necessary implication from

the imposition of the duty as clearly as though it had been specifically stated in the Constitution."

All personal rights arising out of federal statutes were said in the Slaughter-House Cases to qualify as national privileges and immunities since it is clear they would not have existed but for the federal government. Later decisional law has verified the forecast. The United States Supreme Court has ruled that the right to settle on lands under the federal homestead acts is such a privilege and immunity. The Court further held that this right could under federal statute be protected against individuals who would interfere with the right.

The Fourteenth Amendment does not create the rights, privileges and immunities of national citizenship. They existed from the organizations of our national government. The Supreme Court has always understood this, as *Crandall v. Nevada* well illustrates. That case, it must ever be remembered, was decided before the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment. The Fourteenth Amendment only made it clear that these rights could be protected even from state interference - all along it was accepted that previous to the Amendment Congress had the power to create such rights, privileges and immunities and safeguard them from private action. Since the national privileges and immunities do not owe their existence at all to the Fourteenth Amendment, any limitations upon Congressional protective power (such as is customarily thought to flow from the "state action" concept) deemed implicit in the Fourteenth amendment are utterly inapplicable in assessing power of Congress where national rights, privileges and immunities are concerned. The Congress has certain power to vindicate them and protect them against all negation, by state or individual acts.

This ends the text on Particular rights, privileges, and immunities from the book *Modern Constitutional Law* by Antieau.

Let's examine this ruling just a bit.

"In the Slaughter House cases of 1873, the court [Supreme] ruled that freedom of enterprise was not a Fourteenth Amendment Privilege or Immunity. Such basic and fundamental rights that do not owe their existence to the Federal Government are not privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

As can be seen, the basic and fundamental right of *freedom of enterprise* is not a *privilege* or *immunity* of the United States citizen (a United States citizen being a citizen of the jurisdiction of *the District of Columbia*. So their challenge was to find a way to set aside *freedom of enterprise* and make that activity subject to their jurisdiction. Enter the *license*. Almost all business are *licensed* with either a City, County or State, and sometimes even the Federal Government. We might remember that Cities, Counties and States are *municipal corporations*, gaining their

existence in the laws of *the District of Columbia*, making them an *entity of the District* and its jurisdiction. So much for freedom of enterprise.

By virtue of the *license* [a contract or commercial agreement], the owner of the business has made a conscious choice not to engage in *freedom of enterprise*. If one wished to engage in *freedom of enterprise*, he (or she) would not license their business. Then they would not be subject to the corporate jurisdiction (if they properly and timely challenge this jurisdiction in court proceedings). Unless, of course, the court is blatantly criminal.

The problem most people will face is that the government had taken the position that “*United States citizens*” do not have a *right* to engage in *freedom of enterprise*. This, by virtue of their status as subjects of the corporate jurisdiction and corporate laws of *the District of Columbia*. The subjection of most people to this jurisdiction was accomplished through a contract that was acquired by fraud and deceit by virtue of their control over our educational curriculum through the *Department of Education of the District of Columbia* and the total lack of *complete disclosure*. Then, on top of this they don’t tell us it’s a contract, that we will be subjecting ourselves to a *foreign jurisdiction (District of Columbia)*, that we will be subject to an overwhelming body of corporate laws, that because of this contractual agreement we will not have access to the protections of our Constitution and Bill of Rights. On and on the fraud and deceit goes.

I’m certain that a good case and argument can be made. The problem is that we cannot predict how far our legal system will go in its criminal behavior. It will depend on the individual judge. You must begin by making your case with the *administrating agency*. Assert your position and knowledge, then demand a response in a given period of time.

For example, you might be charged with a failure to *license your dog*. Remembering the definition of license... *permission to do what is otherwise illegal*, you might compose a letter stating this definition from Black’s Law Dictionary and assert that you do not believe it is illegal to own a dog. That the *county government* is attempting to act under *color of law* and is doing so *fraudulently* in a scheme to extract money from you. Then you might state that *if it is illegal to own a dog you wish to see a copy of the law which makes dog ownership illegal*. You might also include the tenants of the *Clearfield* decision mentioned earlier and state that *if county government is the holder in due course of a contract or commercial agreement they are to provide a copy of this agreement, signed by you, within XX number of days. And if no such document can be produced, then there is no obligation. Further, if county government disagrees it is to do so in writing by someone with the legal authority to make such contest within XX number of days, otherwise county government will have entered into tacit admission that dog ownership is not illegal and not an activity that must be licensed.*

This is why it is so important that we learn to express ourselves on paper. Without this skill, we are at great disadvantage.

In the final analysis, if we do not try, we cannot win. I'm certain that some of us will have to stick our necks out so that those honorable people 'on the inside' and 'on the outside' can lend their support to our efforts.

As you can see, there is much to be learned from a review of the Slaughter House cases. You might want to read these if you are planning on returning your status to *Sovereign State Citizen*. Reading and writing is seldom necessary if one plans on remaining enslaved.

Twining v. New Jersey: The rights of State Citizens and State Citizens only, are incapable of impairment by legislation or judicial decision. State Citizens may pass freely from State to State, vote in Federal Elections [without voter registration], enter upon public lands and be kept from violence when in the custody of U.S. Marshal(s).

A Federal Area?

The Public Salary Tax Act of 1939 imposed an income tax on Federal employees or anyone working or living in a *Federal area*.

The Buck Act of 1940 allowed States to create new definitions for the terms:
within the State ... and
within this State

The new definitions allowed the corporate STATE OF YOUNAMEIT to be classified as an area within the United States - a Federal area. The result is that the Buck act paved the way for states to become Corporations, municipal in nature, under the laws of *the District of Columbia*. The STATE OF CALIFORNIA is a municipal corporation that is entirely separate from the California Republic.

What do we know about the ZIP code? Who knows what "ZIP" stands for? Virtually none of us? Thank you public education, main stream media, and church leadership. ZIP = **Z**one **I**mprovement **P**lan. What zone? A *Federal Zone* of course. Having a ZIP code attached to you is evidence that you *reside* within a *Federal Zone*, which is the same as a *Federal area* and are subject to Public Salary Tax Act of 1939, along with all the other *corporate laws* of *the District*. Your enslavement leaves no stone unturned. Pay attention you military types for someday it is quite likely you will be called on to enforce this unconstitutional corporate law on the American people.

Employment

Most businesses are *licensed* by a municipal corporation, either the city, county, State or Federal. The State, county and city municipal corporate structures gain their existence in laws that are traceable to *the District*, making them all entities of that jurisdiction. Remembering that *the District* is not inclusive (within the Republic of the united States of America), it is exclusive (without the Republic of the united States of America), meaning that the State Citizen is *foreign* to that jurisdiction. Therefore, when a State Citizen goes to work for a business licensed by a

municipal corporation, he will not have a social security number to provide for tax withholding. This will probably make the employer nervous. What the State Citizen needs to do is to file a [W8 \(http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/w8.pdf\)](http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/w8.pdf) form with the employer. The W8 is an IRS form available from the IRS web site and it is a certificate of *foreign status*. Keep in mind that as we the people become more knowledgeable, they often change things. So always be prepared for this. What I am suggesting here is that it may be possible that the "W8" form has been changed to a different form number, or that its structure may be different than the form linked above. The form is a *certificate of foreign status*, and knowing this should help find the form if it has changed. However, since the above linked form is of an IRS origin, I would think it would remain valid.

Remember that the business is licensed in a jurisdiction *foreign* to the republic, or looking in reverse, the State Citizen is *foreign* to the jurisdiction in which the business is licensed. Fill out the W8 and file it with your employer. This is the paper he needs should the IRS want to know why he is not withholding any income tax for you as a State Citizen.

Whenever we fill out and sign any form, we need to be very careful what we declare on the form. Sign your full First Middle: Last names with the middle and last name separated by a colon. I know this to be proper form for a State Citizen and I believe the reasoning is that the first and middle names belong to you. However, the surname or family name is not yours exclusively.

If we fill out a form in which our name appears, and it is not spelled in proper upper and lower case with the last name separated by a colon, then this name is not yours, it is your [strawman](http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/TradeNameBinder.pdf) (<http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/TradeNameBinder.pdf>). This is your *alterego* which was created with the government issued birth certification and which you can find out more about by following the blue link above. If it is necessary for you to sign such a form, sign your name properly, with upper and lower case lettering, separating your last name with a colon and then under your signature include the words as agent. This is evidence that the person name is not you, but you are acting on his/her behalf. On legal compositions of your own, you might conform your signature to Title 28, Section 1746-1.

Title 28, Section 1746

(1) If executed without the United States: "I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date). (Signature)".

(2) If executed within the United States, its territories, possessions, or commonwealths: "I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (date). (Signature)".

Don't try to trick anyone. Make certain you are a State Citizen and not holding a social security number. Make certain you have renounced your United States citizenship. Participation in Social Security makes the government responsible for you. Failing to pay your tribute for this protection will upset someone and they will come after you. They don't like tricky sheep.

There are organizations out there that lend support. There is also *on line* support for those wishing to know more about State Citizenship, one such on line service may be found by clicking [here](http://www.state-citizen.org/) (<http://www.state-citizen.org/>). Although many American's died to provide **freedom**, being free has become very difficult in the United States. And part of that lies in our lack of knowledge about what freedom entails. Telling ourselves we are free when we are not, only deceives us and endangers those who actually understand what is going on. We should all be embracing (***and protecting***) those people who put themselves on the line to try and be free. And we can *protect* them with our vote as a jury member and by educating other jury members in the *deliberation room*. Of course you will have to lie to get on the jury, the *honorable legal system* certainly does not want jurors who are informed and educated.

Real Estate

Allodium. Land held absolutely in one's own right, and not of any lord or superior; land not subject to feudal duties or burdens. An estate held by absolute ownership, without recognizing any superior to whom any duty is due on account thereof. [Blacks Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

No feudal duty or any duty at all is due on land held in *allodium*. That means taxes. An old book titled "Modern Real Estate Practices", whose publisher and date I failed to get at the time, informed me that all property in the united States of America was set up to be held in allodium. The title to property held in allodium is the 'Land Patent'. When property is owned in allodium some interesting things happen. First, the owner owes no taxes (An estate held by absolute ownership, without recognizing any superior to whom any duty is due on account thereof). Secondly, Eminent domain does not apply. Thirdly, there are no police powers over the land which means that you can cut trees, kill rats, drain wet lands, and build a home without the permission of the government. This means no permits or fees.

To own property in allodium I believe it must first be free and clear of any liens or debt. Probably the most visible people to still own property in allodium would be the Amish. This is a substantial reference to [allodial title](http://mhkehn.tripod.com/LandPatent.pdf) (<http://mhkehn.tripod.com/LandPatent.pdf>).

A FLY IN THE OINTMENT

As we can clearly see, the foundations for New World Order have been laid. There is a fly in the ointment of their plans however. It is the true Christian State Citizen (not the make believe one who wants to be on both sides of the fence at the same time). Why is one Christian State Citizen a threat? Because in Christianity, the individual believer ALWAYS holds the ultimate position of a sovereign superior to the state! So long as such a belief survives in the heart and mind of one man, that man constitutes a danger to the New World Order that is unpredictable.

The way back to a prosperous country with law and order is to restore **Lawful Civil Authority** by termination of all emergencies in progress and a return the Common Law with a restoration of the common law courts supported by a rebirth of churches of God rather than *corporate churches*

of the almighty dollar. This will serve to end the *social engineering* whose object is to destroy America and freedom.

To the policeman who is intent on the arrest of a Citizen without a proper warrant or without just cause (that is a breach of the peace or a felony committed in the presence of the officer) I put this question. What is going to occur when you encounter someone who is willing to die to protect and defend his constitution against all enemies, ***both foreign and domestic***. Is willing to die to defend his freedom and rights that so many others have died to secure? Are you willing to die to take them away unlawfully? Are you going to use violence against someone, who just wants his freedom, a man who has, prior to this point in time, injured no one. I ask this because an arrest is very serious. I have noted that there have been far too many people, who have suddenly died shortly after arrest. People who didn't have a mark on them when arrested but whose bodies were somewhat bruised when examined after their deaths. I don't have to tell you police that there are many who are corrupt among your ranks, you already know this. In so many cases and ways, the American policeman has become as un-feeling and un-caring as those whom he is to protect us from. Think how much different your job might be if you were not operating under *corporate commercial law*. There was a reason that the English established the *common law* as the *law of the land* when they forced King John's signature to the Magna Carta. It was because of the justice it provided as opposed to the injustice of the king's law, which we would equate to corporate law.

But even on a lesser scale, you may be the owner of a restaurant and if you are arrested for any length of time this could certainly hurt your business if not permanently cripple it. You may very well lose everything if you were to be arrested for a period of a few days. If this arrest was done without due process of law then?

Therefore the officer who operates outside of due process of law is operating on very shaky ground and some day he may be held accountable in a manner he did not expect. Those who act to recover their rights and freedom are doing so for all of us, including the police and other legal professionals who mostly do not have a clue.

**We are all on this ship called America together,
either we learn to sail together
or we sink together**

Only the stupid allow wedges to be driven in between them so that they fight each other rather than the enemy. All war is deception.

Due Process

"The contest for ages has been to rescue liberty from the grasp of the executive power."
University of Pennsylvania Law Review, vol. 75, pg. 491, April 1927

"False Imprisonment: Forcefully to deprive a man of freedom to go wheresoever he may is clearly a trespass. False imprisonment was indeed one of the first trespasses recognized by the Common Law." Street's Foundation of Legal Liability, vol. 1, pg. 12

"The infraction of personal liberty has ever been regarded as one of the greatest injuries. The injuries to liberty are principally termed "false imprisonment, or malicious prosecutions." Joseph Chitty, Esq., The Practice of the Law, vol. I, Chap. II, p. 47, London, 1837

"False imprisonment is a wrong akin to the wrongs of assault and battery, and consists in imposing, by force or threats, an unlawful restraint upon a man's freedom of locomotion." Thomas Cooley, Treatise on the Law of Torts, vol. 1, 4th Ed., Sec 109, pg. 345; Meints v. Huntington,, 276 F. 245, 248(1921)

"The general rule of damages in cases of false imprisonment is that the person causing a wrongful imprisonment is liable for all the natural and probable consequences thereof. The plaintiff is entitled to recover damages for what the party wrongfully did. In Murphy v. Countiss, 1 Harr. (Del.) 143, in an action for trespass, assault and battery, and false imprisonment, the court held that the plaintiff could recover, not merely for the time the constable was bringing him to jail, but for the whole period of his imprisonment. And in Mandeville v. Guernsey, 51 Barb (N.Y.) 99, the court said: "The arrest being wrongful, the defendant is liable for all the injurious consequences to the plaintiff which resulted directly from the wrongful act." Knickerbocker Steamboat Co. v. Cusack, 172 Fed. 358, 360-61 (1905)

The foregoing is a brief introduction to False imprisonment. It is presented as a reminder that an officer of our government, acting outside the requirement of due process of law, is engaging in an act of war on behalf of the municipal corporation of which he is an officer. And further that such an action can bring with it a consequence. Has anyone yet realized that if officers were acting in accordance with due process of law that their lives would be on the line a lot less often and that they would probably have a much happier life and better attitude?

Due process - "The law governing this case is elementary. Except for a breach of the peace committed in his presence, or when he has the reasonable ground to believe that the person arrested is a felon or is about to commit a felony, a police officer has no authority to arrest without a warrant." Cook v. Hastings, 150 Mich. 289, 114 N.W. 71, 72 (1907)

Due Process - "33. What constitutes a lawful arrest. -- As a general proposition, no one can make a lawful arrest for a crime, except an officer who has a warrant issued by a court or magistrate having the competent authority." Treatise on the Limitations of Police Power, (1886) Sec. 33

Due Process - "Under our system we have repeatedly decided, in accordance with constitutional principles as construed everywhere, that no arrest can be made without warrant except in cases of felony, or in cases of breaches of the peace committed in the presence of

the arresting officer. This exception, in cases of breaches of the peace, has only been allowed by reason of the immediate danger to the safety of the community against crimes of violence." *Yerkes v. Smith*, 157 Mich. 557, 122 N.W. 223, 224 (1909), citing: *Robison v. Miner*, 68 Mich. 549, 557-58, 37 N.W. 21, (1888)

Due Process - "In 6 C.J.S., Arrest, sec. 4, p. 576 et seq., we find the general rule stated as follows: 'The warrant must, at the time of arrest, be in the possession of and with the person purporting to act there under or of one with whom he is acting in conjunction. * * * Accordingly, where the warrant is at the officer's house some distance from the scene of the arrest, or in the hands of another who is not at the scene of arrest, or in the central office of a city detective bureau, the arrest is unlawful.'" *Alexander v. Lindsey*, 230 N.C. 663, 55 S.E.2d. 470, 474 (1949)

Due Process - "It is the duty of an officer or other person making an arrest to take the prisoner before a magistrate with reasonable diligence and without unnecessary delay; and the rule is well settled that whether the arrest is made with or without a warrant, an action for false imprisonment may be predicated upon an unreasonable delay in taking the person arrested before a magistrate regardless of the lawfulness of the arrest in the first instance." *Mullins v. Sanders*, 189 Va. 624, 54 S.E.2d 116, 120 (1949), citing, 22 Am. Jur., False Imprisonment, sec 20, p. 366; 35 C.J.S., "False Imprisonment," Sec. 30, 31, pp. 545-547.

Due process of law requirements are contained in the Common Law and their purpose is to protect *we the people*. Learn, Learn, Learn, Learn, Learn! I'm sorry, but we can't be stupid and free at the same time.

Those who have read this text to this point understand that income tax liability has been accomplished through fraud and deception. It has been the municipal corporation who has controlled our educational curriculum for many decades and has made certain that our curriculum did not contain any education fully explaining United States citizenship and State Citizenship. Nor did it educate us in *contract law*. Our public education did not detail the creation and operation of municipal corporate government and how we become subject to corporate law. Did not contain any education explaining how government engineers *emergencies* and passes Acts of War pursuant to that emergency which makes U.S. citizens an identified enemy of the United States and suspends many provisions of our constitution. Did not contain education that explained that Congress committed a treason by mortgaging our entire country to the New World Order bankers for ink on paper [Federal Reserve Notes] and that this action is destroying the sovereignty of the republic of the united States of America.

Knowing what you now know, could you vote to put someone into jail for failure to file an income tax return? Who are the real crooks?

"No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury ..." ARTICLE FIVE: United States Constitution

In this, we the people retained to ourselves the power and authority to hold each other accountable, that we were not giving that power to government for our forefathers knew that if the government had the authority, it would become abusive and corrupt. It is time to quit putting people in jail who do not belong there and time to start putting those who have participated (and continue to participate) in the theft of our freedom and country into jail. Do you brave police officers, attorney's and prosecutors think you could do your jobs and begin to protect the American people who depend on you. I know that un-doing it will take time, but the alternative is ultimately a revolution in which many will die. Do you care? Do you care enough to do your jobs?

Review

We now know that with the passage of the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933 we are the enemies of the United States in statute law. That this act, without the declaration of ***emergency*** and the ***rule of necessity***, is an un-constitutional measure. That this ***1933 emergency*** has been kept alive for 75 years (now 2008). That layer upon layer of unconstitutional corporate law has been passed, all pursuant to and deriving their authority from this unconstitutional act or similar *emergency legislation*. That virtually all the problems we are facing in this nation, whether it be loss of our water for agriculture, whether it be loss of access to our timber for an owl, whether it be property use laws that have in many cases made our properties worthless, whether it be property use laws that have sent us to jail, whether it be warrant-less searches, whether it be unlawful arrest and/or police brutality, whether it be destruction of our industrial base, whether it be engineered economic crises, whether it be the choking out of small business in favor of the corporate structures, whether it be environmental laws that cause us more harm than benefit, whether it be schools that no longer educate, whether it be sending someone to jail who has harmed no one, whether it be transferring your country and military over to the United Nations, whether it be the misuse of our military, whether it be the killing of innocent Americans and American children, whether it be the killing of other peoples whose leaders don't wish to subject their country to our *new world order*, whether it be the unjust and unlawful actions of courts, whether it be assessing your property at a value of their choosing for purposes of property tax increase - what ever it might be that comes from government in the arena of laws, rules and regulations, - they either all come from war powers granted to the government under ***war and emergency conditions*** or they are accomplished through fraud and deception. All of which are in the imagination of the politicians who are selling you into slavery.

If you feel these unconstitutional laws are necessary, not for yourself, but to control your neighbor, then, not only do you secure enslavement for yourself, but also for all those you pretend to love. You cannot be free when you are not willing to give freedom to your fellow man. Only an idiot opens this can of worms.

Being free means being responsible for yourself, not your neighbor. And if you cannot give freedom, then neither can you have it. So the question is, are you a sheep or are you a ram? Are you a person who needs mommy and daddy government to take care of you all your life (the liberal mind), or are you mature enough to be responsible for yourself and take care of yourself

and your family without handouts from government (the conservative mind). Government engineers the crises, and then jumps in to save you from the crises they have engineered, then implements the solution they have already planned. And you think you couldn't make it without them. Well, you can, and for many years we American's did, by depending on each other - but we only succeed if we try. Those of us who do not try become a danger to the freedom of those of us who do try and value our freedom.

I pay significant taxes as many Americans do, and like many Americans, I have paid these taxes to expand and protect my freedoms above all other reasons for which I pay these taxes. Not to abolish, eliminate or remove my freedoms at every opportunity.

As is easily seen, this whole scenario, of making ordinary Americans an enemy of the United States in statute law, of creating a second class of citizenship so that Americans may be abused within the corporate law structure, is a fraud and a felony. I say this because the government, through our *Department of Education*, controls the curriculum of our public schools which has never revealed the preceding facts, at least to those of my generation and I doubt they have revealed them to any generation currently living. It's a fraud because the crises and emergencies on which these un-constitutional acts were predicated no longer exist and probably never did. It is a fraud and a felony because it is part of a plan to destroy and undermine the Constitution for the united States of America and bring this country under new rule as well as transfer all ownership (and control) to the predatory world bankers.

This fraud is the reason that we now have the Department of Treasury, The Department of Transportation, Department of Defense, etc. Corporate department after corporate department after corporate department. At one time you had a united States Treasury, not the Treasury Department. No agencies of the Republic are left to serve the people and you wonder why the workers in government agencies generally treat you so poorly. They don't work for you, they work for a corporation which owns you!

You have had a view of how the New World Order is going to tolerate and treat those it views as a threat to their power, control and planned take over. You had a view at Ruby Ridge, Idaho and especially in Waco, Texas. We have many opportunities to see them at work as they engineer events that the American public will 'buy' as a reason to go into other countries and kill the inhabitants. We all have the opportunity to see New World Order tactics at work.

Right now there is still some power in the hands of the American people. The grand and petit juries have the power to nullify unconstitutional law. The question is, do we have the people with sufficient education and back bone to do the necessary job? Has our school system left us so ignorant that we lack the ability to understand what is happening? How many will be exposed to this document and fail to read it because the issues presented are beyond their ability to understand? How many will be exposed to this document and fail to read it because they cannot read? How many will be exposed to this document and not read it out of laziness because we have not been educated on what good citizenship is all about?

There is the law of the republic and there is the law of the corporation. Are we going to continue to send people to jail based on un-constitutional corporate law? When we sit on juries we must remember to ask who is injured by what ever law the accused is being subjected to. Murder, battery, fraud, robbery, theft, destruction of property, blocking or barring another individual from exercise of their unalienable rights, - these actions cause injury to someone. But failing to fill out and file a piece of paper (as in the case of a 1040 tax form) does not harm anyone. Re-roofing our home without a permit does not harm anyone. Remember, the private commercial paper that we refer to as Federal Reserve Notes is not money. It is debt currency, created within the language of the Banking Relief Act of March 9, 1933, to economically enslave America and her people. The interest on the use of this private commercial paper is the reason that the IRS and government will take Americans to court. So the government allowed the Federal Reserve Bankers to steal the peoples gold and in place of that gold, give Americans ink on paper (private commercial paper) to use as currency that will ultimately bankrupt the country and enslave its population. Sounds like fraud to me.

Political Maxim:

Politics is a process of engineering problems to get more money to not solve them.

Corollary 1:

Problems are to be managed not solved.

Corollary 2:

Problems are to be exploited not solved.

We American's often look at the actions of government and say, "*that's not going to solve anything, it'll make it worse. Why are they doing that?*" The problem is in us. We look at the actions of government from the perspective that an attempt is being made to solve the problem. If we begin to understand that the goal is not to solve the problem, but to manage the problem, to exploit the problem, then all the actions we see the government take will make sense.

In writing this document I sometimes wonder if I may have made a target out of myself. Time will tell. Neither the government nor the IRS has a sense of humor about the information, facts, knowledge, and insights provided by the words in this document. And if you pick up the banner, you may also make a target out of yourself. But no one likes a coward, do they?

I can only say that if picked for a jury, I will do my part to protect Americans from un-constitutional laws and un-constitutional behavior. I can only hope that there will be a fellow American who will do the same for me. We have the power to nullify unconstitutional law as members of the jury. Do it!

Remember, the unlawful, unconstitutional action of government can only continue so long as the emergencies in progress continue. It is time to elect a president (Commander and Chief actually) that will terminate all emergencies within his power and to elect representatives in Congress that will terminate all emergencies. With the emergencies terminated, we will then return to *lawful*

civil authority (the law of the republic), we will then have a President functioning under lawful civil authority rather than a Commander and Chief functioning under the Authorities granted by War and Emergency Powers.

“The authority of the State over its people resides in its WAR POWERS.” - Donald Sutherland - From the Oliver Stone movie JFK.

You may have civil rights as part of a political plan, or you may have unalienable rights as part of a heavenly plan. The choice is yours.

CHAPTER 8

RANDOM TOPICS

FORM OF GOVERNMENT

You have probably heard the main stream media, many movies, prominent political figures and school teachers refer to our government as a democracy. ***It is not a democracy!*** Our government is a ***representative republic!*** Democracy is ***majority rule***, or better stated it is **MOB RULE**. Democracy is best described as two foxes and one rabbit sitting down to discuss what they are going to have for dinner.

This foundational concept is one of the biggest problems we now have with our Government. The Seventeenth Amendment altered the way Senators are chosen for service in the Senate of the United States. Let's take a look at the way Senators were originally chosen.

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, chosen by the legislature thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one Vote." Article I, Section 3, United States Constitution.

As you can see, Senators were chosen by the legislatures of the State to represent the interests of the State as an independent nation. Keeping in mind that Congress *amends* our Constitution as a means to take power from the people, let's now read the current Seventeenth Amendment.

"The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years..." Amendment XVII, United States Constitution.

Under the original method, we the people were to know the minds and hearts of those we sent to the State legislatures since they were our neighbors within our district or county. We were close to them and knew who they were. These elected State Legislators were then responsible for knowing the minds, hearts and character of those the same State Legislators sent to Washington, D.C. to represent the interests of ***the people*** of the State. And it was the duty of our state representatives to recall these individuals when they failed to represent the interests of ***the people*** of the State. ***But with this process you couldn't buy your way into the united States Senate.***

Under the current method special interests contribute to the candidate and when the candidate is elected, he or she is owned by special interests. Did you notice that when Dupont's patent on Refrigerant 12 (R12) was running out, President George Bush issued an executive order banning Chlorofluorocarbons removing R12 from the market. And guess who held the only patent on a replacement refrigerant. That's right - Dupont. Boy you catch on quick.

TREATIES

For those who desire to control all, there is no avenue left un-traveled. Our Constitution holds that the President ...

“... shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur;”

We see here that the President may make any treaty he wishes so long as two-thirds of those Senators *present* concur. Given the treaties that have been passed in recent times, it appears that those Senators present, along with our recent Presidents, wish to place the United States of America under control of the United Nations and those that control the same. The treaty we know as NAFTA has a special and interesting significance as pointed out in the book *Trance Formation of America*. Our Constitution further says:

“This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.”

It appears to me that our Founding Fathers did not anticipate anyone ever making it to the position of Senator or President that would wish to enter into treaties that would serve to destroy this country and place the people in a form of enslavement and subject them to specific performance under treaty law. Specific performance that is detrimental to their rights of liberty and happiness. The question that needs to be posed and answered is whether *treaty law* is superior to *the constitution*.

This concept of using treaties to gain the upper hand and establish the Federal Government over the states is not new. The Constitution empowers the Federal Government, but it also limits that same power. As an example, a Mr. Shauver of Arkansas was arrested under this Federal law and in the case U.S. v. Shauver, the court rightfully held that the Federal Government did not have jurisdiction in the state in those matters that are reserved to the state by the tenth amendment. Undaunted, the Federal Government arrested a Mr. McCullagh in Kansas on the same charges. This time the court found the 'Migratory Bird Act' unconstitutional. And so in both cases the courts found against the government.

The two cases above were 'experiments' to test the willingness of the courts to give them that which they desired. Control! But since these experiments failed, they tried a new strategy to secure their power and control. In 1916 the United States entered into a Migratory Bird Treaty with Great Britain (acting on behalf of Canada). Two years later, in 1918, Congress passes legislation to implement the provisions of that treaty. Time for another experiment. And in 1919 a Mr. Thompson was arrested in Arkansas for shooting migratory birds. His case was assigned to a judge that had ruled against the Federal Government in one of the previous cases. This time,

however, the judge ruled in favor of the Federal Government because this time the Feds were acting under the Authority granted by the treaty.

Recently there have been several treaties under consideration that deal with 'the environment'. These treaties, and others will ultimately serve to help implement the 'One World Government/New World Order' sought by those who wish control of everything. Will they get it? It depends on many things. But the one thing operating so well on their behalf within America, is our own ignorance. As long as we remain *uneducated*, the situation remains in their favor and freedom lives in jeopardy and fear. Who among us want to send a man to prison or cause him financial injury with a felony record for shooting a bird to feed himself and his family? **The uneducated, uninformed American, that's who.**

Now you see the power of treaties and their importance to those who wish to control you. All that need be done is to propose a treaty, something that sounds good, like the 'save the environment treaty'. The sheeple can be psychologically profiled to, not only accept it, but demand that it be implemented immediately. And so we help them lock us in our own prison.

From our knowledge of history we can all visualize the young and the unborn, who weren't permitted to live, because of some enlightened thinkers concept of who's life is valid. We all know the stories of the IRS agents who walked in and took all of someone's property without due process of law, and we all know the stories of the fellow who was arrested for vagrancy and somehow ended up dead shortly after his arrest. We must remember that they could not have done this without our willing cooperation. We like to think that *its not my fault ... I didn't kill that person*, yet we are all guilty through our silence and unwillingness to be responsible for our own creation - our government.

A FEW MORE THOUGHTS ABOUT CHILDREN

Who should have jurisdiction over the children? That is who should have the liability for their actions, decide their conduct and issue punishment? Probably most of us could agree that it should be the parent and you will find me in agreement. The Common Law recognizes the children as belonging to their parents. The government should, in no case, involve itself in the family.

I know that some of you are going to present the argument of child abuse and I will concede to you that there is child abuse. However, when the Government is allowed to take a child from their parents, this action embraces the principle that the child is the 'child of the State'. In this country, the single biggest abuse of children occurs at the hands of other children (children of the State). In the Los Angeles area, more than one child is killed each day by another child, not an adult. There was a recent case in Chicago where one child refused to *steal candy* for some other children and so they threw him out an eighth story window. I submit that when the State assumes responsibility for all children, and through the Department of Education and other institutions, instills the values of the State in the child, they have inflicted a far greater harm upon society and the children than most people realize. You must ask yourself where the children

learned so much disrespect for a person's property and another person's life. Go to any school where children murder other children and you will find the beginnings to your answer.

What this does is to bring us back to 'what is the proper realm of law'. Remembering that the 'force of law' is only the collective force of individuals. That if an individual does not have a particular right, then he cannot confer this particular right or power upon government, for you cannot confer what you do not possess. There are none of us who have the right to go into another person's home and take their children and as such, we cannot confer that right upon government.

The question being proposed for your consideration is this. Do you want ***natural law***. Under ***natural law*** the man with the gun makes the law for those without a gun. Is this the type of law you wish your children to grow up under. If not, then you probably should support gun ownership and probably own one yourself. Right now, law is being made by those who will use the most force and violence.

I know that children are abused, sometimes by adults, but you do not break the law to impose your sense of morality upon someone else. As a young man I lived on a small farm. I had a friend who had a real mouth problem. He was disrespectful, caustic and foul in his language. I had told him on several occasions that his mouth would get him in trouble someday. One day he smarted off to his father, who was generally a kind and patient person. But this time the father spun around with a fist and caught his kid right in the mouth knocking out one of his teeth. After that, my friend was a different person. He had a respect he didn't have before. His attitude changed and he began doing better in school. He was polite and considerate. Today the father would probably go to jail. But I fully believe that if the father had not done what he did, the young man would have ultimately ended up in prison. Instead he became a person everyone liked being around and was moderately successful.

Some children are easy going, fun loving and cooperative, while others are mean, hurtful, harmful, antagonistic, uncooperative, disruptive, rude, caustic, troublemakers. I firmly believe that parents know what is needed to deal with their children when they are left alone and made responsible for the conduct of their children. But when government dictates how Mom and Dad are going to raise the children, well - do we have more peaceful, happier young people than we did in 1940 or 1950 when parents were in control, or do we have an ever growing violent youth segment/culture in this country? It does not take a rocket scientist analysis to figure this one out.

Because of the government's welfare programs there has been engineered a large class of people who cannot or will not be responsible for themselves, much less their children and this is as the controllers want it. In so many cases we have been foolish enough to allow the government to replace the male in the household leaving the welfare mother without a 'responsible male role model' from which the children may learn to be responsible themselves. And we relieve the mother from responsibility for her choices and decisions by providing everything she needs. And now we have become foolish enough to allow the government to take children from their parents relieving the parent of this responsibility (ACTS HAVE NO CONSEQUENCES).

But, you say, in some cases the children are so badly abused that it is absolutely necessary. It may be necessary to do something but it is not necessary to empower the Federal and State Governments to take the children and give them authority to undermine all parents. Where have you acquired this power and authority to confer upon government? I certainly do not have the right to do this as an individual, and if I do not, then no one else has this right either? How do we think we can confer a power on government that we do not possess? In the final analysis, what conduct on our behalf is going to be considered *child abuse* and used to take our children? Let us not forget the mother in Chicago whose children were taken into custody by Child Protective Services because the children were over weight. We have got to stop playing God. We're not good at it. Yet, we need to take action when it is necessary. I certainly would have no reservation in filing a complaint on behalf of a child deliberately injured by a parent.

Abortion

At the same time we run around pretending to be so moral and concerned about the children, we stand idly by while the brains are sucked out of the unborn in these *partial birth abortions*. Boy, are we not sick? We see *child abuse everywhere* but not in sucking out the brains of a child about to be born.

I do not support any laws preventing abortion, nor do I support Government funding of abortion. Again, if I am going to enjoy freedom, then I am unwilling to play God and take freedom from others. This decision is a family matter and should be resolved within the family. If you are ever to solve a problem of a moral nature, the solution will only be found in reaching the heart and mind of the other individual(s) involved. You will not solve the problem with law and/or punishment (unless you use the FORCE OF LAW to take the life of the offender ... and then you've solved it with that person).

From the moral perspective, cellular division begins at conception. These cells are known by many names for those who wish to argue in favor of the abortion. But the bottom line is that these cells are a human being in one of many stages of development. A baby of six minutes is in a different stage of development than the same baby will be in six hours, six weeks, six months, or six years. So if you are going to abort one, why not wait till they are twelve or thirteen? They are the same person, just in a different stage of development. And perhaps we can make a much better judgement about their character and contribution to society than we can when they are still in the womb or very young.

But when we conduct our life in an irresponsible manner and end up pregnant, it becomes really easy to authorize the taking of a life the individual has not yet seen or met. That becomes a great deal more difficult after birth, but it is still the same person. But since this person is not yet born, municipal corporation law does not consider them to be a real human being. Some enlightened *social engineer* has determined the child is not yet real and it is therefore ok to dispose of them as you would any other garbage. And so under the laws of corporate government, you can avoid taking responsibility for your conduct and make the individual inside you pay the penalty for your irresponsible behavior with forfeiture of his or her life. How about we keep the life of the

baby and forfeit your life. Obviously, you cannot conduct yourself responsibly. Would you go along with that? Sounds like a good idea to me. The baby hasn't yet been irresponsible or made irresponsible choices. This abortion thing is just another avenue to ***acts have no consequences***. Another avenue to diminishing you and stripping you of your character and humanity.

Go down to any school yard and look at the little children. Which ones should have been aborted because they were not convenient? Then go look in the mirror and see if the person you see there should have been aborted because he/she wasn't convenient. The person growing inside its parent has no choice other than hope that Mom will do everything she can on his or her behalf.

If you decide to have an abortion, at least acknowledge that you are authorizing the death of a person that none of us has yet met. If you can at least acknowledge that this is a person, then I will ask for no more. Go ahead with your decision. But to those of you who deceive yourself by referring to that person as an *unviable tissue mass* or some other such nonsense, you leave me very sad indeed. If you have no regard for the life of another and cannot even acknowledge there is a life there, then how do you expect there to be any regard for your life? The answer, of course, is that the government which makes such laws has no regard for your life. They only care about the bond issued on your birth certificate. In the end, only God has regard for your life. And maybe if you're lucky, your parents will have regard for your life. If you can be corrupted to disregard a life, then you open the door for Government to disregard all life. Remember Waco and remember Vicky Weaver, the mother, and 14 year old Sammy Weaver.

Government is a corporation. This is an artificial person. A person with no soul, no sense of morality, no sense of right and wrong, no sense of guilt, and now, no accountability.

The understandable exceptions are situations where the life of the mother is in danger, where there has been incest, and where there has been a rape resulting in pregnancy. But to dispose of a life because of your own irresponsible conduct or because it is not convenient is a thing that I do not understand.

Welfare

Welfare is presented as *compassion* on the part of those who legislate the giving. That is those *lawmakers* who enact laws to provide some people with the funds that allow them to live off the labor of others. These compassionate lawmakers feel no compassion for those for whom their laws of robbery take property from those who own it and give that property to those who do not own it while keeping some of the property (money) for the benefit of the law maker. These compassionate lawmakers do not care that your children do not eat as well, do not have the opportunities they might otherwise have, do not have the education they might otherwise get, do not have... whatever, all because your money is being taken from you for the benefit of other adults and their children. Other adults who are unwilling to get up off their dead butts and do what is necessary to take care of themselves and their families. Do not be fooled by this *false compassion*. It is not compassion that motivates these lawmakers to authorize the robbery of one group of people to support another. It is the opium of control and greed. By creating a

dependent class of people, they have a constituency that votes to keep them in their position of power and control. True compassion is not measured by how many are receiving hand outs, but is measured by how well our leadership has helped its citizens to be independent of handouts.

But, being independent of others also means that the citizens will also be independent of the lawmakers control over their lives. Lawmakers will give a great deal (of other people's earnings/property), but control is not one concession they will make easily.

Is welfare a way we have always lived? Certainly not! If you and I had lived 100 years ago, we would have had to expend effort on an almost daily basis to exist. If we did not expend the required effort, we died. The fact that effort must be expended on an almost daily basis to justify our existence has not changed.

What happens today if we are not doing sufficient work or expending insufficient effort to justify our existence? In the case of the United States, we administer welfare payments. This means that someone else is either having to work harder and do with less in their own lives to justify the existence of those who do not wish to do their part. In days gone by we had charity, in which we helped and assisted those in need. But today, no one is allowed to build a shelter they can afford, so no one in need of assistance owns their shelter (home).

A side story:

When I was very young, my mother and stepfather lived in a shelter called the cabin. It was a single room, probably 8x12 feet. Living in there were my mother, stepfather, two stepsisters, one stepbrother, and myself... six of us. And we had an out house as well as an outside shower. And guess what... we were all happy. Life was OK. We had decent meals, we ate from clean dishes, we drank clear cool well water from clean cups. Our house was built as we could afford the lumber, therefore at any point we quit building, what was standing was ours. When we first moved into the house there were no windows in the kitchen. So when we got up we had to chase the chickens out of the house and clean up their mess. But in not too long, we had windows and the chickens had to stay outside. We continued to use the outhouse until the septic system was hand dug and concrete lined with a leach line attached. Then we could use the indoor bathroom. Before we had abandoned the cabin to move into the house, my parents had acquired a six-holer from the Ralph L. Smith lumber mill next to our property. A six-holer is a reference to one of the lumber mills numerous outhouses, and this particular one could be used by six men at the same time. Using a tractor, my stepfather dragged the outhouse from the mill yard to the back of the cabin, and with a little carpentry, this became the bedroom of my mother and stepfather. A door in the back of the cabin allowed them to step from the cabin into their bedroom. The gap between the two buildings was open and so once in a while you would get a few drops of rain on your head. The home was built without permits. We were very close to being free back in the 1940's. Well, this ends this short story.

Those that are truly disabled, and have no family or other affiliations that would provide care and support, have this writer's understanding and support. But I don't think we need government to take care of them. I think we Americans are capable of taking care of the truly disabled who

have no support structure. And I certainly think that government has the ability to release its stranglehold on the construction of a shelter. It is because we are a charitable people that some Americans choose to give some of their time and others choose to give some of the family income to charities. However, if there is a family structure then it is the family who should assume the responsibility. That is part of what families are all about.

INDIRECT WELFARE

There are numerous levels of welfare. Many people are welfare recipients who do not recognize themselves as such or are unwilling to recognize themselves in this role. An example of a person who is a welfare recipient and may not recognize themselves as such, are people who have purchased a home on a "low income" program, which provides "affordable" housing for families that qualify as "low income". This means that these people get to enjoy the benefit of a home that they normally would not be able to afford.

This causes at least a couple of things to occur. The first item to recognize is that someone else is making up the difference between the payment the "low income family" is making and the actual payment necessary to purchase this home. To illustrate, suppose that the payment on the home would be \$700.00 per month to anyone who did not qualify for the low income loan. However, the person who actually purchased the home qualified for the low income loan and his payment is \$250.00 per month. This means that citizens in a higher tax bracket make up the difference between the \$250.00 being paid by the low income loan recipient and the \$700.00 that is the home's actual cost.

The second thing that occurs is that the "low income family" comes into competition with families who do not qualify as "low income" and this competition drives up the price of all homes. So, the higher wage earner is penalized in two ways; he has to pay a much higher price for a home because of the competition with the low income earner and he is forced by the *violence* law represents to assist in making the payment on the low income home through his tax burden. If you support this, then do not whine about your taxes going to welfare recipients. I am always amazed at the ways in which the government makes dependent children out of us. And so we have one more avenue to acts have no consequences. This time it is by not getting a decent education that would provide you with a decent income. A choice we make by ourselves.

LAW SUITS

Law suits for civil damages cost money and more specifically they cost you money. Those who sue for their own irresponsible conduct and those juries who have awarded disproportionate amounts of money are responsible for a big portion of the increased cost of almost everything. When someone is stupid enough to spill hot coffee in their lap and then sue the provider of the coffee and is awarded five million dollars in damages, this does five million dollars in damage to you.

The provider of the coffee and their insurance company are not in business for a loss. When they pay out on these types of claims, insurance premiums will increase. This means that ALL small

businesses will suffer an increase in insurance costs. The additional cost of insurance goes into whatever product they sell or whatever service they provide. And so you will pay more for your clothes, your jewelry, your make up, your electricity, your gas, your water, your cable T.V. service, your food... everything goes up. So, as long as the American people can't be responsible for themselves and juries cannot distinguish actions for which an individual should assume responsibility, get used to increasing costs disproportional to inflation.

If you become part of a jury and the case is a claim for civil damages. Evaluate the claim. And if it is something the claimant should be responsible for, deny the claim and help the other juror's to see the liability the claimant has. If it is a valid claim, then decide the damages on a reasonable scale. I knew a fellow who felt that an injured mill worker should be due so many millions because "he might have been going to become a world famous Pianist." If this is the logic, he might have been going to become the worlds richest man, so let's give that kind of money to anyone who is injured. Hopefully, we are intelligent enough to see the fallacy of this logic without explanation.

Jurassic Park

"Let us revisit a place like Jurassic Park, where the soulless monsters graze on the people. You can see them, tall as the skyscrapers, the earth shuddering under each step, their cold eyes surveying the landscape for something to devour. They are not hungry. But they will gorge until they stagger in their tracks. They will regurgitate and eat again, only for the sake of eating.

These monsters are called American corporations. They are called Americans corporations only because they were formed here and have their history here, like a particular dinosaur is an American reptile only because the awful egg was hatched in the primordial ocean shores of Wyoming. But the creatures know no boundaries and they know no loyalty.

As we have already seen, the people are enslaved to this culture of behemoths. The people are its fodder. No human is safe in this landscape. Most cannot hide. Most will be eaten. And the beasts do not graze upon the dead. Like their ancestors in the sea, they eat only the living. They consume the people in great mouthfuls, and often consume others of the beasts themselves. When the easy grazing is over in one land, they scour others - first China, soon Russia, then the small islands of the Pacific, Indonesia, and the Philippines. They trample over Mexico and South America, digging great gaping holes in the land, mindlessly gluttonizing on the people wherever they tread...

Most often no identifiable person can be held responsible in the corporate structure. No individual with a conscience would sell mothers an oral pregnancy test that caused children to be born without arms or legs or a tongue. But one of America's pharmaceutical corporations, with full knowledge of the possible hideous consequences, dumped its excess

stock on welfare mothers in New York City when the drug was about to be banned by the FDA." From the book *GIVE ME LIBERTY* by Gerry Spence

And so we see that there are times for punitive damages. When corporations or anyone wrongfully causes great hardships, they should be punished through punitive damages. Again, use your good judgement and common sense.

A little background on corporations...

Corporations originally had very limited life and purpose in the united States of America. The creation of a corporation was allowed for a very large undertaking which was beyond the ability of an individual or limited partnership to accomplish. For example, building a bridge. In such a case a corporation could be formed for the purpose of *building a bridge*, but when the bridge construction was finished, so was the corporation. The corporation could not own property nor could it own other corporations.

The 14th amendment to the constitution provided *citizenship* for the freed slave and was ratified in 1868. As has been explained, United States citizenship has the status as an *artificial person*. With the passage of this amendment, lawyers began filing cases on behalf of corporations claiming rights under the 14th amendment.

Of the 150 cases involving the Fourteenth Amendment heard by the Supreme Court up to the Plessy v. Ferguson case in 1896 that established the legal standing of "separate but equal," ***15 involved blacks and 135 involved business entities***. Attorney's were thus able to get the corporation recognized as an *artificial person* in court with all the 14th amendment rights of a United States citizen. The corporation now had an *infinite life*, *could own property*, and *could own other corporations*. And so we have truly been taken over by the ***soulless monster***.

Inflation

What causes inflation? If you listen to the media (who is usually quoting some Governmental agency or official), you will hear references to the Gross National Product, the Trade Deficit, the Federal Deficit, the National Debt and a host of other things, mixed in with the news about inflation, that all have absolutely nothing to do with monetary inflation.

As we learned in another part of this document, Federal Reserve Notes are not real money, they are debt currency. Real money does not have evidence of debt nor can real money be a NOTE (as in Federal Reserve Note). If we still conducted business in lawful money in the account of the united States of America, that is gold and silver, there could not be inflation. Read on and discover why.

As *banking* originally began in this the united States of America, paper currency was a *warehouse receipt* for gold or silver deposited. This came about quite honestly simply because it was somewhat inconvenient to carry your gold around with you. It was more convenient to deposit your gold with a *gold smith* or *bank* and receive a *certificate of deposit*. You could then

spend your *certificate of deposit (paper currency)* like it was gold or silver. Not a bad system actually.

But political factions and ambitious men need money to advance their goals and agenda... mostly making themselves wealthy. This could be accomplished with the distribution of more *deposit certificates* without the necessary deposit of gold or silver. Let's take a close look at this practice. Let us say that I have a bank and 100 people come and deposit one dollar in gold with my bank and I issue these people 100 one-dollar *deposit certificates*. And these people are out there spending their *deposit certificates*. But then when tomorrow arrives, I issue another 100 one-dollar *deposit certificates* without taking in any more gold or silver. What just happened? What you bought yesterday for one *deposit certificate* is today, going to cost you two *deposit certificates*. That is because I have the same amount of money (gold & silver) backing those certificates and now have twice as many of them in circulation. In effect I have stolen 50% of your money from you in this scheme. The amount of money stolen from you annually has to show up somewhere. It does... that's your annual inflation rate. It is caused by printing *deposit certificates* without deposits. When there is no printing of *deposit certificates* (paper currency) without deposits, inflation is zero.

Simple to understand, but not taught in *public education*, nor is it presented by the *main stream media*, nor is it shared by any *church*. Yet the scholars in each of the institutions all know the process. They're just not going to share it with you!

Military - Combat Arms Survey

The following is a *Combat Arms Survey* given to Marines at 29 palms. Preceding the survey is a letter by one of the marines. I do not know the identity of this young man, nor do I want to for it might not be to his benefit for anyone to know. But I can see that he knows the difference between lawful orders and unlawful orders and further knows the job of the military. I can also see that it will be most difficult for those in power to make a traitor out of this young man. I would hope that the marine corps, and indeed all the military, were populated with men of this caliber and integrity. This young man has most certainly endangered his military career with the new politically correct marines as well as to make life a hell for himself should they ever figure out who he is. To this young man, I wish to say thank you for your honor, bravery, integrity, and most especially your loyalty to your country and its' citizens. The letter and actual survey content are taken from copies of each.

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

29 Palms Marine Questionnaire

May 15, 1994

Editor

My name is xxxxx xxxxx and I am currently serving in the U.S. Marines Corp's. I am not a SBS member, but I have read several books put out by them and I read back issues of *The New American*. Enclosed is a survey given to myself and other Marines from different units on base that had participated in either operations *Just Cause*, *Desert Storm*, or *Restore Hope*. *A Navy Commander came before us and said he was working on his masters degree and he was writing a paper about giving up our military sovereignty to the United Nations Secretary General.*

Needless to say I was shocked. I marked all of the questions ***Strongly Disagree*** and turned in the survey. The Marine next to me just happened to accidentally grab two surveys as they were being passed out. He agreed to give it to me. This is no fabrication. This survey was given to us on May 10, of this year [1994] at Twenty-Nine Palms Marine Corps base in California. Also enclosed is an article from the base weekly newspaper from March of this year. I hope the survey can be of some use to you. Please feel free to consult me if you wish.

Sincerely,
xxxxx xxxxx

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Combat Arms Survey

This questionnaire is to gather data concerning the attitudes of combat trained personnel with regards to nontraditional missions. All of your responses are confidential. Write your answers directly on the questionnaire form. In Part II, place an 'X' in the space provided for your response.

Part I. Demographics

1. What Service are you in?
2. What is your pay grade? (e.g. E-?, O-?)
3. What is your MOS code and description?
4. What is your highest level of education in years?
5. How many months did you serve in Operation Desert Storm/Desert Shield?
6. How many months did you serve in Somalia?
7. What state or country did you primarily reside in during childhood?

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Part II. Attitudes

Do you feel that U.S. combat troops should be used within the United States for any of the following missions?

8. Drug enforcement

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

9. Disaster relief (e.g. hurricanes, floods, fires, earthquakes)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

10. Security at national events (e.g. Olympic Games, Super Bowl)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

11. Environmental disaster clean-up

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

12. Substitute teachers in public schools

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

13. Community assistance programs (e.g. landscaping, environmental clean-up, road repair, animal control)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

14. Federal and state prison guards

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

15. National emergency police force

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

16. Advisors to S.W.A.T. units, the FBI, or the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (B.A.T.F.)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

17. Border patrol (e.g. prevention of illegal aliens into U.S. territory.)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

[THIS SPACE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Do you feel that U.S. combat troops under U.S. command should be used in other countries for any of the following United Nations Missions?

18. Drug enforcement

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

19. Disaster relief (e.g. hurricanes, floods, fires, earthquakes)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

20. Environmental disaster clean-up

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

21. Peace keeping

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

22. Nation building (Reconstruct civil government, develop public school system, develop or improve public transportation system, etc.)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

23. Humanitarian relief (e.g. food and medical supplies, temporary housing, and clothing)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

[THIS SPACE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Do you feel that U.S. combat troops should be used in other countries, under command of non-U.S. officers appointed by the United Nations for any of the following missions?

24. Drug Enforcement

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

25. Disaster relief (e.g. hurricanes, floods, fires, earthquakes)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

26. Environmental Disaster clean-up

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

27. Peace keeping

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

28. Nation building (Reconstruct civil government, develop public school system, develop or improve public transportation system, etc.)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

29. Humanitarian relief (e.g. food and medical supplies, temporary housing, and clothing)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

30. Police Action (e.g. Korea, Vietnam, but serving under non-U.S. officers)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

[THIS SPACE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Consider the following statements:

31. The U.S. runs a field training exercise. U.N. combat troops should be allowed to serve in U.S. combat units during these exercises under U.S. command and control.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

32. The United Nations runs a field training exercise. U.S. combat troops under U.S. command and control should serve in U.N. combat units during these exercises.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

33. The United Nations runs a field training exercise. U.S. combat troops should serve under U.N. command and control during these exercises.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

34. U.S. combat troops should participate in U.N. missions as long as the U.S. has full command and control.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

35. U.S. combat troops should participate in U.N. missions under United Nations command and control.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

36. U.S. combat troops should be commanded by U.N. officers and non-commissioned officers (NCO's) at battalion and company levels while performing U.N. missions.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

37. It would make no difference to me to have U.N. soldiers as members of my team. (e.g. fire team, squad, platoon)

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

38. It would make no difference to me to take orders from a U.N. company commander.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

39. I feel the President of the United States has the authority to pass his responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief to the U.N. Secretary General.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

40. I feel there is no conflict between my oath of office and serving as a U.N. soldier.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

41. I feel my unit's combat effectiveness would no be affected by performing humanitarian missions for the United Nations.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

42. I feel a designated unit of U.S. combat soldiers should be permanently assigned to the command and control of the United Nations.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

43. I would be willing to volunteer for assignment to a U.S. combat unit under a U.N. commander.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

44. I would like U.N. member countries, including the U.S., to give the U.N. all the soldiers necessary to maintain world peace.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

45. I would swear to the following code:

"I am a United Nations fighting person. I serve in the forces which maintain world peace and every nation's way of life. I am prepared to give my life in their defense."

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

46. The U.S. government declares a ban on the possession, sale, transportation, and transfer of all non-sporting firearms. A thirty (30) day amnesty period is permitted for these firearms to be turned over to the local authorities. At the end of this period, a number of citizens groups refuse to turn over their firearms.

Consider the following:

I would fire upon U.S. citizens who refuse or resist confiscation of firearms banned by the U.S. government.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree No Opinion

END OF SURVEY

In the first part of the survey, under Demographics, there is a question concerning the pay grade of the person completing the survey. You will see (e.g. E-?, O-?), where 'E' is for Enlisted men and an 'O' which is for an Officer. We can therefore, deduce that this survey has also been given to military officers in an effort to assess the command mentality necessary to carry out this mission. I don't think that it takes the mental genius of a rocket scientist to understand that if the leadership of our Government is planning for *armed confrontation* with American Citizens, then Government leadership will not want military men who know that their oath of office is to *protect and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic*, or that these military men (and women) *are obligated to protect and defend the American Citizen*. If the marine, and military in general, understand their obligation and responsibility, they may very well take our *so called leadership* into custody. Those in power want good authoritarians that will provide the means by which Americans can be enslaved.

In reading this survey I am of the opinion that our Government is *testing the waters* to see if our military has been, or is, sufficiently psychologically profiled and *mis-educated* to carry out a mission which involves the killing of American Citizens.

I know that there are some of you who are going to feel that this is just an isolated incident and has no significance and I am sorry about that. For it is this unwillingness to see what truly endangers America and all of its people. It is this attitude that prevailed in Germany when people were being put in ovens and cooked to death.

Gun Ownership

The Constitution of the United States of America is a profound document, filled with wisdom and protection for the people for whom it was framed. But to many statesmen and informed individuals of the time at which it was written, it had at least one glaring defect. This was the absence of articles specifically prohibiting the Federal Government from invading an individual's rights of life, liberty, and property. The general consensus, at that constitutional convention, was that a Federal Bill of Rights was not necessary because the States guaranteed individual rights in their own respective constitutions and the States are independent nations. However, Massachusetts, Maryland, and New York made their ratification of the Constitution contingent upon the adoption of a Federal Bill of Rights.

If you consult a History Book, one pertaining to The History of the United States during this time period (i.e., 1775 to 1800), you may find the ten articles which comprise the Bill of Rights, you might even find the two additional articles that failed to pass, but what you may not find are the three paragraphs preceding the Articles. The first paragraph of the Bill of Rights is of special importance and is presented here in the case you do not have access to this document. It reads as follows:

“The Conventions of a number of the States having, at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added. And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government, will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution:”

What this paragraph says is - Although the States adopted the Constitution of the United States of America, they had some misgivings about the power the Constitution gave to the Federal Government, and in their own words they wanted "to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers." It is obvious that our founding fathers were fully aware that Government is quite capable of abusing the people and should not be trusted.

If you carefully examine the Bill of Rights and the Constitution for the united States of America, you will notice that these documents contain many provisions to protect the *rights of the individual* (to protect the individual from government). People are so easy to *coerce* and if not challenged or held in check, the Government will soon convince the people that government is

superior to the individual and has full authority to trample the rights of the individual. This is mob rule - it is a democracy. That is why the constitution mandates that a republican form of government be maintained in each of the union States. That is why our founding documents are filled with protection for the individual. Without individual protection, we have no protection at all. The necessity of this is quite evident today with governments rules & regulations finding their way into our lives from all angles (democracy at work - or if you prefer, mob rule at work). Is it time that we stop being part of the mob?

Now we come to the Second Article of the Bill of Rights which is presented in its entirety. This Second Article establishes:

"A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

"Shall not be infringed" is the key here. The writers of this article did not want the people armed with small caliber revolvers or single shot bolt action rifles while the government is fully armed with bazookas and automatic weapons. In effect, our founders did not want the government so superiorly armed that it could remove all individual rights and freedoms with no hope for these individuals to form a coalition to resist the evil that all governments become in time and neither do we! Question: If you are unarmed, by what means are you going to regulate the militia or any military if they or their command should choose not to be regulated?

Since the original composition of the above paragraph the *Department of Justice* has weighed in on the second amendment. And they have determined that it is an individual right and not a collective right. This may be viewed at two locations: 1) [Alternate web location](#) and 2) the Department of Justice web site: <http://www.usdoj.gov/olc/secondamendment2.htm>.

Questions:

1. Who owns more semiautomatic and fully automatic assault weapons than anyone else in the United States of America?
answer: Federal, State, County & local Governments.
2. Who owns more assault bullets and assault explosives than anyone else in America?
answer: Federal, State, County & local Governments.
3. And finally, who is the only group or entity to use weapons of assault and military hardware against women, children, elderly, and peaceful Americans?
answer: The Federal Government at Waco, Texas.

It should be obvious, but in the event that it is not I will point out that if the Government is going to continue to pass and enforce un-constitutional corporate law upon the people with the intent of giving their country away, taking all the peoples property and finally enslaving the American people, firearms may be one of the few tools at the disposal of the American people to prevent their planned enslavement by their servant.

ONLY BELLIGERENTS HAVE RIGHTS

In U.S. vs. JOHNSON (76 Fed, Supp. 538), Federal District Court Judge James Alger Fee ruled that,

"The privilege against self-incrimination is neither accorded to the passive resistant, not to the person who is ignorant of his rights, nor to one who is indifferent thereto. It is a fighting clause. It's benefits can be retained only by sustained combat. It cannot be claimed by attorney or solicitor. It is valid only when insisted upon by a belligerent claimant in person." *McAlister vs. Henkle*, 201 U.S. 90, 26 S.Ct. 385, 50 L. Ed. 671; *Commonwealth vs. Shaw*, 4 Cush. 594, 50 Am. Dec. 813; *Orum vs. State*, 38 Ohio App. 171, 175 N.E. 876.

Note the confrontational language: "*fighting*", "*combat*", and most surprising, "*belligerent*". Did we ever expect to see a Federal Judge condemn citizens for being "passive" or "ignorant"? Did we ever expect to see a verdict that encouraged citizens to be "belligerent" in court? Sometimes we attack Judges and what they say, but they are often on our side. However, they have to be on our side in a way that is not apparent. I think that this may be the case with Judge Fee. He is telling us the *lay of the land*, so that we will know how to conduct our self. He probably should be thanked. This revealing statement succinctly describes the essence of the American legal system.

The court ruled that the constitutional right against self incrimination (Article V of the Bill of Rights) is not automatically guaranteed to any citizen by any government branch or official. Moreover, despite the government's usual propaganda, this right is not made available to all persons: It is not available to the "passive", the "ignorant" or the "indifferent". Nor can this right be claimed by an attorney on behalf of his client. The right against self-incrimination is available only to the knowledgeable, "belligerent claimant in person", to the individual willing to engage in "sustained combat" to FIGHT for his rights.

Here we see that government claims it is obligated to recognize your constitutional right against self incrimination only if you fight for those rights. The above ruling claims that our courts are free to ignore this right of any citizen who is 1) ignorant of his right and/or 2) lacks the courage to fight for his right... ***You can't be stupid and free at the same time.***

IF ONE WHY NOT ALL

If one of our Constitutional rights is only available to citizens who are both knowledgeable and belligerent, how are the balance of our rights any different?

I can assure you, they're not.

Fundamentally, if you don't know your rights, the court claims to be under no obligation to inform you, or to protect your rights. Even if you know your rights, but lack the guts to fight for them the court claims it is not obligated to protect you. However, you have to know how the

system is supposed to work in order to fight intelligently. Otherwise, the court will proceed against you and ignore your rights on the presumption that you waived your rights because you did not claim and fight for them. In the legal system most everything is presumed. The government agent (most often a police officer, but can be any enforcement agent) will assert wrong doing on your part. If you do not contest or dispute the asserted presumption of wrong doing, then by the rule of tacit admission, you have agreed that the assertion is true and correct. You think it is about justice, but you couldn't be more wrong. It's commercial, someone is going to make money on your misfortune, but only if they can attach the asserted presumption to you! Learn how to write. Learn how to compose your own affidavit and file it with the court clerk. Most clerks will help you if your document needs a certain structure to be submitted. Get your affidavit notarized. Become proactive.

Our ignorance or passivity empowers our adversary to exploit us in court. If the opposing side (the prosecution) tries to railroad you and ignore your Constitutional rights, the judge will not protect your rights (he is not on your team or the team of justice) and see to it that they are honored. This is particularly true in cases where our opponent and accuser is the Government (a District or State attorney for example). This is seen repeatedly when the sheep are led into our cash register courts, sheared, bled, and butchered under the kindly gaze of the presiding judge, who is actually the prosecutor's team mate working to convict you to protect government revenues and/or public policy and/or his cushy job.

Our cowardice and fear of the courts typically entices us to "play nice" when in court. But that's exactly the wrong strategy because by "playing nice", we become accomplices in our own destruction. By not objecting and defying the courts, we implicitly approve, validate, and accept whatever injustice the court cares to dispense on our lives. By not fighting, we give Government license to destroy us. You will be offered many contracts from the bench. For example, the judge might say, "*If you persist I will hold you in contempt of court!*" A contractual offer. Accept it. Tell the judge that you are fully aware he has the power to injure you, however you intend to tell the whole truth, not a partial truth as you have taken an oath to do, or perhaps you fully intend to claim your right even if that means going to jail. A belligerent claimant in person as set forth by Federal Judge James Alger Fee and referenced in an earlier chapter. Remember that Judge Fee said that it requires sustained combat to secure your rights. If you are not willing to take a stand and fight for them, then you do not have any rights.

Educated Warriors - THE ANTIDOTE FOR APATHY. Even though the Declaration of Independence states "that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men...", the reality is that the Government does not secure or defend our rights, even though we pay taxes for such service. What's a reasonable person to do?

Clearly, we must do something, for as Edmund Burke said, "The only thing necessary for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing." But apathy ("doing nothing") isn't simply a function of cowardice or indifference; "apathy" is a synonym for "ignorance".

Ignorance makes the public more "manageable" in the courts and in confrontations with the government. Insofar as government naturally seeks to expand its powers at the expense of citizens rights and freedoms, government has a vested interest in the public's ignorance and consequent apathy. The interest in expanding its powers encourages the Government to provide little, none, or even false, education on what your rights are, and how our system of government is supposed to work.

So first, you must learn your Constitutional rights. If you don't know what your rights are, you can't fight for them or preserve them for your children and grandchildren.

Second, given the reality of American education, you can't rely on the State government to teach you your rights. Therefore, you must study, learn, and educate yourself.

Third, teach your family, friends and neighbors. It's not enough to know your rights. You must also know and respect your neighbor's rights. Likewise, your neighbor must learn to know and respect his, and your rights, too. The mark of a free and civilized society is a mutual respect for individual rights. Our chances of compelling Government to concede our rights are hugely improved when the general public also understands and respects those rights.

Fourth, knowledge alone is not enough. Once you know your rights, find the courage to fight for them. Courage (belligerence) is the final requirement to secure your rights. Fight for your rights, and more, learn to respect the rights of others. Make no mistake, anyone who's fighting for his rights, is also fighting for yours. He's entitled to your respect.

Fifth, don't trust the government. We need a course at college... Government is not your friend 101. Recognize the true nature of a citizen's relationship to government is *ADVERSARIAL*. All governments naturally seek to expand their powers at the cost of their citizen's rights and freedoms. This has been true since the beginnings of recorded history and probably before, and is not going to change in this life. You have what they want; personal power (and as a consequence, freedom from government authority). Trust the government and you, your children and grandchildren will be enslaved and robbed blind under color of law. The carrot has the potential to be mightier than the stick. The most effective tyrannies begin by luring subjects with carrots (government handouts). Only later, after the people are addicted to handouts and weak, will they use the stick to compel obedience and compliance.

America thrived for nearly two centuries based on the Constitution's mandate of limited government and maximum freedom. But limited government demands self-reliance. As government has grown in size with the carrots of welfare, entitlement's, grants and special interest programs, the public has become increasingly dependent on the government, and the nation and the economy has declined and will continue to decline.

This is America, boys and girls. It's not a piece of land, it's a political miracle -- the only nation the world has ever seen with an anti-government constitution. But this miracle is conditional and dependent on the knowledge, courage, and self-reliance of its citizens. Freedom will not

flourish in a nation of ignorant fools and irresponsible weaklings. To live free takes knowledge, nerve, courage, and personal responsibility.

Thomas Jefferson warned us that if we wanted to preserve our freedoms and liberties, we would have to jealously guard them:

"Let us hear no more about confidence in man, but let us keep them from mischief by binding them down by the chains of the Constitution." - Thomas Jefferson

Freedom isn't free

Everyone knows in their gut that freedom requires a struggle, a fight. The government, however, would have you believe that the fight is best waged in the jungles of Vietnam, or the beaches of Grenada, or the dunes in Iraq.

WRONG !!!

The fight for American freedom can only be waged right here in the U.S.A., and that fight can only be waged by *knowledgeable, belligerent citizens* against the one true threat to our Constitutional rights and freedoms -- the men in our own government and those men who control the men in our government.

Make no mistake, the very first principle of Constitutional government is the fact that the Constitution itself is both the law and the government. It does not provide that any group of men shall become the government over and above the constitution. On the contrary, all government officials (the men in government) are required to take an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution. The Constitution only provides for installing men to administer the law established by the Constitution.

CONCLUSION: - It is a hope that you will become an active participant in this educational effort:

NOTE: Some of the material related to the constitution in this chapter was taken from an article published in "The Anti-Shyster" entitled "TO WHOM DO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS BELONG? TO THE BELLIGERENT" written by Richard C. Donaldson and Alfred Adask

Let me make an important point. The goal of this writing is to restore the government according to the Constitution and to route all those men in government who are working, participating and directing the destruction of the united States of America, our Constitution and lawful civil authority. It is my hope that this writing will be used to educate and to help each individual who fights for his freedoms.

Your Vote

In the republic of the united States of America you have at least three votes. One vote for your representation, one vote as a member of the Grand Jury and one vote as a petit jury member. The most important vote you will make is your vote as a jury member. At this point, the buck stops with you. In this setting each juror has more power than the President, all of Congress, and all of the judges combined! This is the power given you by our founding fathers under the grace of God, so that government is left without the power to abuse the people without your approval. A vote of *not guilty* means that there will be no punishment at the end of the trial. Thus, those acting in the name of the government must come before the common man to get permission to enforce the law. One person who understands the principles of justice, even if the other eleven do not, makes the difference. It is not your job to be a RUBBER STAMP! Its not your job to be a rubber anything!

Having said that I know that judges have set aside jury verdicts from time to time. But that is not a reason to avoid jury duty or voting your heart.

"The jury has a right to judge both the law as well as the fact in controversy." John Jay, 1st Chief Justice , United States Supreme Court

"The jury has the right to determine both the law and the facts." Samuel Chase, U.S. supreme Court Justice, 1796, Signer of the unanimous Declaration.

"The pages of history shine on instances of the jury's exercise of its prerogative to disregard instructions of the judge..." U.S. vs. Dougherty, 473 F 2nd 1113, 1139, (1972).

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Chapter 9

THE FUTURE

This is where I turn into a prophet of sorts and make some observations about what I see coming in our futures. I make these predictions based in knowledge and understanding of the past.

The Government (or New World Order bankers) will probably engineer a major economic disaster for this country aimed at breaking the back of the Middle Class. This observation ties into a theory of mine that I call the 'LAST BEAN THEORY'.

[Note: The above prediction was made in 1996 in a much earlier version of this book. It is now 2008 and the United States is, indeed, in a severe economic down turn. Completely predictable when you know and understand the game and goals. If we throw a rock in the air, we need not see it hit the ground to know that it has, in fact, hit the ground. That is because we understand gravity. It is the same in the political arena. Understand the game, goals and strategy, and you too can predict and foresee what will occur. It is no mystery and nothing happens in the political arena that was not planned beforehand. It was on my knowledge of the game, goals, practices, and strategy of the global elite that I constructed the "*Last Bean Theory*." The text of this chapter was written in 1996, and is coming to fruition now (2008).]

Last bean theory

As a small boy I had a child's book in which Mickey, Donald and Goofy were poor farmers. There came the day when they were down to their last bean in the old bean jar. Mickey dumped the last bean onto a plate, stabbed it with a fork, laid a knife against the fork, looked at goofy and said "*Do you want an inside cut or an outside cut?*" We may soon be like these three, down to our last bean in this country. The economy will collapse as engineered. **We will be given the opportunity to be saved but, it will cost us.** The question that hangs in the air is a critical one. Will we, the sheeple, be willing to give up every last freedom and right we have ever possessed to whomever will guarantee to us, our one two hundred fifty millionth (1/250,000,000) slice of that last bean? Or will we be willing to stand together, independent of government, and survive without all the luxuries? Will we choose life as a bird in a cage, or a life with freedom and liberty? What will our legacy be?

It seems rather apparent that their plan is for us to give up everything for that last government handout. That we will give up our freedom for civil order. And most likely they believe we will give up our country to some global concept, such as the North American Union. I notice that the Amero, the new currency planned for us, is a currency of the North American Union which is stamped on the coin. If American's accept this currency, then it would seem that by the rule of tacit admission, we are embracing a new jurisdiction and dispensing with the united States of

America. And why shouldn't they think that, look at what we Americans have already given up with our spineless and cowardly apathy.

As an economic collapse takes place and things begin to worsen much of the population may turn to drugs or alcohol. As despair grips the nation, the government can then rescue us. The solution to the *economic problem* has already been planned, which is easy to know because the *economic downfall* was planned. When we the people demand that **they** do something, their planned solution will be ready to implement. A solution that satisfies the goal **they** wish to achieve with the crisis **they** engineered. Are we becoming educated and knowledgeable enough to see this? Only time will tell.

It is difficult to know the method of their plan, but the plan itself is easy to see. New World Order with the destruction of the republic of the united States of America. One of the biggest and most pervasive problems we face is those American's who refuse to believe the evidence in front of them. Those who cling to the fallacy that our top levels of government are populated with good men, doing the *right thing* for the country... and nothing could be further from the truth. All the evidence is clear that the goal is to destroy the country. Will we have another *Emergency Banking Relief act of March 9, 1933*? But one that will be far more damaging than just making us an enemy of the United States and far more damaging than just stealing all our money in the banks and retirement accounts. It is much more likely **they** will move toward elimination of our current constitution and the creation of the North American Union as a total replacement of the united States of America. Any new constitution will be written in a manner to enslave you although it will have words that appear to retain all your rights.

To accomplish this they are applying choke holds to Agriculture, Business, Manufacturing, Construction, Finance, Banking, and all other free society institutions as well as continuing to issue currency with no backing. They will also employ the use of agreements with other countries similar to NAFTA and GATT. These in themselves will ultimately be responsible for a great deal of harm to this country. It may take a few years, but the damage will come. More and more jobs will be eliminated from the American Job market and the economy will decline.

The result will be very few jobs for the minimally educated and those that exist will have pitiful salaries. Manufacturing will leave this country, and we will become a consumer rather than a supplier, a certain downfall for the economy. This is going to lead to some very bad times for many good people who will probably end up doing illegal things to survive. Remember this when you sit on a jury. Some of the material I have encountered estimates that in the near future, over 50% of our male population will have to spend some time in prison to support the police, attorney's, courts, medical and incarceration systems. Our prisons are now being turned over to multinational corporations to 'warehouse' (their term, not mine) people. Is this what you want for America?

“The United States has the highest prison population rate in the world, some 686 per 100,000 of the national population, followed by the Cayman Islands (664), Russia (638), Belarus

(554), Kazakhstan (522), Turkmenistan (489), Belize (459), Bahamas (447), Suriname (437) and Dominica (420).

However, more than three-fifths of countries (62.5%) have rates below 150 per 100,000. (The United Kingdom's rate of 139 per 100,000 of the national population places it above the midpoint in the World List; it is now the highest among countries of the European Union.)" - <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs2/r188.pdf>

Do we really think we're *doing it right?* I do not.

Here is something to consider. If I were to *use force and violence to take your car*, you would conclude I have committed a crime. So I'm tried, convicted and sent to prison. OK, now what? It takes \$56,000 a year, for 3 years, to warehouse me in prison for the taking of your \$22,000 car. Does this make sense to you? Then, to get the money needed to provide for my \$56,000 a year imprisonment, the government uses *force and violence* (law) against you to take your property (money) to keep me in jail. Government commits the same crime of robbery against every California citizen to keep me in jail for the same thing they do daily. Does this make sense to you? In three years it will have cost Californian's \$168,000 because I took a \$22,000 car. *Everything is commercial!* Get it?

As I do this 29th rewrite, I have developed additional concern. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the *New World Order / Global Plantation elite* has released biologicals upon other nations to decimate their population. I think there is a chance they may do the same thing to America. I hope not, but given how far they have gone to take our country, destroy our freedom and enslave us, it would be a possibility. They have lied and misled us so much that they have no credibility. If you were to read *Trans Formation of America*, you will not know who to trust. But, if we are unwilling to accept the responsibility for what our government is doing to the rest of the world by virtue of our financial support and general apathy, perhaps we too should suffer the same fate.

Remember, the name of the game is CONTROL and YOU ARE THE TARGET.

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

APPENDIX A - References

and additional reading

Now for the references. Well ... this whole writing may be fiction and I portray nothing else. If you're serious about finding out, try reading the following:

Magna Carta (1215)

Mayflower Compact (1620)

Declarations of Rights (1765 and 1774)

Declaration of Independence (1776)

Articles of Confederation (1778)

United States Constitution

Your State Constitution

Vultures in Eagles Clothing by Lynne Meredith: Available from Free the People, c/o 17011 Beach Blvd. Suite 900, Huntington Beach, California, Postal Code 92647. Book Order Line: (714)375-6631. This provides specific references and is the best overall reference of the bunch. It is the text I would recommend as next on the list to read but not to the exclusion of the others.

Sui Juris, Pardon me but... #5 - Available from North Point Teams, P.O. Box 129, Topton, North Carolina 28781... for a cost of \$3.00 each copy. (This one is a must)

War and Emergency Powers by Dr. Gene Schroder: Available by writing War and Emergency Powers, 4656 Alta Vista, Dallas, Texas 75229. Cost is \$20.00 for the Report (book) and \$25.00 for the Video. The video is excellent when Dr. Schroder begins his presentation... (This also is a must)

Operation Vampire Killer 2000 - American Police Action Plan for Stopping World Government Rule. Published by: Police Against the New World Order. Available from Operation Vampire Killer 2000, P.O. Box 8712, Phoenix, Arizona 85066 for a cost of, I believe, \$6.00 per copy.

The Common Law of the united states of America. By Jerry Henson and published by Lighthouse Color Press, P.O. Box 15742, Del City, Oklahoma, Postal Code 73155. (This book is very important and could be instrumental in establishing a Common Law court in your county.

The material between the two sets of stars is available from KC & Associates, 13510-A Aurora Avenue North, Suite 108, Seattle, Washington 98133. Craig Hulet is a public policy analyst who provides copies of the actual government documents containing various laws and provides in depth analysis and understanding of what it means to you. Craig does not speculate without telling you. Typically his presentation is straight forward and factual without any speculation. Contact KC & Associates for current prices at 206-288-2652.

The Final Solution: This covers FEMA and Federal Emergency Powers; Rex 84 Bravo; Exec Order 11490; etc.

The Constitution Buried by Craig Hulet.

Fascism 2000: Democratic Fascism - One step forward, two steps back.

A Paper on Executive Action: Includes Exec. Order 12919; Presidential Decision Direction 13 & 25; U.S Army Field Manual 100-23 which places U.S. Military Forces Under United Nations and much more.

The following may be available from State Citizen Service Center at (714)283-2254 or FAX (714)998-9139.

The Theory of the Common Law by James M. Walker and Charleston, S.C. Boston: Little, Brown and Company 1852.

State Citizenship - Do you know what I mean?

Right to Travel.

Limitations on Federal Jurisdiction.

A TREATISE ON ARREST AND FALSE IMPRISONMENT; by Charles A. Weisman. A presentation on due process of law concerning arrest. Available from Freedom Bound, c/o 2101 Main Street, Suite 18-1776, Baker, Oregon Republic.

Why A Bankrupt America? Available from Devvy Kidd, POWER; P.O. Box 492200; Redding, California 96049,2200

The Committee of 300 - The Hierarchy of a Conspiracy; by Dr. John Coleman. Available from Joseph Publishing, 2533 North Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada 89706.

You may also wish to obtain a copy of the Citizens Rule Book. Available from the Free Enterprise Society, 300 West Shaw Avenue, Suite 205, Clovis, California 93612.

I will now repeat the disclaimer one more time. I have tried to the best of my ability and research facilities to provide factual information to the best of my knowledge and understanding, but who knows how good that is. It is your responsibility as reader to verify any information or facts presented herein. I assume no responsibility for any actions taken on your part, legal or otherwise, as a result of reading this material. If you haven't learned anything else from me I would have hoped that you would have learned that you are responsible for yourself and if you've made it this far, you're damned tough - a ram for certain. Good luck AMERICA, may God be with you.

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

APPENDIX B - More on flags

I have made reference to the Treatise on the American Flag of Peace by Tom Gipson earlier in this document. I have included the entire Treatise here for your review. The following treatise on the flag was taken from:

<http://www.texasrepublic.com/flaglaw.html>'.

TREATISE

ON THE TITLE 4 U.S.C. 1, AMERICAN FLAG OF PEACE
OF THE united STATES OF AMERICA.
by Tom Gipson

THE FLAG, AS WITH ALL THINGS IN LAW, IS HIGHLY DEFINED

On June 14, 1776, Congress made the following resolution: "The flag of the United States shall be thirteen stripes, alternate red and white, with a union of thirteen stars of white on a blue field..." Because Congress made no rule for the arrangement of the stars, they were displayed in different ways, most usually in a circle. As new states joined the Union, they demanded representation in the stars and stripes of the flag. In 1795 Congress voted to increase to 15 the number of stars and stripes. Legislation enacted in 1818 reestablished the number of stripes at 13 and instituted the policy, "That on the admission of every new state into the Union, one star be added to the Union of the flag..."

An executive order issued by President William Howard Taft on Oct. 29, 1912, fixed the overall width and length of the U.S. flag, known technically as the hoist and fly, respectively, in a ratio of 1: 1.9. The thirteen stripes were fixed at equal width. The hoist of the blue field containing the stars was fixed at seven-thirteenths of the overall hoist, that is, as extending from the top of the flag to the bottom of the seventh stripe. The fly of the blue field was fixed at a tiny fraction over three-fourths the overall hoist. The diameter of each star was established as a minute fraction under one-sixteenth of the overall hoist.

Currently, the Flag of the united States of America is defined at title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 and Presidential Executive Order 10834, found in the Federal Register at Vol. 24. No. 166, P.6365-6367. The American Flag of Peace of the united States of America is described as red, white and blue, with thirteen alternating red and white horizontal stripes, and a blue field (union) with 50 stars, one to represent each of the several States. The Flag is proportional, (1 X 1.9) . This proportion is easily determined by measuring the length (fly) and dividing by the measurement of the width (hoist). The length divided by the width should be very nearly 1.9. If the flag is not to the correct 1 X 1.9 proportion, it is not a title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 American Flag of Peace of the united States of America.

THERE ARE ABSOLUTELY NO PROVISIONS IN THE LAW FOR ADDING A FOURTH COLOR (YELLOW FRINGE) TO THE TITLE 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 FLAG.

Title 4 U.S.C. 3 provides that anything put on the title 4 U.S.C., 1, 2 Flag (gold fringe) MUTILATES the Flag and carries a one-year prison term. This is confirmed by the authority of title 36 U.S.C. 176 (g). The gold fringe is the fourth color and represents "color of law" and when placed on the title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 Flag, mutilates the Flag and suspends the Constitution and establishes "color of law." (Refer to title 18 U.S.C. 242, see Black's Law Dictionary).

As provided by title 36 U.S.C. 173 and Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 2-1(b), the Flag of the united States of America is defined and described in title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2. Civilians must use the title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 Flag (see title 36 U.S.C. 173 and Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 2-7) and when military flags are displayed by Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 2 and title 36 U.S.C. 175.

THE ONLY AUTHORITY FOR A FRINGE ON THE FLAG IS IN THE ARMY REGULATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL (MILITARY) FLAGS ONLY

The U.S. Attorney General has stated: "The placing of a gold fringe on the national flag, the dimensions of the flag, and the arrangements of the stars in the union are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but are within the discretion of the President as Commander-in- Chief of the Army and Navy. . .ancient custom sanctions the use of fringe on regimental colors and standards, but there seems to be no good reason or precedent for its use on other flags. . .the use of such a fringe is prescribed in current Army Regulations, No. 260-10." (See 34 Ops. Atty. Gen. 483 & 485) The only statute or regulation, in the United States, prescribing a yellow fringed United States flag is Army Regulation No. 260-10, making it a military flag.

By Army Regulation 260-10, the gold fringe may be used only on regimental "colors," the President's flag, for military courts martial, and the flags used at military recruiting centers.

"A military flag emblem of a nation, usually made of cloth and flown from a staff; FROM A MILITARY STANDPOINT flags are of two general classes...those flown from stationary masts over army posts, and those carried by troops in formation. The former are referred to by the general name of flags. The later are called colors when carried by dismounted troops. COLORS AND STANDARDS are more nearly square than flags and are made of silk, with a knotted FRINGE OF YELLOW ON THREE SIDES. . .USE OF A FLAG -- THE MOST GENERAL AND APPROPRIATE USE OF THE FLAG IS AS A NATIONAL SYMBOL OF AUTHORITY AND POWER." (National Encyclopedia, Vol. 4)

The adornments on the top of the flag pole are for military use only. The gold eagle is for the use of the President of the United States only, and only in time of war. The gold spear ball is for military recruiting centers only. The gold acorn is for military parades only. (Army Regulation 840-10, chapter 8).

Colors -- "A flag, ensign, or standard borne in an army or fleet." (Webster's 1971)

Color -- An appearance, semblance, or simulacrum, as distinguished from that which is real. A prima facie or apparent right. Hence, a deceptive appearance; a plausible, assumed exterior, concealing a lack or reality; a disguise or pretext. (Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Ed.)

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 state law." (Atkins v. Lanning, 415 F. Supp. 186, 188)

Colorable -- That which is in appearance only, and not in reality, what it purports to be, hence counterfeit, feigned, having the appearance of truth. (Windle v. Flinn, 251 P. 2d 136, 146)

Colorable alteration -- One which makes no real or substantial change, but is introduced only as a subterfuge or means of evading the patent or copyright law. (Black's 6th)

Colorable imitation -- In the law of trademarks, this phrase denotes such a close or ingenious imitation as to be calculated to deceive ordinary persons. (Black's 6th)

The Title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 American Flag of the united States of America takes precedence over all other flags, as it is the superior flag, and establishes the jurisdiction of the united States of America, and the laws made in pursuance thereof.

THE LAW OF THE FLAG

The Law of the Flag, an International Law, which is recognized by every nation of the planet, is defined as: " .. a rule to the effect that a vessel is a part of the territory of the nation whose flag she flies. The term is used to designate the right under which a ship owner, who sends his vessel into a foreign port, gives notice by his flag to all who enter into contracts with the ship master that he intends the Law of that Flag to regulate those contracts, and that they must either submit to its operation or not contract with him or his agent at all." (Ref.: Ruhstrat v. People, 57 N.E. 41)

By the doctrine of "four cornering" the flag establishes the law of the country that it represents. For example, the embassies of foreign countries, in Washington D.C., are "four cornered" by walls or fencing, creating an "enclave." Within the boundaries of the "enclave" of the foreign embassy, the flag of that foreign country establishes the jurisdiction and law of that foreign country, which will be enforced by the Law of the Flag and international treaty. If you enter an embassy, you will be subject to the laws of that country, just as if you board a ship flying a foreign flag, you will be subject to the laws of that flag, enforceable by the "master of the ship," (Captain), by the law of the flag.

Under Article IV, section 3, of the Constitution for the united States of America, no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State. So -- why have the Germans been allowed to erect a German enclave at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico, under the Law of the Flag? Why have the judges of the State and Federal courts been allowed to erect

foreign enclaves within our courthouses under the foreign flag of the yellow fringe on the soil of Texas?

The flags displayed in State courts and courts of the United States have gold or yellow fringes. It is your warning that you are entering a foreign enclave and will be under the jurisdiction of that flag. The flag of the gold or yellow fringe has no constitution, no laws, and no rules of court, and is not recognized by any Nation on the earth, and is foreign to Texas and the United States of America. When you enter a courtroom displaying a gold or yellow fringed flag, you have just entered into a foreign country, and you better have your passport with you, you may not be coming back. The judge under a gold or yellow fringe flag becomes the "captain" or "master" and has absolute power to make the rules as he goes. The gold or yellow fringe flag is your warning that you are leaving your Constitutionally secured rights at the door. "It is an elementary rule of pleading, that a plea to the jurisdiction is a tacit (silent) admission that the court has a right to judge in the case and is a waiver to all exception to the jurisdiction." (Girty v. Logan, 6 Bush KY, 8)

You can watch over the ramparts by the dawn's early light, with bombs bursting in the air, until you go blind, but you will not see a title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 Flag with its bright stars and broad stripes. When the flags are gone, the Country is gone.

You may see something that looks like an American Flag, (a colorable flag, a colorable alteration or imitation) but it is a shortened National Flag, for military use only. Take your tape measure and calculator to determine what kind of a flag it is. Five will get you ten that its proportion is 1 X 1.66 or 1 X 1.5. It looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck, but it ain't a duck.

Why do private businesses display National Flags with military adornments on the flag pole? Why do banks display gold or yellow fringed flags, with gold adornments, in their lobbies? Is McDonald's competing with the Army recruiters? Why have military "colors" been placed in our public schools? Why are our children being taught under martial law, in foreign or military enclaves with no Constitutionally secured rights, under the Law of the Flag. Why do most churches display gold or yellow fringed flags with gold adornments? Does your Church have a pastor or chaplain? A military or foreign flag, displayed without the presence of a title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 Flag suspends the Constitution, by the international law of the flag.

BUT MOST OF ALL, WHY DO CIVILIAN COURTS DISPLAY MILITARY OR FOREIGN FLAGS? WHY DO CIVILIAN JUDGES CONDUCT COURTS MARTIAL FOR CIVILIANS?

Under martial law, you are presumed guilty until proven innocent.

WHY ARE THERE NO MANUFACTURERS THAT PRODUCE CORRECT TITLE 4 U.S.C. 1 FLAGS? Try to buy one.

**AMERICA HAS BEEN CONQUERED AND BY TACIT ADMISSION,
THE PEOPLE HAVE SURRENDERED!!**

When two nations go to war, the object of the game is to capture the other guy's flag. When you go onto foreign soil, take the other guy's flag down and put yours up, you have captured the other guy's territory and put it under the law (Constitution) of your flag.

Sun Tzu, the ancient Chinese philosopher and general, said that when the Art of War is brought to its highest pinnacle, the enemy will be conquered without the opposing armies ever having met in the field. By skillfully using the art of deception, and skillful use of agents to infiltrate the enemy's government, the enemy may be conquered without the enemy even knowing that it had been conquered.

WE HAVE BEEN CONQUERED! WHERE IS THE VFW? WHERE ARE THE VETERANS THAT PAID SO HIGH A PRICE FOR THE TITLE 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 AMERICAN FLAG AND THE LIBERTY AND COUNTRY THAT IT REPRESENTS? WILL THESE MEN WHO SACRIFICED SO MUCH CONTINUE TO CONSENT TO THE FALL OF OUR NATION BY THEIR CONTINUED SILENCE? HAVE THEY CAPITULATED BY TACIT AGREEMENT?

Capitulation -- the act or agreement of surrendering upon negotiated or simulated terms. (Black's Law Dictionary, 6th Ed.)

Tacit -- Existing, inferred, or understood without being openly expressed or stated; implied by silence or silent acquiescence, as a tacit agreement or tacit understanding. Done or made in silence, implied or indicated, but not actually expressed. Manifested by the refraining from contradiction or objection; inferred from the situation and circumstance, in the absence of express matter. (Black's Law Dictionary 6th Ed.)

Tacit admissions -- An acknowledgment or concession of a fact inferred from either silence or from the substance of what one has said.

Maxim of Law -- "Tacita quaedam habentur pro expressis" -- THINGS UNEXPRESSED ARE SOMETIMES CONSIDERED AS EXPRESSED.

CONCLUSION

Our elected officials, judges, county commissioners, city councils, school boards and school administrators, police, the State Legislators, Governor, the U.S. Congress, and even the President have all committed acts of CONSTRUCTIVE TREASON, (defined as: "..an attempt to establish treason by circumstantiality, and not by the simple genuine letter of the law, and therefore is highly dangerous to public freedom." C.J.S., vol. 87, p. 910) either knowingly or unknowingly, against the People of the united States of America by surrendering the American Flag of Peace of the united States of America to the foreign state/power of the yellow fringe flag and erecting 'foreign enclaves' on the soil of the several States in breach of Article IV, Section 3. When all of the title 4 U.S.C. 1, 2 American Flags are gone, our country, the united States of America and our precious Constitutions are gone.

If the flag is not important, why then, did an entire battalion of Marines, in early 1942, die to the last man on Wake Island defending the flag against the Japanese? These Marines DID NOT SURRENDER THE FLAG!

In early 1942, in the Philippines, a young officer named Lt. Ramsey, under the command of Gen. Wainwright, led the last mounted calvary charge in the history of the U.S. Army. Lt. Ramsey and his men fought so viciously and with such determination that, against overwhelming odds, the Japanese were routed, buying precious time to enable the American forces to retreat to the peninsula of Bataan. When the American forces were finally forced by starvation to surrender to the Japanese, Lt. Ramsey refused to surrender and slipped through the Japanese lines with a handful of his men and continued to make war against the Japanese with the Philippine Army. By hiding in the mountains and jungle, Lt. Ramsey, though poorly equipped, was able to train a guerrilla army and wreak havoc on the Japanese until Gen. McArthur returned. Lt. Ramsey did not surrender his flag!

DEFINITION

Constructive Treason -- Officers that swear an oath and affirmation for supporting and defending the Constitution for the united States of America and by surrendering the oath and affirmation to the foreign state/power of the foreign yellow or gold fringe flag, causing the party before the court a deprivation of rights, with will of intent by the judge, by overt acts to surrender the Constitution of the united States of America into the hand of a foreign power/state, by definition is guilty of constructive treason.

Constructive Treason -- Treason imputed to a person by law from his conduct or course of action, though his deeds taken severally do not amount to actual treason. (Black's 6th)

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

APPENDIX C - An understanding of the Buck Act

The united States of America

The map of the united States of America includes the 50 sovereign and independent states who are joined together in a union. It does NOT include the "District of Columbia," which was created by the Constitution of the Union as the legal home of the "federal" government -- which was intended to be a "Servant" to the Union States, not their "Master!"

In order for the Federal Government to tax a Citizen of one of the several states, they had to create a contractual nexus. This contractual nexus is called "Social Security". The Federal government always does everything according to principles of laws.

In 1935, the federal government instituted Social Security. The Social Security Board then, created 10 Social Security Districts creating a "Federal Area" which covered the several states like an overlay.

In 1939, the federal government instituted the "Public Salary Tax Act of 1939", which is a municipal law of the District of Columbia, taxing all Federal and State government employees and those who live and work in any "Federal area."

Now, the government knows it cannot tax those citizens who live and work outside the territorial jurisdiction of Article I, Section 8, Clause 17, or Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2. So in 1940, Congress passed the "Buck Act" 4 U.S.C.S. 104-113. In Section 110(e), this Act allowed any department of the federal government to create a "Federal Area" for imposition of the Public Salary Tax Act of 1939, the imposition of this tax is at 4 U.S.C.S. section 111, and the rest of the taxing law is in Title 26, The Internal Revenue Code. The Social Security Board had already created an overlay of a "Federal Area".

As a result, the Federal Government created Federal "States" which are exactly like the Sovereign States, occupy the same territory and boundaries, but whose names are capitalized versions of the Sovereign States. Congress (Remember that Proper Names and Proper Nouns in the English language have only the first letter Capitalized.) For example, the Federal "State" of ILLINOIS is overlaid upon the Sovereign State of Illinois. Further, it is designated by the Federal abbreviation of "IL", instead of the Sovereign State abbreviation of "Ill." So too is Arizona designated "AZ" instead of the lawful abbreviation of "Ariz," "CA" instead of "Calif," etc. If you use a two-letter CAPITALIZED abbreviation, you are declaring that the location is under the jurisdiction of the "federal" government instead of the powers of the "Sovereign" state.

As a result of creating these "shadow" States, the Federal government assumes that every area is a "Federal Area", and that the Citizens therein are "Federal" citizens.

4 U.S.C.S. section 110(d).

"The term `State' includes any Territory or possession of the United States."

4 U.S.C.S. section 110(e).

"The term Federal area means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United States or any department, establishment, or agency of the United States; any federal area, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a Federal area located within such State."

There is no reasonable doubt that the federal "State" is imposing directly an excise tax under the provisions of 4 U.S.C.S. Section 105 which states in pertinent part:

"Section 105. State and so forth, taxation affecting Federal areas; sales and use tax"

"(a) No person shall be relieved from liability for payment of, collection of, or accounting for any sales or use tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such tax, on the ground that the sale or use, with respect to which tax is levied, occurred in whole or in part within a Federal area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect any such tax in any Federal area, within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area."

"Irrespective of what tax is called by state law, if its purpose is to produce revenue, it is income tax or receipts tax under the Buck Act [4 U.S.C.S. sections 105-110]." *Humble Oil & Refining Co. v. Calvert*, (1971) 464 SW2d. 170, *affd* (Tex) 478 SW2d. 926, *cert. den.* 409 U.S. 967, 34 L.Ed2d. 234, 93 S.Ct. 293.

Thus, the question comes up, what is a "Federal area?" A "Federal area" is any area designated by any agency, department, or establishment of the federal government. This includes the Social Security areas designated by the Social Security Administration, any public housing area that has federal funding, a home that has a federal bank loan, a road that has federal funding, and almost everything that the federal government touches though any type of aid. *Springfield v. Kenny*, (1951 App.) 104 NE2d. 65.

This "Federal area" attaches to anyone who has a social security number or any personal contact with the federal or state governments. Thus, the federal government has usurped Sovereignty of the People and state Sovereignty by creating these federal areas within the boundaries of the states under the authority of the Federal Constitution, Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2, which states:

"2. The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

The "SHADOW" States of the Buck Act

Therefore, the U.S. citizens [citizens of the District of Columbia] residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an "individual entity" *Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox*, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773.

Under the "Buck Act" 4 U.S.C.S. sections 105-110, the federal government has created a "Federal area" within the boundaries of all the states. This area is similar to any territory that the federal government acquires through purchase or conquest, thereby imposing federal territorial law upon those in this "Federal area". Under federal territorial law as evidenced by the Executive Branch's yellow fringed U.S. flag (see Federal Courts for an explanation) flying in schools, offices and all courtrooms.

So, when you send mail using the two-letter CAPITAL abbreviation for the state, you are addressing the corporate shadow state created by the Buck Act as an extension of the federal District of Columbia, and you are accepting the jurisdiction of the FEDERAL Government within the borders of the Sovereign States!

What you are experiencing is an unprecedented GRAB for power by the "federal" government! In fact, Agents of the "federal" government have NO jurisdiction within the borders of these separate and sovereign united States -- unless you give it to them!

Copyright Symbol Copyright 1997 !SOLUTIONS! Data Services Co. All rights reserved

[THIS AREA LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK]

Appendix D - Children of tomorrow

Children of tomorrow
I apologize to you
On behalf of those in my time
For the things we didn't do
We didn't stop the tyrants
So your fate could be prevented
We watched them steal our freedom
By our silence we consented
We didn't choose to circumvent
The doom you've not escaped
While the 'BILL of RIGHTS' was murdered
And the 'CONSTITUTION' raped
Some of us were lazy
Others too afraid
To think about our children
The ones we have betrayed
I guess we were too busy
To be concerned or care
To try to ease the burden
Of the chains we made you wear
We could have been good shepherds
When the wolf got in the fold
But we watched the flame of freedom die instead
And left you cold
We changed our great republic
Which was forged in liberty
To a socialistic welfare state
We laughingly call democracy
I'm sorry we were timid
My selfish generation
We left but a remnant
Of a free and prosperous nation
I'm sorry for our actions
Like cowards we behaved
We could have left you freedom
Instead you are enslaved
Children of tomorrow
Descendants of our land
I'm sorry we allowed this
The fate you now withstand
(Author - unknown)

INDEX

1040.	Page 82 , Page 225
abortion.	Page 5 , Page 60 , Page 109 , Page 111 , Page 113 , Page 231 , Page 232
activity.	Page 8 , Page 12 , Page 29 , Page 54 , Page 58 , Page 68 , Page 73 , Page 76 , Page 78 , Page 82 , Page 86 , Page 89 , Page 117-119 , Page 121 , Page 124 , Page 126 , Page 149 , Page 160 , Page 162 , Page 202 , Page 209 , Page 210 , Page 215 , Page 216
acts have no consequences.	Page 113 , Page 230 , Page 232 , Page 234
admiralty.	Page 85 , Page 142
allodium.	Page 150 , Page 151 , Page 219
American.	Page 1-3 , Page 7 , Page 9 , Page 18 , Page 19 , Page 22 , Page 27 , Page 29 , Page 31 , Page 35 , Page 37 , Page 39 , Page 43 , Page 45 , Page 50 , Page 51 , Page 55 , Page 58 , Page 59 , Page 62 , Page 67 , Page 69 , Page 70 , Page 73 , Page 74 , Page 76-78 , Page 82-84 , Page 90 , Page 91 , Page 93 , Page 102 , Page 104 , Page 107-109 , Page 114 , Page 115 , Page 118 , Page 120 , Page 124-126 , Page 130 , Page 131 , Page 135 , Page 136 , Page 139 , Page 143-153 , Page 158-163 , Page 165 , Page 166 , Page 169 , Page 174 , Page 178 , Page 182 , Page 183 , Page 192 , Page 193 , Page 197 , Page 198 , Page 206 , Page 211 , Page 212 , Page 217 , Page 220 , Page 223-225 , Page 229 , Page 235 , Page 238 , Page 244-247 , Page 249 , Page 250 , Page 252 , Page 253 , Page 255 , Page 258 , Page 260-263
American people.	Page 37 , Page 43 , Page 50 , Page 55 , Page 58 , Page 70 , Page 73 , Page 74 , Page 124-126 , Page 131 , Page 136 , Page 139 , Page 143-153 , Page 159-162 , Page 169 , Page 174 , Page 178 , Page 182 , Page 193 , Page 206 , Page 217 , Page 223 , Page 224 , Page 235 , Page 246
arrest. . .	Page 17 , Page 24 , Page 28 , Page 54 , Page 59 , Page 69-71 , Page 78 , Page 117 , Page 188 , Page 201 , Page 220-223 , Page 229 , Page 256
artificial person.	Page 131 , Page 152 , Page 172 , Page 184 , Page 186 , Page 202 , Page 232 , Page 236
attorney. .	Page 21 , Page 40-42 , Page 44 , Page 56 , Page 65 , Page 66 , Page 83 , Page 90 , Page 91 , Page 151 , Page 247 , Page 248 , Page 259
bank.	Page 64 , Page 70 , Page 76 , Page 115 , Page 117 , Page 122-124 , Page 126 , Page 128 , Page 131-136 , Page 140 , Page 143-146 , Page 150 , Page 153-157 , Page 160 , Page 161 , Page 163 , Page 200 , Page 205 , Page 206 , Page 236 , Page 237 , Page 265
batf.	Page 2 , Page 20 , Page 28 , Page 32 , Page 37 , Page 48 , Page 54 , Page 55 , Page 57
birth certificate.	Page 161 , Page 162 , Page 173 , Page 200 , Page 201 , Page 203 , Page 232
birth certification.	Page 161 , Page 218
board. . .	Page 42 , Page 75 , Page 91 , Page 98 , Page 122-124 , Page 126 , Page 130 , Page 142-144 , Page 160 , Page 173 , Page 186 , Page 204 , Page 205 , Page 214 , Page 260 , Page 264
bond.	Page 12 , Page 66 , Page 108 , Page 161 , Page 162 , Page 190 , Page 200 , Page 201 , Page 205 , Page 212 , Page 232
buck act.	Page 173 , Page 174 , Page 217 , Page 264-266
bureau of land management.	Page 23

child. [Page 5](#), [Page 12](#), [Page 19](#), [Page 20](#), [Page 30](#), [Page 32](#), [Page 38](#), [Page 43-45](#), [Page 50](#),
[Page 57](#), [Page 63](#), [Page 104](#), [Page 107](#), [Page 109-117](#), [Page 185](#), [Page 186](#), [Page 203](#),
[Page 204](#), [Page 209](#), [Page 212](#), [Page 229](#), [Page 231](#)

children. [2](#), [Page 1-3](#), [Page 6-8](#), [Page 11-13](#), [Page 17](#), [Page 19-21](#), [Page 24](#), [Page 27-30](#),
[Page 32](#), [Page 33](#), [Page 40](#), [Page 42-45](#), [Page 47](#), [Page 51](#), [Page 52](#), [Page 55](#), [Page 60](#),
[Page 62](#), [Page 63](#), [Page 74](#), [Page 77](#), [Page 82](#), [Page 86](#), [Page 91](#), [Page 104](#), [Page 105](#),
[Page 108](#), [Page 109](#), [Page 111-114](#), [Page 116](#), [Page 117](#), [Page 130](#), [Page 131](#), [Page 134](#),
[Page 138](#), [Page 160](#), [Page 163](#), [Page 185](#), [Page 186](#), [Page 192](#), [Page 199](#), [Page 201](#),
[Page 203](#), [Page 204](#), [Page 207](#), [Page 209](#), [Page 211](#), [Page 212](#), [Page 223](#), [Page 229-232](#),
[Page 234](#), [Page 235](#), [Page 246](#), [Page 249](#), [Page 261](#), [Page 267](#)

children of tomorrow. [2](#), [Page 267](#)

churches. [Page 87](#), [Page 144](#), [Page 171](#), [Page 194](#), [Page 195](#), [Page 207](#), [Page 208](#), [Page 219](#),
[Page 261](#)

citizen. [Page 22](#), [Page 23](#), [Page 59](#), [Page 61](#), [Page 70](#), [Page 72](#), [Page 88](#), [Page 89](#), [Page 93](#),
[Page 101](#), [Page 116](#), [Page 118-120](#), [Page 125](#), [Page 130](#), [Page 131](#), [Page 151](#), [Page 152](#),
[Page 154](#), [Page 155](#), [Page 157](#), [Page 165-169](#), [Page 172](#), [Page 174-176](#), [Page 178](#),
[Page 179](#), [Page 181](#), [Page 182](#), [Page 184](#), [Page 186-189](#), [Page 194](#), [Page 200-206](#),
[Page 213-215](#), [Page 217-220](#), [Page 236](#), [Page 244](#), [Page 247](#), [Page 254](#), [Page 256](#),
[Page 264](#)

citizens. [Page 7](#), [Page 21](#), [Page 27](#), [Page 51](#), [Page 58](#), [Page 59](#), [Page 62](#), [Page 69-71](#), [Page 77](#),
[Page 83](#), [Page 85](#), [Page 88](#), [Page 89](#), [Page 91](#), [Page 94](#), [Page 97](#), [Page 118](#), [Page 125](#),
[Page 130](#), [Page 136](#), [Page 140](#), [Page 146](#), [Page 151](#), [Page 152](#), [Page 155](#), [Page 156](#),
[Page 160](#), [Page 165](#), [Page 167-170](#), [Page 172-175](#), [Page 178](#), [Page 181](#), [Page 182](#),
[Page 184](#), [Page 191](#), [Page 198](#), [Page 200](#), [Page 202-206](#), [Page 212](#), [Page 215](#), [Page 217](#),
[Page 222](#), [Page 233](#), [Page 234](#), [Page 237](#), [Page 244](#), [Page 245](#), [Page 247](#), [Page 249](#),
[Page 250](#), [Page 257](#), [Page 264](#), [Page 266](#)

clearfield. [Page 155](#), [Page 157](#), [Page 176](#), [Page 216](#)

code enforcers. [Page 16](#), [Page 20](#), [Page 23](#), [Page 24](#)

collateral. [Page 134](#), [Page 135](#)

collective right. [Page 62](#), [Page 65](#), [Page 67](#), [Page 68](#), [Page 246](#)

combat arms survey. [Page 237](#), [Page 239](#)

commercial. [Page 19](#), [Page 36](#), [Page 70-74](#), [Page 76-80](#), [Page 82](#), [Page 83](#), [Page 85](#), [Page 91](#),
[Page 105](#), [Page 107-109](#), [Page 111](#), [Page 115-119](#), [Page 121](#), [Page 125](#), [Page 130](#),
[Page 135](#), [Page 136](#), [Page 141](#), [Page 147-149](#), [Page 151](#), [Page 154-157](#), [Page 160](#),
[Page 162-164](#), [Page 175](#), [Page 176](#), [Page 178-182](#), [Page 184](#), [Page 190](#), [Page 194](#),
[Page 199-204](#), [Page 210-212](#), [Page 216](#), [Page 220](#), [Page 225](#), [Page 248](#), [Page 254](#)

commercial activity. [Page 73](#), [Page 76](#), [Page 117-119](#), [Page 121](#), [Page 149](#), [Page 160](#), [Page 162](#),
[Page 202](#)

common force. [Page 65-68](#), [Page 70](#), [Page 71](#), [Page 73](#)

common law. [Page 58](#), [Page 71](#), [Page 72](#), [Page 84](#), [Page 85](#), [Page 88](#), [Page 100](#), [Page 102](#),
[Page 103](#), [Page 142](#), [Page 162](#), [Page 171](#), [Page 173](#), [Page 176](#), [Page 181](#), [Page 189](#),
[Page 190](#), [Page 194](#), [Page 199-201](#), [Page 204](#), [Page 207](#), [Page 210-212](#), [Page 219-222](#),
[Page 229](#), [Page 255](#), [Page 256](#)

conspiracy. . . . [Page 37](#), [Page 74](#), [Page 101](#), [Page 120](#), [Page 121](#), [Page 126](#), [Page 136](#), [Page 139](#),
[Page 144](#), [Page 153](#), [Page 161](#), [Page 171](#), [Page 185](#), [Page 204](#), [Page 206](#), [Page 256](#)

constitution. [2](#), [Page 1](#), [Page 2](#), [Page 5](#), [Page 11](#), [Page 17](#), [Page 22-24](#), [Page 31](#), [Page 42](#),
[Page 57](#), [Page 58](#), [Page 61](#), [Page 63](#), [Page 64](#), [Page 66](#), [Page 68-73](#), [Page 75](#), [Page 77](#),
[Page 85](#), [Page 86](#), [Page 88](#), [Page 89](#), [Page 101-103](#), [Page 107](#), [Page 120-123](#), [Page 126-128](#),
[Page 135](#), [Page 138](#), [Page 140-142](#), [Page 145-150](#), [Page 153-155](#), [Page 158](#),
[Page 160](#), [Page 164-173](#), [Page 175](#), [Page 177](#), [Page 178](#), [Page 181](#), [Page 182](#), [Page 184](#),
[Page 185](#), [Page 187](#), [Page 188](#), [Page 190](#), [Page 191](#), [Page 193](#), [Page 197](#), [Page 199](#),
[Page 201-208](#), [Page 212](#), [Page 214-217](#), [Page 220-225](#), [Page 227](#), [Page 228](#), [Page 236](#),
[Page 244-250](#), [Page 253](#), [Page 255](#), [Page 256](#), [Page 259-265](#), [Page 267](#)

contract. . . . [Page 6](#), [Page 68](#), [Page 73](#), [Page 78](#), [Page 80](#), [Page 90](#), [Page 117](#), [Page 134](#), [Page 150](#),
[Page 155-158](#), [Page 170](#), [Page 173](#), [Page 174](#), [Page 176](#), [Page 181](#), [Page 183](#), [Page 187](#),
[Page 190](#), [Page 199](#), [Page 200](#), [Page 203](#), [Page 204](#), [Page 212](#), [Page 216](#), [Page 222](#),
[Page 260](#)

counts. [Page 11](#), [Page 43](#), [Page 76](#), [Page 114](#), [Page 253](#)

court. [Page 21](#), [Page 24](#), [Page 25](#), [Page 41](#), [Page 54](#), [Page 61](#), [Page 65](#), [Page 66](#), [Page 69](#),
[Page 70](#), [Page 83](#), [Page 85](#), [Page 86](#), [Page 88](#), [Page 90](#), [Page 91](#), [Page 93-100](#), [Page 121](#),
[Page 127](#), [Page 132](#), [Page 140](#), [Page 141](#), [Page 147](#), [Page 152-157](#), [Page 164](#), [Page 165](#),
[Page 167](#), [Page 168](#), [Page 172](#), [Page 180-182](#), [Page 184](#), [Page 186-188](#), [Page 193](#),
[Page 194](#), [Page 197](#), [Page 202](#), [Page 208](#), [Page 209](#), [Page 212-216](#), [Page 221](#), [Page 225](#),
[Page 228](#), [Page 236](#), [Page 247](#), [Page 248](#), [Page 251](#), [Page 255](#), [Page 261](#), [Page 263](#)

currency. . . . [Page 74](#), [Page 84](#), [Page 122-124](#), [Page 130-140](#), [Page 142-144](#), [Page 146](#), [Page 150](#),
[Page 163](#), [Page 206](#), [Page 207](#), [Page 225](#), [Page 236](#), [Page 237](#), [Page 252](#), [Page 253](#)

debt. . . . [Page 102](#), [Page 132-136](#), [Page 138](#), [Page 163](#), [Page 205](#), [Page 219](#), [Page 225](#), [Page 236](#)

delegate. [Page 67](#)

dewey. [Page 19](#), [Page 104](#)

dictator. [Page 129](#), [Page 130](#)

disclaimer. [Page 10](#), [Page 257](#)

dollar. [Page 7](#), [Page 135](#), [Page 138](#), [Page 163](#), [Page 213](#), [Page 220](#), [Page 237](#)

dr. [Page 38](#), [Page 40](#), [Page 47](#), [Page 114](#), [Page 118](#), [Page 255](#), [Page 256](#)

dr. george counts. [Page 114](#)

due process. . . . [Page 30](#), [Page 54](#), [Page 69-73](#), [Page 85](#), [Page 102](#), [Page 150](#), [Page 172](#), [Page 176](#),
[Page 185](#), [Page 186](#), [Page 197](#), [Page 213](#), [Page 214](#), [Page 220-222](#), [Page 229](#), [Page 256](#)

eagle. [Page 138](#), [Page 259](#)

elite. [Page 1](#), [Page 73-75](#), [Page 111](#), [Page 120](#), [Page 124](#), [Page 128](#), [Page 136](#), [Page 143](#),
[Page 146](#), [Page 153](#), [Page 162](#), [Page 163](#), [Page 171](#), [Page 191](#), [Page 198](#), [Page 252](#),
[Page 254](#)

employer. [Page 174](#), [Page 218](#)

enemies. [Page 24](#), [Page 118](#), [Page 125](#), [Page 150](#), [Page 162](#), [Page 193](#), [Page 220](#), [Page 223](#),
[Page 244](#)

enemy. [Page 23](#), [Page 92](#), [Page 118](#), [Page 119](#), [Page 123-125](#), [Page 131](#), [Page 138](#), [Page 146](#),
[Page 149-153](#), [Page 158-160](#), [Page 162](#), [Page 164](#), [Page 192](#), [Page 198](#), [Page 220](#),
[Page 222](#), [Page 224](#), [Page 253](#), [Page 262](#)

enforce. . . . [Page 16](#), [Page 17](#), [Page 28](#), [Page 66](#), [Page 70](#), [Page 78](#), [Page 86](#), [Page 99](#), [Page 157](#),
[Page 158](#), [Page 217](#), [Page 246](#), [Page 251](#), [Page 260](#)

enforcement. [Page 21](#), [Page 23](#), [Page 28](#), [Page 29](#), [Page 35](#), [Page 45](#), [Page 50](#), [Page 57](#), [Page 66](#),
[Page 70](#), [Page 71](#), [Page 73](#), [Page 78](#), [Page 240-242](#), [Page 248](#)

enfranchisement. [Page 172](#)

evidence. . [Page 21](#), [Page 23](#), [Page 33-35](#), [Page 39](#), [Page 42](#), [Page 49](#), [Page 52](#), [Page 53](#), [Page 70](#),
[Page 88](#), [Page 89](#), [Page 93](#), [Page 97-99](#), [Page 136](#), [Page 139](#), [Page 144](#), [Page 148](#),
[Page 157](#), [Page 168](#), [Page 177](#), [Page 182](#), [Page 186](#), [Page 201](#), [Page 210](#), [Page 217](#),
[Page 218](#), [Page 236](#), [Page 253](#), [Page 254](#)

fabricated evidence. [Page 21](#)

fbi. . . . [Page 20-22](#), [Page 29](#), [Page 30](#), [Page 37](#), [Page 40](#), [Page 41](#), [Page 43-49](#), [Page 52](#), [Page 53](#),
[Page 55](#), [Page 66](#), [Page 74](#), [Page 164](#), [Page 240](#)

federal reserve. [Page 122-124](#), [Page 126](#), [Page 130](#), [Page 132-140](#), [Page 142-146](#), [Page 150](#),
[Page 153-155](#), [Page 157](#), [Page 160](#), [Page 161](#), [Page 163](#), [Page 175](#), [Page 200](#), [Page 205](#),
[Page 206](#), [Page 225](#), [Page 236](#)

federal reserve bank. . . . [Page 122](#), [Page 123](#), [Page 126](#), [Page 132-136](#), [Page 140](#), [Page 143-146](#),
[Page 150](#), [Page 153](#), [Page 154](#), [Page 157](#), [Page 160](#), [Page 161](#), [Page 200](#), [Page 205](#),
[Page 206](#)

federal reserve board. [Page 122-124](#), [Page 126](#), [Page 130](#), [Page 142](#), [Page 143](#), [Page 160](#)

fee. [Page 65](#), [Page 66](#), [Page 99](#), [Page 150](#), [Page 157](#), [Page 191](#), [Page 247](#), [Page 248](#)

fish and game. [Page 23](#), [Page 164](#)

flight from truth. [Page 6](#)

force. [Page 2](#), [Page 28](#), [Page 29](#), [Page 33](#), [Page 35](#), [Page 39](#), [Page 42](#), [Page 45](#), [Page 54](#),
[Page 59](#), [Page 61](#), [Page 62](#), [Page 65-68](#), [Page 70-74](#), [Page 76-80](#), [Page 84](#), [Page 86](#),
[Page 87](#), [Page 109](#), [Page 115-117](#), [Page 121](#), [Page 144](#), [Page 151](#), [Page 153](#), [Page 160](#),
[Page 161](#), [Page 169](#), [Page 193](#), [Page 197](#), [Page 204](#), [Page 221](#), [Page 230](#), [Page 231](#),
[Page 240](#), [Page 254](#), [Page 260](#)

forest service. [Page 23](#), [Page 164](#)

franchise. [Page 131](#), [Page 172](#), [Page 173](#), [Page 184](#), [Page 186](#), [Page 202](#)

freedom. [1](#), [2](#), [Page 1](#), [Page 2](#), [Page 7](#), [Page 11](#), [Page 12](#), [Page 24](#), [Page 58](#), [Page 61](#), [Page 63-65](#),
[Page 70-72](#), [Page 74](#), [Page 77](#), [Page 82](#), [Page 84](#), [Page 95](#), [Page 97](#), [Page 98](#), [Page 103](#),
[Page 109](#), [Page 116](#), [Page 117](#), [Page 121](#), [Page 147](#), [Page 149](#), [Page 160](#), [Page 168](#),
[Page 172](#), [Page 180-182](#), [Page 191](#), [Page 193](#), [Page 199](#), [Page 201](#), [Page 204](#), [Page 212](#),
[Page 215](#), [Page 216](#), [Page 219-221](#), [Page 223](#), [Page 224](#), [Page 229](#), [Page 231](#), [Page 249](#),
[Page 250](#), [Page 252](#), [Page 254](#), [Page 256](#), [Page 262](#), [Page 267](#)

freeman. [Page 7](#), [Page 23](#), [Page 29](#), [Page 102](#), [Page 174](#)

George. [Page 48](#), [Page 114](#), [Page 162](#), [Page 192](#), [Page 227](#)

george counts. [Page 114](#)

global elite. . [Page 1](#), [Page 73-75](#), [Page 120](#), [Page 136](#), [Page 143](#), [Page 153](#), [Page 162](#), [Page 163](#),
[Page 191](#), [Page 198](#), [Page 252](#)

goal. [Page 2](#), [Page 4](#), [Page 5](#), [Page 19](#), [Page 20](#), [Page 78](#), [Page 104](#), [Page 112](#), [Page 120](#),
[Page 225](#), [Page 250](#), [Page 253](#)

Gritz. [Page 21](#), [Page 55](#)

gun.	Page 2 , Page 14 , Page 22 , Page 24 , Page 30 , Page 32 , Page 33 , Page 35-37 , Page 39 , Page 42 , Page 43 , Page 54 , Page 55 , Page 57 , Page 76 , Page 86 , Page 101 , Page 115-117 , Page 159 , Page 169 , Page 180 , Page 200 , Page 230 , Page 245
gun ownership.	Page 32 , Page 230 , Page 245
harris.	Page 20 , Page 21 , Page 54 , Page 55
herbert hoover.	Page 122
herd.	Page 4 , Page 5 , Page 9 , Page 14 , Page 17 , Page 19 , Page 24 , Page 77 , Page 83 , Page 104 , Page 120
hoover.	Page 74 , Page 122-124 , Page 143 , Page 144 , Page 161
Horiuchi.	Page 20 , Page 55
individual right.	Page 62 , Page 68 , Page 246
Inflation.	Page 134 , Page 163 , Page 235-237
internal revenue.	Page 82 , Page 157 , Page 174 , Page 175 , Page 177 , Page 178 , Page 206 , Page 264
international law.	Page 152 , Page 260 , Page 261
international monetary fund.	Page 154 , Page 191
interpol.	Page 154
james.	Page 65 , Page 75 , Page 90 , Page 100 , Page 157 , Page 247 , Page 248 , Page 256
jurisdiction.	Page 63 , Page 64 , Page 73 , Page 97 , Page 119 , Page 130 , Page 137 , Page 142 , Page 149 , Page 167-171 , Page 173 , Page 175-177 , Page 181-183 , Page 197 , Page 202-204 , Page 206 , Page 215-218 , Page 228 , Page 229 , Page 252 , Page 256 , Page 260 , Page 261 , Page 264-266
jury.	Page 14 , Page 21 , Page 23-25 , Page 37 , Page 55 , Page 61 , Page 69 , Page 70 , Page 77 , Page 81 , Page 83 , Page 88 , Page 89 , Page 91 , Page 93-102 , Page 115 , Page 182 , Page 189 , Page 195 , Page 198 , Page 201 , Page 213 , Page 214 , Page 219 , Page 222 , Page 225 , Page 235 , Page 251 , Page 253
kahl.	Page 22 , Page 23
label.	Page 18 , Page 27 , Page 54
law.	Page 4 , Page 7-9 , Page 15 , Page 17 , Page 21 , Page 23 , Page 25 , Page 28-30 , Page 33 , Page 35 , Page 45 , Page 48-50 , Page 54 , Page 56-88 , Page 90-96 , Page 98-103 , Page 107 , Page 108 , Page 111 , Page 115-119 , Page 122 , Page 123 , Page 125-132 , Page 134-142 , Page 145-151 , Page 150-152 , Page 154-158 , Page 160 , Page 162 , Page 164-190 , Page 193-202 , Page 204 , Page 206-212 , Page 214-217 , Page 219-226 , Page 228-232 , Page 234 , Page 246 , Page 249-251 , Page 254-256 , Page 258-266
law enforcement.	Page 21 , Page 23 , Page 28 , Page 29 , Page 35 , Page 45 , Page 50 , Page 57 , Page 66 , Page 70 , Page 71
law of nations.	Page 151
law of prize.	Page 150 , Page 151
law suits.	Page 145 , Page 152 , Page 234
laws of form.	Page 6 , Page 113
legal plunder.	Page 80 , Page 84
legal theft.	Page 84
license.	Page 8 , Page 32 , Page 48 , Page 65 , Page 73 , Page 79 , Page 90 , Page 111 , Page 121 , Page 123 , Page 124 , Page 148 , Page 152 , Page 164 , Page 173 , Page 174 , Page 180 ,

	Page 181 , Page 187 , Page 188 , Page 200 , Page 202 , Page 209-211 , Page 215 , Page 216 , Page 248
lien.	Page 79 , Page 164 , Page 165 , Page 172 , Page 173 , Page 175 , Page 176 , Page 181 , Page 183 , Page 186 , Page 189 , Page 191 , Page 208 , Page 225 , Page 226
maritime.	Page 73 , Page 85
marriage.	Page 5 , Page 63 , Page 195 , Page 200 , Page 209-211
marriage license.	Page 209 , Page 210
marshal.	Page 180 , Page 214 , Page 217
mclamb.	Page 21-23 , Page 55
military.	Page 1 , Page 27-29 , Page 37 , Page 42 , Page 45 , Page 49 , Page 52 , Page 72-74 , Page 93 , Page 95 , Page 122 , Page 124 , Page 127 , Page 129 , Page 135 , Page 146 , Page 154 , Page 159-162 , Page 164 , Page 167 , Page 173 , Page 176 , Page 193 , Page 197 , Page 203 , Page 205 , Page 217 , Page 223 , Page 237 , Page 238 , Page 244-246 , Page 256 , Page 259 , Page 261
militia.	Page 69 , Page 89 , Page 246
money.	Page 2 , Page 4 , Page 18 , Page 27 , Page 64 , Page 65 , Page 68 , Page 69 , Page 72-82 , Page 84 , Page 86 , Page 105 , Page 106 , Page 108 , Page 109 , Page 112 , Page 113 , Page 115-117 , Page 123 , Page 124 , Page 128 , Page 132-138 , Page 141 , Page 143 , Page 145 , Page 146 , Page 150 , Page 153 , Page 155 , Page 162 , Page 175 , Page 177 , Page 191 , Page 201 , Page 202 , Page 205 , Page 216 , Page 225 , Page 232 , Page 234-237 , Page 248 , Page 253 , Page 254
morality.	Page 59 , Page 79 , Page 81 , Page 82 , Page 113 , Page 115 , Page 230 , Page 232
mortgage.	Page 136
mt. carmel.	Page 28 , Page 31-34 , Page 36-40 , Page 42-51
myth.	Page 16 , Page 128
natural person.	Page 131 , Page 132 , Page 182 , Page 184 , Page 186 , Page 191
necessity.	Page 59 , Page 122 , Page 127 , Page 153 , Page 159 , Page 182 , Page 196 , Page 223 , Page 246
negro.	Page 167
oath.	Page 24 , Page 31 , Page 154 , Page 193 , Page 243 , Page 244 , Page 248 , Page 250 , Page 263
obedience.	Page 11 , Page 12 , Page 15 , Page 16 , Page 249
one world government.	Page 57 , Page 120 , Page 135 , Page 205-207
organized justice.	Page 87
plunder.	Page 72 , Page 78-81 , Page 83 , Page 84 , Page 86 , Page 87 , Page 117 , Page 146
police.	Page 1 , Page 2 , Page 20-24 , Page 35 , Page 39 , Page 47 , Page 55 , Page 56 , Page 66 , Page 70-74 , Page 76 , Page 78 , Page 79 , Page 91 , Page 129 , Page 141 , Page 142 , Page 154 , Page 160 , Page 164 , Page 188 , Page 194 , Page 197 , Page 219-221 , Page 223 , Page 240 , Page 242 , Page 248 , Page 253 , Page 255 , Page 262
powers of attorney.	Page 151
president.	Page 23 , Page 37 , Page 44 , Page 48 , Page 55 , Page 69 , Page 75 , Page 118 , Page 119 , Page 122-125 , Page 128-130 , Page 139 , Page 141 , Page 143 , Page 144 , Page 148 , Page 150 , Page 153 , Page 158-160 , Page 166 , Page 167 , Page 177 , Page 206 , Page 225-228 , Page 243 , Page 251 , Page 258 , Page 259 , Page 262

proclamation. [Page 123](#), [Page 124](#), [Page 129](#), [Page 130](#), [Page 144](#), [Page 158](#), [Page 167](#)

profiling. [Page 28](#), [Page 31](#), [Page 61](#), [Page 62](#), [Page 64](#), [Page 67](#), [Page 120](#)

property. [Page 1](#), [Page 7](#), [Page 24](#), [Page 31](#), [Page 58-66](#), [Page 68-70](#), [Page 72](#), [Page 75](#), [Page 76](#),
[Page 78-81](#), [Page 84](#), [Page 87](#), [Page 88](#), [Page 102](#), [Page 115-117](#), [Page 121](#), [Page 128](#),
[Page 129](#), [Page 131](#), [Page 134-136](#), [Page 138-140](#), [Page 143-145](#), [Page 150-153](#),
[Page 163](#), [Page 167](#), [Page 172](#), [Page 174](#), [Page 177](#), [Page 181](#), [Page 182](#), [Page 185](#),
[Page 194](#), [Page 202](#), [Page 219](#), [Page 223](#), [Page 225](#), [Page 229](#), [Page 230](#), [Page 232](#),
[Page 233](#), [Page 236](#), [Page 245](#), [Page 246](#), [Page 254](#), [Page 265](#), [Page 266](#)

psychological. [Page 28](#), [Page 30](#), [Page 31](#), [Page 48](#), [Page 50](#), [Page 61](#), [Page 62](#), [Page 64](#),
[Page 67](#), [Page 92](#), [Page 120](#)

public salary tax act. [Page 217](#), [Page 264](#)

randy weaver. [Page 20](#), [Page 21](#), [Page 54](#)

real estate. . . . [Page 64](#), [Page 76](#), [Page 84](#), [Page 88](#), [Page 134-136](#), [Page 138](#), [Page 207](#), [Page 219](#)

reserve. . . [Page 122-124](#), [Page 126](#), [Page 130](#), [Page 132-140](#), [Page 142-146](#), [Page 150](#), [Page 153-155](#),
[Page 157](#), [Page 160](#), [Page 161](#), [Page 163](#), [Page 175](#), [Page 200](#), [Page 205](#), [Page 206](#),
[Page 222](#), [Page 225](#), [Page 236](#)

reside. [Page 57](#), [Page 168](#), [Page 201](#), [Page 202](#), [Page 217](#), [Page 239](#)

right. [Page 7](#), [Page 10](#), [Page 18](#), [Page 21](#), [Page 31](#), [Page 34](#), [Page 41](#), [Page 47](#), [Page 49](#), [Page 53](#),
[Page 55](#), [Page 57](#), [Page 62](#), [Page 63](#), [Page 65-70](#), [Page 76](#), [Page 79](#), [Page 82-84](#), [Page 86](#),
[Page 88](#), [Page 90](#), [Page 92](#), [Page 93](#), [Page 95](#), [Page 97](#), [Page 98](#), [Page 102](#), [Page 106](#),
[Page 109](#), [Page 110](#), [Page 114](#), [Page 116](#), [Page 122](#), [Page 141](#), [Page 142](#), [Page 150](#),
[Page 165](#), [Page 168](#), [Page 171-173](#), [Page 176](#), [Page 180](#), [Page 181](#), [Page 183](#), [Page 185](#),
[Page 187](#), [Page 188](#), [Page 191](#), [Page 193](#), [Page 195](#), [Page 196](#), [Page 200](#), [Page 202](#),
[Page 206](#), [Page 208-211](#), [Page 213-216](#), [Page 219](#), [Page 224](#), [Page 227](#), [Page 230-232](#),
[Page 246-248](#), [Page 250-254](#), [Page 256](#), [Page 260](#), [Page 261](#)

right to travel. [Page 180](#), [Page 214](#), [Page 256](#)

roosevelt. . . . [Page 103](#), [Page 118](#), [Page 123](#), [Page 124](#), [Page 126](#), [Page 128](#), [Page 132](#), [Page 141](#),
[Page 144](#), [Page 198](#), [Page 208](#)

roosevelt's. [Page 123](#), [Page 124](#), [Page 132](#), [Page 139](#), [Page 142](#)

rule of necessity. [Page 122](#), [Page 127](#), [Page 182](#), [Page 223](#)

sammy weaver. [Page 20](#), [Page 54](#), [Page 73](#), [Page 198](#), [Page 232](#)

school. [Page 5](#), [Page 9](#), [Page 17-19](#), [Page 49](#), [Page 90](#), [Page 92](#), [Page 101](#), [Page 104-114](#),
[Page 116-118](#), [Page 130](#), [Page 160](#), [Page 163](#), [Page 164](#), [Page 167](#), [Page 168](#), [Page 175](#),
[Page 199](#), [Page 210](#), [Page 214](#), [Page 224](#), [Page 227](#), [Page 230](#), [Page 232](#), [Page 241](#),
[Page 242](#), [Page 262](#)

sheriff. [Page 22](#), [Page 23](#), [Page 65](#), [Page 69](#), [Page 72](#), [Page 180](#), [Page 201](#)

sheriff gene mathews. [Page 22](#), [Page 23](#)

shots. [Page 34-36](#), [Page 40](#)

social security. . . . [Page 79](#), [Page 158](#), [Page 173-176](#), [Page 179](#), [Page 184](#), [Page 187](#), [Page 191](#),
[Page 199](#), [Page 203](#), [Page 204](#), [Page 206](#), [Page 218](#), [Page 264](#), [Page 265](#)

son. . . [Page 4](#), [Page 7](#), [Page 11](#), [Page 12](#), [Page 14](#), [Page 20](#), [Page 31](#), [Page 33](#), [Page 38](#), [Page 40](#),
[Page 44](#), [Page 55](#), [Page 61](#), [Page 64](#), [Page 68](#), [Page 72](#), [Page 74](#), [Page 80](#), [Page 84](#),
[Page 88](#), [Page 91](#), [Page 98](#), [Page 101](#), [Page 115](#), [Page 116](#), [Page 124](#), [Page 128](#), [Page 134](#),
[Page 143](#), [Page 149](#), [Page 154](#), [Page 181](#), [Page 200](#), [Page 211](#), [Page 214](#), [Page 220-222](#),

	Page 224 , Page 225 , Page 235 , Page 248 , Page 251 , Page 259 , Page 262 , Page 263 , Page 265
species of intercourse.....	Page 149
state citizen.	Page 23 , Page 152 , Page 165 , Page 166 , Page 169 , Page 174-176 , Page 178 , Page 179 , Page 181 , Page 182 , Page 186 , Page 187 , Page 194 , Page 200-202 , Page 204 , Page 217-219 , Page 256
statute.....	Page 66 , Page 98 , Page 132 , Page 141 , Page 142 , Page 148 , Page 149 , Page 153 , Page 182 , Page 184-186 , Page 201 , Page 213 , Page 215 , Page 223 , Page 224 , Page 259
tax.....	Page 22 , Page 32 , Page 33 , Page 73 , Page 84 , Page 101 , Page 117 , Page 134 , Page 139 , Page 141 , Page 154 , Page 155 , Page 157 , Page 158 , Page 167 , Page 171-176 , Page 178 , Page 179 , Page 195 , Page 200 , Page 204 , Page 205 , Page 207 , Page 213 , Page 217 , Page 218 , Page 222 , Page 223 , Page 225 , Page 234 , Page 264 , Page 265
taxed.....	Page 138
teachers.	Page 11 , Page 17-19 , Page 23 , Page 69 , Page 74 , Page 105-109 , Page 111-117 , Page 210 , Page 227 , Page 240
thinker.	Page 14
toast.	Page 30 , Page 57
treasury department.	Page 2 , Page 154 , Page 224
treaties.	Page 4 , Page 120 , Page 228 , Page 229
treaty.	Page 189 , Page 228 , Page 229 , Page 260
united nations.....	Page 154 , Page 183 , Page 197 , Page 206 , Page 208 , Page 223 , Page 228 , Page 238 , Page 241-244 , Page 256
us marshals.....	Page 22
vicky.....	Page 198 , Page 232
violate.....	Page 77 , Page 87
voting.	Page 9 , Page 85 , Page 86 , Page 158 , Page 172 , Page 251
waco.....	Page 27-29 , Page 31 , Page 33 , Page 36 , Page 39 , Page 42 , Page 43 , Page 49 , Page 50 , Page 52-56 , Page 66 , Page 73 , Page 124 , Page 126 , Page 154 , Page 191 , Page 195 , Page 197 , Page 224 , Page 232 , Page 246
weaver.	Page 20 , Page 21 , Page 54 , Page 55 , Page 73 , Page 190 , Page 198 , Page 232
welfare.	2 , Page 13 , Page 59-61 , Page 84 , Page 85 , Page 108 , Page 109 , Page 115 , Page 117 , Page 141 , Page 177 , Page 230 , Page 232-234 , Page 236 , Page 249 , Page 267
writ of habeas corpus.....	Page 148