

# **Sui Juris - The Law Of Full Age**

Your Sovereign Claim To  
Unalienable Individual Rights

By

Robert David Johnson

© Robert David Johnson 12/31/2010 Held By Author

All Rights Reserved

### Inspirational Thanks To:

My Mother, My Wife, My Daughter, God, Jordan Maxwell, John Quade, Robert Arthur Menard, Lindsey Williams, Marc Stevens, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Hamilton, William Shakespeare, And many others too numerous to mention.

## **Table of Contents**

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Pages 5 - 6.....             | Forewords                                      |
| Chapter 1.....7 - 21.....    | The Supreme Law<br>Of The Land                 |
| Chapter 2.....22 - 25.....   | Consent Through<br>Registration                |
| Chapter 3.....26 - .40.....  | Court, Conflict,<br>Honor, And Dishonor        |
| Chapter 4.....41 - 47.....   | The Attorney Client<br>Relationship            |
| Chapter 5.....48- 53.....    | Dealing With Police                            |
| Chapter 6.....54 - 71.....   | Notices Affidavits<br>Writs And Allodial Title |
| Chapter 7.....72 - 77.....   | Powers Of Notaries<br>Public                   |
| Chapter 8.....78 - 83.....   | The County Sheriff                             |
| Chapter 9.....84 - 97.....   | Accepted For Value                             |
| Chapter 10.....98 - 118..... | The Role of a<br>Doctor and Prohibition        |

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Chapter 11.....119 - 127..... | ..Money, Banking<br>The Federal Reserve Bank<br>And The History of Fractional<br>Reserve Banking |
| Chapter 12.....128 - 136..... | 14 <sup>th</sup> Amendment<br>Rights v. God Given Rights   |
| Chapter 13.....137 - 155..... | The Feudal Duty to<br>The Sovereign, The Income<br>Tax   |
| Chapter 14.....156 - 161..... | Summary and<br>Conclusions   |

# Forewords

This book has been put together by the demands of those who have read and are interested in learning more about the nature of the American System of law. Much of the information in this book is likely to flip conventional wisdom completely upside down, in favor of provable facts. I am not an attorney, but not because I do not comprehend matters of law. I am not an attorney because I refuse to swear an oath of allegiance to England in exchange for the title of nobility Esquire.

The goal of this text is to make the realm of law something that every single American can comprehend, navigate, and make use of in their every day lives. My intent is to take the endless lines of codes and statutes that compose the system of American law, and to make this all as simple as it was once intended to be.

Law was never intended to be comprehensible only by professionals. All Americans are expected to obey the law, so it is reasonable that all laws are supposed to be written in a manner that the American of average intelligence is going to be able to comprehend. If a law does not clearly identify what it requires of an American, it is not law.

This book is composed of years of independent research into matters of law, statute, rights, privileges, and is intended to explain the differences between them as well as the difference between legal and lawful and illegal and unlawful

The fact is that most Americans are not abiding law, but conventional wisdom, fables of what people tell each other about law, without having ever researched it. Law is simple. In fact law is so simple that if lawyers had not created their own language by redefining common terms, no one would ever require the services of an attorney to administrate their own affairs at law.

Many things are likely to be explained in this book that most people have absolutely zero knowledge of. It is important to understand that this is not your fault, and I am no better than anyone else. I was once ignorant of all of this too. Being ignorant is not an insult, ignorance is a lack of awareness, and it is not through the fault of the people, but those who have betrayed the public trust their office entails and requires. And as you read you will discover the great lengths of deception professionals have employed to flip upside down the most basic American principals. That all individuals are equal, and equality under and before the law is paramount.

# **Chapter 1**

## **The Supreme Law of the Land**

While discussing law, it is imperative to understand that there are two types of law. The law of the land, and the law of water. The law of the land is the common law that the people of a given land abide. In the united states of America the supreme law of the land, is the self governing people individually. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution for these united states, and supreme court rulings in line with both of those founding documents, as those founding documents are instruments of common law, represent the law of the land. A change in law represents a change in religion.

In the united states of America, the supreme law of the land, being the will of self governing free people, is The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution for these united states of America, and supreme court rulings in line with both of those founding documents. While working on the research for this book I found it nearly impossible to contemplate law without getting into religion or god at least a little bit.

It doesn't matter what religion specifically an individual follows, most of them have the same concepts as to the origins of law being from the word of god, and rights flowing from this same source as well. The common law is biblical law applied, derived from applications of canon and biblical law by the Christian churches in England in the 8th 9th 10th and 11th centuries.

It has been proven that 64% of the Constitution is reasoned from statements in Deuteronomy and commentary upon Deuteronomy, by a seven year study conducted by The University of Houston in the 1980's referencing 15284 sources. This text does not seek to favor one faith over another, all faiths are transcended by the ideas that establish law, the individual right to the lawful defense of life, freedom, and property.

The common law is the direct connection between the bible and the Constitution. In the state of New York the common law is embodied within the State Constitution, which is also what happens to determine that the county Sheriff is the highest Constitutional law enforcement officer in the county, with jurisdiction over all municipalities villages and townships within the county, as well as those local police departments. This can be verified in the about us section of the Erie County Sheriff's web site but is self evident. Every time I refer to common law, I am in fact referring to those founding documents of divine inspiration.

The first law is gods law. Law is the individual right to the lawful defense of freedom, property, and life. Crime is the causation of harm to another. There are only three ways anyone can actually break the law or breech the peace, 1. Damage or injure person or property. 2. Violate another's lawful rights. And 3. The use of fraud in contracts.

With all of the endless sections of United States Code, the Code of Federal Regulations, state laws, ordinances, bylaws, directives and every statute encoded, it is easy to get confused and over complicate matters. In my opinion the laws of this country have been intentionally over complicated to break that beginning principal of everyone being equal under and before the law.



The supreme law of the land, the common law, The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution for these united states of America, and Supreme Court rulings in line with them, constrict and restrain all other laws. The United States Code, the Code of Federal Regulations, state laws, ordinances, bylaws, directives and every statute encoded, are all children of the common law.

A statute may be passed by a legislature, and given the form and name of law, but if that statute conflicts with the common law, the supreme law of the land, or if it infringes or violates a lawful right, it is not law, but null and void, unless you consent to the authority of such a statute by your signature, which will be detailed more later on. There are many Supreme Court rulings that enforce this self evident truth that any item given the form and name of law that is repugnant to the constitution is void. **"An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no right; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."** Norton vs Shelby County 118 US 425 p.442. **"The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and the name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it."** 16th American Jurisprudence 2d, Section 177, late 2nd, Section 256

**"All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void.**  
**" Finding that the statute conflicted with the Federal Constitution,**  
**Marshall considered it "the essence of judicial duty" to follow the**  
**Constitution.**

He concluded that “the particular phraseology of the Constitution of the United States confirms and strengthens the principle, supposed to be essential to all written constitutions, that a law repugnant to the constitution is void; and that courts, as well as other departments, are bound by that instrument” It is a proposition too plain to be contested, that the constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it; or, that the legislature may alter the constitution by an ordinary act. Between these alternatives there is no middle ground. The constitution is either a superior, paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it... . If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act contrary to the constitution is not law: if the latter part be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts, on the part of the people, to limit a power in its own nature illimitable. Marbury vs Madison, 5 US (2 Cranch) 137, 174, 176, (1803)

“Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.” Miranda vs. Arizona, 384 US 436, 491.

"The claim and exercise ...of a constitutional Right cannot be converted into... a crime." Miller vs. U.S., 230 F. 486, 489.

"There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of this exercise of constitutional Rights." Snerer vs. Cullen, 481 F. 946

As we can see from these Supreme Court decisions and American Jurisprudence, it is quite clear that any item of law or statute, must be in agreement with the common law to be valid and applicable in any situation. But what is not made clear is that one is able to consent to give a statute the force of law, even if it conflicts with the common law. Your consent creates an authority that would not otherwise exist without your consent, but I fear I may be getting a little ahead of myself here.

The greatest issue I perceive that is causing most of the Constitutional concerns in our system of law, is the failure to differentiate and distinguish between that which is law, and that which is statute. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are not just ideological nonsense. They are quite literally the highest law in this country. People have been deceived, whether intentionally or unintentionally, about the very nature of their rights, and the applications of law. This obfuscation of how far Constitutionally protected rights extend begins in school where the Constitution is just glossed over as a side note in history class. People are no longer taught the potency of their rights, but to sacrifice their rights voluntarily, albeit unknowingly, but voluntarily none the less, for an opportunity benefit or privilege offered by government in various adhesion contracts. Contracts where you sacrifice your highest status and protected rights by signed consent, in exchange for 14<sup>th</sup> amendment privileges that mimic rights.

In order to understand how powerful rights are and where they come from we must examine history to understand how much power we have individually. After the Declaration of Independence (1776), the American Revolution, and the Treaty of Peace with Great Britain (1783), the American people became complete, sovereign freeholders in the land, with the same rights as the King our ancestors had defeated. The King had no further claim to the land and could no longer tax or otherwise encumber it. America became a country composed 100% of individual Kings and Queens.

Every American became as sovereign as the King over their own property, rights, and all personal affairs, and this is not just important, it is vital to understanding sovereignty in America. All rights in this country are bestowed upon mankind by their creator, or the very nature of their humanity. Whatever faith a person follows, or even if they follow no faith, the fact of your existence is evidence of your inherent unalienable rights. Sovereignty itself is a very misunderstood concept and is only usually heard when speaking of the several states or Native American land.

The fact is that every American is as sovereign as the King was. Sovereignty simply means that there is no higher authority to seek permission from to engage in an activity. All sovereignty in America derives from property. While a person cannot own another, everyone has exclusive ownership over themselves. You have sovereign property the day you are born into this world. There is no higher authority to seek permission from regarding anything to do with your property, or affairs, whatever form the property may take.

So the sovereign is a person of the highest authority over a given piece of property, the owner. Owner and sovereign are virtually synonymous if not completely. No one person or group of people regardless of the size of the group, may exercise any decision over another person's property, rights, or affairs. The majority cannot vote on or affect another person's property, anymore than they can vote any person's other inherent rights away. The deception I personally see in America may not be intentional, but it could be intentional, and in either case it is designed to cast a perception that American individuals have no power, but this perception is complete illusion. The three most basic rights which all other rights are derived from are the right to life, freedom, and the pursuit of happiness.

The pursuit of happiness also contains within it the inherent right to own property in allodium. The American people desired to acquire, utilize and "own" their own land without interference from any government, including the government of the united states of America. Property owned in absolute ownership without any fees duties payable to any lord or superior. After the colonial war and the Constitution, congress passed in a 20 year span, 13 laws guaranteeing allodial title to every man, woman, and child. This is why in America every man's home is his castle. On your allodial lands you had the same rights and prerogative as the king, and still do today.

Even though many tricks have been employed to make people forget about this principle, allodial title still exists even today. In England prior to the American Revolution, there was only one sovereign, the King, and the King held allodial ownership of all land in that country and ours before the treaty of peace was signed. By defeating the King and becoming individual Kings, the American people acquired all of the same rights as that King, including the right to own property in allodium, free from any government encumbrance of any kind, taxes, permits etc. Property owned in allodium cannot have a lein placed against it, nor can it be seized, allodial ownership answers to no one other than the sole discretion of the owner.

The Declaration of Independence is the document that within the first paragraph set the frame work for our Constitutional Republic, and established a country wide common law jurisdiction, where all individuals are equal and have equal rights. "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. — That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed,".

The Constitution set up a system of protection for the rights of the people. But the brilliance of the Constitution is not in the enumerated rights it protects. The brilliance is in the lack of enumeration of rights, and the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment to the Constitution protects all other rights not enumerated. Our founders realized that enumerating rights was dangerous, as those they failed to enumerate could be denied to the people. So in this common law Jurisdiction where everyone is equal, everyone is able to claim any right, to any lawful activity. Meaning everyone is able to freely engage in any activity of their choice, as long as they cause no harm to another through the claim and exercise of such rights. The importance of this will become more apparent later on.

The supreme Court has also ruled in favor of the wording of the Declaration of Independence regarding the judicial power of the court, and reinforced the point that the reason men form governments is to secure the blessings of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That the courts entire jurisdiction is limited to protecting the life, liberty, and property of the American people. "To adjudicate upon, and protect the rights and interests of individual citizens, and to that end to construe and apply the laws, is the peculiar province of the judicial department. The judicial power "is the power to hear and determine those matters which affect the life, liberty, or property of the citizens of the state." **City of Sapulpa v. Land, 101 Okl. 22, 223 P. 640, 644, 35 A.L.R. 872, 878. Nash v. Brooks, 297 N.Y.S. 853, 855-856.**

It should be rather obvious at this point that the common law, is the highest law in the country. State Constitutions are also a part of the common law. The fact is that law itself is very simple to understand, while statute is confusing and written in a language that is not common English. There are only 2 ways one can be subject to statutes. 1. Through their signed hand written authorized consent. 2. Giving a judge consent by claiming to understand the charges.

Statute is maritime admiralty jurisdiction, and it can only be entered into by voluntary consent, or through harm to another. In every other situation the supreme law of the land supercedes all statutes. Your rights supercede all statutes. If a statute is passed that places a tax upon an American for exercising the right to speak in public, that statute is not law. It can only be given the force of law by your signed consent.

The Constitution and Declaration of Independence, State Constitutions, and Supreme Court rulings, are the highest law in America. This country's founding documents constrict and restrain all other acts that may have the form and or name of law. Any act, statute, bylaw, ordinance, directive, or requirement must be in agreement with these founding documents to be valid and applicable, or must be given the force of law by the signed hand written authorized consent of the individual. The seventh amendment to the Constitution is just as important as any of the others and most people do not even know the meaning of it any more. "In Suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any Court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law."

All behavior is lawful regardless of whatever statute would claim the contrary as long as the behavior does not cause actual damage or injury, or violation of a legal right. Corpus Delicti must exist for any case to have standing in an American court. The 3 elements necessary to be proven to establish corpus delicti are; 1. alleged damage or injury, 2. alleged violation of a legal right, and 3. redress ability of the court.

Corpus Delicti must be proven not merely asserted, and any case in which corpus delicti cannot be proven there is no standing, and without standing the court does not have jurisdiction to hear any case. **Clifford v Superior Court 45 Cal Rptr 2nd 333, 335 Without standing there is no actual or justiciable controversy and courts will not entertain such cases.**

Americans have many inherent rights which have been converted into licensed, monitored privileges, and non criminal behaviors have since been criminalized. Americans may; own and carry a displayed firearm, hunt, fish, marry, travel by boat, car, motorcycle, snowmobile etc, own a pet, open a private business, obtain medicine, drink alcohol, make additions or changes to their property, tear down and rebuild on their property, work, and engage in any other behavior as long as it does not actually cause damage or injury to another, or violation of another's inherent rights. Americans may engage in these activities without license. All of these licensed activities must be lawful outside of the licensing framework, otherwise the licensing body is licensing criminal behavior. So unless one would contend that they could obtain a license to commit rape, murder, or robbery, all licensed behaviors are lawful without license. License will be explained more in the chapter titled Consent Through Registration.

We cannot completely comprehend what law is , or the scope of the supreme law of the land, without examining exactly what it is and how it applies to our rights and duties that accompany freedom. To begin, our rights do not come from the Constitution, and our form of government is not a democracy as many believe. These things also relate directly to law. There is also an enormous difference between rights and privileges, which again is a deliberate obfuscation perpetrated by those who benefit from this system of deceit. The Constitution is a procedural instrument of common law, it protects rights it does not grant them.



While the Constitution is one aspect of the supreme law of the land, the Declaration of Independence is another. The Declaration of Independence in it's divinely inspired brilliance, established a common law jurisdiction, where there is one set of laws that everyone must obey, meaning that government must obey it's own laws, and established that everyone is equal under and before the law.

Equality under and before the law being paramount is a maxim in law. Maxims in law are an established principle or proposition. A principle of law universally admitted. They are principles and authorities, and part of the general customs or common law of the land; and are of the same strength as acts of parliament, when the judges have determined what is a maxim; which belongs to the judges and not the jury. *Terms do Ley; Doct. & Stud. Dial. 1, c. 8.* Maxims of the law are holden for law, and all other cases that may be applied to them shall be taken for granted. *1 Inst. 11. 67; 4 Rep. See 1 Com. c. 68; Plowd. 27, b ~ Bouvier's 1856 Law Dictionary.*

The Constitution is a document that applies only to government, not to the people, the Constitution can not be used against the people, but only against government. This documents protects all of the rights of the people in the common law jurisdiction established. There are very few rights enumerated in the Constitution, most of the document is an outline for what government's role is, which is why government cannot stand the existence of this document. Only the powers specifically granted to government by the Constitution may be exercised, and any duty not explicitly authorized is prohibited. While only very few rights are enumerated, all are protected under the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment, meaning that anyone can claim any right which does not violate the rights of another, or damage or injure another person or their property.

While I personally came to understand law from the study of religion and have no problem intertwining the two somewhat, I do not wish to offend anyone. Rights, come from our creator and are bestowed upon us at birth. Only the creator can bestow a right, and only a jury can take away a right upon conviction of having caused harm to another through the claim and exercise of a right. The same is true of property. By this standard anyone claiming the authority to take your property outside of this framework has gained that authority by your signed consent.

With the claim and exercise of rights, enjoyment of freedom, and respect to the rule of law, it is our duty to claim and exercise rights to ensure their existence for future generations. Along with this comes the duty to ensure no harm comes to another through the claim and exercise of rights. These duties are the bulb the flower of rights blossom from, it is why you will not hear a police officer testifying to his rights, but his duties, and why if you want to have any chance in a court appearing *sui juris*, you must make the same argument, not testifying to your rights, but to your duty to claim those rights and exercise them, and to defend them if anyone should try to take them from you, absent having caused actual harm. All of us will only ever enjoy the rights we will aggressively assert and defend. If you make no claim to a right you might as well not even have it. No one will protect your duty to your rights for you, rights are your property given to you by your creator, and should be jealously guarded like the precious jewel that they are.

The three most fundamental basic rights from which all other rights stem from are the right to life, the right to freedom, and the right to pursue happiness, which was originally the right to property, but had to be changed if the end of slavery were ever to be a realistic goal. You will notice I do not use the word liberty here. I do not desire liberty, I desire freedom.

Liberty is something a ship captain gives to his crew when they go ashore, liberty is a maritime admiralty term which has nothing to do with freedom. Liberty can be given by another man meaning it can also be taken away at any time.

Freedom is a notion of divine inspiration that has thrived throughout all time, freedom is the divine right of kings, freedom is the highest status an entity could seek, and in England prior to the American Revolution, the King of England was the only one who had this divine connection. The country we have today is based solely upon the notion that each of us have a divine connection to our creator and share all of the rights and privileges of our former King, including the right to administrate all of our own affairs and to own property in allodium.

These basic fundamentals of freedom, property rights and administration of our own affairs, is the entire back bone of a free American handling all matters sui juris. The right to pursue happiness and the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment indicate clearly that anyone can claim any right to do anything that does not harm another. All of the enumerated rights certainly derive from the three most fundamental rights which The Declaration of Independence established. However it is not just the enumerated rights which are protected, all rights that relate in any way to the primary three are also protected under the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment, such as the right of travel, and determining one's own bed time. Neither of these are enumerated but are so essential to freedom that they cannot be denied to the people.

The Declaration of Independence establishes not just a common law jurisdiction where everyone is equal and has equal rights, but also establishes a system of government where the individual is number two only to god.

We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, and endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights. This is the most important and completely over looked aspect of this country's founding documentation. We do not derive our rights from governments or other men, but from our creator. Of course god is the highest source of authority, this is the sovereign source of authority the King of England derived power from, and so too now it is the source of authority the individual people derive their inherent individual power from.

So while the Constitution and Declaration of Independence establish protections of freedom rights and property, rights do not arise from those documents alone, and nor does law. Law is not something that is written in complicated code no one was intended to be able to comprehend. As we have established that rights are laws, and rights come from god, it must be assumed that law also comes from god, and that it only has to do with not causing conflict and harm through the claim and exercise of rights. This is why you can use discussion to avoid conflict, and do no harm to another and go throughout your life without ever worrying about courts. If you are fulfilling a duty to claim and exercise rights, that duty is to the lawful exercise which causes no harm to another.

All men and women above the age of 18 are lawyers. Ignorance of the law is no excuse for breaking the law because there is a copy on the mantle of every family. Our history is based on men willing to shed blood and die to maintain the sanctity of god's law in opposition to all others. The first law is gods law. Your modern Christian when confronted with this will say no, we live under grace, and has set grace against law creating utter lawlessness and establishing a false dicotomy. And the churches are now peaching this and removed the entire Christian population from the battle to preserve freedom and god's law.

This whole system of thought was condemned by the great reformers in the second century as heresy. And compounding the problem, the churches have opted for a privilege called tax exemption in a 501c3. This means ecclesiastical jurisdiction has been voluntarily sacrificed.

To acquire protection of common law you must assert that right. You must be a belligerent claimant in person to assert your rights, or you have none. "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.

While this book is intended to make the process easier for everyone and restore the rule of law by exposing the adhesion contract fraud, *Sui Juris* is all about giving the individual the information to do just as the court decisions above have indicated. To allow you to appear *sui juris* autonomous in personam as a belligerent claimant to assert and defend your rights. If you can not do at least this much no court is going to help you, and now that you are aware, if you fail to do so, may god have mercy on your soul. Leaving your affairs to an attorney is to leave them at your own risk and the declaration of incompetence to the court.

## Chapter 2

### Consent Through Registration

As explained in the first chapter, many terms have been redefined in statutory code to mean something far different from the definition of the word as used in common language. All too often Americans are finding themselves in a situation they cannot navigate themselves, simply because the matter has been over complicated by those who wish to extract capital from the ignorance of the masses. There are 5 words definitions in law dictionaries that explain how it is an American can find them self in legal trouble, without having caused harm, as well as how to avoid it. Those words are \*Submission of an \*Application for \*Registration, \*Statute, and \*Society.

The most important thing to understand here is that statutes are not laws. The fact is that a statute can only be given the force of law, by your hand written signed authorized consent via the Submission of an Application for Registration of some type. **SUBMIT:** To agree to bend to another's will, must be voluntary to be lawful. **APPLY:** To beg, plead, petition. **REGISTER:** To sign over for safe keeping, to leave to another's discretion. **STATUTE:** A legislative rule of a society given the force of law. **SOCIETY:** A number of people joined by mutual consent working toward a common goal.

As demanded by the Declaration of Independence, governments derive their just powers only from the consent of the governed. Most of the things people today believe to be a mandatory obligation of law, is actually a voluntary privilege from government.

Every time you SUBMIT an APPLICATION for REGISTRATION and receive a CERTIFICATE in return for something, you are in fact giving consent, hand written authorized consent, by your wet signature, when you Submit an Application for Registration, to have statutory code applied against you. Why? Because you are abandoning what it is you are Registering.

When you Register your car for example. The moment you SUBMIT an APPLICATION for REGISTRATION and receive a CERTIFICATE OF TITLE in return, you hold prima facie evidence that you no longer own your car. Under MARITIME ADMIRALTY SALVAGE the State accepts the ALLODIAL TITLE to your car which you are abandoning by your act of registration. And they then hold that ALLODIAL TITLE as surety against you for your compliance to the MOTOR VEHICLE CODE, the statutory rules. If you did not register your car you would need no more permission to use it than you do a bicycle. The moment you purchase something you own it in allodium. Your receipt is your evidence of allodial ownership. So a driver's license is not permission to use your property on public roads, you are the public that is a common right, it is not permission to own property, again that is a common right. A driver's license is in fact permission from the State to use property that is theirs. Your license is permission to use their car, which you signed over to them voluntarily, abandoning allodial ownership.

This is why you have a license plate. A license plate is a tax id number, identifying that you have paid the tax for the privilege of using property that you signed over to the State for safe keeping. A license plate, driver's license, and registration sticker, are prima facie evidence that you have given voluntary consent to have the related statutory Motor Vehicle Code applied against you.

Every single time whether it is property like a car as shown above, boats, homes, motor cycles, snow mobiles, etc, your allodial ownership is always transferred away by your voluntary signed consent when you SUBMIT an APPLICATION for REGISTRATION, and every time you receive a "CERTIFICATE" in return for it.

The most insidious aspect of all of this is that it is not just the registration of property where you give consent to this statutory garbage. ANY item of Registration for which you receive a certificate in return, contains these hidden adhesion contracts that you sign consent for to have statutes applied against you. Marriage, Children, Voting, Social Security, and Firearms registrations, are also voluntary acts and not mandatory obligations of law. Ask yourself this. If you have an obligation of law to sign your child over to the State for safe keeping and obtain a social security account number for them, why do you have to apply? If it were mandatory you would not have to agree, it would just be assigned.

Registering your children and obtaining a birth certificate is where your signed consent allows CPS to raid your home without a warrant or any evidence and take your kids away. Registering your marriage is where your signed consent allows the courts to adjudicate in your relationship and divorce and distribute property and demand you pay alimony if you separate. Registering your home is where your signed consent makes you liable for property taxes, and to obtain permits to make changes or additions to your home. Registering into social security and registering to vote is where your signed consent makes you liable for the income tax, and you promise your property, fortune, and future income to the error of politicians. Registering a firearm, car, boat, or other mechanical conveyance is why you are required to have a license to use those properties.



It is why you can be forced to pay money for exceeding a speed limit by 2 miles per hour. And this is all the reason why you cannot argue Constitutionally protected rights when you end up in court for these matters. You waived all Constitutionally protected rights and accepted privileges in return in these hidden adhesion contracts when you applied for registration.

Lucky for us we have inherent rights and we can undo anything we have done by mistake of fact, by affidavit. This will be covered later on in the appropriately named chapters. Every American has the right to own their property in allodium. Every American has the lawful authority to engage in any lawful activity without permission. That is what it means to be free. If you have to ask permission as an adult, from someone else to engage in an activity that is lawful, government assumes you are a child, and treats you as such. The notion that there could be an obligation of law that requires someone to beg for permission to exercise a right, is absolute nonsense. Not only could such a law not exist, but such laws DO NOT exist. I would challenge anyone to find a section of law that mandates a parent to obtain a birth certificate and social security account for their children. And I mean law, not statute.

## **Chapter 3**

### **Court, Conflict, Honor, And Dishonor**

Court itself is not what most people think that it is, and consequently it is most often true that the most frequent reason the average American ends up in court it is related to some violation ticket of some type like a traffic ticket. When you are in court for most of these situations, every situation where there is no actual complaining party alleging damage, injury, or violation of a lawful right, you are not in trouble in court for what you did to get brought into court, like speeding. You are in trouble for what you did not do in the 30 day period prior to going to court. The simple truth is that traffic and violation tickets are not what most people think they are. A traffic ticket is a “Bill of Exchange”. It is a notice. It is an unconditional order in writing signed by the person giving it, addressed to the person receiving it, requiring the person to whom it is addressed to pay or perform upon a third party a specific sum of money at a fixed or determinable time.

A traffic citation is a notice which you cannot ignore or you end up in court in conflict in dishonor. A traffic ticket is very much like a bill at a restaurant. You cannot refuse acceptance of this type of bill. Court is all about honor and dishonor more so than the specific charges. When a cop gives you a ticket what he wants you to do is sign the original, take the copy, and either pay or go to court in 30 or so days. The problem with this is that when you sign the ticket, you have just dishonored a bill of exchange exactly as if you had refused to sign it.

This is like a waitress demanding you to sign the bill at the restaurant and refuse to allow you to pick up the bill and pay it so she can take it to the bouncers and have them beat you up. Since a traffic ticket is in fact a bill of exchange you have the right to demand the original. When the cop presents you the ticket to sign, the only way you can get out of this situation in honor is to state; "I recognize that as a bill of exchange and I am willing to accept your presentment, no dispute go ahead and give it to me, I want the original". The officer will play the "oh you don't want to sign it" game. Just say "why would I wish to dishonor your bill of exchange, I am open to you presenting the original".

The officer will always refuse to give you the original because if they give you the original they cannot take you to court. So what you do is sign the ticket "Under protest and duress" with your signature. Because they refused to give you the original and claimed it was presented you can take that ticket right to a Notary Public and send the copy with a Notice of protest for non presentment back to the issuing police department. They then have 3 days to provide the original or the officer that wrote it becomes liable to pay it when you go to court just like a waitress that forgot to give a customer their bill. This will be covered more in complete detail in the chapter titled, Notices, Affidavits, Writs and Allodial Title. It is mentioned here only to show how you end up in court in conflict in dishonor.

There are four ways to deal with a traffic ticket. Dispute it, Ignore it, Pay it, and the final option they never tell you about, is Conditional Acceptance. The first two options will land you in conflict in dishonor, and the third option you are paying it, so the only real option to not pay the ticket and remain in honor is conditional acceptance.

You have the right to accept the notice of the bill of exchange (the ticket) conditionally, and then to impose conditions upon it. If you go to court about a traffic ticket without having sent any notices of your own, you will be in conflict in dishonor. The great thing about these notices, is that you can discharge the notice with your own notice. What you will do is send a notice to the issuing police department called Notice of Conditional Acceptance. In your notice you accept their notice and impose conditions that are impossible for them to fulfill. For example you have a right to demand an original signed bill and a copy of the lawful 2 party contract that makes you liable to pay it. A notice is a simple document, it does not have to be over complicated or long. When you receive no response to your notice you send another notice, Notice of Dishonor, advising them that they have dishonored your notice. The third and final notice to them is Notice of Protest for Non Acceptance, and all three notices are notarized.

Sending notices of your own not only discharges the notice you got for the ticket, it evidences your attempt to offer discussion which was refused. Every time a case goes to court one party is there for creating conflict in dishonor. This process of discussion simply assures that you are never the one in conflict and dishonor. The judge could care less what the ticket was written for. All he has to do is see who is in conflict in dishonor. Disputing or ignoring a notice without offering discussion is what places one in conflict in dishonor, and as this is a common law jurisdiction and we are all equal, police officers are not immune.

The general rule is that conflict is avoidable, it is undesirable, and offering discussion to avoid conflict is the only way to remain in honor in court. This does not only apply to traffic tickets though. It applies to any type of bill, and any type of notice or citation. You can discharge any notice with your own notice and impose conditions.

You can use notices in any situation to offer discussion to avoid conflict. Any situation where you foresee conflict could arise, you can send notices to offer discussion to avoid that conflict, and if conflict arises you can go to court and remain in honor. People use lawyers to prevail when in conflict. People use the Notary Public and notices to avoid conflict and lawyers. If you use these notices and offer discussion there is never a need to be afraid to go into court and speak on your own behalf. Which is what the object of this book is all about.

We the People own the courts, every American should be able to administrate their own affairs at law without using a lawyer's services, this is the only way to go into court as will be explained in Chapter 4 which will detail the reasons people should avoid hiring lawyers. By the end of this book you should be competent to administrate all of your own affairs at law, and be able to rival even Harvard educated lawyers. The fact is you will win your case whatever the matter is, simply because the party you are trying to enter discussion with, refuses to talk, placing them in conflict in dishonor, and as you have remained in honor by offering discussion to avoid this conflict, you win by default.

If you are the defendant in a court case there are many things you can do while acting sui juris that will not be available to you when you hire an attorney. You consent to statute, and maritime admiralty jurisdiction, in 2 ways. The manner of Submission of an Application for Registration has already been explained. The other way is through not knowing what you are saying in court. When you are in a court that has an American flag with gold fringe around it, and the judge asks you if you understand the charges against you, when you say yes, you at that moment consent to the jurisdiction of that court and the statutory code being enforced. You are being asked for your consent to stand under the charges against you.

Guilty and not guilty also do not mean what people think it means. They mean guildded and not guildded respectively, that you are going to pay, or you are not going to pay. So when you claim to understand the charges and that you are not guilty, through your own ignorance you have just fallen into dishonor by consenting to the authority of the court and statutory charges, and then refusing to pay.

All American courts where cases are brought, that do not involve a complaining party alleging damage or injury, or violation of a lawful right, are defacto courts, or fraudulent courts. A dejour court is much different. These defacto courts are in the business of extracting capital through transactions of security interests. As with police which will be explained in chapter 5, in court you are under no obligation to reveal your name unless and until you are accused of an actual crime by a complaining party.

Where a lot of people get into trouble is they accuse themselves. What they want you to do is stand up give your name and then enter a plea. But there are a few steps they are skipping. Take your ticket and claim to be an agent for the accused. If you claim to be the accused you just accused yourself. Ask the prosecutor to identify the accused. In most situations it should not go any further than this to be dismissed. If it does state for the record "I am capable of administrating my own affairs, I am not surety for the accused although our names may appear similar, and I do not consent to this transaction of a security interest, nor to adjudication as there has been no discussion in the matter". More will be explained on discussion and the notices you show the judge at this point to evidence an attempt to avoid conflict, later on. After that go ahead and ask "Is this a defacto court"? They have to answer and say yes. Ask, "Is this a transaction of a security interest?" Again they have to say yes or you can just walk out. If it is not a security interest there will be no obligation to pay or perform generated. If it is a security interest you have to consent to it.

When a judge asks you if you "UNDERSTAND" he is not making sure you comprehend English. He is asking for you to consent to STAND UNDER what he is telling you. "Do you understand the charges?" "How do you plead?" (Plead means beg.) The flag you stand before determines the jurisdiction you are under, but you must consent to that jurisdiction absent actual charges of a crime alleged by a complaining party.

You have no obligation of law to consent to maritime admiralty jurisdiction. You have the right to remain under the protection of common law jurisdiction, and not face any charges absent a complaining party accusing you under oath of a crime. Without these 2 elements corpus delicti cannot be established and any case as such has no standing, conferring no jurisdiction upon the court except through your consent. When in these situations having the right questions is more important than having all of the answers, although you will have all of the answers, it is unwise to ask a question to which you do not know the answer. Your questions should not be geared toward addressing the competence, integrity, or character of the person placing you in these situations, but they should only address the knowledge of the definitions of the body of words people will use to attempt to claim authority over you.

Whenever it is someone will be attempting to claim authority over you, it is obvious and self evident that two things are required in order for this to be possible. People and words are the two things that exist in every situation where someone is trying to claim authority over another. As this is the case in every situation the success of someone to gain actual authority over another will always depend upon their specific knowledge of the body of words they are using to claim that authority, the knowledge of words alone can in many cases extricate you from situations that will allow you to avoid this hassle all together.

Where most books would fall short here I am going to give a rough outline of the words that will be used to claim authority over you, and the questions you can ask and in what situations, to get yourself out of the cross hairs of bureaucratic attacks.

Let's start with traveling, because this is when most of us will come into contact with those who claim to have authority. Whether traveling by foot or automobile or on any type of pleasure craft, you are under no obligation to reveal any information to anyone unless and until you have been accused of a crime. And again crime as defined in causing harm to another, through impairment of another's rights or damage or injury to person or property.

So if a police officer asks you to produce identification or license registration and or insurance, you should be asking him to produce a proof of a claim that you have an obligation to possess such a thing. You have no obligation to register your car, if you do not register your car you have no obligation to possess a license, or even to carry insurance, unless you are doing commerce on the roads using public resources for private gain. If you do not do commerce on the roads and simply use them to travel, the courts have already long ruled and upheld that this locomotion by either horse drawn carriage or automobile, or even the common conveyance of the day, is a fundamentally protected right under the right to freedom.

If an officer is claiming that the Motor Vehicle Act is the body of words he is enforcing which gives him authority over you, just ask him to define the word Act and when he cannot he should back right down. Again challenging only the knowledge of the person using the words to define those words will in most cases prevent conflict and court action or any other of those unpleasant tyrannies when we have caused no harm.



Say you are on your front porch having a beer and an officer claims he is going to confiscate your beer, ask him why he would remove your property without clear lawful authority, which is the definition of confiscate.

My personal favorite is when an officer claims to possess the authority to remove your property like your automobile, from you. Even a basic knowledge of enumerated rights can prevent this from happening to you, because in this country property and rights can only lawfully be removed from an individual by a jury upon conviction of a crime, not conviction of a statutory infraction. So under no circumstance does any body of government or any other entity possess the lawful authority to remove your property from you for any reason, especially not for things like refusing to agree to contracts you have no obligation to sign like registrations. Simply ask an officer attempting to seize your property if he has taken an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, they will all say yes. Then ask which section authorizes government to remove property from an individual absent conviction of a crime by a jury.

That should stop the seizure on the spot, if it does not get the county Sheriff to the scene and tell him the police are trying to steal your car under color of law. By the time an officer is attempting to seize your property though you should have already activated your fee schedule and be operating under protest and duress. The police have guns and do not always have the lawful authority to do what they claim they are going to do, and they are allowed to lie to you. By operating under protest and duress you can then collect damages for all of their unlawful actions and hold them accountable. Because this is a common law jurisdiction the police cannot break the law any more than any one else can. No position or office protects unlawful violations of property, rights, and law. You are going to discover how to use notices to avoid these situations actively instead of just learning how to deal with them when they arise.

If you end up in court for some ticket of some type after reading this book you will be able to show your notices and evidence an attempt at discussion. However our courts have become corrupt and in the constant business of transacting security interests to extract capital from the people. So be prepared to go all the way through trial, you will be able to do this successfully in the end, but you will most often find the cases against you dismissed for non presentment as will be explained in the section about notices. All of the courts in America are admiralty maritime administrative tribunals, they are not courts of law, but defacto courts. The flag in the court room with the gold fringe around it is a battle flag, the courts are invading, under maritime admiralty law, or martial law, which the country has been under since 1933 under emergency bankruptcy, and the courts are overseeing the bankruptcy. A citizen of a state, or of the united states of America has no standing in a court of law. A citizen, resident alien, subject, slave, is someone who has signed a social security agreement registered to vote and pledged their property for the error of politicians. They place a lein on your physical person and property when you register to vote.

If a matter does go to court your first experience inside of court will most likely be you standing in front of a judge asking how you plead. The only answer you should give is, "I am not surety for the accused, I am competent to administrate my own affairs and speak upon my own behalf, I am appearing sui juris autonomous, in personam to find out what is going on here, I do not stand under the charges, and I refuse consent to adjudication services as there has been no discussion in this matter." At this point you can either produce for the judge your signed judgement, or the notices you sent to attempt discussion which are notarized, or both. In the situation where you got a ticket and demanded the original and sent off a notarized protest for non presentment of the demanded original, the officer who wrote that ticket will become liable to pay it.

There are a slew of other questions you should ask before you can even determine if you are required to enter a plea and answer for the charges. Look at the words, it all relates to charges, transactions, bills of exchange. So in addition to the questions you have already asked, in any case or situation you are in where you are in court, the existence of a complaining party is the most important determining factor. Here is a great selection of arraignment and pretrial questions, the only one of which matters is the last one, is there evidence of a complaining party?

What stage of the proceedings are we in? (the arraignment). What exactly is an arraignment? ( formal reading of a criminal complaint in the presence of the defendant to inform the defendant of the charges against him or her). Am I entitled to a fair trial? (yes) Can I get a fair trial if there is a conflict of interests?(no) Am I entitled to a meaningful hearing?(yes) If I ask a question will you answer it to the best of your ability?(yes) If there's something I don't understand will you try to explain it to me?(yes) You will meet little resistance at this point, the court will appear to be helpful honest and just at first glance, however with the following questions that cordial demeanor will start to slip away as it becomes apparent that their authority will be diminishing

Who does the prosecutor represent? (The State) Who do you represent judge? (The state) (who each party represents proves conflict of interest from the outset) Am I presumed innocent of this alleged crime? (yes, judge should answer without a problem) Am I presumed innocent of every element of this alleged crime? (yes, judge will likely not answer) Are you presuming there is no jurisdiction? (yes, judge will likely not answer) How many elements are there to the cause of action against me? (there are 3 but the judge most likely will not answer.)

Is there evidence of a complaining party? (THIS IS THE ONLY QUESTION THAT REALLY MATTERS, and the judge most likely will not answer, and that is because there is no evidence of a complaining party in most cases, which is why this is a defacto court and not a de jour court.).

A couple of other good questions to ask the judge when you are asked how you plea or in response to a refusal to answer one of your questions are, "Is this a defacto court? (Yes, and they must answer yes) Is this a transaction of a security interest? (Yes and again they must answer). If it is a transaction of a security interest simply refuse to consent, and if it is not you can simply walk out, because if it is not a transaction of a security interest there will be no obligation generated to pay or perform, and your consent is required to enter into the transaction of a security interest.

In the event that the judge stops answering and refuses to answer your questions and attempts to offer a plea on your behalf note for the record that the judge has taken the defendant's stand and will be answering for the charges. Note for the record that you are not refusing to enter a plea, nor entering a plea of guilty or not guilty, but there has been no discussion and no discovery, and as such you cannot even begin to hope to understand the cause and nature of the charges against you, let alone enter a plea because you have not been afforded the opportunity to comprehend, you have no obligation to stand under any charge.

You cannot possibly understand or stand under charges when your questions that would allow you to comprehend the nature and cause of those charges, are not being answered. These questions are designed to make you more informed about what is going on, and as long as you are asking questions there is nothing anyone can do, for while you are asking questions the assumption must be that you do not understand.

Due process of law is a fundamental protected right, and everyone must receive due process, which is a trial by jury, in order to have any rights or property removed. All one has to be able to do in order to administrate all of their own affairs at law is to be able to ask questions and process information, and if one cannot do those things, winning in court is the last of your concerns. Your right to due process is as important as your right to be secure in your person papers and affects.

If your right to due process, property, or any other right has been violated by another, or under color of law by an officer, violation of your will and violation of due process of law, you have peaceful lawful remedy and recourse provided by law against the person or government seizing your property or depriving you of your property and or rights unlawfully. The illegal seizure of property without due process of law, does establish corpus delicti, as it alleges violation of your legal right to not be deprived of property without due process of law. The damage or injury is the depravation of your property, and assessment of impounding fees. The local court has jurisdiction to hear these matters, and the police have the oath of upholding the constitution, and enforcing the law does not empower one to violate the law while enforcing it.

If for some reason the court is extremely corrupt you may still have to go to a trial and even possibly appeal the decision, so be prepared to question the witnesses, who will all most likely be police officers in most situations. While it is true that in most situations the judge will demand the prosecutor to provide you with the evidence and discovery you are seeking within ten days and the case will be dismissed when they cannot do that (because there is no complaining party and you are requesting evidence of one), there are instances when either through ignorance or corruption the case will not be dismissed.

Go ahead and take it to trial, the more people that see what is going on by an American exposing the corruption in the system simply by standing under truth and law, and the fact that you get to have a jury decide any matter that exceeds twenty dollars, you will be victorious at trial. Again if you serve proper notice it should never get to that point, but we prepare for the worst and hope for the best. Here is an outline of questions to ask the police officers if the judge forces the matter to trial. The judge should dismiss the case for failure to prosecute, lack of jurisdiction, and absence of a complaining party, but trial is not difficult when you opt not to hire an attorney. Hiring an attorney could get you out of the situation, but you certainly are not empowered to deal with it should it arise again, and handling things like this on your own in the right way, actually acts to deter these matters from being raised against you in the future. It only takes two questions to impeach a witness especially if all of the witnesses are police.

AT TRIAL if the court has not dismissed the case based on lack of standing they will likely have the police officer or multiple officers testify against you. It is important to object when the officer is giving a legal opinion. "Objection calls for legal conclusion the witness cannot testify." The judge will most likely overrule your objections, but you are doing this for appeal if necessary, and to show that the judge will overrule your objection and sustain the prosecutor's identical objection, which will end up getting the charges dismissed, and that is the end goal. When it is your turn to cross examine the "witness" ask the following questions. 1. Did you file a valid cause of action against me? (YES) 2. How many elements are in a valid cause of action? There are three but again the officer will not be allowed to answer, usually right here the prosecutor and or judge will object to protect their witness and declare them incompetent to testify, because they are working together, and they will end up impeaching the all of the witnesses against you to protect their scam. If they admit how many elements there are they have to prove all three as we know they cannot, they aren't stupid just corrupt.

Another good line of questioning is; Is it your testimony that I was within (whatever state you are in) on this day? (yes) Would there be jurisdiction if I was not within the state on this day? (no) You're confident I was within the state on this day?(YES) Is that an arbitrary opinion? (no) So it is based on facts currently within your knowledge? (yes) Factually what is a state? ( a State is a legally created fictitious entity created by an act of congress. The cop will not be allowed to answer.) Again here the prosecutor will fly out of his chair objecting and impeaching the witness. The prosecutor will not attempt to allow a police officer to define what a State factually is, because the accurate explanation of this would completely self destruct the entire case against you as it will prove the State does not exist.

There are situations where states can lawfully exist, and they have existed in the past. The existence of a state depends entirely upon a contractual relationship between the Citizen and the State. I personally am amazed at how many people will claim to be a U.S. Citizen without ever having learned the definition of what that actually is. Citizenship itself is a contractual relationship, where the citizen pledges an oath of allegiance in return for a duty of protection.

The problem with this is that government on every level has asserted that there is no obligation or duty of any individual protection to anyone, and because of that breach of the contractual relationship, any such contract is void ab initio. This means that there is no state, for without citizens, there can be no state. This is why only when a court acts within it's lawful jurisdiction of protecting the life liberty and property of the individual, a de jour court exists, and all other courts are defacto courts.

If we are not obeying and upholding the rule of law, the right of the individual, no other aspect of government gains legitimacy. The entire scope of the courts jurisdiction is to protect the life, freedom, and property of the individual. Without proper recognition of our form of government and the hierarchy of law created where the individual is number two only to the creator, there are no courts, no cops, no judges, no president, no congressmen, no representatives, no local city officials, no country, no city and no state. This is the kind of realization one can have when they learn first hand about how and why to question, instead of blindly bowing to any who claim to have authority.

This is why appearing *sui juris* autonomous in personam as a belligerent claimant is so important and is the only way to assert rights. This country is a Constitutional Republic in form of government, not a democracy. No one I am aware of has ever pledged allegiance to democracy, but the constitutional republic, the system of common law. The Constitutional Republic is the form of government that ensures it is never forgotten that the supreme law is derived from the people, and the right of the individual, who's rights are bestowed by their creator and not from men, and therefore cannot be removed by men.

A Democratic form of government is mob rule, *vox populi, vox dei*, the voice of the people is the voice of god. 51 of 100 people can vote on any issue on any day and the voice of the people is law. This is the insanity that destroyed the Roman Empire along side the fractional reserve banking structure we once again have today. The common law in this constitutional republic is unchanging, and not subject to the whims of the people, and again this is all the reason why one is able to proceed of one's own right as a free adult of the lawful age and proceed *sui juris* administrating all of one's own affairs.



## Chapter 4

### **The Attorney Client Relationship**

The conventional wisdom of our day says that any man who represents himself has a fool for a client. I respectfully disagree. Legally any man who has another represent him and speak on his behalf is the fool, as anyone who hires an attorney is defined by law as a client, and a client is defined by law as a ward of the court. Blacks law dictionary defines a ward of the court as; an infant, or a person of unsound mind, so the law says when you become a client you declare yourself incompetent to the court. By hiring an attorney you are declaring to be an infant or a person of unsound mind, which negates the entire meaning of Sui Juris. You are going to be required to understand and comprehend this if you wish to gain knowledge of the attorney client relationship.

I suppose that since this book is entitled Sui Juris at some point I would have to explain precisely in no uncertain terms what this means, and how it differs from Pro Se. Yes you are going to have to learn a little Latin to understand what is going on, and how you became a child in the eyes of your government and courts through your own actions and consent

Sui Juris literally means “of one’s own laws”. In civil law the phrase sui juris indicates legal competence, the capacity to manage one’s own affairs (Black's Law Dictionary, Oxford English Dictionary). It also indicates an entity that is capable of suing and/or being sued in a legal proceeding in its own name without the need of an ad litem. It also relates to customary, unique rights afforded to an individual unequal and exceptional.

In Roman law, which American law is modeled upon right down to Capitoline Hill, the care giver or guardian of a spendthrift (prodigus) or of a person of unsound mind (furiosus), and, particularly, one who takes charge of the estate of an adolescens, i.e., of a person sui juris, above the age of a pupillus, fourteen or twelve years (boys and girls, respectively), and below the full age of twenty-five. Such persons were known as minors, i.e., minores viginti quinque annis. While the tutor, the guardian of the pupillus, was said to be appointed for the care of the person, the curator took charge of the property. The English word "autonomous" is derived from the Ancient Greek (from autos - self, and nomos - law) which corresponds to the Latin "sui iuris".

The Congress is a good example of a sui juris based institution. However any individual is able to assemble with any other, and is able to administrate their own affairs. The two chambers of the Congress assemble into session by their own right as defined in the Constitution (Twentieth Amendment) on January 3 every year. The US President does not have to invite or call the Congress to assemble for regular sessions. In the United States, the legislature is independent of the executive

This is in contrast with many parliamentary democracies like India, where the federal Parliament can assemble if and only if the President of India summons it (on the advice of the Prime Minister). This is because the Indian Constitution is largely based upon the conventions of the British monarchy, in which it was a crime of treason for the English Parliament to assemble without the permission of the King. This goes back again to the self evident truth that every American is individually a King themselves. Everyone who is of the age of consent in America is presumed to be sui juris, such as an adult. There is some variation upon the age requirements, but it is sufficient to say that if you are old enough to pick up a gun, and go to another land and kill people, you are of the age of consent. The State of New York where I live the age of consent is 17.

Ignorance is the reason most people hire lawyers to begin with and give up their highest status by claiming to be a child or a person of unsound mind. If you have caused no harm, and no one is complaining against you, you have committed no crime. You have nothing to fear about court unless you hire an attorney. Never underestimate the potential for abuse when someone has a financial interest in you giving them your power. We are all kings, so we should act like it. The courts are ours, they belong to the people, not the lawyers. And the courts respond appropriately when it is apparent that you are not weak and ignorant.

You have all the rights, but when there is a representative on your name you are not there and the court acts as though there is no human there with rights, no parents, only slaves, and the STATE is operating under the doctrine of Parens Patriae – Universal Trustee – Government as Parent. The difference between pro se, pro per and sui juris are night and day, but those with other motives would have you believe they are synonyms for one another. There is tremendous difference between "represented status", "pro se" and "pro per" or "sui juris" status in the court. The deception is that "pro se" means literally "represent myself", you do not "represent" yourself, you are yourself. Pro per means "for myself", and Sui Juris literally means "of my own right" It is only when you appear sui juris in personam that you actually have rights and are able to speak on your own behalf. All of this deception whether intentional or not is run through the B.A.R.

Every single franchise branch of the B.A.R. whether it is the New York State B.A.R. or any other State franchise branch, the B.A.R. means British Accreditation Registry. So the New York State B.A.R. is in fact the New York State British Accreditation Registry. The issue here is not so much their actions as lawyers, but when they move on to occupy offices of public trust, like becoming judges or law makers.

Lawyers were never intended to serve any office of public trust or profit, nor were they intended to become law makers, as law makers hold offices of public trust. There is an amendment to the Constitution that prohibits any attorney from obtaining an office of public trust by stripping the Citizenship of all lawyers. This amendment no longer appears in the Constitution but it was properly ratified and never lawfully repealed, so it is still today part of the supreme law of the land.

This original 13<sup>th</sup> amendment was passed by Congress May 1, 1810 - Ratified December 9, 1812 **"If any citizen of the United States shall accept, claim, receive, or retain any title of nobility or honour, or shall without the consent of Congress, accept and retain any present, pension, office, or emolument of any kind whatever, from any emperor, king, prince, or foreign power, such person shall cease to be a citizen of the United States, and shall be incapable of holding any office of trust or profit under them, or either of them."**

The war of 1812 had everything to do with The hidden 13th Amendment. For over 50 years the 13th Amendment was included in publications of the Constitution for America. It is no coincidence the targets of the English war effort were to destroy evidence of this Amendment's ratification, for with it, they could never subvert our courts and pervert law. Most of what passes as law in America is actually not law, it is statute, and this statutory nonsense that no one can comprehend is not law. Statutes is not just a foreign language, it is a foreign language written by men and women who have sworn an oath of allegiance to the crown of England when they accepted the title of nobility Esquire.

There are also 2 other sections of the current constitution that prohibit these noble titles. **Article 1 Section 9 - Limits on Congress** No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince or foreign State. And **Article 1 Section 10 Powers prohibited of States** No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility. Consequently with the disappearance of the original lawfully ratified 13<sup>th</sup> amendment, every amendment after the 12<sup>th</sup> is improperly numbered. The 13<sup>th</sup> amendment that appears in copies of the Constitution in modern days through today, is actually the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment and so forth.

This amendment was discovered in the winter of 1983, by archival research expert David Dodge, and former Baltimore police investigator Tom Dunn, when they were searching for evidence of government corruption in public records stored in the **Belfast Library on the coast of Maine**. Printing by a legislature is prima facie evidence of ratification. There is also no Constitutional requirement that the Secretary of State, or anyone else, be officially notified to complete the ratification process. The Constitution only requires that three- fourths of the states ratify for an Amendment to be added to the Constitution. If three-quarters of the states ratify, the Amendment is passed period. Going back a little further in history will reveal evidence of its historical significance: First, "titles of nobility" were prohibited in Article VI of the Articles of Confederation in 1777.

Clearly, the founding fathers saw such a serious threat in "titles of nobility" and "honors" that anyone receiving them would forfeit their citizenship. Since the government prohibited "titles of nobility" several times over four decades, and went through the amending process (even though "titles of nobility" were already prohibited by the Constitution), it's obvious that the amendment carried much more significance for our founding fathers than is readily apparent today.

All of this is not to say that lawyers have no place in America. They certainly do. Nothing in this book can help someone who is actually being accused of a crime by a complaining party, when they are guilty. However if you legitimately did not do what someone claims you did, there can be no proof that you did, so again there is no reason to be afraid of the courts, unless you have actually caused harm. I personally advise against anyone ever hiring an attorney. You do not have to know all of the specific ins and outs of court room lingo to do well. All you have to do is know and speak the truth.

The information presented in this book is intended only to be of assistance to those who have not actually caused any damage or injury to another. I respect that there are many lawyers out there who are trying to do good and assist the public, but at the same time lawyers are responsible for perverting the law so the average American is no longer able to identify what the law requires of them. They are responsible for this conventional wisdom that has no basis in fact or law, which people operate upon and end up in court in conflict in dishonor as a direct result of this obfuscation of facts.

The statement that the truth shall set you free is not just some cliché, it is reality. Finding the truth is difficult at times which is why I have assembled this book with the intention of helping people administrate their own affairs. Protecting the rights of everyone ensures the protection of my own.

I have expended great effort to simplify the things that the law society over complicates. Knowing a lawyer's oath, dual duties, and the status you claim by hiring one, I cannot understand why law is not a primary subject in every grade of school.

Every American is expected to know and obey the law, as ignorance of the law is no excuse for breaking the law. Not everyone is expected to speak a second language, but that is a requirement before law in American schools. Law is simple, so simple in fact that if everyone were aware of what is "law" as opposed to what is "statute" and how their status is compromised in a court if they hire an attorney, everyone would once again be on equal footing under the law.

## **Chapter 5**

### **Dealing With Police**

Before you can deal with police you must know exactly what law is, as opposed to what statute is. Police have a duty to differentiate between statutes and laws, as do lawyers, but if you do not know there is a difference they will know that quickly as soon as you produce identification without having been accused of a crime, and they will neglect that duty. Police are not your enemy, they are just as sick of enforcing statutory nonsense as we are of dealing with it. While you may disagree with a cop in one moment they would most likely pull you from a burning wreck and save your life in another without missing a beat. That being said there are police officers that just signed up for the power.

So what is law? If statutes are these convoluted rules you have to sign consent to by registration, what is law? Law is the collective or individual right of lawful defense. Rights are laws. Every American is guaranteed the right to the free exercise and worship of the religion or other set of beliefs of their choice for example. That is the law. So the only way to break the law, is to deprive someone else of a right or property. As a matter of fact anyone can claim a right to any activity that does not involve harm or deprivation of another's rights. That is law. It is that simple. In contracts both parties have a right to the truth, this is why fraud is unlawful.

I have little sympathy for anyone who would intentionally cause damage or injury, or deprive another of their rights. This is why it is expected that everyone know and obey the law. The common law, the supreme law of the land, is completely detailed in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.



There is no lawyer speak or confusion. The “LAW” is clearly written, concise, and unequivocal. It is further explained by supreme court rulings. Something can be a violation of a statute and not against the law, but something that is against the law is always accompanied by a statute of some type.

Traveling a few miles over the speed limit is not a crime, it may violate some statutory body of words, but unless it actually causes damage no crime has been committed. You are only liable for a penalty for this when harm is not involved, if you have consented to give the Motor Vehicle Act statutes the force of law through the Submission of an Application for Registration of your car. This is not to say you can go however fast you want wherever you want. Exercising rights like the right to travel, comes with the attached responsibility to do no harm. Putting people in imminent danger through wreckless excessive speed does violate the rights of other travelers’ safety. A police officer could actually be the complaining party for this type of offense. A police officer has every right everyone else does in a common law jurisdiction.

The things we want to avoid are unnecessary intrusions on our freedoms by police officers for statutory compliance checks. We want to avoid arrest for not having committed any crime against person or property. We want to be free. In order to be free we must know what our rights are, and now that we know that our rights are the highest law, and how one breaks the law, it is time to deal with the nonsense and behavior of those who enforce these statutory codes.

The first matter of importance when dealing with a police officer is knowing that they have a duality to their position. Primarily and foremost a police officer is a peace officer and sworn to the Constitution as every other public official.

You can hold them to their status of peace officer and refuse to allow them to be statutory code enforcement officers. How we deal with the police will determine how they deal with us. In all of my endeavors toward peaceful free discussion with officers and other public offices it is apparent that they are just people. Everyone is just a human being in a common law jurisdiction. You can affect them through emotion and like us they will respond more to truth, compassion, and integrity, more favorably than they will respond to ignorance and personal attack. All you have to do to destroy their illusion of authority over you is question the definitions of the words they are using to claim authority over you. You need not insult their intelligence or intentions. It is amazing how quickly an officer's authority disappears when they are unable to define the words they are using. Like the word ACT in the Motor Vehicle Act.

Knowing what questions to ask in which situations is more important than having the answers. This is true in every communication with government. Everyone by now is aware of the Miranda warning people are given when they are arrested. But what they are not aware of is what exactly is going on. When an officer is reading you "your rights" does he or she read you all of your rights? No, absolutely never. The only rights they read you are; "You have the right to remain silent, you have the right to an attorney (which is not even correct) if you are not able to afford an attorney one will be appointed to you, do you understand? Right here when you claim to understand you are not claiming to comprehend.

The officer when asking you if you understand is not making sure you speak the same language. He is asking you for your consent to stand under the rights and only those rights he read to you, as well as his authority and the body of statutory code they are attempting to enforce. Say no you do not stand under that. If asked what you do not understand ask the officer what makes them believe you are not aware of what they are asking you, and if they are claiming you have no choice.

Tell them “no I will not stand under the assertion that those are my rights, nor that you have the authority to dictate my rights to me.” The next line is famous. I have read you your rights as required, anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law, do you understand? Say nothing. Even a no here is an agreement to go to court. ANYTHING you say here, including no can be used against you in court, their question is an invitation to court, and saying anything is acceptance of their offer.

In a common law jurisdiction there are no orders or commands. We are all equal, so the only tool police officers have are offers. If it appears to be more than an offer the fundamental point of the offer is for you to accept their offer that they have the authority to order you. Orders in every case generate liability for a bill. Go to Burger King and place an order and see what happens if you refuse the bill. You are not obligated to obey an officers orders, you have a right to accept them and bill the officer for them, but you have the right to say no, unless you have actually been accused of a crime by a complaining party, a police officer has no authority to give you an order. If you are threatened with arrest or violence you have the right to operate under protest and duress, and then you get to make the terms of the contract for filling their orders. No one is immune for unlawful activities, not even police or judges. No one is above the law.

More will be explained in the chapter on Notices regarding putting a fee schedule on file. The fact is no American whether traveling on foot or by automobile, is ever obligated to even reveal their name to an officer or anyone else, unless and until they have been accused of a crime. No American is obligated to carry identification even if an officer claims they have an obligation to see identification, their obligations do not dictate ours. You are obligated by law to reveal your name if you have been accused of a crime by a complaining party, but not under any other circumstances.

Most of what police officers operate upon is assumption and presumption. If you are in a car that has license plates, a registration sticker, and an inspection sticker, it is assumed that you are the “tenant” authorized to use that piece of state owned property that was transferred to the State by registration. Make no mistake you have no obligation of law to possess these things and you will fare better off in a traffic stop than someone who has them, although you may be stopped quite a bit more frequently your fee schedule will make it worth your while. My fee schedule is \$1,000.00 per hour or portion thereof to even talk to a police officer for these statutory compliance checks.

It is at a point where police do not even use complete sentences. What is the first thing you hear when pulled over? Is it not, license, registration, insurance? The fact is you should be the first one to be speaking when stopped by a police officer demanding to know the authority they are claiming and the cause of action for the traffic stop. You also have a right to know if that is a “valid” cause of action. If an officer asks you for identification or a driver’s licence you ask them a question back “Do you have proof of claim that I have an obligation to possess such a thing?”

You can ask this for everything they are asking you to produce. Unless you are doing commerce on the roads by operating a taxi, stage coach or omnibus, or are otherwise using public resources of the roads for private gain, you have no obligation to have any form of license, license plates, registration, inspection, or even insurance. It is responsible to carry basic liability insurance, but not required, unless you have registered your car or are doing commerce.

As mentioned license plates are evidence that the car is State property, it is a tax ID number identifying that you have paid the registration tax, and the registration is further evidence that you are not the owner of that property. It is also evidence of your requirement to have a license to use that property, as it is the State's, now they can place any requirement they want which you agreed to in your registration. Where as if you did not register it you would not have any of these obligations as there would be no evidence of your consent by your signature to the application of those statutory rules.

However this is only if you own that car. If you are traveling in a friends registered car you are not obligated by their actions to possess a license. Producing a license is simply more evidence that an officer is dealing with someone who is liable to by consent, the statutory acts. An officer cannot even write you a ticket without a name and a date of birth. No one is able to prove as a matter of fact the day they were born. It is all hearsay even if someone tells you the exact day you were born. What can be proven was born was the legal fiction created to mimic you that is evidenced by a name in all caps and a date of birth, under maritime admiralty. Without evidence that there is a person subject by consent to these statutes, there is no authority.

## Chapter 6

### Notices Affidavits Writs, and Allodial Title

This chapter contains examples of the Notices you will be using most often, as well as details the extent and meaning of allodial ownership of property. The Notices you will use most often are; 1. **Notice Of Understanding, Intent, Claim of Right, and Notice of Permanent Estoppel by Acquiescence.** This notice is self explanatory and this is not my work. This sample notice is actually available all over the internet. The issue here is that you should be able to craft your own notices for any situation using these as a template. Due diligence is always completely advised as opposed to just finding something on the internet you do not understand and playing around with it in ignorance. The second notice in the discussion process is **Notice Of Dishonor.** This is a short notice simply advising the party it is addressed to that they have dishonored your notice (bill of exchange) through non acceptance. And the final notice is **Notice Of Protest For Non Acceptance.** This final notice is not from you as the other notices. The notice of protest for non acceptance is a statement from the Notary Public, advising the other party that the Notary is protesting in formal written statement the refusal of acceptance by the other party, to accept the documents being held by the Notary Public for collection. You will use Notice of Conditional Acceptance if you are not initiating the communication.

A sovereign American affects their affairs at law through notices, affidavits, and writs. As mentioned before these notices are your evidence of attempting and offering discussion to avoid conflict, should conflict arise. The powers and duties of the Notary Public will be explained in the next chapter in detail. You can use this common law discussion process to communicate with any business, individual or branch of government.

Using these three notices you can secure an Administrative Default Judgement of Permanent Estoppel by Acquiescence. You can secure an Administrative Default Declaratory Judgement in your favor, granted by the Notary Public, without any court action necessary, which is sufficient for Sheriffs to act upon to seize property. You can also use this process to declare allodial ownership of property like cars and homes.

Affidavits are slightly different from notices but not much, they are slightly more powerful. An affidavit is a formal sworn statement of fact, signed by the author, who is called the affiant or deponent, and witnessed as to the authenticity of the affiant's signature by a taker of oaths, such as a notary public or commissioner of oaths. I suggest using affidavits to declare under penalty of perjury, allodial ownership of property, and to file the affidavit with the county recorder. I suggest using notices to claim rights and to send your notice of claim of right to any party where you can foresee a conflict, or disregard for your rights arising. Notice of understanding intent and claim of right can be served upon the sheriff containing a fee schedule to claim and exercise your rights and collect damages if they are infringed by statutory compliance officers. It can be served upon the TSA and Department of Homeland Security to avoid being molested while traveling by air. It can be served upon the Department of Health to assert your right to authorize your own prescription medications. You need a little knowledge of how to craft a notice and what your rights are but not much more than that. You can secure these declaratory judgements to aide in defending your rights.

Writs like a writs of Habeas Corpus should be a last resort, to liberate your body or property if it is unlawfully seized restrained or if you are arrested and have not committed a crime. Here in NY where I live, a writ of habeas corpus can be used for all matters where you are in any manner or under any color or pretense, constrained in your freedom.

A writ is an order or mandatory process in writing issued in the name of the sovereign or of a court or judicial officer commanding the person to whom it is directed to perform or refrain from performing an act specified therein. As each of us are as sovereign as our former King and each as sovereign as the several States, we each have the authority to make use of writs to protect our freedom.

The 3 most frequent notices you will use are given in the examples below. It is important to make sure you craft your other notices outside of the county Sheriff to fit the specific rights you are claiming and party you are informing. I have already completed the notice series to the County Sheriff, my next step is the Department of Health to secure my right to authorize my own prescription medications. Just as we are all born our own lawyer, we are also born our own doctor. Prescriptions have become a license or permission to obtain and possess medicine which is unacceptable. The role of a doctor was never intended to be a role of permission and command, but advice and information. I will cover this more in later chapters.

The notice of understanding intent and claim of right below is the notice I am using for the Department of Health. Everyone should be able to craft their own notices for their own purposes once they realize they can claim any right to any activity that causes no harm, and that you have a right to communicate with any branch of government, you can begin to custom tailor your notices to each of them. I have also included below the standard notice I am using for the Sheriff. This notice to the sheriff is not my original work, but I credit it to Robert Arthur Menard. Robert Menard operates the Free Man Society of Canada, and I encourage everyone to examine his material.. Each party you enter discussion with gets 3 notices. The initial claim of right notice, notice of dishonor, and notice of protest for non acceptance.



You print these up, have them notarized, and the Notary Public opens a file and holds this original Bill of exchange for collection. The Notary sends a certified true copy, in my case to the Department of Health and county Sheriff respectively. If the party you are trying to communicate with registers a response they may pick up the original bill of exchange and all is done. If there is no response you go to the next notice, Notice of Dishonor. These are my actual notices that I am using, but you can feel free to custom tailor them to your situation.

**Notice Of Understanding, Intent, Claim of Right, and Notice of Permanent Estoppel by Acquiescence**

Dear (Your County Sheriff, or any other party you are trying to communicate with)

Notice to agent is notice to principal, notice to principal is notice to agent. Affected parties wishing to dispute the claims made herein or make their own counterclaims must respond appropriately within FIFTEEN (15) days of service of notice of this action.

I am serving herewith, My Notice Of Understanding and Intent and my Claim of Right, as well as Notice of Estoppel through acquiescence. You will find the enclosed intact and complete.

I \_\_\_\_\_ of the \_\_\_\_\_ family , a flesh and blood living soul do hereby make oath and state the following is my truth and my law.

Whereas : it is my understanding that America and all her people enjoy the protection of common-law and it is my understanding that all living beings (flesh and blood) are created equally under one creator and it is my understanding that we are sharing this existence on Earth together under our creator and it is my understanding that we have been given a conscience to deliberate and make decisions for ourselves and it is my understanding that equality before the law is paramount and mandatory and it is my understanding that a statute is defined as a legislative rule of society which has been given the force of law, and it is my understanding that a society is defined as a number of people joined by mutual consent to deliberate, determine and act for a common goal and it is my understanding that the government of America is a Representative Body and Representation can only come from consent and

Whereas I am a peaceful and responsible human being and it is my understanding that peace officers have a duty to distinguish between statute and law and Whereas I have the power to refuse intercourse or interaction with peace officers who have not observed me breach the peace. Whereas permanent estoppel by acquiescence barring any peace officer or prosecutor from bringing charges against a Freeman-of-the-Land under any act is created if this claim is not responded to in the stated fashion and time.

Therefore be it now known to any and all concerned and effected parties, that I, (\_\_\_\_\_ of the \_\_\_\_\_ family ) a Sovereign Freeman-on-the-Land do hereby state clearly and specifically and unequivocally my intent to peacefully lawfully exist free of all statutory obligations restrictions and maintain all rights at law and trade, exchange and barter.

Furthermore: I claim the right not to apply for licenses, permits or to seek permission to do any action, that are already lawful,

I claim the right to exercise my “common law right to travel”, unhindered, unencumbered, at my discretion in my private conveyance of the day, to wit, my private, unregistered, unlicensed mechanically propelled automobile,

I claim the right to possess, cultivate or use medicinally any plant or other medicine. Also to exercise omnipotent control over all of my own medical affairs with or without a Doctor's oversight.

I claim the right to possess unregistered firearms and ammunition and to use the same for target practice at a range or for hunting for food and further swear under oath never to open fire on another human being unless I am in fear of my life and as a last resort to protect any other human life. I Also swear to come to the aide of any peace officer should they request my assistance. That is my personal oath.

Furthermore, I claim that the intentional blurring of the lines and the failure to define between that which is legal, and that which is lawful in order to extract capital from the masses by legislating freedom and then putting a price tag on it is a crime on Man, and the failure to define between the Natural man and the State created Fiction is nothing short of fraud, theft, breach of trust and forced slavery, a heinous criminal activity of the most odious form.

I claim that the courts in the United States of America are de-facto and are in fact in the profitable business of conducting, witnessing and facilitating the transactions of security interests and I furthermore claim that they require the consent of both parties prior to providing any such services.

I claim that anyone who interferes with my lawful activities after having been served notice of this claim and who fails to properly dispute or make lawful counterclaim is breaking the law, cannot claim good faith or colour of right and that such transgressions will be dealt with in a properly convened court de jure.

Furthermore, I claim all transactions of security interests require the consent of both parties and I do here by deny consent to any transaction of a security interest issuing under any Act for as herein stated as a Freeman-on-the-Land I am not subject to any Act.

Furthermore, I claim my FEE SCHEDULE for any transgressions by peace officers, government principals or agents or justice system participants is (1oz of gold ) ONE OUNCE OF GOLD (\$1,366.00) per hour or portion thereof if being questioned, interrogated or in any way detained, harassed, searched or otherwise regulated and (5oz of gold) FIVE OUNCES OF GOLD (\$6,830.00) per hour or portion thereof if I am handcuffed, transported, incarcerated or subjected to any adjudication process without my express written and Notarized consent.

Furthermore, I state that it is my duty to Claim such rights, to protect them and ensure they exist for future generations. Furthermore, I claim that the law of agent and principal does apply and that service upon one is equal to both. Furthermore, I claim the right to deal with any counterclaims or disputes publicly and in an open forum using discussion and negotiation and to capture on video tape said discussion and negotiation for whatever lawful purpose I see fit.

Responses must be under Oath attestation, upon full commercial liability and penalty of perjury and registered in the Notary Office herein provided no later than ten days from the date of original service as attested to by way of certification of service.

Failure to register a dispute against the claims made herein will result in an automatic default judgment and permanent and irrevocable estoppel by acquiescence barring the bringing of charges under any statute or Act against me.

Signed: .

Witness: .

Notary:

This is the notice I am sending to the state of New York Department of Health, to claim the right to authorize my own medicines and act as my own doctor as I am able to act as my own attorney. I do not recommend people copy my notices, but to craft their own.

**Notice of Understanding Intent And Claim of Right.**

Please feel free to take a full 30 days to respond to this for due diligence. Responses must be under oath, bond, and full commercial liability within thirty (30) days. A lack of response will be assumed to be a shared understanding. Notice to agent is notice to principal, notice to principal is notice to agent.

Dear (Department of Health),

I greatly appreciate receiving a response from your office. I will keep this as brief as possible in respect for your time. I am giving your organization notice that it is my understanding that I have inherent authority to authorize my own medicinal affairs. My intent is to obtain and possess ANY medicine I deem needed. And I am claiming the right to do this so long as no harm is ever caused to another through my claim and exercise of this right.

I mean no insult to you, and I have no quarrel with you or your department, but I need clarification regarding a few of your assertions. Your Assertion that I have no fundamental right to administrate all of my own medical affairs, and to have access to medicine, without permission, license, or accreditation from some other source, has no more merit than if the New York State B.A.R. were to assert that I have no fundamental right to administrate all of my own affairs at law, without permission, license, or accreditation from some other source, and to deny me access to the courts for refusing to contract with the New York State B.A.R.

I have a fundamental right to act sui juris in all of my own legal matters. I may not be able to act for another, but I certainly am lawfully able to administrate my own legal affairs.

This right, like the right to administrate all of my own medical affairs, is a protected fundamental right. I have claimed and can prove I have a fundamental right to administrate ALL of my own legal affairs, much in the way I have a fundamental right to administrate all of my own medical affairs. Thankfully we are all created equal, and no one or group has any authority to dictate my rights and duties, and I am quite capable and competent to administrate my own affairs.

Your assertion that I have no fundamental right to administrate my own medical affairs, or have access to medicine, is equivalent to an assertion that I have no fundamental right to purchase the foods of my choice, cook my own meals, in my own kitchen, without some prerequisite inspection, test, permission from the FDA, Department of Health, or some professional nutritionist. I also wonder where it is you gained the assumption that I was a lay person. I assure you I am quite well read into both law and medicine. As for a pharmacy and the application of the "statutory rules" you have mentioned, those rules do not exclude me as being an authorized practitioner. I do not consent to give those statutes the force of law.

Are you willing to claim that a law could exist and be constitutionally applicable, which can create the authority to deny or disparage ANY RIGHT retained by the people? Let us not forget Norton vs Shelby County 118 US 425 p.442 "An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no right; it imposes no duties; affords no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed."

So while the statutory authority you have quoted may have the form and name of law, when it interferes with any right, life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, conflicts with the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution, including all protected enumerated rights, or any unenumerated rights protected by the 9th amendment, or life, liberty, or the pursuit of happiness, it is not law, but entirely null and void, it affords no protection. I consider this right as fundamental as the right I have to speak on political issues, without license or permission from some bureaucratic regulatory body before I speak.

After conversations with my local police regarding this issue, they were completely unwilling to claim that any law prevented a pharmacy from filling my self authorized order for medicine. I am still looking at filing criminal charges against this pharmacist. Your assumption that a fundamental right does not exist, is both incorrect and improper. The State of New York does not determine my rights and duties, with sovereign authority I decide those myself.

I am lawfully able to claim and exercise any right, and as long as no harm to another is caused through my claim and exercise of any right, this right cannot be deprived or infringed, except by a jury upon conviction of having done harm, or violation of someone else's rights. Where does the State of New York derive the authority to determine the rights of sovereign free people? I assure you that while unenumerated, this right exists as much as my right to set my own bed time, protected under the 9th amendment to the Constitution for these united states of America, as well as in the Declaration of Independence under my right to the pursuit of happiness. I as an American, have a duty to claim, exercise, defend, and jealously guard this and all other rights, this duty is my sole motivation behind my activity.

Government has proven in 1919 with the ratification of the 18th Amendment, and subsequent repeal by the 21st Amendment, that they require constitutional amendment to gain the authority to prohibit any substance. And alcohol was the only substance they ever pursued the authority of prohibition regarding. If government possessed the authority of prohibition, or even regulation, without such an amendment, amending the constitution would have been entirely moot. The 18th Amendment is prima facie evidence that government requires amendment to prohibit any substance. And the 21st amendment is prima facie evidence that government no longer has ANY authority to prohibit or regulate, ANY substance.



I am currently exploring other avenues as well as discussion with your organization. I must however insist that the following questions be answered and signed, by someone in your organization with a B.A.R. card, upon oath, bond, and full commercial liability. In the event that your organization is unable to respond I have already answered these questions, and your lack of response will constitute acquiescence, a permanent shared understanding.

1. Are you claiming that the common law right to administrate one's own medical affairs no longer exists in the State of New York? (NO)
2. Are you claiming one can be lawfully denied the fundamental right of access to medicine in the administration of one's own medical affairs, for not possessing license, permission, or other authority from a doctor or government body? (NO)
3. Are you claiming that the common law right to administrate all of one's own affairs at law no longer exists in the State of New York? (NO)
4. Are you claiming that one can be lawfully denied access to the courts in administration of one's own affairs at law, for not possessing license, permission, or other authority from a lawyer or government body?(NO)
5. Are you claiming that there is an obligation of law that can mandate lawyers to deny me access to the courts, in affairs of my own, because I have no permission?(NO)
6. Are you claiming there is an obligation of law, that can mandate a pharmacy to deny me access to medicine, in affairs of my own, because I have no permission (NO)
7. Are you claiming that statutes are laws? (NO)
8. Are you claiming it is unlawful to authorize my own orders for medicine? (NO)

Sincerely,

Signature

Witness

Notary

Because we have a fundamental right to act in any of our own affairs to whatever extent we judge ourselves competent so long as we cause no harm, we may exercise any authority by ourselves that we can exercise by transference. Even in situations where mental competence is an issue, a doctor cannot force you to take a medication. You requesting a medicine is what creates the authority for a doctor to write a prescription. As you are able to transfer this authority, you must possess it to be able to transfer it.

More will be covered about this later on, I have included this notice in this section because it is another example of a notice of understanding, intent, and claim of right. You have the right to communicate with anyone, and you have the right to assert a claim of right and offer discussion in this manner, in any situation where you could foresee conflict arising. The responsible thing to do when you foresee conflict is to discuss it. You can offer discussion to avoid conflict with anyone. If you have a neighbor that is not friendly, and you want to cut down a tree, the responsible thing to do is to consult your neighbor to avoid conflict related to any potential damages. If you offer discussion and your neighbor does not respond you have a shared understanding, and your attempts at discussion will nullify any action that could be brought against you.

Below is the second notice in the notice series, notice of dishonor. You print this up, have it notarized, and the Notary Public puts this original in the file and holds this original bill of exchange for collection along with the first one. The Notary sends a certified true copy, to the party you are attempting to communicate with. As before, this is another opportunity given to respond and collect the original bills of exchange, if they respond and all is done. If there is no response the next notice **is crafted by the Notary**, and placed into your file, sending another certified copy of that Notice to the addressed party.

### **Notice Of Dishonor**

Dear (Your County Sheriff, or any other party you are trying to communicate with)

I am writing to inform you that you have dishonored my Notice of Understanding, Intent, Claim of Right, and Permanent Estoppel by acquiescence, by failing to accept and respond. Through your silence you have confirmed that we share an understanding regarding all points in the original notice received by you on October 7th 2010. This notice is to both inform you of the fact that you have dishonored my notice, and to give you another opportunity to respond and to clarify anything you do not understand. You have another ten (10) days to respond to this original notice that I have properly served upon you. I look forward to your response and an opportunity to discuss this matter. Responses must be under oath, bond, and full commercial liability, and received within ten (10) days from the date this notice is received. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Signature

Witness

Notary

If there is no response to the Notice of dishonor, **the Notary Public crafts** the notice of protest for non acceptance. Protest is a formal statement in writing **by a notary public**, under seal, that a certain bill of exchange or promissory note was on a certain day presented for payment, or acceptance, and that such payment or acceptance was refused.

The receiving party gets another 15 days to come in and pick up these original bills by registering a response. You specify the time limit. As the notice below is from the Notary it is worded as such.

### **Notice Of Protest For Non Acceptance**

Dear (Your County Sheriff, or any other party you are trying to communicate with)

As Notary Public I am writing this notice of Protest for Non Acceptance, under seal, in a formal statement, to advise you that a bill of exchange was on 10/06/2010, presented for acceptance, and that such acceptance was refused. The notice sent on 10/06/2010 was verified received by your signature via certified mail return receipt on 10/07/2010, and fifteen (15) days were given for acceptance.

On 11/16/2010, well after the time frame given, Notice of Dishonor was presented and held for collection also, and that notice was served by this office to advise you that you had dishonored a bill of exchange. This FINAL NOTICE, Notice of Protest For Non Acceptance, sought by the party presenting the bill of exchange, is to advise you again that this office is holding for collection a bill of exchange presented for acceptance, and that acceptance has been refused.

Per instruction of the party presenting said bill of exchange, you now have another fifteen (15) days to accept the bill of exchange and all original notices related, and they can be accepted in this office, either in person, or by certified mail, by registering a notarized response in this office, per the presenting party, in the fashion stated within the first notice given. The party presenting the bill of exchange has requested that this Notary Public fulfill their duty under New York Executive Law Section 138, to protest for non acceptance of the bills of exchange currently being held for collection under the same section. Protest service requested by signature of party below on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ in the year of \_\_\_\_\_

Please note that the Notary Public is simply holding these bills of exchange, attested to under oath by the presenting party, for collection, and protest relates only to the non acceptance of them, not the matters involved.)

Sincerely,

Signature

Witness

Notary

After this if there is no response you win by default, all points not refuted in the Notice of Understanding and intent constitute a shared understanding by acquiescence through failure to respond. You can take all of the Notarized originals to a justice of the peace and secure your administrative judgement. Also as will be detailed more in the next chapter, the Notary Public has the authority to issue your judgement, you do not ever need to step foot into a court room if you properly use discussion.

The Declaration of Independence and Constitution have set up a guaranteed right to own ALL property in allodium. Say you go to the store and purchase a brand new bicycle. The moment you pay for it you possess allodial title to that property, it is yours free and clear, no taxes, no duties, no other requirements, you can take it out on the road that very moment.

Your receipt is your allodial title. This truth is the same when you purchase an automobile. Your automobile does not BECOME a MOTOR VEHICLE unless you register it. As explained before registration is the signing over of partial ownership, it is the transfer of the allodial title to the State for safekeeping, once registered the allodial title is used against you as surety for your compliance to the motor vehicle code, and a requirement of a license is imposed, lawfully because you consented through registration, the right to travel is not removed by law, it is waived by consent.

Americans have a fundamental right to own all of their property in allodium, and if you have made the mistake of registering it, it can still be undone. You have the right to cancel registration at any time. The state only has partial ownership while it is registered. Once you cancel your registration you can lawfully swear out an affidavit or notice, whatever you prefer, to declare under penalty of perjury that you have allodial title. Call it, "Affidavit Declaring Allodial Title". Your notice will not be refuted, no one is going to touch this.

Once you own your property in allodium you no longer pay any tax on it, it is just like buying a bicycle, there is no obligation of law to register your car, home, or any other property, once you own that property in allodium you can feel free to enjoy and use it. You have a right to own property, you have a right to travel, and as long as you do not do commerce on the road you have no requirement that precedes your private travel.

Not registering your car does not mean you cannot use it, not having a license doesn't mean you cannot operate it. Allodial title means complete incontestable, indisputable, free, and complete access and use to a piece of property. It cannot be leined by judgements or the IRS, and you have the lawful authority to use force to defend it, even from those who claim to have the lawful authority to seize it. In short, no one ever attempts to seize allodial property.

## **Chapter 7**

### **Powers Of Notaries Public**

A common law Notary Public is the magic joker of public officers, and their powers and duties are explained by law. Because the statutes are in line with the common law they are valid laws that must be obeyed. The legislation for Notary powers vary state to state, but it is most certain that whatever state of the union of America one hails from the powers are likely very similar.

Here in the state of New York the powers and duties of common law Notaries Public are laid out in New York executive law section 138. I have included this entire section for context. **POWERS AND DUTIES EXECUTIVE LAW 138.** Powers of notaries public or other officers who are stockholders, directors, officers or employees of a corporation.

A notary public, justice of the supreme court, a judge, clerk, deputy clerk, or special deputy clerk of a court, an official examiner of title, or the mayor or recorder of a city, a justice of the peace, surrogate, special surrogate, special county judge, or commissioner of deeds, who is a stockholder, director, officer or employee of a corporation may take the acknowledgment or proof of any party to a written instrument executed to or by such corporation, or administer an oath of any other stockholder, director, officer, employee or agent of such corporation, and such notary public may protest for non- acceptance or non-payment, bills of exchange, drafts, checks, notes and other negotiable instruments owned or held for collection by such corporation; but none of the officers above named shall take the acknowledgment or proof of a written instrument by or to a corporation of which he is a stockholder, director, officer or employee, if such officer taking such acknowledgment or proof to be a party executing such instrument, either individually or as representative of such



corporation, nor shall a notary public protest any negotiable instruments owned or held for collection by such corporation, if such notary public be individually a party to such instrument, or have a financial interest in the subject of same. All such acknowledgments or proofs of deeds, mortgages or other written instruments, relating to real property heretofore taken before any of the officers aforesaid are confirmed. This act shall not affect any action or legal proceeding now pending.

The Notary Public is listed in this section as a public officer, above a justice of the supreme court and other public officers. The Notary's ranking determines that they are able to perform any duty of the other positions of public office, as long as they are acting in non contentious matters they even have the authority to issue judgements related to the default discussion process explained in Chapter 6. Per section 138 the notary has the power to hold for collection bills of exchange, drafts, checks, notes and other negotiable instruments. The notices we are using are bills of exchange.

The Notary is not only given the authority to hold these for collection but also to protest for non- acceptance or non-payment, these bills of exchange. Reading statute is not just about reading the words written in black, but also reading the white, reading what is not stated. Because the Notary has the power to hold for collection and to protest for non acceptance of bills of exchange and other notes, they also must have the authority to perform any and all menial functions related to those including serving notice of them by making certified true copies, sending the copy certified mail to the addressed party, and placing all of the originals in a file to be given back to the presenter in the case that there is no response.

My Notary Public that I am using, like most others, was not aware of the authority they had, but now they are and they are fulfilling their duties. A Notary Public as a public officer ranked above a supreme court justice by New York executive law, is able to act in an administrative capacity to perform the duties of all other officers below them. Meaning that if there is no response to the Notary's notice of protest for non acceptance, the Notary at that time has the authority to grant the judgement on the spot. Default declaratory administrative judgements are used quite frequently. Since there has been no response to the notices you sent, or the Notary's notice, you win automatically without ever having to step foot into a court. And as the matter is non contentious and administrative, it is well within the powers of the Notary Public to grant such a judgement related to this discussion process.

Where Notaries Public have been confused is related to documents for use in civil law, which is far different from common law. Civil law is all of that statutory nonsense. It is absolutely true that a Notary may not handle documents for use in civil law other than to witness oaths. However bills of exchange and notices are documents for use in common law, not civil law, so they may absolutely handle these documents as explained herein. A civil law notary is an attorney, a common law notary is not an attorney, so they can not practice civil law as attorneys cannot practice common law. New York Executive law also spells out similar duties to civil law notaries, but in different sections, because they are very different. The force of the judgements issued by a Notary Public is equal to the force of a judgement issued by a Supreme Court justice. It is sufficient for a county Sheriff to act upon.

If you offer discussion prior to conflict, you never have to go to a court, courts are all about conflict, and discussion is all about avoiding conflict. We are not intended to be forced to create conflict with our fellow man in order to find remedy and justice.

This is why discussion is important in common law. All conflict can be avoided through honorable discussion and open and honest communications. Using these notices in common law you are acting sui juris, of your own law and understanding, being of the full lawful age of consent, an adult has conscience to determine and deliberate, and to make their own decisions. What is to stand in the way of someone acting of their own law, when they are swearing to exist peacefully and lawfully with their fellow man, swearing everything is true under penalty of perjury, and simply exercising lawful rights? There is nothing to prevent anyone of lawful age of consent from administering all of their own personal affairs and decisions.

I do not intend to discuss religion, but research of religion is where I came to understand the beauty and truth of law. Each time I researched a more ancient faith, I discovered that law and faith were interconnected. Law transcends religion because law, being the collective and individual right to lawful defense, is something all people of any faith can agree with. The notice process here of discussion to avoid conflict is derived from the teachings of Jesus Christ. While religion and god are a discussion for another time and another place, the fact is Jesus had significant comprehension of law, and how the courts worked.

This is not my opinion it is provable fact and comes right from the text of Matthew 5:25. "Settle matters quickly with your adversary who is taking you to court. Do it while you are still with him on the way, or he may hand you over to the judge, and the judge may hand you over to the officer, and you may be thrown into prison." New International Version 1984. "When you are on the way to court with your adversary, settle your differences quickly. Otherwise, your accuser may hand you over to the judge, who will hand you over to an officer, and you will be thrown into prison." New Living Translation 2007.

“Come to terms quickly with your accuser while you are going with him to court, lest your accuser hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the guard, and you be put in prison.” English Standard Version 2001 “Make friends quickly with your opponent at law while you are with him on the way, so that your opponent may not hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the officer, and you be thrown into prison.”

This is why your average American is legitimately concerned about their well being in matters of court and law. They have not made an offer of amends and tried to offer discussion with their adversary to avoid conflict prior to going to court. This is why people hire attorneys to “re-present” them. You are in court for creating conflict in dishonor if you have not offered discussion. If you offer discussion to avoid conflict you are never in court for creating conflict in dishonor, so you do not need to hire someone to speak on your behalf and declare yourself an incompetent person of unsound mind, of child status. Only by properly offering discussion and conditional acceptance can you remain in honor should conflict arise and under these circumstances you are able to proceed sui juris autonomous in personam, and administrate your own affairs without an ad litem. Your sui juris status is what the intimidation of the court seeks to separate you from by giving you all the opportunity in the world to declare yourself incompetent and in need of “re-presentation”.

Using the services of the Notary Public properly and using notices to offer discussion, sworn truths under penalty of perjury, and conditional acceptance is how you befriend your adversary without getting walked all over. Common law discussion levels the playing field in the chess game, and because governments are not set up for discussion, you will rarely or never receive a response to your notices, but always be able to evidence an attempt to offer discussion to avoid conflict, and maintain your honor, which is what court is all about.

We are all created equal in a common law jurisdiction, equality above and before the law is paramount. Maintaining your sui juris status, your sovereign full age of conscience, will, and all rights, comprehending these principles outlined allows the individual to rival any opponent at law.

## Chapter 8

### The County Sheriff

The county Sheriff as mentioned in other chapters, is a unique type of law enforcement officer. The Sheriff is the highest Constitutional law enforcement officer in the county, and is elected by the people. The Sheriff has many duties which in my state, again this is likely to vary but be quite similar state to state, are embodied within the State Constitution..

To quote directly from the Erie County New York Sheriff's website "The Office of the Sheriff is the oldest office under the system of common law in the United States and is an integral part of government in the State of New York." "As the oldest constitutional law enforcement officer of the county, the Sheriff is charged with maintaining the peace in all municipalities, villages, and townships within his jurisdiction and the care and custody of persons pending court action. The Sheriff also serves as the Chief Executive Officer of the Courts. "

The powers and the duties of the Sheriff are embodied in the constitution of each state. As the Sheriff is the highest constitutional law enforcement officer, and he is sworn by oath of office to uphold and defend the Constitution, the peace and rights of the people are his highest charge. The Sheriff as CEO of the courts within the county is equal to the President of the united states of America in authority, and does not answer to the Federal government, the Sheriff answers to the people. This is why I have set up my notice and claim of right to be served upon the Sheriff. If anything I were claiming were unlawful the Sheriff would have a duty to let me know.

As explained in chapter 4 the Sheriff having a duty to the common law, and the common law being the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the Sheriff has the ability to remove from an office of public trust, a member of the B.A.R., The British Accreditation Registry, for holding the title of nobility, Esquire, this stems from an amendment to the Constitution which is a no longer published, but properly ratified, amendment to the constitution, known as the titles of nobility amendment or the hidden 13th amendment. Using the powers of our county Sheriff we the people can once again restore the rule of law.

As the highest officer of common law this position as the CEO of the courts is responsible for ensuring statutes, by laws, orders, ordinances, directives, etc, do not conflict with the Supreme law of the land, and to nullify those that do in the interests of preserving the common law. When a law conflicts with the Supreme law of the land, the conflicting law is no law, and the Supreme law of the land must supercede

When ever we examine law, and whatever the law is we are examining, it statute, ordinance, regulation, order, commandment, directive, or guideline throughout the entire land of this country whether local, State, or Federal, must be compared to the Constitution of these united States of America. Any be in agreement with the entire Constitution, and if it is not it is wholly null and void as if it did not exist.

All law is law, notwithstanding the Constitution. All behavior is legal regardless of whatever statute would claim the contrary as long as a behavior does not cause actual damage or injury, or violation of a legal right to another.

A License offered by government confers no right upon an American, but only confers a privilege. The absence of a privilege does not cause an absence of any inherent right. As such no license can be required of any American to engage in a rightful behavior, and again any behavior may be engaged in by any American provided there is no damage or injury or violation of a right. Consent is the determining factor. If a man punches a man in the back of the head without provocation assault has been committed and that establishes the violation of the legal right to not be assaulted as well as damage and injury. However if two men decide to consent to engage in a hand to hand altercation their mutual consent implies they accept responsibility for the injuries they may sustain. The consent to engage in hand to hand combat is an American right, and no law may render this right criminal, nor convert the right into a privilege, nor impose sanction or penalty upon either party of any kind, unless there is further damage to other private or public property or person not a party to the consented conflict.

Because the Sheriff is charged with maintaining the peace in all areas of the county all officers answer to the Sheriff. The fee schedule put on file with the Sheriff in your notices is applicable to all officers in all areas within the county, and as agent principal rules apply your notice to the Sheriff is notice to all other officers under him, as well as those above him throughout the State, including the attorney general. Once the Sheriff receives your notice he is responsible for disseminating it under the agent principal rule to those above and below him. You do not need to notice every branch of government separately, but you certainly have the option to.

The notice I have served to the Sheriff claims among many other rights, the right to travel freely of my own free will, in my unregistered unlicensed automobile. There are numerous supreme court rulings upholding the individual right to travel by automobile or horse drawn carriage.



It is not a mere privilege which can be permitted and prohibited at the discretion of local state, or federal governments. These supreme court rulings upon and in line with the common law, must be upheld by the Sheriff. The Sheriff does not get to decide which parts of the supreme law of the land he will uphold and defend, he is sworn to all of it. The supreme court cases deciding that travel is a fundamental right are as follows.

"The use of the highways for the purpose of travel and transportation is not a mere privilege, but a common and fundamental Right of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived." [emphasis added] *Chicago Motor Coach vs. Chicago*, 169 NE 22; *Ligare vs. Chicago*, 28 NE 934; *Boon vs. Clark*, 214 SSW 607; 25 Am.Jur. (1st) Highways Sect.163.

"The Right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, either by horse drawn carriage or by automobile, is not a mere privilege which a city can prohibit or permit at will, but a common Right which he has under the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." [emphasis added] *Thompson vs. Smith*, 154 SE 579.

"For while a Citizen has the Right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, that Right does not extend to the use of the highways, either in whole or in part, as a place for private gain. For the latter purpose no person has a vested right to use the highways of the state, but is a privilege or a license which the legislature may grant or withhold at its discretion." *State vs. Johnson*, 243 P. 1073; *Hadfield*, supra; *Cummins vs. Homes*, 155 P. 171; *Packard vs. Banton*, 44 S.Ct. 256; and other cases too numerous to mention.

"Heretofore the court has held, and we think correctly, that while a Citizen has the Right to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, that Right does not extend to the use of the highways, either in whole or in part, as a place of business for private gain." *Barney vs. Board of Railroad Commissioners*, 17 P.2d 82; *Willis vs. Buck*, 263 P.1 982.

What is this Right of the Citizen which differs so "radically and obviously" from one who uses the highway as a place of business? Who better to enlighten us than Justice Tolman of the Supreme Court of Washington State? In *State vs. City of Spokane*, supra, the Court also noted a very "radical and obvious" difference, but went on to explain just what the difference is: "The former is the usual and ordinary right of the Citizen, a common right to all, while the latter is special, unusual, and extraordinary." "This distinction, elementary and fundamental in character, is recognized by all the authorities." *State vs. City of Spokane*, supra.

"the right of the Citizen to travel upon the highway and to transport his property thereon in the ordinary course of life and business, differs radically and obviously from that of one who makes the highway his place of business and uses it for private gain in the running of a stagecoach or omnibus. The former is the usual and ordinary right of the Citizen, a right common to all, while the latter is special, unusual, and extraordinary." *Ex Parte Dickey*, (*Dickey vs. Davis*), 85 SE 781.

The right of the Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, is a common right which he has under the right to enjoy life and liberty, to acquire and possess property, and to pursue happiness and safety.

It includes the right, in so doing, to use the ordinary and usual conveyances of the day, and under the existing modes of travel, includes the right to drive a horse drawn carriage or wagon thereon or to operate an automobile thereon, for the usual and ordinary purpose of life and business." *Teche Lines vs. Danforth, Miss.*, 12 S.2d 784; *Thompson vs. Smith, supra*.

"Personal liberty -- or the right to enjoyment of life and liberty -- is one of the fundamental or natural rights, which has been protected by its inclusion as a guarantee in the various constitutions, which is not derived from nor dependent on the U.S. Constitution... It is one of the most sacred and valuable rights [remember the words of Justice Tolman, *supra*.] as sacred as the right to private property...and is regarded as inalienable." 16 C.J.S. Const. Law, Sect.202, p.987.

## Chapter 9

### Accepted For Value

What if everything you thought you knew was not just wrong, but categorically incorrect all together to a degree where everything you thought you knew was not just wrong, but so wrong you were living an illusion you believed to be true. That is the case, and not because I say so. We are going to explore Accepted For Value together and learn as we go so we are not held under any misconception about this. To comprehend accepted for value we have to understand House Joint Resolution 192 and Executive Order 6102.

#### **H.J. Res. 192, 73rd Cong., 1st Sess. (Also see Executive Order 6102)**

Is an item of law we must examine closely. I used to believe that Roosevelt was an evil man, then I did some research and discovered I had to change my opinion, I believe he was brilliant in these acts, and that any other information about him must be examined separately from this. Whatever he did or did not do I believe he did the right thing at the time under the circumstances, but again that is my opinion which no one is required to share.

This resolution and Executive Order made it impossible for every single American to be able to pay any kind of bill. Even if you wanted to pay a bill, there is no money to do so, so you cannot, and you are not lawfully allowed to. You could go to jail for 10 years under this executive order if you attempt to pay a bill. YOU ARE EXEMPT FROM LEVY EVIDENCED BY YOUR SOCIAL SECURITY ACCOUNT. IT IS YOUR EXEMPTION ID#.

The fact that you cannot pay, is the payment. You can not pay a bill, you can only discharge a debt. What people have been doing through deceptive manipulation, is not paying bills with checks like they believe , but paying an administration fee for not discharging their security interests themselves, in an amount equal to the debt. Your check does not constitute a payment that cancels out the bill like you believe. Your signature on the check empowers who you are endorsing it to, to discharge the debt on your behalf. Read the line you sign your name on, on your check.

IT IS NOT A SOLID LINE, YOU HAVE BEEN DECEIVED. It says AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE, which authorizes whoever you send it to, to do the administration on the security interest for you, and collect a fee equal to the debt for administrating the remittance. You are a banker, and the banking you can do is called acceptance.

Acceptance for value is really a quite simple process, that is only over complicated by either those who do not know what they are talking about, or because it is so simple the brain itself has been trained to make it difficult. Do you know what the word forgiven means? When the Government seized the gold of the people upon this resolution it literally forgave every debt that could be incurred by the people. Forgive means to give before, we have been deceived out of our own language. Everything you could receive a bill for obtaining, has already been paid for by this gold seizure.

You first and foremost are not getting away with something, it is already yours. Banks and government cannot create wealth, **ONLY YOU CAN BECAUSE YOU ARE ALL THAT IS REAL. GOVERNMENTS AND BANKS ARE FICTITIOUS CREATED ENTITIES.** This is why only your signature can give a note value.

When you sign a bank note you are creating the value for the amount of the note, you create the money, once you sign it it becomes legal tender. You essentially create a 300,000 dollar bill. This is why the bank will not give it to you. They keep it, insure it sell it and so on, then make you sign a promissory note claiming you will pay back the value you created plus interest for 30 years. THAT IS THE SCAM, NOT WHAT YOU COULD DO. THIS WAS PUT IN PLACE TO PROTECT US AND BURIED SINCE.

The full text of the resolution is below, this is how you accept something for value. If you receive any type of bill, mortgage, telephone, electric, car loan, student loan, any type of security interest including traffic citations, you can accept them for value, and discharge them to the U.S. Treasury. This is why you go to court. You have remedy available and are not using it, putting you in dishonor. You simply take the bill and to make a complete transaction write upon it the paragraph below.

You send this to your local IRS office. Most people fear the IRS, because they are not discharging their security interests. The Federal Reserve Bank (IRS) knows how to handle these transactions where most commercial banks will not. You are the creditor not the debtor. Only you can create money. This all may sound insane, but no one can create a liability in the public with out providing the remedy. Look at the bill they do not, they do provide the check to pay the bill, it is called a remittance. A remittance is a specie of money sent from one merchant to another, when you put your wet signature on it you create money out of it. This is how things will be until the government returns the gold it seized forgiving the debts of all Americans BY PREPAYING THEM.

This paragraph below is written on any bill and sent to the local IRS branch with the remittance. Simply replace your information with John Smith's and send it off. You could have to do some due diligence as is always completely recommended when dealing with government or any member of the IRS. They may respond to your A4V claiming they do not have a mandate, isn't it great that we the people have all the power and not them?

Accepted for value

Exempt from Levy **H.J. Res. 192, 73rd Cong., 1st Sess. / Executive Order 6102**

Your Signature / DATE (Not all caps)

Exemption ID# (JOHN SMITH / 123456789 ( ALL CAPS)

Deposit to the U.S. Treasury DBA The Internal Revenue Service

Charge the same to (JOHN SMITH /123456789)

If you wish to be overly cautious you can send a notice with your bill that can be used to address almost any response they would send to you regarding your acceptance for value. As mentioned the most common response will be a claim that they have no mandate. The mandate exists in House Joint Resolution 192 and Executive Order 6102. Your notice is further evidence of their mandate and should appear as below, custom tailored to your needs. Perfection is unnecessary, your notice needs only to be clear concise and unequivocal. As we the people are the highest authority in the land, we have the authority to create a mandate for them if such a mandate did not exist. Simply writing the paragraph above upon the bill should suffice, but occasionally there will be questions asked, and you should be able to both explain and justify exactly what it is you are doing.

## Notice of Mandate Authority by Claim of Right

Warning: If notice is not answered or mandate is not performed, silence confirms claim, otherwise liability has been imposed in the public without remedy. Respond or perform mandate within (15) Fifteen, Days of receiving this notice.

Consumer Purchase

Authority Mandated by Claim Of Right

Claim: Lawful Excuse, Exempt from Levy, Cannot lawfully pay.

Exemption ID# 123456789 ( Your SSN)

H.J. Res. 192, 73rd Cong., 1st Sess. Approved June 5, 1933, 4:30 p.m.

Executive Order 6102

Instructions and Orders:

Immediately perform mandate as ordered.

Deposit to the U.S. Treasury

Charge the same to (JOHN SMITH / 123456789 )

Your Signature:

Date:

Notary Public:



It should be mentioned that accepted for value is not intended to allow someone to live the high life. Anything you do an accepted for value on should be justified as basic necessities of life, modern life, but necessities none the less. This was designed so the people of this country never ended up broke, starving, downing in debt and living on the cold streets their forefathers tamed and bled for.

While utility bills, mortgages for homes and transportation, credit card debt, medical expenses, education, and a wide variety of other billed services can be accepted for value, you should be using this remedy to become more prosperous, not to directly profit. It should be used to satisfy debts already incurred and to off set basic costs of living expenses, not with the intent of over indulging. A top of the line home could get you into serious trouble, but a reasonably priced home, property, and transportation can easily be justified as a necessity of a comfortable modern life which these banks are profiting from us enjoying.

This may seem to be extraordinary, but it is really quite simple, our ancestors literally prepaid every debt anyone could incur upon surrendering their gold in compliance to executive order 6102 and House Joint Resolution 192. Not only are Americans unable to pay bills because there is no money to do so, but it is punishable by up to ten years in prison for attempting to pay a bill. Again it is not getting away with something or taking advantage of someone, or even welfare to use accepted for value. I try to think of it more like a trust fund I was unaware of. The fact is by being able to make use of this fund we were unaware of, we become more individually prosperous and contribute more to the general well being of others through our own individual prosperity.

The reason I personally hold no moral reservation regarding the use of accepted for value is because of the primary reason there is an account to be accessed in the first place. The day we were born and a social security account set up in our name by our parents, the government began floating a bond in each of our individual names that is corresponding to the red CUSIP ID# that exists on the back of every original birth certificate. The legal fiction created in our name is actually a mutual fund, that is traded on the New York Stock Exchange which generates value every single year.

The very fact that you exist and that your birth certificate is a security which is traded publicly in your name means that all returns on the principle are yours, unless slavery has been made lawful again and no one has been told about it.. All of this money has been going into a general fund, where your Social Security Account Number is the identification of your lawful ability to access those funds.

Government draws from this fund and contributes nothing. Government cannot claim to be able to access this fund while the people remain unable to do so. Again this is why every thing goes through lawyers with social security disability insurance. They are protecting not you, but the account from you, and ensuring you do not have access to it, or limited access to it in the event of disability.

Since there is little else to be done regarding discovering that we are a traded commodity, the only practical option is to make use of this fund to offset those costs of living that would make us more prosperous if we were not encumbered by them. The following text will detail the exact wording of both House Joint Resolution 192 and Executive Order 6102.

Executive Order 6102 is an Executive Order signed on April 5, 1933 by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt ", which unlawfully seized by way of theft, all of the Gold Coin, Gold Bullion, and Gold Certificates" from the American people. History tries to pass this act off and blame this unlawful seizure of property as necessary, and the people are blamed for hoarding gold. This excuse is nonsense when one contemplates and comprehends the nature of fractional reserve banking.

The Federal Reserve was instituted under the guise of protection for the people from unethical fractional reserve banking practices. Before 1913 all money in America was a physical amount of gold or silver, and certificates were given to people who deposited their savings into the treasury. The Federal Reserve Bank was instituted under the false premise of being able to prevent bank runs and to protect the deposits of the people from banks that go out of business in this fashion.

Bank runs were not caused by greedy Americans as history would have you believe. Bank runs were a direct result of fractional reserve banking practices using gold. Banks would print more gold certificates than they had physical gold to support, and would only need to keep on hand 10% to handle daily transaction, as they realized that customers of the bank would only ever withdraw about 10 percent of their savings at any time.

People began to realize what was going on, and this is not the first example of an inflated form of currency in America. After learning of the practices the banks were using to essentially loan out the savings of the people, the people could not be certain they would be able to reclaim all of the gold for which they held gold certificates.

This fractional reserve banking which our entire economy is based upon today is the reason banks were run and went out of business. It had nothing to do with the greed of the people, but the greed and unethical behavior of these banks.

The first example of inflated currency on American soil actually happened very quickly after the defeat of England. Each of the original 13 colonies began printing their own paper currencies which rapidly became useless through inflation. This economic crisis due to inflated, debased currency is what prompted the constitutional convention and lead to the Constitution which we have today, that demands only gold and silver can become lawful money or legal tender in payment of debts. This provision has not been repealed, and so today we are experiencing the same economic issues as the original 13 colonies under articles of confederacy.

### **House Joint Resolution 192, 73rd Cong., 1st Sess.**

Joint resolution to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States. Whereas the holding of or dealing in gold affect the public interest, and therefore subject to proper regulation and restriction; and Whereas the existing emergency has disclosed that provisions of obligations which purport to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency of the United States, or in an amount of money of the United States measured thereby, obstruct the power of the Congress to regulate the value of money of the United States, and are inconsistent with the declared policy of the Congress to maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar, coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts.

Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a) 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 in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy; and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred.

Every obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provisions is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any such coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts.

Any such provision contained in any law authorizing obligations to be issued by or under authority of the United States, is hereby repealed, but the repeal of any such provision shall not invalidate any other provision or authority contained in such law. b) As used in this resolution, the term "obligation" means an obligation (including every obligation of and to the United States, excepting currency) payable in money of the United States; and the term "coin or currency" means coin or currency of the United States, including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations.

SEC. 2. The last sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 43 of the Act entitled " An Act to relieve the existing national economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emergency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes", approved May 12, 1933, is amended to read as follows:

"All coins and currencies of the United States (including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations) heretofore or hereafter coined or issued, shall be legal tender for all debts, for public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues, except that gold coins, when below the standard weight and limit of tolerance provided by law for the single piece, shall be legal tender only at valuation in proportion to their actual weight." Approved June 5, 1933, 4:30 p.m.

### **Executive Order 6102**

Forbidding the Hoarding of Gold Coin, Gold Bullion and Gold Certificates By virtue of the authority vested in me by Section 5(b) of the Act of October 6, 1917, as amended by Section 2 of the Act of March 9, 1933, entitled

An Act to provide relief in the existing national emergency in banking, and for other purposes in which amendatory Act Congress declared that a serious emergency exists, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do declare that said national emergency still continues to exist and pursuant to said section to do hereby prohibit the hoarding gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates within the continental United States by individuals, partnerships, associations and corporations and hereby prescribe the following regulations for carrying out the purposes of the order:

Section 1. For the purpose of this regulation, the term "hoarding" means the withdrawal and withholding of gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates from the recognized and customary channels of trade. The term "person" means any individual, partnership, association or corporation.

Section 2. All persons are hereby required to deliver on or before May 1, 1933, to a Federal Reserve bank or a branch or agency thereof or to any member bank of the Federal Reserve System all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates now owned by them or coming into their ownership on or before April 28, 1933, except the following:

(a) Such amount of gold as may be required for legitimate and customary use in industry, profession or art within a reasonable time, including gold prior to refining and stocks of gold in reasonable amounts for the usual trade requirements of owners mining and refining such gold.

(b) Gold coin and gold certificates in an amount not exceeding in the aggregate \$100.00 belonging to any one person; and gold coins having recognized special value to collectors of rare and unusual coins.

Gold coin and bullion earmarked or held in trust for a recognized foreign government or foreign central bank or the Bank for International Settlements.

(d) Gold coin and bullion licensed for the other proper transactions (not involving hoarding) including gold coin and gold bullion imported for the re-export or held pending action on applications for export license.

Section 3. Until otherwise ordered any person becoming the owner of any gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates after April 28, 1933, shall within three days after receipt thereof, deliver the same in the manner prescribed in Section 2; unless such gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates are held for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a),(b) or © of Section 2; or unless such gold coin, gold bullion is held for purposes specified in paragraph (d) of Section 2 and the person holding it is, with respect to such gold coin or bullion, a licensee or applicant for license pending action thereon.

Section 4. Upon receipt of gold coin, gold bullion, or gold certificates delivered to it in accordance with Section 2 or 3, the Federal reserve bank or member bank will pay thereof an equivalent amount of any other form of coin or currency coined or issued under the laws of the United States.

Section 5. Member banks shall deliver all gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates owned or received by them (other than as exempted under the provisions of Section 2) to the Federal reserve banks of their respective districts and receive credit or payment thereof.

Section 6. The Secretary of the Treasury, out of the sum made available to the President by Section 501 of the Act of March 9, 1933, will in all proper cases pay the reasonable costs of transportation of gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates delivered to a member bank or Federal reserve bank in accordance with Sections 2, 3, or 5 hereof, including the cost of insurance, protection, and such other incidental costs as may be necessary, upon production of satisfactory evidence of such costs. Voucher forms for this purpose may be procured from Federal reserve banks.

Section 7. In cases where the delivery of gold coin, gold bullion, or gold certificates by the owners thereof within the time set forth above will involve extraordinary hardship or difficulty, the Secretary of the Treasury may, in his discretion, extend the time within which such delivery must be made. Applications for such extensions must be made in writing under oath; addressed to the Secretary of the Treasury and filed with a Federal reserve bank. Each application must state the date to which the extension is desired, the amount and location of the gold coin, gold bullion, and gold certificates in respect of which such application is made and the facts showing extension to be necessary to avoid extraordinary hardship or difficulty.

Section 8. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and empowered to issue such further regulations as he may deem necessary to carry the purposes of this order and to issue licenses there under, through such officers or agencies as he may designate, including licenses permitting the Federal reserve banks and member banks of the Federal Reserve System, in return for an equivalent amount of other coin, currency or credit, to deliver, earmark or hold in trust gold coin or bullion to or for persons showing the need for same for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a), , and (d) of Section 2 of these regulations.

Section 9. Whoever willfully violates any provision of this Executive Order or these regulations or of any rule, regulation or license issued there under may be fined not more than \$10,000, or, if a natural person may be imprisoned for not more than ten years or both; and any officer, director, or agent of any corporation who knowingly participates in any such violation may be punished by a like fine, imprisonment, or both.





## **Chapter 10**

### **The Role Of A Doctor And Prohibition**

This is a section that should stir a great deal of controversy, but that is not the goal, and once again we will be standing upon solid lawful ground. Medicine is such an important topic that it had to be discussed in complete detail in it's own chapter. All too often today the role of a doctor has been corrupted by government, and this is another area where the goal is to make you give up your highest status of sovereign law abiding individual operating sui juris and administrating all of your own affairs.

The proper role of a doctor is not the presumption of supreme medical authority that most people assume it is today. A doctor only gains authority through transference from the individual seeking medical advice. And in the same way no state branch of the British Accreditation Registry can lawfully prevent an individual from administrating their own affairs at law, the Department of Health, Department of Education, various medical professionals, and others of the like, cannot lawfully prevent an individual from administrating their own medical affairs, and this includes authorizing your own medications that can be lawfully filled at any pharmacy.

I have spoken at length through email with my own local police department regarding this and what they would not say is just as important as what they did say. I still have the emails so this can be supported if it is ever called into question.

I was going to include the emails however I removed them for everyone's privacy, the point is any police department will give the same answers if they give an answer at all, because police have a duty to differentiate between statute and law. The police refused to claim that it was unlawful, or in any manner fraudulent, to attempt to fill a hand written self authorized order for medicine.

The police refused to claim that a pharmacy had any obligation of law to refuse such a self authorized order. As this is true it must also be true that it is lawful to attempt to fill a self authorized order for medicine, and that a pharmacy does not have any obligation in law to refuse such an order. The police would only claim that pharmacies will not fill such orders, as the words they use are important, it is clear that it is a matter of the pharmacies will, meaning they certainly have the lawful capability to fill and adult's self authorized order. However I would argue that a pharmacy has no more of an authority to refuse such an order for any legitimate business reason, and as all individuals have the right to access medicine much in the same way they do food, a pharmacy may not refuse a self authorized order for medicine, any more than a supermarket can refuse to sell food to an individual for no legitimate business reason.

One may simply ask their pharmacist a few simple questions to determine the truth of this, and the same notice process that has been explained can be used in this situation. You will of course have to custom tailor the initial notice of understanding, intent, and claim of right to this specific situation and to the pharmacy you intend to use. Again using discussion and notices can be used to set up a fee schedule, and to avoid conflict all together.

You sign a statement in your original notice which is notarized, claiming the right to authorize your own medications and fill them of your own free will, right and law, and by operating sui juris you sign that notice taking all responsibility upon yourself, and waiving all possible liability to the pharmacy, swearing upon oath to ensure no harm comes to another through the claim and exercise of this right. Your fee schedule is strictly for dealing with violations and infringements upon this right, and once again you can use the same notice process to collect upon this fee schedule. Are you starting to see a pattern here? By now you should be starting to understand the principals of being the highest source of authority over your own affairs, which do not involve harm to others.

A doctor's role is properly defined as a role of advice and information regarding medical choices. However all of the authority of choice and control lies in the hands of the individual. This is why you must sign a consent to treatment form whenever you go to a hospital. Doctor's have abused the trust the people have placed in them and have taken on a role of medical dictator and licensing bureau. A prescription for medication has been perverted into a license to obtain and possess medicine, and doctors today now treat their customers as if they were criminals for the simple act of seeking a narcotic pain reliever.

We can avoid this scrutiny all together by simply authorizing our own medications and only seeking the services of a doctor when we are not individually capable of making a choice without information, or if a procedure requires a professional hand. I would not attempt my own open heart surgery, nor would I try to pull my own tooth, but it is certainly my right to do so. No law can deny me access to medicine any more than it can deny me the lawful authority to pull my own tooth.

And so long as we are never convicted of having caused harm through the claim and exercise of this right it cannot be removed regardless of what the Drug Enforcement Agency may think.

Prior to sending any notices in writing, do a little experiment. Walk into any local pharmacy and ask the following questions. The answers to these questions should show both you and the pharmacist the truth of the matter. It is important to keep this conversation calm, and to be polite and respectful to who you are speaking with. These people although they may be very ignorant of the law, are trying to do good. Your behavior must be beyond reproach if you wish to be successful. We want to travel the path of least resistance, which means the pharmacist must be able to understand where it is you gain the authority to do what you are doing. You could be successful without using the notices if you execute this properly. I am forced to use the notices to succeed here, however as these questions were answered, it makes the violation of these rights a willful act on the part of the pharmacist, and a criminal act, for which civil and criminal penalties apply.

1. As an adult American of sound mind, body, and judgement, is there anything but my consent, that can empower a doctor to write a prescription on my behalf? (NO) 2. Do I as an American have the right to exercise 100% complete control over all of my own medical affairs, and decisions? (YES) 3. If I am sick, or under any other circumstances, are there any laws that can require me to see a doctor? (NO) 4. Can I be denied my right to exercise complete control over my medical affairs and decisions, as long as mental competence is not an issue? (NO) 5. Do I have a right to obtain the medicine of my choice, based upon fully informed consent, as long as I am willing and able to pay for it? (YES)

6. Are all contracts with doctors 100% voluntary for an adult American of sound mind, body, and judgement?(YES) 7. If all contracts with doctors are 100% voluntary, can any penalty be imposed against an American for deciding not to contract with a doctor? (NO) 8. If only my consent can empower a doctor to write a prescription on my behalf, do I possess this authority personally? I understand that I must possess that authority personally in order to be able to voluntarily transfer that authority to someone else to act upon my behalf? (YES). 9. Will you fill my hand written self authorized prescription? (NO will be the most likely response in spite of all of this).

We will only ever have the rights which we will assert and defend, and no one is going to protect these for you, if you cannot do it yourself you are at a disadvantage. Proceeding in all matters sui juris is the most informative and empowering way to handle your affairs, as experience is wisdom, because wisdom is the knowledgeable application of information. When I went in and started asking questions I expected them to call the police out of ignorance but they did not, and had they I would have actually been able to charge the pharmacist, and still may, as well as evidence the truth that I was not doing anything unlawful from their own emails between them and myself. Again discussion, when foresight says there could arise conflict, is the rule of thumb. Any time and in any situation where you can foresee conflict arising you can use discussion to avoid that conflict.

If they do call the police here is how you handle that situation competently, by simply asking questions that reveal self evident truths, and expressing these truths that cannot be denied. You should comprehend the significance of what these questions mean at this point. “Are you acting as a peace officer and in my best interest”?

As we are all equal in this common law jurisdiction I simply wish to discuss this situation. I have not breached the peace in any manner, I have been nothing but calm and respectful, attempting to execute my duty as an American to claim and exercise all of my rights to ensure that they exist for future generations, in this case exercising my right to administrate all of my own medical affairs. I spoke with this pharmacy representative, they informed me through answering my procedural questions that I do in fact have the right to exercise 100% complete control over my medical affairs. This is not in dispute. They also informed me that contracts with doctors are 100% voluntary.”

“Since I am doing nothing unlawful per our communications there is no authority for you to act in any manner against me as I have not breached the peace. However I believe infringing my lawful right to obtain medicine is a breach of the peace.

Is ignorance of the law, an excuse for breaking it? While you are here I must insist that you arrest (which ever pharmacy reps you spoke to), for denying me an essential freedom secured to me by the Declaration of Independence and Constitution, which you are sworn by oath to uphold and defend.

I am willing to drop this charge if they simply obey the law and fill my lawful order. As it is clear through our communications that there is no obligation of law for them to refuse this order, it is lawful remedy for them to fill the order.”

Again here the police are not above the law. They must respect and operate upon the rule of law once you put them in their proper role of peace officer, and hold them to that role. Criminals do not desire to have confrontations with police, and neither does a sovereign who operates sui juris. The difference is those who operate sui juris are able to be respectful, polite, intelligent, and act without causing conflict or a breach of the peace.

There is no need to get angry, once you have a fee schedule set up in writing and under administrative judgement, you can collect for having to operate under protest and duress, so if you do end up getting arrested you will not be thrown down and violently beaten, but gently cuffed and detained just long enough for them to determine it is going to cost a lot of money for them to hold you without valid charges.

Only if one has actually caused harm should one be concerned about speaking with police officers, or if one has no comprehension of the words they are using. Most police officers are simply doing a job like everyone else and trying to do good, expressing the truth you can affect them the same way as everyone else. Your dealings with them should be brief and few after having read this, and that element of fear will be removed from the equation, for fear comes only from ignorance, and that dark deception has been exposed with every page. The notice I used to the Department of Health is in chapter 6 in it's entirety and can be used as a template for your own notices to claim these rights yourself.

I have pursued criminal charges against the pharmacy that denied my rights we well and have sent via email a criminal complaint to the local U.S. Attorney's office, also seeking to charge the officers that refused to take my complaint.



I will be serving this notice shortly myself in writing by certified mail, but I am taking this all one step at a time myself. By the time this book comes out I will have served my criminal complaint in writing. Again I have removed names for personal privacy of the individuals involved.

**Criminal Complaint to U.S. Attorney's office.**

Dear U.S. Attorney's office of \*\*\*\*\*

I Robert, am an American, alleging violation of a lawful right, and damage/injury to my self, related to the violation of this right. I realize the subject matter involved may appear quite unconventional, however upon investigation and due diligence it will be apparent that I am correct. I wish to convey that I am absolutely serious about following through with filing and prosecuting these charges, and that I believe everything I am doing is correct and true, not intended to harass, but to fulfill my duty to defend lawfully the rights I was born with. I am willing to testify to the truth of all of these facts which I will detail under penalty of perjury, and I also wish to have charges filed against the officers of the local police department, who have refused to take and investigate my valid criminal complaint.

I am not the average American, I am very well read and I am aware that the first two elements of Corpus Delicti alleged by me, a complaining party, establish the third, redress ability of the court. Regardless of the beliefs of the officers, this complaint is certainly valid. I will now give full complete and accurate details of the incident, those involved and what has occurred.

On 10/16/2010 at 4:45PM \*\*\*\*\*, the \*\*\*\*\* at \*\*\*\*\*, located at, Common Law Jurisdiction: \*\*\*\*\*, did violate my lawful rights, and in so doing, damage and injury based upon this violation of rights has occurred. \*\*\*\*\* of the \*\*\*\*\* Police Department was notified of this transgression on that very day 10/16/2010. He passed the complaint off to \*\*\*\*\*, who responded for the first time 10/20/2010. I presume \*\*\*\*\* is one of \*\*\*\*\*'s underlings, and I received two responses to my complaint from Mr. \*\*\*\*\*, which I can evidence at any time.

The first response attempted to assert jurisdictional difficulties, which is nonsense as I am aware of how Jurisdiction works and the authority of the police as well as their duty to take criminal complaints alleging violation of a lawful right, and damage and injury. The second response from Mr. \*\*\*\*\* suggested I contact the U.S. Attorney's office, so that is what I am doing. And I am now expanding my complaint to include dereliction of duty, and violation of oath of office by \*\*\*\*\* and \*\*\*\*\*. I am aware that this is all very serious, and I intend to follow through with this till the end. I have a duty to other Americans to report the violation of this right, and to take every lawful peaceful action to defend it.

I went to the Pharmacy at \*\*\*\*\*, the location given, and I asked several revealing questions of the Pharmacist, which he answered candidly. After answering these questions regarding medical rights, it was apparent the Pharmacist was very aware of the situation, and this makes his violation of my rights knowing and willful. The 7 questions I asked are as follows:

1. As an adult American of sound mind, body, and judgement, is there anything but my consent, that can authorize a doctor to write a prescription for me? Answer given (NO). 2. Do I have the right to exercise 100% complete control over all of my own medical concerns? Answer given (YES). 3. Is there any situation outside of emergency quarantine, that can obligate me to contract with a doctor? Answer given (NO). 4. Can I as an American , be lawfully denied my right to exercise complete control over my medical concerns, presuming there is no mental fitness concern? Answer given (NO) 5. Do I have a right to pursue, and obtain the medicine of my choice, based upon my fully informed consent? Answer given (YES). 6. Are all contracts with doctors 100% voluntary. Answer given (YES). 7. If all contracts are voluntary, can any kind of penalty be imposed against me, for the declination of contracting with a doctor? Answer Given (NO).

After these questions were answered I attempted to write my self a self authorized prescription for medicine, a common antibiotic, Amoxicillin, and the order for medicine was refused, imposing a penalty against me, solely for declining to contract with a doctor. As established by communication between myself and the local police regarding this 1. There is no requirement of law that prevents a pharmacy from filling a prescription authorized directly by the patient. 2. There is no law requiring me personally to obtain any sort of license to engage in this activity on my own behalf. This authority and right does in fact exist within me. Any statutory code requiring my consent I do not consent to give the force of law, and such statutes even if I did give consent to them, would not preclude me as an authorized practitioner over my own affairs. I am claiming only the right to administrate my own medical affairs, I am not claiming the right to act in the affairs of others.

The police would NOT claim the contrary to these facts. Their only very carefully worded statement was "If you insist on writing your own prescriptions, a pharmacy is under no obligation to fill them, a pharmacy will only fill scripts by those duly licensed in the State of New York. They did not say a pharmacy was required by New York State, nor did they point to any law of New York State requiring this of a pharmacy, including the controlled drugs and substances act.

The police quite clearly even if cryptically stated it was the pharmacy's will, to only fill scripts authorized by one with a license. I do not agree that a Pharmacy has the right to refuse a prescription which is self authorized, especially since they are quasi governmental reporting to the DEA. I believe the pharmacy has no more right to refuse me medicine under my own lawful authority for no legitimate business reason, than a supermarket has a right to refuse me the right to purchase food, for no legitimate business reason.

As I understand it The Federal Civil Rights Act further protects the inherent rights of all sovereign free people the right to "full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, and accommodations of any place of public accommodation. As there was no legitimate business reason for the refusal of service, and no lawful mandate to refuse me such service, the discrimination was arbitrary and unlawful. Their only possible reason for refusing me service was my declination of a voluntary contract with a doctor. The lack of some permission from a doctor which I clearly do not require.

The refusal is an unlawful penalty for refusing consent to a voluntary contract that could not be imposed upon me if these contracts are in fact voluntary, and they are.

I state here and now clearly and unequivocally that I cannot any longer voluntarily contract with a doctor to obtain medicine, as the penalty is imposed, it is an involuntary contract which is involuntary servitude and void ab initio under protest and duress on its very face. This presents an impossible situation that has indefinitely infringed my rights, and duty to claim and exercise them.

I am not an unreasonable man, I am a forgiving and peaceful man. I am willing to drop all charges against all parties if I am able to find remedy prior to adjudication being necessary. I would suggest all it would take to remedy this situation is a phone call to the pharmacy, advising them that I do in fact have a lawful protected right to authorize my own prescriptions, and that refusal of service arbitrarily in this manner is an unlawful violation of my rights.

I am willing to not only drop all charges against the pharmacy and local police if they honor my self authorized prescriptions. I am willing to waive in writing ALL of their liability for filling my scripts, and take that responsibility upon myself under penalty of law, if I abuse or misuse that right causing harm to any other. Much the same as when one fills a script written by a doctor.

Remedy is both available and simple, this matter need not go to court. But if necessary I will follow it through to the very end, prosecuting all to the fullest extent of the law. I give this option of remedy to save the country I love the expense of prosecution. I respectfully request your office to contact me at this email address, to advise me of a time to come in and sign my written complaint, should your attempt to contact the pharmacy fail.

At that time I will happily exchange my phone and location information.  
Thank you very much for your time and cooperation.

Most Sincerely,

Signature,

---

Notary Public

Prohibition and government authority must be examined closely not only to uncover the truth about pharmaceutical medication, but also other substances. No one would deny that there are many substances in existence that are highly addictive and dangerous like crack and other hard street drugs. But at the same time marijuana alone accounts for the 90 percent of the illicit drug trade that fuels as a finance source and market for the other more dangerous substances. It is the prohibition of a thing that gives rise to a black market, which is the primary reason government requires Constitutional amendment to gain this authority. The atmosphere that surrounds prohibition is the true danger, more so than any substance.

The war on drugs is an abysmal failure, and an expensive one, one that was never intended to be won or has anything actually to do with the general welfare of the people, but is all about power and control of government. So let us examine prohibition and government authority for a moment. As mentioned previously government has proven in 1919 with the ratification of the 18th Amendment, and subsequent repeal by the 21st Amendment, that they require constitutional amendment to gain the authority to prohibit any substance.

Alcohol was the only substance they ever pursued the authority of prohibition regarding. If government possessed the authority of prohibition, or even regulation, without such an amendment, amending the constitution would have been entirely moot. The 18th Amendment is prima facie evidence that government requires amendment to prohibit any substance. The 21st amendment is prima facie evidence that government no longer has ANY authority to prohibit or regulate, ANY substance, because when the 18<sup>th</sup> amendment was repealed, all authority of government prohibition was repealed with it.

Obviously marijuana existed in 1919 at the time of the prohibition amendment as it has for thousands of years. Like alcohol the change in the common law regarding marijuana requires a change in constitutionally granted authority, to confer upon government the authority from the people, the source all authority stems from. There has been no further such amendment to the Constitution, or even the pursuit of such an amendment regarding marijuana or any of the pharmaceutical medications, and as such no authority for government to prosecute those related charges.

The only currently lawfully prosecuted charges, relate to breeches of the peace and other actual crimes, such as robberies which fund addictions and black market interests. Possession, cultivation, and even sales of marijuana are not lawful charges, and no authority exists to criminalize these behaviors. As much as it pains me to say it there is not even in existence the lawful authority to prohibit or prosecute the harder drugs which is the real problem. I would support an amendment to allow government to prohibit crack extacy and other dangerous drugs, but I also support allowing the free market to provide safe alternatives. There has never been one case of overdose from marijuana, so it is much safer than alcohol.

It is the unlawful act of criminalizing marijuana and administering one's own medicinal affairs that has caused the existence of a massive black market that controls prices and is able to freely move product internationally. No one is suggesting that these things be made available for children or that one should be able to endanger others by exercising other judgement and responsive comprehension related rights like traveling in an automobile. Like alcohol operating an automobile impaired does endanger and infringe the right of others, and as such this is unacceptable and a crime that can be prosecuted.

The fact is by criminalizing marijuana the so called authorities have only made it more available for children and the youth, because black market street peddlers do not care who or how old their customers are. Of course no one wants to see this obvious truth. As this book is called sui juris and is all about the law of full age, this only applies to those who are of the lawful age of consent which is something the State has a right to set, and has set between 17 and 18 years of age. 21 may be the age required by some statute to purchase alcohol, but again if you are of the lawful age of consent and able to proceed sui juris this does not apply to you.

While marijuana is relatively safe and could be less available to the youth through the undoing of this unlawful prohibition, the prohibition of it has placed a 26 billion dollar per year revenue into the hands of real criminals who care nothing about law or the well being or lawful age of the people. Removing this finance source would remove the finance of those other more dangerous substance. This means that the free market would determine the safe alternatives.



Essentially in order to win the war on drugs, we have to restore the principals of individual responsibility and sanity back to both medicine and governmental authority, and reign in the heavy hand of government in areas where we the people have not specifically granted government authority to engage in an activity. Especially since government is inept and incompetent with specifically authorized duties such as securing the border, which relate directly to this unlawful prohibition and war waged on the law abiding people of this land, we must defend our rights..

If people wish to they certainly may delude themselves into believing that others are not currently able to get any item from the black market that they want, they are, the only difference is the price mark up which is solely responsible for the cause of robberies used to feed addictions. At least if the substances were sold lawfully, proper age requirements would be met by the extinguishment of the alternative market street peddlers, by removing the excessive profits from the equation. The black market can only move prohibition items because there is then no oversight on price mark up. Those who are addicted, whatever it is they are addicted to, those people are not well, and should not be treated like criminals because they have an addiction, that may be from prescription pharmaceuticals through no fault of their own. And those who have never struggled with an addiction would not understand this. It is the individual's responsibility not to become addicted to a substance, and to accept all responsibility for their own actions, including seeking help for addictions.

Addiction has never been prevented or cured by prohibition throughout all history. Only education can prevent addiction, and only love and compassion can make one who is addicted come out of the shadows to seek treatment. No one will admit to having a disease while that disease is treated like a plague or a crime such as leprosy.

All prohibition has done is push addiction further back into the shadows where it cannot be reached by those who can help, or sought by those that need help. Police and bureaucrats are not trained to handle addiction, just crime and infractions, so these people should not be harassing addicts.

And then there is the elephant in the living room no one who supports this prohibition wants to even acknowledge exists, and that is the rise of even routine basic medical care costs. We must not allow ourselves to forget that it is the unlawful prohibition of medicines, and the interference in the medical rights and personal choice decisions of individuals, that has both caused costs of routine medical care to skyrocket to unaffordable levels, as well as the role government has manipulated doctors into performing under intimidation.

By interfering in the free right of the people to obtain possess and treat their own conditions, placing this fictional requirement everyone believes is a mandatory obligation of law, to pay a doctor for their advice and permission prior to being able to obtain medicine, government has essentially forced free law abiding people of the age of consent to contract against their will, and subject them to the whims of doctors.

Forcing patient's to seek medical care simply to obtain a medicine that they have an inherent right to obtain, possess, and use, under the right to freedom and pursuit of happiness, has increased demand on a the time of all doctors, and reduced the supply of that time which raises costs. Also forcing doctors to shoulder the burdens of responsibility for medications and other personal individual choices has forced costs to skyrocket once again through medical malpractice insurance costs.

People would flip out if they knew how much more they were paying for medical care than they have to because of this unlawful interference from government, it would shock, stagger, and greatly upset the masses of people.

If not for government interference in individual medical concerns and choices there would be no need for people to possess insurance, at least for the routine every day ordinary care, those expenses would be affordable, and the more expensive health treatments would come down in costs because of that as well.

Insurance is a good option if you are at risk for cancer or heart disease, those are things you may wish to insure against, but refusing this insurance should not deny one access to routine preventative health care or medicine. It is high time we stopped blaming the patient who is the victim of crime, the crime of infringement upon their god given rights. After all it is not the doctor or the government that suffers the whims of this made up legislation that has no force of law without your signed consent. It is the individual that must shovel the shit government has manufactured and spoon fed them for their entire lives to control them.

This chapter could not be complete without an explanation, even if a brief one, about why a doctor requires a license or permission to treat others, and why the individual requires no permission or license to treat themselves. It is the same reason why a lawyer is required to be licensed, and the individual acting sui juris has unlimited access to the courts without license or permission. We are individually the highest authority over the administration of our own affairs, at law, medicine, or any other, to whatever extent one judges themselves competent to act.

Below is the notice I intend to use with my pharmacy to put them on notice of my lawful claim of right. This notice is what any court action necessary will be based upon, however the expected response should be no response, meaning it will be a default judgement again like the others covered in previous chapters.

**Notice of understanding, intent, claim of right, and waiver of all related liability through informed decision**

**UNDERSTANDING:**

I \_\_\_\_\_, of the \_\_\_\_\_ family do hereby give notice that it is my understanding that only my consent can give a doctor the authority to treat me, that I do decline such consent for said permission, as well as any form of advice or counsel regarding my personal medical choices from any doctor or pharmacy in receipt of this notice. I stipulate it may be, and reiterate MAY, be required of a doctor to possess a license to write a prescription on my behalf, however no such requirement has any application to me, acting lawfully regarding my own affairs and medical decisions.

I understand my medical choices to be within my control alone omnipotently, and that denial of service is equal to a denial of my claim of right, and obstruction of my duty to ensure the protection of these rights for future generations. In addition I understand that by exercising this right of fully informed personal choice, the responsibility of ensuring no harm comes to any human or property, related to my obtaining the here within stated medicine, is a responsibility all my own just as if a doctor had issued this approval to provide said medicine. I take personal oath that said harm will come to no one, and under penalty of law, accept said responsibility.

#### INTENT:

It is my intent to obtain medicine of my own accord and judgement, with or without a doctor's oversight, as I judge necessary, at personal will within my sound minded judgement.

#### CLAIM OF RIGHT:

I am acting upon a hitherto not refuted claim of right, dutifully notarized as this notice is, and served upon and verified received by the Erie County Sheriff. It is my duty as a free American of sound mind and body, to exercise this right, and to ensure it exists for future generations, to be able to obtain the medicine of my choice and consented judgement, without oversight or counsel of any medical or pharmaceutical professional, nor stigmatization or harassment by said medical professionals for my choice of treatment.

#### FULL LIABILITY WAIVER:

I \_\_\_\_\_ do hereby relieve ALL IMPLIED, EXPRESSED, AND OTHERWISE CONSIDERED LIABILITIES THROUGH MY INFORMED LAWFUL DECISIONS, and fully informed judgement and do make said liabilities my personal responsibility, hopefully reducing costs of malpractice burdens for doctors and pharmacy employees who are needed by customers who are not as informed as I am, and are not able to make independent judgements upon their medical affairs as I am.

I take this duty of my own free will to reduce the burdens of costs of health care services to those not as informed and able to pay for said services, as well as to ensure this right is not converted into a licensed privilege, leaving free people to suffer the whims of a doctor.

Medicine Authorized by WILL OF SOUND MINDED JUDGEMENT OF PATIENT:

DATE:

MEDICINE:

QUANTITY:

INSTRUCTIONS: To patient's discretion

Signature:

---

Witness:

---

Notary:

## Chapter 11

### **Money, Banking, The Federal Reserve Bank And The History of Fractional Reserve Banking**

Prior to 1913 money in America was very different from what it is today. Each certificate of "money" was a representation of physical gold, that could be redeemed upon demand by the bearer at any time at the United States Treasury. The language on the bills for example said "This Certifies that \$10 in gold coin have been deposited in the United States Treasury, and is redeemable by the bearer upon demand at anytime. These certificates were not the money themselves, they were a representation of the money. These are what we know as notes.

Today the money we have is not redeemable anywhere in gold or silver, nor payable in anything to the bearer upon demand. The Federal Reserve Bank, is not Federal, it is a privately held International Bank. The Federal Reserve holds no reserves, and it does not secure the assets of the American people so it is not even a Bank. A 3 word name of which all three are complete fantasy and fabrication. When congress was charged with regulating the country's money it was not charged to micro manage it, but to keep it regular. To ensure that a dollar was a standard weight of silver or gold, identified by Alexander Hamilton as 371 4/16 grains of pure silver. It takes over 17 Federal reserve dollars to buy one legal dollar today. Congress was never given the authority to out source it's responsibility of regulating the money, especially not to a private international bank.

This system which needs constant stimulation to survive is the reason we have a nearly 100% disposable economy today. You trade true wealth, for a product that was designed to break down. Value is squandered this way. Do you know the saying "they don't build them like they used to?" This is literal in every sense. We are on the pinnacle of state of the art technology but as we advance everything is designed to need to be replaced, instead of being built to last

Money itself came about as a sole means of preserving wealth. If you were a farmer and grew 10,000 heads of lettuce, but would only need 1,000 for yourself, you would trade the perishable lettuce for a non perishable physical commodity that would maintain value, to preserve your labor. Gold and Silver have maintained their value for thousands of years, and became the standard for the preservation of wealth. Our money today is not money, it is evidence of debt. We wonder why the economy is failing when this system was designed to implode and leave the international banks with ownership of the property. The entire system is the most monumental fraudulent scam in the history of mankind. The most intriguing aspect is that it is not a new phenomenon. This is the method by which great nations have been destroyed throughout the ages.

The Roman empire fell because their currency could not maintain itself. Consequently we face identical problems with our economy today as the original 13 colonies under articles of confederacy. The constitutional Convention was held solely because the States debased their currency through inflation, and the economy needed to be fixed. This is why only gold and silver were allowed to become "money", demanded by the Constitution signing which repaired the shattered economy.



Today people see prices in the stores, at the pump, and in the commodities markets rising, and unlike in the past we no longer have the slightest inkling as to why. The value of bread has not increased, nor milk, oil, eggs, etc. The value of the dollar has been stolen through inflation. The more money government prints the more value is stolen from the people's savings and purchasing power of every dollar in circulation.

Federal Reserve Notes are not redeemable upon demand by the bearer at anytime in anything, no physical commodity backs our money today. A 3 word term of which all three are complete fantasy and fabrication. It takes 17 Federal reserve dollars to buy one legal silver dollar today. So a 1 dollar Federal Reserve Note is not worth 1 dollar as the term dollar is understood. It is worth 1/17th of a dollar.

This means that if you believe you earn 17 dollars per hour, you actually only earn 1 dollar in reality. Of course this fact flips minimum wage laws upside down. In the State of New York, minimum wage is now 7.15 per hour, and if the earnings of the people actually had their intended value, those would be salaries one could live well on as they did prior to 1913. Of course the word wage has a different meaning from what it is common English definition of wage.

Most people view the scale backwards. Silver and gold do not fluctuate in value compared to one another, and for the most part price fluctuation in commodities of all types is minimal, rare, and due to market conditions. The majority of price fluctuations we see in the stores, at the pump, and in commodities markets is in the value of the dollar.

When government prints more dollars, dollars lose value compared to gold as all products and services. This is called inflation, paper currencies bringing down the reign of Empires is a common theme throughout history.

It has been explained how and why paper currencies are dangerous, as well as fractional reserve banking practices, but not so much how they come into being, and the answer to that question, simply must be war. When countries go to war the international banks circle like sharks to lend both sides money so they can scoop up the pieces of the shattered economies. These are wars the banks themselves usually start via false flag attacks, to stimulate lending needs, as no one become indebted faster than governments while at war.

The fractional reserve system of monetary expansion is inherently inflationary. The act of expanding the money supply without a proportional expansion of goods and services will always debase a currency, and I point to the Weimar republic as an example as well as the 13 colonies under the articles of confederacy.

The only way the money can come into existence in this fractional reserve banking scam established in 1913 is through loans, therefor if everyone in the country including government were able to pay off all loans, there would not be one single dollar in circulation. To quote the federal reserve directly "If there were no debts in our money system, there wouldn't be any money."  
--Marriner Eccles Governor of the Federal reserve September 30th 1941. House committee hearing on Banking and Currency. The last time the entire national debt of the country was completely paid off was 1835 after Andrew Jackson shut down the central bank that preceded the Federal Reserve.

At that time society flourished. A great struggle has been endured by this country, a more important battle than occurred against any invading nation or band of nations throughout all history. The opposition of central banking.

"The bold efforts the present bank has made to control the government are but premonitions of the fate that awaits the American people should they be deluded into a perpetuation of this institution, or the establishment of another like it." -- Andrew Jackson. If all money is borrowed from a central bank, and is expanded by commercial banks through loans, only what is referred to as the "principal" is ever created.

The interest owed to the banks is never even created let alone put into circulation, and this means that the debt is not only ever growing, but that it is a perpetual form of bondage everyone is born into. The financial instrument of the United States (corporation started in England in 1776) the federal reserve note, is no longer backed by gold. This begs the question what is the commodity that supports the useless paper?

The correct answer is much worse than most can imagine as they believe it to be nothing at all, but this is not the case. The Federal Reserve Dollar is backed by interest payments on the federal deficit, known as income taxes. The commodity that the dollar is supported by, is nothing other than the very labor of the people, ensuring not just generations of debt and inflation, but also a silent evil, almost imperceptible form of bondage and involuntary servitude. It is the only "allowed" tender in payment of debts after, and ever since House Joint Resolution 192 and Executive Order 6102 ( both of which are completely unlawful and lawless in themselves), neither of which are law, but statute, and executive order.

Executive Orders by their very definition apply only to the executive branch, not the people, not the courts, and not the Congress. As such the Executive Order issued by Roosevelt in 1933 seizing the gold holdings of the people was unlawful theft. Unless of course one complied by their voluntary consent which is how all rights and property are taken through deception, by manipulating people into believing they have an obligation of law, when there is no obligation, but an offer alone.

There are only two types of markets, free markets, and subsidized government manipulated, opposite of free markets. What is the opposite of free? In a true democracy like the Roman Empire perhaps communism and government ownership of private industry would be allowed, but absolutely not in a Constitutional Republic. The free market ended with the establishment of the Federal Reserve Bank under the guise of a benevolent protection from the very fractional reserve lending practices and inflation of gold certificates that caused the bank runs which lead to the unlawful gold seizure.

Socialism is not socialism, it is progressivism toward communism. Politicians and spin are no longer going to be effective means of deceit in the future and those who are raping the people in far more than just a financial manner. People have been robbed of their most fundamental rights to true education, law, money, property ownership, and intelligence.

We are to a point in this country where people can no longer recognize money, comprehend law, exercise rights without permission, or earn a living without owing under penalty of law, duties and fees to a superior known as the IRS. Let us make this clear, the IRS is a private debt collector for a private international bank owned mostly by two banking families.

The IRS has no more authority than a bill collector for Bank of America, because the Federal Reserve Bank is no more Federal than Fed Ex. This means that the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act binds the collection tactics of the IRS.

So why is it that government, lawyers, and corporations are bound to statutory acts and the sovereign free individual is not? Because corporations and limited liability companies owe their existence to charter powers granted by the state for accepting the government privilege of passing off debt to the public, when they registered their private lawful business to the State, signing over ownership to the State incorporating it. This means that we can hold these lawyers government agents and companies inside of the cage created by the law society that they attempted to place around us, and just step out of the cell leaving them locked inside it. No one has any obligation of law to register their private business.

If at this point we do not know what money, wealth, and value truly are we are in much more trouble than I thought. Wealth is the preservation of our efforts. All property can be owned in allodium as any plot of land because all property is originally derived from the physical wealth of the minerals of the Earth in one way or another. This is why the declaration of allodial ownership not only exempts the owner from any and all taxes duties, fees, imposts, or other encumbrances of government including from lein and seizure, but is an assertion of ownership of the mineral rights, and complete absolute ownership of the land your home is built on. Real Estate is the ownership of the house, trees, grass, and plants, and of those things above ground, and through that clouding of the allodial title subjects the property to statutory rules, as well as the registration of that property also subjects the owner to statutory rules and permit requirements, as the land your property exists on, the mineral rights to that plot, are retained by the bank or the county.

Your property tax is a rental fee for building your property on someone else's land, on land to which you do not possess the mineral rights. The most brilliant aspect regarding our Constitutional Republic is that the rights of the individual cannot be brought to vote by any majority or individual, nor the property of the individual.

Rights granted by god cannot be taken away by the mob or another individual, that is what crime is, so law is literally the lawful defense of god's rights. Any right given by man can be taken away, and any institution that is able to print money, will inevitably and invariably seek to legislate and own government as it does here in America today.

Understanding law, rights, duty, privileges, and paper currency, is the root to the understanding of what money, wealth, value, and self governing common law citizens at law are. Money is a direct relative of property, labor is a direct relative of property, and property ownership is one of the most precious god given rights. In this system of government we are not the debtor as government efforts constantly try to impress upon the people with their enormous figures of debt.

We the people are the original creditor through the unlawful 1933 gold seizure, So the national debt clock is not a figure displaying the numeric debt of the people of this country to the banks, but the debt of the banks which is owed to the people including interest payments on the annually generated revenues from the mutual funds of everyone with a birth certificate, that can be checked by a stock broker which is traded on the New York Stock Exchange under the Red CUSIP ID# that appears on the bottom left corner.

This mutual fund is the reason one is able to assign value to paper documents as has been done with every Federal Reserve Note. This is the backbone of money, because in this system you are a banker, and everything you do in your realm of banking which is acceptance, creates value, and money is created in the current debt system.

Because we the people financed the banking industry through the unlawful 1933 gold seizure, every debt that could ever be incurred (not cured) in the public has been prepaid and quite literally forgiven, given before it was incurred. Again until we have restored sanity and gold standards back to American currency this will continue to be the nature of money and accepted for value, or accepted as valuable, will remain a lawful manner for the discharge of debt and expenses of public utilities and other basic necessities of modern life and private business.

The two party system is a failure only because both parties are owned and operated by the Federal Reserve Bank. Anyone seeking a career in politics should be forbidden from ever becoming a public servant. Great men and women do not seek great power. Great power is thrust upon great men and women because they will not seek it, showing reverence for the power thrust upon them. A great leader must have the courage to accept the power the people would place in them, the conviction to refuse powers no one person should hold, and the integrity to lay down power once liberty has been achieved, before the purity of the message can be corrupted by the very power entrusted to the individual. Power and corruption are inherent in one another. Anyone who does not fear the power they are seeking is destined to become enslaved to that power and serving only the ends of power itself. This is why term limits are essential to a Constitutional Republic.

## Chapter 12

### **14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Rights v. God Given Rights**

If we wish to seek further proof of the corruption which has penetrated every level of government we need look no further than the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment. Aside from the fact that this and every other amendment after the 12<sup>th</sup> is misnumbered because of the existence of 2 lawfully ratified 13<sup>th</sup> amendments as explained in chapter 4, the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment was passed by unconstitutionally unseating several Senators and Representatives, under the lie that it was necessary to give rights to black people.

When I said earlier that freedom is the birthright of all, that statement was completely color blind. Freedom and rights do not recognize skin color or understand discrimination. The 14<sup>th</sup> amendment of 7/9/1868 gave black people rights in the form of a taxable government privilege, that are no rights at all, and mimic rights.

This is where marriage licenses originated. The fact is that this amendment was moot from its onset as all peoples, black and white alike after 1 of the 2 13<sup>th</sup> amendments was passed abolishing slavery, ( the second 13<sup>th</sup> amendment ratified 12/6/1865 ), were born with rights. All this sought to do was to rob real citizenship and rights from all people, not to give rights to one group that had none. God gave rights to those who were slaves and brought here against their will in the same way as to the settlers who brought slaves with them.



The founders of this country were abolitionists, and the right to property, which is still a lawful right today, was turned into the right to the pursuit of happiness, because our abolitionist founders did not want slavery to continue, they did not wish for slave owners to be able to claim another human as property. In this country we own only our own individual selves, not others. To assume that the free black people needed to be given rights is to deny their connection to their creator. All humans in this country have the same rights, and have always had them. Slavery is not just wrong as of 1865, it is wrong retroactively to the very beginning, and the end of slavery was not a change in the lawful status of those individuals, but the new recognition of a freedom that existed from birth prior to the recognition of that freedom.

The 14<sup>th</sup> amendment was a lie perpetuated by the misnumbering of the 13<sup>th</sup> amendments and the efforts of socialism after the war of 1812. As the original 13<sup>th</sup> amendment ratified in 1819 was intended to prevent invasion through the courts by those who possess title of nobility from England including esquire, and this is approximately the time the original 13<sup>th</sup> amendment stopped appearing in publications of the Constitution, well after the war of 1812, it is apparent there is an inside influence of socialist origins that seeks to remove common law god given rights from all. Slavery was never ended, it was transformed and expanded into feudal serfdom and financial servitude. And with the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment, common law inherent rights began to be transformed into licensed monitored privileges.

This confusion created is the seed that has lead to the fear and the cognitive dissonance regarding dealings with police officers, government, law, and the erosion of freedom. It is the same confusion between the actual message of Jesus and law, and the false dichotomy now perpetuated by the churches who have sacrificed ecclesiastic jurisdiction for that government privilege in the form of a 501c3 tax exemption.

Anyone can start a church of god, no matter what religion they claim, and maintain this ecclesiastic jurisdiction by refusing to seek this privilege. The church having set grace against law has compounded their errors in this false dichotomy through the perpetuation of this ignorance and rejection of law, promoting lawlessness.

Ecclesiastic jurisdiction is the same as individual sovereign authority derived from the creator and includes the right of allodial title to the lands of the church, which are sacrosanct. I have nothing against the faith of Christianity, simply the posturing and positioning of the church to be worshiped instead of the divine words of Jesus or the creator, the heavenly father. This posturing in my opinion, and I have tried and done well to avoid giving many religious opinions, is the most anti Christian activity possible next to killing in the name of god, another human, because they have different views or any other reason than self defense. Anti, does not mean opposed to as conventional wisdom would have us believe, anti means instead of, or in place of, so from my research and understanding the term anti Christ relates to one or many who seek to be worshiped in place of Christ, or god.

As I said earlier it was impossible to write a book about common law without a little discussion on faith, god, and religion. As common law itself originated from the Christian churches in England and sui juris, autonomous, belligerent claimants appearing in person asserting rights under common law, are asserting rights given by god and a duty to claim and exercise them, that duty is lawful excuse to violate any court order or any statute by law ordinance or what have you, that does not involve harm to another. Even the Federal Reserve Note claims that we place our trust in god so I have no issue intertwining god, religion, and law.

Throughout history the law has always been handed down by god to man, and since even the time of Moses man has sought to undermine god's law. Even one of the ten commandments has been modified from thou shalt not murder to thou shalt not kill to confuse a very simple distinction.

Administering all of your affairs sui juris, autonomous, as a belligerent claimant in personam asserting and defending your rights is literally the action of one's own law, right, and sovereign kingly authority, acted upon the reaching of the full age of consent and full free adult will. Autonomous refers to the capacity of a rational individual to make an informed, un-coerced decision, while sui juris indicates legal competence, it also relates to customary, unique rights afforded to an individual unequal and exceptional, as per feudal prerogative legal structures additionally in personam and so legally reciprocal at the scale of personhood.

Living by the law of the truth, peace, harmony with your fellow man, honest contracts, and dealings with individuals, companies, and government, respecting the rule of law and forsaking lawlessness, is the right of the self governing kings this country is completely composed of, even if those kings are unaware of their lawful highest status, it does exist and remains protected under common law. An individual can act of one's own right in the same manner as an organization such as Congress or the churches to name a few examples. Your highest sovereign status has been the goal and obsessive compulsion of political organizations. Politics and government are the things that should be separated, not god and law. The entire notion of a separation between church and state is pure fabrication as this is nowhere mentioned in our country's founding documents. All that is mentioned is a prohibition for government to favor one religion over another, or to enact any law with respect to the establishment of religion.

This provision in the Constitution was intended to protect the lawful right of all to worship freely, and bind the government from interference in religion, not to remove god from law and politics.

14<sup>th</sup> amendment privileges have nothing to do with rights that come from god, nor do they have anything to do with providing to black people anything that they were not born with under the law of the self governing free people of this land. And as these are government privileges they have attached of course those hidden adhesion contracts where you voluntarily give up those god given protected rights of a free individual, in exchange for a contractual benefit from government which is a taxable leinable activity through your voluntarily signed consent to any one or more of the following; Social Security Registration, Birth Registration Certificate, Marriage License Registration , Voter Registration, Property Registration, Weapon Registration, Pet Registration, every time it is through voluntarily created authority. Your voluntary consent and unlimited ability to contract, and government prohibition by the Constitution from passing legislation to impair the obligations of contracts, is how your consent can create contractually an authority that cannot Constitutionally exist without your signed consent.

Any time one has to sign an agreement that agreement is always voluntary, otherwise it would not be an agreement. This is why the courts are invading through the law society and international banks by submissions of applications for registration. To get the free people to consent voluntarily to tyrannical serfdom, the rule of pharaoh revived, within the same bloodlines of those who ruled in Egypt in that ancient time. Intriguing how time flows much like a steady river and history has a tendency to repeat. The exodus from Egypt was also the forsaking of the rule of pharaoh in defense of the principles of god's law.

The only difference today's age is that there is no where left to exit to in order to escape the clutches of the rule of men. The men who stood bravely at Lexington and Concord in the battle fought on April 19, 1775, one of the first that initiated the American Revolution, understood well the divine inspiration of the common law and held to their Christian duty to defend freedom.

Those who advocate there is no need of guns and who feel the police are for the protection of citizens, need to observe the rulings of the courts which have stated that the government is not responsible to provide a secure and safe environment for each individual. This is the reason there is no reciprocal duty of protection for the pledged duty of allegiance and the citizen state relationship is contractually null and void by breach. *Bower v. DeVito*. Our personal safety is our own responsibility as ruled properly by the court, "There is no constitutional right to be protected by the state against being murdered."

On April 15th, 1775, Major General Thomas Gage sent a column of seven hundred troops to Concord under the command of Lt. Col. Francis Smith and his second, Major John Pitcairn. Learning that the depot in Concord held a growing store of gunpowder and arms, he sent these soldiers twenty miles from Boston to seize the military supplies. On the evening of the 18th, Dr. Joseph Warren, President of the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, sent Paul Revere and other messengers to Lexington to warn patriots there. In the predawn light of April 19, the beating drums and peeling bells summoned between 50 and 70 militiamen to the town green at Lexington. As they lined up in battle formation the distant sound of marching feet and shouted orders alerted them of the Redcoats' approach.

Twenty-three-year-old Sylvanus Wood was one of the Lexington militia who answered the call that spring morning. Several years after the event he committed his recollection to paper in an affidavit sworn before a Justice of the Peace which was first published in 1858: To quote Sylvanus Wood directly from several years after the event where he committed his recollection to paper in an affidavit sworn before a Justice of the Peace which was first published in 1858: "On the events I, Sylvanus Wood, of Woburn, in the county of Middlesex, and commonwealth of Massachusetts, aged seventy-four years, do testify and say that on the morning of the 19th of April, 1775, I was an inhabitant of Woburn, living with Deacon Obadiah Kendall; that about an hour before the break of day on said morning, I heard the Lexington bell ring, and fearing there was difficulty there, I immediately arose, took my gun and, with Robert Douglass, went in haste to Lexington, which was about three miles distant.

When I arrived there, I inquired of Captain Parker, the commander of the Lexington company, what was the news. Parker told me he did not know what to believe, for a man had come up about half an hour before and informed him that the British troops were not on the road. But while we were talking, a messenger came up and told the captain that the British troops were within half a mile. Parker immediately turned to his drummer, William Diman, and ordered him to beat to arms, which was done. Captain Parker then asked me if I would parade with his company. I told him I would. Parker then asked me if the young man with me would parade. I spoke to Douglass, and he said he would follow the captain and me.

By this time many of the company had gathered around the captain at the hearing of the drum, where we stood, which was about half way between the meetinghouse and Buckman's tavern.

Parker says to his men, 'Every man of you, who is equipped, follow me; and those of you who are not equipped, go into the meeting-house and furnish yourselves from the magazine, and immediately join the company.' Parker led those of us who were equipped to the north end of Lexington Common, near the Bedford Road, and formed us in single file. I was stationed about in the centre of the company. While we were standing, I left my place and went from one end of the company to the other and counted every man who was paraded, and the whole number was thirty-eight, and no more.

Just as I had finished and got back to my place, I perceived the British troops had arrived on the spot between the meeting-house and Bucknian's, near where Captain Parker stood when he first led off his men. The British troops immediately wheeled so as to cut off those who had gone into the meeting-house. The British troops approached us rapidly in platoons, with a general officer on horseback at their head. The officer came up to within about two rods of the centre of the company, where I stood, the first platoon being about three rods distant. They there halted. The officer then swung his sword, and said, 'Lay down your arms, you damned rebels, or you are all dead men. Fire!' Some guns were fired by the British at us from the first platoon, but no person was killed or hurt, being probably charged only with powder.

Just at this time, Captain Parker ordered every man to take care of himself. The company immediately dispersed; and while the company was dispersing and leaping over the wall, the second platoon of the British fired and killed some of our men. There was not a gun fired by and of Captain Parker's company, within my knowledge.

I was so situated that I must have known it, had any thing of the kind taken place before a total dispersion of our company. I have been intimately acquainted with the inhabitants of Lexington, and particularly with those of Captain Parker's company, and, with one exception, I have never heard any of them say or pretend that there was any firing at the British from Parker's company, or any individual in it until within a year or two. One member of the company told me, many years since, that, after Parker's company had dispersed, and he was at some distance, he gave them 'the guts of his gun.'"

The men who stood on the green in Lexington had comprehension of the importance of freedom, law, rights, and self governance. The men were outnumbered at least ten to one, but any free man knows he would rather die defending the will of god's law in the protection of freedom, than as a slave under the lash of a master.

This very struggle is the same as was fought by the Hebrew people against the will of the rule of pharaoh. It is the struggle that led to the American Revolution against the rule of the king of England in favor of the common law, god's law. Freedom and rights, were something our founders felt were worth dying for, and I believe that the people today if properly educated about freedom and rights, would share that opinion as I do.

The next chapter on the income tax, will explain in much greater detail why rights, property, law, and the divine connection between god's law and the Constitution in the common law, is so integral to the Constitutional Republic as a form of government. For in this system, the people are Caesar individually with the same rights, prerogative and inherent authority as our former king.



## Chapter 13

### **The Feudal Duty to the Sovereign, The Income Tax**

While writing this book I have imposed no preconceived notions about the form and length it would take as I did not want to limit this in any way. This chapter will perhaps be the longest, because we are not just going to examine the income tax, we are going to thoroughly rip it apart and examine most of it. The Income tax Act, like all other acts in statutory rule, is not law, and has not been enacted into positive law. Positive law applies to everyone, where non positive law does not apply to everyone.

I have briefly explained that statutes are not laws, but have not covered in length that statutes can be laws. Every time statute is actual law, it is because the statute is in agreement with common law, and every time this is true an element of actual harm exists, these statutory rules in line with the common law, are elaborations upon the common law, but the simplest principle is do not cause harm and do not worry about what the statute says at all. Traveling from point A to B here we only need to worry about the sector of the map that exists between the points, not all of the other distractions around the route.

That being said the income tax is not positive law, so it does not apply to everyone. Who you may ask, does it apply to then? The answer is those who are subject to the jurisdiction and rules of that act.

How does one become “subject” to the income tax act? The same way as explained in chapter 2, that the individual free American becomes “subject” to any legislative rule of society. Through their voluntary consent via submission of application for registration, to vote, to obtain or retain social security benefits, or by accepting any other opportunity, benefit or privilege from government.

The progressive income tax is one of the 10 goals laid out in the communist manifesto, and as explained, progressive socialism has communism at it’s goal. Before we jump right into title 26 of the United States Code there are some terms that were briefly mentioned that must be more detailed in explanation. U.S. citizens are the primary scope of the parts of the internal revenue code that we will be examining, so knowing what a citizen is, is absolutely necessary if you want to know who is a subject or slave of government.

Citizens are members of a political community who, in their associative capacity, have established or submitted themselves to the dominion of government for the promotion of the general welfare and the protection of their individual as well as collective rights. – Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Ed. p.244. A subject is one that owes allegiance to a sovereign and is governed by his laws. Men in free governments are subjects as well as citizens; as citizens they enjoy rights and franchises; as subjects they are bound to obey the laws. The term is little used, in this sense, in countries enjoying a republican form of government." – Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1425. Do you remember who the sovereign is in this country, that’s right, it is you. Do you as sovereign owe allegiance to a sovereign, of course not. So are you a subject? No, subjects are subject to this act.

You are only a subject if you have voluntarily elected to apply for subject status and receive privileges, by giving up your highest status of sovereign, through the submission of applications for registration with government. Most people do not know what they are doing when they elect for these voluntary permissions. It is great that involuntary servitude was abolished by the second 13<sup>th</sup> amendment, as because of this no one can require you to give your voluntary consent eternally, and as such you can undo anything you have done previously to undermine your highest status, and reclaim it through declaration.

Anything you may have consented to, especially without full knowledge of the affect of those hidden adhesion contracts, are things you can withdraw your consent from, including the consent you gave by registering to vote, to be represented and owe allegiance to a sovereign. A sovereign elector has no need to register to vote, the entire electoral college is composed of sovereign electors, and this is who actually determines presidencies. Only citizens register to vote and their votes do not count toward determining the presidency, this is provable fact that is not even denied although it is well camouflaged in the unread ignorance of the majority. This failing in majorities is the reason we have a constitutional republic and not a mob ruled vox populi vox dei democracy.

Domicile, Inhabitant and Resident are also terms we are going to need to comprehend well to properly understand the scope of the income tax. Selective service, much like voting, is another one of those adhesion contracts. Conscription is limited to citizens and residents. It specifically omits people who aren't citizens (i.e., inhabitants). It is a mistake to assume that everyone is a resident, who resides at a residence. A residence is not the same as a domicile. An inhabitant has a domicile.

A resident has a residence. Why are YOU claiming residency? It is always based on eligibility for entitlements and benefits of national socialism, a movement that gained the popular term Nazi with the despotic tyrannical communist dictatorship we all know from Germany as it's end game goal, that this national socialist movement seeks to reestablish.

Now we will examine the income tax code itself. Title 26 of the United States Code and the Code of Federal Regulations sound like daunting incomprehensible word games no one was intended to figure out. With it's enormous size and intentional over complications, this whole volume of statute should be scrapped completely, but very important information can be gained from actually reading it.

The best place to start is with the W-4 withholding agreement, as this is another opportunity for you to deny consent to these statutory rules instead of voluntarily subjecting yourself to them by your signed consent. The first point of clarity with the W-4 withholding agreement is the fact that it says agreement right on it. No one is ever obligated to agree to anything, if they were it would not be an agreement but a mandate, your signature would be unnecessary.

Because it is an agreement if you sign one it can only be by voluntary consent. Looking to the actual code that governs the W-4 withholding agreement shows that this is clearly a voluntary act, even for those who have social security numbers and are citizens or residents with driver's licenses and voter registration cards are able to refuse consent here.

This is the actual and complete text of the section of internal revenue code that governs the W-4 withholding agreement. 26 CFR 31.3402 (p)-1 Voluntary Withholding Agreements (a) In general. An employee and his employer may enter into an agreement under section 3402(b) to provide for the withholding of income tax upon payments of amounts described in paragraph (b)(1) of Sec. 31.3401(a)-3, made after December 31, 1970.

An agreement may be entered into under this section only with respect to amounts, which are includible in the gross income of the employee under section 61, and must be applicable to all such amounts paid by the employer to the employee. The amount to be withheld pursuant to an agreement under section 3402(p) shall be determined under the rules contained in section 3402 and the regulations thereunder. See Sec. 31.3405(c)-1, Q&A-3 concerning agreements to have more than 20-percent Federal income tax withheld from eligible rollover distributions within the meaning of section 402. (b) Form and duration of agreement. (1)(I) Except as provided in subdivision (ii) of this subparagraph, an employee who desires to enter into an agreement under section 3402(p) shall furnish his employer with Form W-4 (withholding exemption certificate) executed in accordance with the provisions of section 3402(f) and the regulations thereunder.

The furnishing of such Form W-4 shall constitute a request for withholding. (ii) In the case of an employee who desires to enter into an agreement under section 3402(p) with his employer, if the employee performs services (in addition to those to be the subject of the agreement) the remuneration for which is subject to mandatory income tax withholding by such employer, or if the employee wishes to specify that the agreement terminate on a specific date, the employee shall furnish the employer with a request for withholding which shall be signed by the employee, and shall contain-- (a) The name, address, and social security number of the employee making the request, (b) The name and address of the employer, A statement that the employee desires withholding of Federal income tax, and applicable, of qualified State individual income tax (see paragraph (d)(3)(I) of Sec. 301.6361-1 of this chapter

(Regulations on Procedures and Administration), and (d) If the employee desires that the agreement terminate on a specific date, the date of termination of the agreement. If accepted by the employer as provided in subdivision (iii) of this subparagraph, the request shall be attached to, and constitute part of, the employee's Form W-4. An employee who furnishes his employer a request for withholding under this subdivision shall also furnish such employer with Form W-4 if such employee does not already have a Form W-4 in effect with such employer. (iii) No request for withholding under section 3402(p) shall be effective as an agreement between an employer and an employee until the employer accepts the request by commencing to withhold from the amounts with respect to which the request was made.

(2) An agreement under section 3402(p) shall be effective for such period as the employer and employee mutually agree upon. However, either the employer or the employee may terminate the agreement prior to the end of such period by furnishing a signed written notice to the other. Unless the employer and employee agree to an earlier termination date, the notice shall be effective with respect to the first payment of an amount in respect of which the agreement is in effect which is made on or after the first "status determination date" (January 1, May 1, July 1, and October 1 of each year) that occurs at least 30 days after the date on which the notice is furnished. If the employee executes a new Form W-4, the request upon which an agreement under section 3402 (p) is based shall be attached to, and constitute a part of, such new Form W-4.

Now we'll look at the United States Code for more information. 26 U.S.C. 3402(p)(3)(a) (p) Voluntary withholding agreements (3) Authority for other voluntary withholding The Secretary is authorized by regulations to provide for withholding - (A) from remuneration for services performed by an employee for the employee's employer which (without regard to this paragraph) does not constitute wages, and (B) from any other type of payment with respect to which the Secretary finds that withholding would be appropriate under the provisions of this chapter, **if the employer and employee, or the person making and the person receiving such other type of payment, agree to such withholding.** Such agreement shall be in such form and manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. For purposes of this chapter (and so much of subtitle F as relates to this chapter), remuneration or other payments with respect to which such agreement is made shall be treated as if they were wages paid by an employer to an employee to the extent that such remuneration is paid or other payments are made during the period for which the agreement is in effect.

Every aspect of the W-4 agreement tells you that it is voluntary from the word agreement on the form to the very sections of statute that govern it. Furthermore sections 26 CFR 31.3402(a)-1, 26 CFR 31.3402(f)(2)-1(e), 26 CFR 31.3402(f)(2)-1(g), 26 CFR 31.3402-(n)(1), and 26 CFR 31.3402 (g)-1(a)(2) address Requirement of withholding, Withholding exemption certificates, Employees incurring no income tax liability, and Supplemental wage payments. All of these sections are here for context as curiously most employers assert a requirement to withhold from employees wages for income taxes. And the tax professionals that companies rely upon are most likely unaware of these sections of statute or through cognitive dissonance have dismissed them.

As seen below most Americans are not liable for income taxes on their domestic sources of income so one could easily make the statements in 26 CFR 31.3402-(n)(1) which are what constitutes a withholding exemption certificate. Tax professionals will try to confuse you with the W-4 exempt form which is **STILL A WITHHOLDING AGREEMENT**, not a **WITHHOLDING EXEMPTION CERTIFICATE**.

An employers requirements as shown in 26 CFR 31.3402(a)-1 and others like it are all nullified by 26 CFR 31.3402-(n)(1). Here is the entire section for context. It clearly establishes that a withholding exemption certificate is not a substitute W-4 and that the statements as described are what constitute the certificate, not the specified government form W-4. You will see it says W-4 no where in this section. The rules of 26 CFR 31.3402(f)(2)-1(e), and 26 CFR 31.3402(f)(2)-1(g). determine what is an **INVALID** withholding exemption certificate. I encourage you to see these sections. Law is easy to read if you just read it. It has to be easy enough for a person of average intelligence to understand.

26 CFR 31.3402-(n)(1) Employees incurring no income tax liability. (a) In general. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subpart (except to the extent a payment of wages is subject to withholding under 26 CFR 31.3402 (g)-1(a)(2), an employer shall not deduct and withhold any tax under chapter 24 upon a payment of wages made to an employee, if there is in effect with respect to the payment a withholding exemption certificate furnished to the employer by the employee which certifies that (1) The employee incurred no liability for income tax imposed under subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code for his preceding taxable year; and (2) The employee anticipates that he will incur no liability for income tax imposed under subtitle A for his current taxable year.



Mandatory flat rate withholding. To the extent wages are subject to income tax withholding under 26 CFR 31.3402 (g)-1(a)(2), such wages are subject to such income tax withholding regardless of whether a withholding exemption certificate under section 3402(n) and the regulations thereunder has been furnished to the employer. Rules about withholding exemption certificates. For rules relating to invalid withholding exemption certificates, see 26 CFR 31.3402(f)(2)-1(e) , and for rules relating to disregarding certain withholding exemption certificates on which an employee claims a complete exemption from withholding, see 26 CFR 31.3402(f)(2)-1(g).

I provided more information here than was necessary because cognitive dissonance is powerful, people will read these sections and still believe they have an obligation of law to execute the government form W-4 and enter into a voluntary withholding agreement. Yes I myself have earned money working for a company where no taxes were withheld under refusal to consent to a voluntary withholding agreement. Absent this agreement there is no authority of law that can authorize the company or person you work for to withhold your earnings from you, and again notices and administrative judgements are how you protect these earnings, for everyone is equal in a common law jurisdiction, and as police and public officials are not immune neither are payroll professionals. Most of them carry errors and omissions insurance and you can collect on this for every cent unlawfully withheld from their insurance or bond.

This utter disregard of conventional wisdom and blindly obeying things that “everybody knows” is the power and very spirit of sui juris, autonomous, administration of one’s affairs. Examining source material and seeking clarity in law are interconnected. If you are not examining the foundational source of law you are not acting or proceeding sui juris and if you only use your brain and not your heart as well, you are going to miss the grand scale of all of this.

Your labor is your property, and people will blindly take it with no basis in law for doing so, not rarely, but routinely with every check for your time and sweat that you receive, to pay a debt you do not owe, but through the authority you create by your signed consent.

The 1040 income tax return is the next item we must examine in order to comprehend what is going on with the income tax. The 16<sup>th</sup> amendment must also be explained in a little bit of detail as well. To over simplify both, even individuals who have done everything prior to getting a job which binds them to the hidden adhesion contracts, are not liable for any tax until they swear that income to be taxable under penalty of perjury, by executing form 1040 with their signed consented signature.

The great lie is that the 16<sup>th</sup> amendment authorized government to collect income taxes, but court rulings upon the 16<sup>th</sup> amendment correctly apply it in the scope of the taxing clauses of article 1 of the Constitution, which were not repealed by or impacted by the 16<sup>th</sup> amendment in any way. In short, an unconstitutional tax post 16<sup>th</sup> amendment, is just as unlawful as an unconstitutional tax before it's ratification.

The 16th Amendment to the United States Constitution as correctly interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court in such cases as *Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. Co.*, 240 US 1 1916 and *Stanton v Baltic Mining Co.*, 240 US 103 1916, identified the income tax as an indirect excise tax in accordance with Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, and that the 16th Amendment does not authorize a tax on individual citizens living and working exclusively within the States United, but is applicable to non resident aliens stated by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in T.D.(Treasury Decision)2313 dated March 21, 1916.

There are many irrelevant arguments about the 16th amendment regarding its ratification, but that is not something that matters to the issues. Whether or not the 16th Amendment was properly ratified it granted no new taxing powers to congress. Even if the 16th amendment did grant new taxing powers to congress that is also completely irrelevant to the point. There is no sense in debating what congress has the authority to tax. Nothing on this site questions the constitutionality of the tax laws or any amendments to the constitution.

The simple fact is that we do not need to debate whether or not Congress has the authority to place a tax on the domestic income of United States Citizens, because the laws as written and detailed in this prove that Congress did NOT place such a tax. It also stands to reason that Congress did not place a tax on the domestic income of the Citizens of the United States because they are aware of the constitutional limitations to their taxing authority. As shown in this section with the various court rulings and other cases where the supreme court has ruled regarding the 16th amendment it is clear that the income tax is an indirect excise tax upon taxable income, and not a tax on Citizens directly.

The 16th amendment did not repeal the taxing clauses of article 1 of the constitution, in fact the 16th amendment was worded quite correctly to keep it in line with the requirements of the constitution. The purpose of the 16th amendment was never to institute any type of new tax, and as shown by the court rulings upon the 16th amendment it did no such thing, and its sole purpose was to identify the income tax as an indirect excise tax. The income tax laws as written are completely in line with the 16th amendment and the taxing clauses of article 1 of the U.S. constitution, as American Citizens were never the object of this tax as articulated by the aforementioned court rulings.

Both the 16th Amendment, and title 26 state that the tax is upon TAXABLE INCOME from whatever SOURCE derived, and the wording of the tax laws as detailed by 26 USC 861 and the related regulations 26 CFR 1.861-1 through 26 CFR 1.861-14T determine the SOURCES of income for the purposes of the income tax. Section 26 CFR 1.861-8(f)(1) Specifically lists the operative sections which give rise to the STATUTORY GROUPINGS of gross income, which means the gross income from a specific source or activity which must first be determined in order to arrive at 'taxable income' which are the object of the income tax.

The earnings of the average American living and working exclusively within the boundaries of one state of the union, or any where within the union, do not lawfully constitute income from whatever source derived, which is the specific object of the tax. Not to mention one who works within one state never crosses state lines, and the federal government has no jurisdiction to place such a tax within the state. This is why government will always tell you that the income tax is based upon voluntary compliance and self assessment.

More closely examining the form 1040 not only gives us a great deal of more information about the nature of the income tax, but also who it applies to, and what type of earnings have been taxed. In fact examining form 1040 close enough gives us all of the protection we could ever need from the IRS, who extorts charity through intimidation. We would deal with the IRS the same way as anyone else, using notices, but the specifics of this form have handed us an air tight locked defense that can be used at any time in any stage of related proceedings.

Form 1040 also does not constitute a valid collection of information request as described in 5 CFR 1320.3© and 5 CFR 1320.6 known as the paperwork reduction act. Every collection of information request form from government must be approved and is managed by the Office of Management and Budget, and bears and OMB control number.

Requests with invalid or unassigned numbers may be ignored without penalty, and form 1040 is one of those improper bootleg information collection requests that just happens to bear an invalid unassigned control number. The only form that has ever been approved requesting information from American Citizens regarding subtitle A income taxes is OMB #1545-0067 which corresponds to form 2555 FOREIGN EARNED INCOME, which is completely in line with what we have already learned about taxable privileged activities.

Form 1040 bears OMB # 1545-0074, which can be looked up on the Office of Management and budget's website, and it will show to be not currently assigned to any form. The air tight defense against the IRS for refusing to comply with form 1040 is provided by 5 CFR 1320.6(a).

“Public Protection Public Protection (a)Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information that is subject to the requirements of this part. The protection provided by paragraph (a) of this section may be raised in the form of a complete defense, bar, or otherwise to the imposition of such penalty at any time during the agency administrative process in which such penalty may be imposed or in any judicial action applicable thereto.”

At any stage of court or administrative procedure related to form 1040 one can assert protection under 5 CFR 1320.6(a) because form 1040 is a bootleg request and no penalty can be imposed against the individual. Form W-4 also does not constitute a valid collection of information request as described in 5 CFR 1320.3© and 5 CFR 1320.6 like an I-9 does.

W-4 does not specify whether or not the information requested is voluntary or mandatory. Again all invalid collection of information requests may be ignored without penalty, and now that you know how to protect your interests sui juris, you can start acting like the sovereign king or queen that you are.

The subjection to these hidden adhesion contracts can further be understood to be completely voluntary by examining the statutory rules of social security, as to who is required by obligation to possess a number. **42 U.S.C. 405(c)(2)(B)(i)–(iii)** is the section that details who is required to be assigned a social security account number, and much to your amazement, again as not positive law this clearly does not apply to everyone, and as a maxim in law the inclusion of one excludes the other.

Again first hand examination is necessary so I have provided the entire section here for context. This section identifies the types of individuals that ARE required to be assigned a social security number in order to live and work in America. Simply stated the average American Citizen is not the specified individual subject to these requirements.

**Wage records** (1) For the purposes of this subsection--(A) The term ``year" means a calendar year when used with respect to wages and a taxable year when used with respect to self-employment income.(B) The term ``time limitation" means a period of three years, three months, and fifteen days. The term ``survivor" means an individual's spouse, surviving divorced wife, surviving divorced husband, surviving divorced mother, surviving divorced father, child, or parent, who survives such individual. (D) The term ``period" when used with respect to self-employment income means a taxable year and when used with respect to wages means--(i) a quarter if wages were reported or should have been reported on a quarterly basis on tax returns filed with the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate under section 6011 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or regulations thereunder (or on reports filed by a State under section 418(e) \1\ of this title (as in effect prior to December 31, 1986) or regulations thereunder), (ii) a year if wages were reported or should have been reported on a yearly basis on such tax returns or reports, or (iii) the half year beginning January 1 or July 1 in the case of wages which were reported or should have been reported for calendar year 1937.

(2)(A) On the basis of information obtained by or submitted to the Commissioner of Social Security, and after such verification thereof as the Commissioner deems necessary, the Commissioner of Social Security shall establish and maintain records of the amounts of wages paid to, and the amounts of self-employment income derived by, each individual and of the periods in which such wages were paid and such income was derived and, upon request, shall inform any individual or his survivor, or the legal representative of such individual or his estate, of the amounts of wages and self-employment income of such individual and the periods during which such wages were paid and such income was derived, as shown by such records at the time of such request.

**(B)(i)** In carrying out the Commissioner's duties under subparagraph (A) and subparagraph (F), the Commissioner of Social Security shall take affirmative measures to assure that social security account numbers will, to the maximum extent practicable, be assigned to all members of appropriate groups or categories of individuals by assigning such numbers (or ascertaining that such numbers have already been assigned):(I) to aliens at the time of their lawful admission to the United States either for permanent residence or under other authority of law permitting them to engage in employment in the United States and to other aliens at such time as their status is so changed as to make it lawful for them to engage in such employment; (II) to any individual who is an applicant for or recipient of benefits under any program financed in whole or in part from Federal funds including any child on whose behalf such benefits are claimed by another person; and (III) to any other individual when it appears that he could have been but was not assigned an account number under the provisions of subclauses (I) or (II) but only after such investigation as is necessary to establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Social Security, the identity of such individual, the fact that an account number has not already been assigned to such individual, and the fact that such individual is a citizen or a non citizen who is not, because of his alien status, prohibited from engaging in employment;

Most people get their Social Security number when they are born. Their parents sign an SS-5 for them at a time in their lives when they are unable to question what is going on. Almost every institution from education to medical, from banking to employment, people are unknowingly, illegally compelled to disclose their Social Security Numbers that they had no legal requirement of law to obtain let alone use. It is very difficult to get a job and function in America without this number.



Employers make absurd claims that they are required to obtain your social security number in order to pay you for your work, but this is not true. You are not obligated to possess a social security account in order to live and work freely in America.

The law itself shows exactly what is required of employers regarding this issue. 26 CFR 301.6109-1© and 26 USC 6109(a)(3) relate to the entity's requirement to REQUEST a social security number. But they also show that there is a waiver of penalties if they fail to obtain one. They only need to show due diligence by signing an affidavit stating the REQUEST WAS MADE. There is no requirement for them to OBTAIN one, simply to REQUEST one.

See the sections OF THE LAW for context. And this makes perfect sense that employers would be required to collect and report social security numbers from people whom ARE REQUIRED TO BE ASSIGNED A SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER UNDER 42 USC 405(c)(2)(B)(i). And it also makes perfect sense that the law would provide for a waiver of penalties imposed for failing to obtain Social Security numbers from those who work, but do not have one, and cannot be compelled to get one, simply to live and work in the United States, because in this situation it is expected that there will be people that do not have a Social Security Number.

Once the affidavit is signed stating that the company requested the number and was unable to obtain one, their due diligence is evidenced by that affidavit and 26 U.S.C. 6724 provides for a waiver of any penalties that may be imposed for failing to obtain a Social Security Number from a worker.

The problem is that most Americans ASSUME that they know what the law requires of them without ever looking at it. 26 U.S.C. 6724 would be completely moot if every single person that works was required to have a Social Security Number. Specifically American Citizens that do not wish to participate in social security, would not have a Social Security Number. And the courts have ruled on this issue and this ruling has not been overturned. RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD V. ALTON RAILROAD CO. 295 U.S. 330 55 S. Ct. 758(1935) "US CITIZENS CANNOT BE COMPELLED TO REGISTER IN AND SUBSEQUENTLY PARTICIPATE IN GOVERNMENT ENTITLEMENT PROGRAMS, AS THE AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE SUCH FROM CITIZENS IS A POWER WHICH OBVIOUSLY LIES OUTSIDE THE ORBIT OF CONGRESSIONAL POWER."

It has been proven that the acceptance voluntarily of these government entitlements is what subjects one of their voluntary consent to these statutory rules that have no force of law without your consent. It has been proven that these hidden adhesion contracts are voluntary and mostly done through ignorance of what is being given up. Your highest status and protections are sacrificed for these privileges opportunities and benefits provided by government. It is rationalized as not being slavery because it is done by ignorant signed consent, but I know serfdom when I see it. People no longer are aware that they have a choice and ability to say no and possess the highest sovereign status and standing as a sui juris autonomous belligerent claimant in person asserting rights, and claiming a duty to defend them for future generations. Slave or Sovereign is the most ancient question posed since the ability of free thought was gifted to mankind, and only individually can it be answered, not collectively. That is why our founders built the Constitution around and to act as an instrument of common law procedure.

There were those who desired individual self governance and the rule of the common law and who were willing to bleed and die to defend that idea. The idea that each individual was not a criminal but inherently good and upstanding who could be responsible to the rule of law, and were responsible to achieve self governance.

Our founding fathers were all condemned as heretics during the American Revolution, so to the English law society the rule of law in American common law, which is not the rule of the king, but individual kings, is the law of heretics. I agree that this is not the case, and that our founders were visionaries with an individual moral compass that was in agreement with the most fundamental foundations of law and faith. And I point to the Constitutional connection to the book of Deuteronomy again to evidence that connection.

## Chapter 14

### Summary And Conclusions

Perhaps the greatest source of confusion regarding law is the assumption that Americans are lawless, and that without everyone being bound to abide endless lines of incomprehensible statutory codes that the country would descend into complete lawlessness and chaos. This presumption of lawlessness is not only provable incorrect, but it also destroys every concept that all are presumed to be innocent until proven to be guilty.

The standard is now a presumption of guilt until the proof of innocence. This erroneous contemplation of a presumption of guilt has lead to a world where individual rights are completely disregard. The very notion of pre employment drug testing is a slap in the face to the presumption of innocence. Every single American should be offended and outraged by the notion of a pre employment drug screening.

I have mentioned that no one can be required to waive any inalienable right as a condition of a contract. Rights can be waived in contracts, but the waiver of such rights must be voluntary, and cannot be compelled as a condition of the contract, or such waiver is under duress and is not lawful. I do not care if the contract relates to travel, work, medicine, or any other type of transaction, you cannot be required or compelled to waive a right as a condition of a contract, as such a condition implies that a denial of that contract will follow the refusal of the waiver, and as such is under duress and involuntary.

Allowing someone to examine your urine must be voluntary, and to my knowledge no one would ever endure this or other invasions of their rights voluntarily. Much in the same way no one can stipulate a contract will only be offered if you agree to give up your right to life, a contract that stipulates it will only be offered upon the waiver of any other right is just as an unlawful condition.

As with preemployment drug testing, an employer that compels the examination of the urine blood or hair, as a condition of employment is violating the right of the individual to be secure in their person, papers, and effects, which is protected by the 4<sup>th</sup> amendment to the Constitution. This right cannot be lawfully waived under duress as a condition of employment. Only by voluntary consent could this right be waived. It could be requested by a prospective employer, but not required as a condition of employment, as such a condition implies an unlawful penalty for refusing to waive a right. To say that it is voluntary because you do not have to accept that job is utter nonsense, especially since most companies have adopted and unlawfully enforce this as a condition. Any penalty imposed for one refusing to waive a right is an unlawful penalty, including denial of service or rescinding of an offer to hire, or not extending an offer to hire based solely upon the refusal of the waiving of such rights.

William Shakespeare was perhaps one of the most visionary authors known to history, and Julius Caesar is a very important work of art even today. This book is intended to be a blade in the belly of the tyrant, for in our system the people are Caesar, and no one individual is the king alone, each of us are the king over our own affairs, property, lives, families, and all decisions. The tyrant this book seeks to slay is not a man, but a metaphor, the perversion of the rule of law for the rule of men. Caesar can be replaced by statutory rules.

To quote directly from Julius Caesar Act 3 Scene 2 “ If then that friend demand why Brutus rose against Caesar, this is my answer: Not that I loved Caesar less, but that I loved Rome more. Had you rather Caesar were living and die all slaves, than that Caesar were dead, to live all free men? As Caesar loved me, I weep for him; as he was fortunate, I rejoice at it; as he was valiant, I honour him: but, as he was ambitious, I slew him. There is tears for his love; joy for his fortune; honour for his valour; and death for his ambition. Who is here so base that would be a bondman? If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so rude that would not be a Roman? If any, speak; for him have I offended. Who is here so vile that will not love his country? If any, speak; for him have I offended. I pause for a reply.”

To put this in some American context, or even a context any individual in any land on this globe can comprehend, I seek to slay the notion that men must be ruled by other men. Would you rather that statutory codes live and all individuals die as slaves, or that statutory code die and live as free men and women under the self governing rule of law. Unlike Brutus I have no love for any figure who would make slaves of men.

Who is here so base that would be a bondman? Base means not following or in accordance with standards of honor and decency, contemptible, curish, despicable, detestable, dirty, dishonorable, execrable, ignominious, low, low-down, low-minded, mean, nasty, paltry, sly, sordid, vile, wretched. A debased currency is a currency not following or in accordance with standards of honor and decency as ours is today. A bondman is defined as a male bound to serve without wages or a person who is owned by someone. A bondsman is a person who provides bond or surety for another.

Who is here so rude that would not be an American? Who is here so vile that will not love his country? The love of America, the land of the free self governing law abiding individual, the home of the brave, and the lawful defense of life, freedom, and pursuit of happiness, is something that all who inhabit America are duty bound to defend. In this country as the people are the supreme law of the land, and freedom and rights are bestowed to all by their creator, who would live by the rule of men and abide statutory code becoming a willing bondman by their signed voluntary consent, when the rule of law is steady unchanging, and as constant as the northern star?

Like America, Rome was a republic once, that declined into a mob ruled democracy, and eventually ended in tyranny until the slaying of the ambitious tyrant. Julius Caesar was a real person, a Roman general and statesman not just a play. He played a critical role in the gradual transformation of the Roman Republic into the Roman Empire. Today America itself has become an Empire, and Woodrow Wilson is America's Julius Caesar, for he is responsible for the establishment of the Federal Reserve Bank, and the beginning of Imperialism.

Americans are not the lawless, despicable, contemptuous, monsters that we have been portrayed as in this ambitious pursuit of transformation of our country from a free Constitutional Republic into an Empire under martial law. The American people are inherently good and law abiding, living in peace with their fellow man and living freely under the rule of law. Law as explained herein, not what passes for it having the form and name of law, but not the same goal. The goal of the rule of law is the lawful defense of freedom, the goal of the rule of statute, is the enslavement of all mankind, not just Americans, to the will of other men.

Your government is not able to do anything about this because here in America at least, your servitude is assumed to be voluntary by your signed consent, and your government is forbidden from impairing the obligations of contracts. The ability of the individual to contract is unlimited, including to contract with government, and one can obligate themselves by their signed voluntary consent, to a life of servitude to the will of the rule of men. Most of us were born into bondage.

I know I sure did not apply for a social security account, and I also know that I cannot be bound by any contract I myself did not knowingly willfully and voluntarily enter into. I also know that I am lawfully able to rescind consent at any time to these and other contracts.

Ignorance is the manner by which enslavement is accomplished today. Manipulation through ignorance and conventional wisdom was turned a once free nation of individual kings, into an entire country of slaves who falsely believe that they are free. This bondage is more evil than outright slavery as the form it took in Egypt. It is a barely visible prison cell with lavishly decorated bars to distract one from the evidence of their imprisonment.

The great illusion is that we are all free, but free men need not ask permission to engage in lawful activities, that is something only children and slaves are obligated to do. Administering all of one's own affairs *sui juris* autonomous and appearing in court as a belligerent claimant *in personam* to assert and defend your lawful rights is not an optional contemplation for free men, it is the only way to remove the assumption that your government operates upon, that you are a child.



Sui Juris The Law of Full Age, intends to restore the lawful sovereign adult status of all free individuals, and to detail how it is that each individual has voluntarily sacrificed all protected rights and accepted by such voluntary consent, 14<sup>th</sup> amendment privileges that are bestowed and governed by the rule of other men. Rights, are governed by the rule of natural law, and Americans have a duty to claim, assert, and defend all of their god given rights.

The right to life, freedom, the pursuit of happiness, property ownership, all enumerated protected rights and all unenumerated rights protected under the 9<sup>th</sup> amendment, must be jealously guarded from any who approach that jewel, either twirling their mustache and cackling viciously, or with good intentions. The road to hell is paved in gold with good intentions, and no matter how pure the intent, the unlawful removal through deception and ignorance of any right from any individual, is evil and criminal.

Now that this information is at everyone's fingertips, there is no reason why any individual cannot proceed in all of their matters and administrate all of their own affairs sui juris autonomous, of their own right, law, and full age as a conscious free thinking adult.