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Federal Reserve Act 1913

On the night of December 23, 1913 the United States Congress passed the Federal Reserve Act and thereby committed the greatest act of TREASON in history. It surrendered this nation's sovereignty and sold the American people into slavery to a cabal of arch-charlatan international bankers who proceeded to plunder, bankrupt, and conquer this nation with a money swindle.

The "money" the banks issue is merely bookkeeping entries. It cost them nothing and is not backed by their wealth, efforts, property, or risk. It is not redeemable except in more debt paper. The Federal Reserve Act forced us to pay compound interest on thin air. We now use worthless "notes" backed by our own credit that we cannot own and are made subject to compelled performance for the "privilege".

From 1913 until 1933, the United States paid the "interest" with more and more gold. The structured inevitability soon transpired: the Treasury was empty, the debt was greater than ever, and the United States declared bankruptcy. In exchange for using notes belonging to bankers who create them out of nothing on our own credit, we are forced to repay in substance (labor, property, land, businesses, resources - life) in ever-increasing amounts. This may be the greatest heist and fraud of all time.

When a government goes bankrupt, it loses its sovereignty. In 1933 the United States declared bankruptcy, as expressed in Roosevelt's Executive Orders 6073, 6102, 6111, and 6260, House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933, confirmed in Perry v. United States, (1935) 294 U.S. 330-381, 79 L.ed 912, as well as 31 USC 5112, 5119, and 12 USC 95A.

The bankrupt United States went into receivership, reorganized in favor of 115 creditors and new owners. In 1913, Congress turned over America... lock, stock and barrel to a handful of criminals whose avowed intent from the beginning was to plunder, bankrupt, conquer, and enslave the people of the United States of America and eliminate this nation from the face of the earth. The goal was, and is, to absorb America into a one-world private commercial government, a "New World Order."

With the Erie R.R. v Tompkins case of 1938, the Supreme Court confirmed their success. We are now in an international private commercial jurisdiction in colorable admiralty-maritime under the Law Merchant. We have been conned and betrayed out of our sovereignty, rights, property, freedom, common law, Article III Courts, and... our Republic. The Bill of Rights has been statutized into "civil rights" in commerce.

America has been stolen. We have been made slaves, i.e. permanent debtors, bankrupt, in legal incapacity, rendered commercial "persons," "residents," and corporate franchisees known as "citizens of the United States" under the so-called "14th Amendment." Said "Amendment," which was never ratified - see Congressional Record, June 13, 1967; Dyett v. Turner, (1968) 439 P2d 266, 267; State v. Phillips, 1975 (affirmed) - created a citizenship for corporations, abstract statutory entities which are the products and definitions of the legislature and are fully taxable and regulatable thereby. Thomas Jefferson's prophecy has come to pass: "If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of currency... the banks... will deprive the people of all property until their children will wake up homeless on the continent their fathers conquered."

Since 1933 what is called the "United States Government" is a privately owned corporation of the Federal Reserve/IMF. It is merely an instrument whereby the banksters administer their ongoing subjugation and plunder of what was once considered "the last great hope of human freedom." All "public servants," officials, Congressmen, politicians, judges, attorneys, law enforcement officers, States and their various agencies, etc., are the express agents of these foreign principals - see Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938; 22 USC 286 et seq, 263A, 185G, 267J, 611(C) (ii) & (iii); Treasury Delegation Order #91 - who have stolen the country by clever, intentional, and unrelenting fraud, trickery, treachery, non-disclosure, mis-representation, intrigue, coercion, conspiracy, murder (example: the murder of President John F. Kennedy and the continuing cover-up), etc. If there is a greater tragedy in human history it is hard to know what it is.

An insidious aspect of this is that "officials" like you may think you are "public servants," or upholding the "law," or other hoaxes. In truth you are conscientiously and assiduously serving the arch-enemies of yourselves, your own rights, your fellow citizens, continued... human rights, life, and freedom in general. YOU are seditiously administering the plunder, bankruptcy, conquest, destruction, dismantling, and elimination of your country. YOU are systematically defrauding, extorting, impoverishing, and injuring human life on the basis of crimes and lies of such magnitude, depth, and proportions as to be beyond human comprehension.

By so doing, you are committing TREASON and PERFIDY so immense as "to make the angels weep." If you and your fellow "officials" do not understand the real situation, you are ignorant, naive, deceived, and conned. You are sheer dupes. If you do know and are parties to it, you are guilty of evil and heinous BETRAYAL. You are in such case TRAITORS and CRIMINALS. All of you "in power" are therefore, either fools or knaves, either of which eminently invalidates your "authority" and renders null and void absolutely all moral obligation to pay allegiance or to obey the TREASONOUS SYSTEM you enforce with such mechanical viciousness.

If, you, "public servants" had any shred left of humanity, awe, heart, clarity, sanity, access to your true being and conscience, you would instantly resign and do everything possible to inform the American people of their plight and help us retrieve our rights and our country. Only by such means can you even begin to atone for your endless crimes against humanity, the lives you so arrogantly and mindlessly butcher with the "meat-grinder of the law."

You DID NOT CREATE the lives you "legally" assault; they DO NOT belong to you. Ignorance of the law - moral and natural law - is no excuse. You cannot engage in bringing harm to life and, like the Nazi's defense at Nuernberg, presume that because you do so under the "authority" of an imaginary, abstract, unreal legal fiction called "government" you are freed of the consequences of your acts. Moral and natural law are not obviated by ignorance, hubris and self-righteous militancy. Your entire system - from the ground up - is deceit and fraud. It is illicit in essence and ab initio. As Broom's Maxims 297, 729 put it: "A right of action cannot arise out of fraud." Honor is earned by honesty and integrity, not under false and fraudulent pretenses. The color of the cloth one wears cannot cover up the usurpations, lies, and treachery. "When black is fraudulently declared to be white, not all will live in darkness."

More and more people are awakening to the truth. What do you think the American people will do as they discover that they have no more country, that they are slaves to mortal enemies, that they have been tricked and betrayed by their "leaders" who sold them out? what do you think they will do when they realize that all their alleged "public servants" are willing or stupidly compliant parties to the plunder, bankruptcy, subjugation, and ruin of their lives and country?

Thomas Jefferson wrote: "An honest man can feel no pleasure in the exercise of power over his fellow citizens." Lincoln said: "Just as I would not be a slave, neither would I be a master." I will not participate in your corrupt, arrogant, and cruel fraud, either as perpetrator or victim. The great Indian poet Tagore wrote: "Power takes as ingratitude the writhing of its victims."

I will no longer sit here and writhe. The TYRANNY over this nation MUST END! If you continue with this course, you will have natural and moral law and higher powers to answer to, not to mention all those you have wronged under phony color of law. You will also have your own laws turned against you, as you have turned the law against us. To transform the shield of protection into a sword of exploitation, subjugation, and plunder is perfidy. You have now been placed on notice. All further actions on your part will be willful!

Resolutely, an American who demands his country back.

CICERO  
Power and law are not synonymous. In truth, they are frequently in opposition and irreconcilable. There is God's Law from which all Equitable laws of man emerge and by which men must live if they are not to die in oppression, chaos and despair. Divorced from God's eternal and immutable Law, established before the founding of the suns, man's power is evil no matter the noble words with which it is employed or the motives urged when enforcing it. Men of good will, mindful therefore of the Law laid down by God, will oppose governments whose rule is by men, and if they wish to survive as a nation they will destroy the government which attempts to adjudicate by the whim of venal judges.   
Marcus Tullius Cicero  106-43 B.C.

Cases  Person Defined

Homo vocabulum est naturae; persona juris civilis. Man (homo) is a term of nature; person (persona) of civil law. Calvin (from Black's Law Dictionary, Second Edition (1910), page 577.)

Homo vocabulum est naturae; persona juris civilis-Man is a term of nature; person of civil law. Bouvier's Law Dictionary (1914), "Maxim," p. 2136.

American Law and Procedure, Vol. 13, page 137, 1910:  
"This word 'person' and its scope and bearing in the law, involving, as it does, legal fictions and also apparently [IN APPEARANCE ONLY] natural beings, it is difficult to understand; but it is absolutely necessary to grasp, at whatever cost, a true and proper understanding to the word in all the phases of its proper use. A person is here not a physical or individual person, but the status or condition with which he is invested. Not an individual or physical person, but the status, condition or character borne by physical persons. The law of persons is the law of status or condition."

Black's Law Dictionary definition of "person"  
...Scope and delineation of term is necessary for determining those to whom Fourteenth Amendment of Constitution affords protection since this Amendment expressly applies to "person."

CHAPTER 311. CODE CONSTRUCTION ACT (TEXAS)  
§ 311.0 0 5 . GENERAL DEFINITIONS. The following definitions apply unless the statute or context in which the word or phrase is used requires a different definition:  
(2) "Person" includes corporation, organization, government or governmental subdivision or agency, business trust, estate, trust, partnership, association, and any other legal entity. [Ed. Note: Reader advised to discover legal meaning of "includes".]

United States Code  
TITLE 15 - COMMERCE AND TRADE  
CHAPTER 1 - MONOPOLIES AND COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE § 7.   
"Person" or "persons" defined  
The word "person", or "persons", wherever used in sections 1 to 7 of this title shall be deemed to include corporations and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of either the United States, the laws of any of the Territories, the laws of any State, or the laws of any foreign country. (Emphasis added.)

United States Code  
TITLE 15 - COMMERCE AND TRADE  
CHAPTER 1 - MONOPOLIES AND COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE § 12. Definitions; short title  
(a) The word "person" or "persons" wherever used in this Act shall be deemed to include corporations and associations existing under or authorized by the laws of either the United States, the laws of any of the Territories, the laws of any State, or the laws of any foreign country. (Emphasis added.)

[Ed. Note: Reader advised to discover legal meaning of "shall" and "include". Reader is asked,  
Do you see the word "man" or "woman" in these code items? Perhaps they are not "included" or "applicable"?]

Texas Code of Criminal Procedure

CHAPTER 17A. CORPORATIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS

Art. 17A.01. APPLICATION AND DEFINITIONS.  
This chapter sets out some of the procedural rules applicable to the criminal responsibility of corporations and associations. Where not in conflict with this chapter, the other chapters of this code apply to corporations and associations.   
In this code, unless the context requires a different definition:  
(1) "Agent" means a director, officer, employee, or other person authorized to act in behalf of a corporation or association.  
(2) "Association" means a government or governmental subdivision or agency, trust, partnership, or two or more persons having a joint or common economic interest.   
(3) "High managerial agent" means:  
an officer of a corporation or association;  
a partner in a partnership; or  
an agent of a corporation or association who has duties of such responsibility that his conduct may reasonably be assumed to represent the policy of the corporation or association.   
(4) "Person," "he," and "him" include corporation and association.  
Added by Acts 1973, 63rd Leg., p. 979, ch. 399, Sec. 2(D), eff. Jan. 1, 1974. (Emphasis added.)

Art. 17A.02. ALLEGATION OF NAME.  
In alleging the name of a defendant corporation, it is sufficient to state in the complaint, indictment, or information the corporate name, or to state any name or designation by which the corporation is known or may be identified. It is not necessary to allege that the defendant was lawfully incorporated. (Emphasis added.)

In alleging the name of a defendant association it is sufficient to state in the complaint, indictment, or information the association's name, or to state any name or designation by which the association is known or may be identified, or to state the name or names of one or more members of the association, referring to the unnamed members as "others." It is not necessary to allege the legal form of the association. Added by Acts 1973, 63rd Leg., p. 979, ch. 399, Sec. 2(D), eff. Jan. 1, 1974.

The Texas Penal Code clearly is law to be administered and enforced against a person(s) i.e. Texas Government Code section 311.005(2); CCP Art 17A.01(4). However, the Penal Code fails to include the term "Sovereign." Numerous courts have held that statutes must be specific and that for a Sovereign to be bound by statute, the Sovereign must be specifically named. And without a doubt a sui juris man / woman is a Sovereign. [Ed. Note: Reader is advised to get to known sui furls.]

By way of example, the Michigan Supreme Court and the United States Supreme Court concurred and made it perfectly clear that the term "person" does not include the "Sovereign" and that for a Sovereign to be bound by statute the Sovereign must be "specifically named." Will v. Michigan state Police, 105 L. Ed. 2nd 45 (1938) "Since in common usage, the term "person" does not include the Sovereign. Statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." United States v. Fox, 94 US 315.

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure - RULE 52. ALLEGING A CORPORATION

An allegation that a corporation is incorporated shall be taken as true, unless denied by the affidavit of the adverse party, his agent or attorney, whether such corporation is a public or private corporation and however created.
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Media Blackout: 161 Federal Tax Charges - 0 Convictions

IRS Suffers Staggering Defeat Tax Questions Raised Regarding

Gold and Silver Coins Used to Pay Wages

Around noon on Monday, September 17th, a Las Vegas federal jury returned its verdict refusing to convict nine defendants of any of the 161 federal tax crimes they had been charged with. The charges included income tax evasion, willful failure to file and conspiracy to evade taxes.

The four-month trial centered around the family businesses of Robert Kahre who paid numerous workers for their labor with circulating gold and silver U.S. coins, and did not report the wages. The payments took place over several years, allegedly totaling at least $114 million dollars.

On September 20, 2007, three days after the federal trial's dramatic conclusion, the Las Vegas Review Journal, reportedly under a degree of public pressure, ran its first (and last) story about the outcome of the trial. To this day, with exception of the single article by the Review Journal, no major media entity has published a news story regarding the outcome of this important federal criminal tax case.

The censorship of this important news story is, unfortunately, not unexpected given the continuing, worldwide onslaught against the U.S. "dollar" -- specifically the Federal Reserve variety, and the ever growing numbers of Federal Reserve Notes required to trade for an actual ounce of silver, gold, oil, or for that matter, anything.

In short, this failed prosecution has coalesced and exposed truths our Government desperately needs to hide from [We] the People: the truth about our money, the truth about our (privately-owned) central bank (a.k.a., [the] Federal Reserve Bank), and the truth about the fraudulent nature of the operation and enforcement of the federal income tax system.

According to defense attorney Joel Hansen, who represented co-defendant Alex Loglia, the primary "willfulness" defense was that the defendants believed they had no legal obligation to withhold, pay income taxes or report anything to the government because, in part, the nominal ( i.e., face value) of the gold and silver coins is so small as to fall beneath the reporting thresholds set by the Internal Revenue Code.  
The Defendants also argued that regardless of the valuation of the coins for internal revenue purposes, there is no law that requires average American workers to file or pay direct, un-apportioned taxes on the fruits of their labor.

The Government argued that the payments in solid gold and silver U.S. coins must be considered at their bullion (i.e., intrinsic full-market) value when considering the worth of the wages for purposes of the internal revenue code.

Attorney Hansen cited two Supreme Court cases bolstering Defendant's monetary argument at the heart of the defendants "willfulness" defense.

The essence of the argument is that under the Constitution Congress is obligated by law to mint and circulate such coins as demand requires, and must establish the value of coins as they are used as legal tender, but the coins' market value, arising as valuable personal "property," is a distinct, separate attribute of such coins, and is of no legal consequence if the coins are used as legal tender.

In other words, if a worker is paid with such coins, his taxable "income" (if any) can only be the face value indicated upon the coin money paid -- i.e., $1.00 for a circulating silver dollar or $50 for a circulating gold U.S. coin. Not surprisingly, the IRS has never issued any public guidance regarding this significant issue.

The first case, Ling Su Fan v. U.S., 218 US 302 (1910) establishes the legal distinction of a coin bearing the "impress" of the sovereign:  
"These limitations are due to the fact that public law gives to such coinage a value which does not attach as a mere consequence of intrinsic value. Their quality as a legal tender is an attribute of law aside from their bullion value. They bear, therefore, the impress of sovereign power which fixes value and authorizes their use in exchange."

The second case, Thompson v. Butler, 95 US 694 (1877), establishes that the law makes no legal distinction between the values of coin and paper money used as legal tender:  
"A coin dollar is worth no more for the purposes of tender in payment of an ordinary debt than a note dollar. The law has not made the note a standard of value any more than coin. It is true that in the market, as an article of merchandise, one is of greater value than the other; but as money, that is to say, as a medium of exchange, the law knows no difference between them."

Defense attorney Hansen confirmed that members of the jury were able to actually hold and inspect the gold and silver U.S. coins paid to the workers.

After almost four months of testimony and three and a half days of deliberation, the jury did not convict any of the defendants of any of the 161 crimes alleged. Although some defendants were acquitted of multiple counts, and several were acquitted completely, others may have to stand for a retrial if the Government brings charges a second time.

The Review Journal reported the jury foreman claimed DOJ prosecutors admitted they were "shocked" by the outcome.

In March 2007, the primary defendant, Bob Kahre, filed a federal civil rights lawsuit against the prosecutor and IRS agents who had conducted what he alleges to be an unlawful search and seizure raid. In 2005 the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals refused to overturn a previous District Court ruling holding that the federal prosecutor is not entitled to absolute immunity for the unlawful raid.

The media suppression of this story is similar to the widespread mainstream media suppression of the July 11, 2007 acquittal of Louisiana attorney Tommy Cryer who was also charged with multiple federal income tax crimes and relied upon numerous Supreme Court precedents and U.S. tax laws to establish his "willfulness" defense.

United States Constitution Article One, Section 10. No state shall enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; grant letters of marque and reprisal; coin money; emit bills of credit; make anything 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.

TITLE 31 UNITED STATES CODE § 371  
The money of account of the United States shall be expressed in dollars or units, dimes or tenths, cents or hundredths, and mills or thousandths, a dime being the tenth part of a dollar, a cent the hundredth part of a dollar, a mill the thousandth part of a dollar; and all accounts in the public offices and all the proceedings in the courts shall be kept and held in conformity to this regulation.   
(Emphasis added.)(See also, Public Law 97-258, September 12, 1982.)

How to Respond to Contempt of Court  Judicial Attack  
Here it is - EVERYONE should keep this - it could save you - it WORKS, we have used it in court many times and if used properly it will back a raging dragon judge right back down in his chair docile…. believe me it is not easy to do that ....

"KNOW RIGHTS OR NO RIGHTS" William Mayhar

How to Respond to Contempt of Court, Judicial Attack

We cringe for people going into court, dealing with the "sons of vipers, offspring of serpents" in these outlaw courts today. So many people write to us and call us, as they are being rendered in the money machine every day, liquidated to the Funding Streams for the elite.

If you know the right words, they back down right now - they may still have you arrested, but you have said the right words on the record to discredit him in his contemptuous acts against you, and you will use this record in any appeal or future hearings as you go. The main thing is you DISCREDIT HIM and IMPEACH HIM IN HIS OWN COURTROOM if you say the right things.

This can be used in any court in any setting, at any level, all the same basic process. I think in any country, with slight variations. Sui Juris process is simple and common law, as "any reasonable people would understand" and bridges all forms of courts or dealing with public authorities.

One of the main TOOLS they use to arrest you in a courtroom is "CONTEMPT OF COURT". Contempt is an instant six months in jail or a year sentence; potentially that is what you face. They use this for any or no reason, mainly for intimidation, and this is where they will (have already) use a stun belt or gun on a defendant who "irritates" the court asking for our rights.

When they do this to you, and it happens so fast it makes your head spin, if you have this written down, and can keep your wits about you enough to remember to say it, (you should practice it! It is THAT important!) Here is what you say:

"IS THAT CIVIL CONTEMPT OR CRIMINAL CONTEMPT JUDGE?" (You wait for a response on the record - do not talk until he answers and if they pause this LONG pause is on the record that he cannot answer you - the silence of a witness answering a question is an admission of truth in a court record and the longer the pause the better. All you want on the record is to make them COMMIT and then you go on, and now you have them caught in the permanent record)

If he says "CRIMINAL CONTEMPT" - you say, "WHO MAKES THE CLAIM, WHAT IS THE CRIME AND WHO IS THE INJURED PARTY?" and wait again as long as it takes for him to say something.

If he says "CIVIL CONTEMPT" - you say, "WHERE IS THE CONTRACT BETWEEN ME AND YOU? I DON'T AGREE TO THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT, JUDGE. "

NOW you have him acting CRIMINALLY OUTSIDE OF ANY LAWFUL JURISDICTION AND OUT OF IMMUNITY in his own courtroom on the record and here's why. In civil court, EVERYTHING is a CONTRACT and nothing can be done that is not a form of a contract. And ONLY HUMANS CAN LAWFULY CONTRACT. Every citation, money exchange, order, anything at all is an exchange - a contract - between two humans. The constitution is a contract with the Children of a Creator with Inherent Rights and the Constitutionally Sovereign People in the state, bonded by the JUDICIAL OATH - their contract.

Anyway, when you say to him "I don't agree to the terms of the contract" he KNOWS he does not have a contract with you and if you have committed no crime he has no authority to arrest you or even be conducting the hearing - he is OUT of his lawful jurisdiction and OUT of his IMMUNITY.

Now, if he says "CRIMINAL CONTEMPT", like one judge did to me, Judge Robert Walberg, with no lawful oath by the way, he made a FOOL of himself! He said "IF YOU ASK THAT AGAIN I AM HOLDING YOU IN CONTEMPT OF COURT" I said "IS THAT CRIMINAL OR CIVIL CONTEMPT WALBERG?" and he raged and said "CRIMINAL".

I said "WHAT CRIME HAVE I COMMITTED AND WHO MAKES THE CLAIM? WHO IS THE INJURED PARTY?' He went nuts and started yelling "THE STATE OF OREGON", "THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM", "THE COURT"  I said "YOU KNOW THAT ONLY A HUMAN CAN MAKE A CLAIM AND THERE IS NO CRIME AND NO INJURED PARTY - YOU KNOW THAT THE STATE OF OREGON CANNOT MAKE A CLAIM" he backed down and sat there red faced (he had already arrested me about three times for speaking before this contempt attempt) and it shut him down.

This was on the third day of the battle in his courtroom/sham jury trial last January - so after this confrontation backed him down he sat WAY BACK in his chair for three hours and let me make the record, while the jury waited in the back. MAKING THE RECORD WAS MY ONLY GOAL ANYWAY TO UPDATE THE RECORD IN OUR CASE. Unfortunately for us, the juries do not understand anything at all, and these confrontations scare them, so all the knowledge of court process and higher law goes right over their heads and they do EXACTLY what the judge LETS them do by the way he manipulates the instructions. This judge held his finger   
to his upper lip and looked like a cadaver for three hours, listening to the record of the crimes of our evidence against the state and his own treason as I outlined what has happened.

That is how you make the Record. You have to use another trick called "OFFER OF PROOF". When they fight you and attack you, and rage, and say you can't say anything in front of the jury, and the DA interrupt literally EVERY sentence to stop you from speaking for days (I have gone through this!)... You tell the judge "I AM GOING TO MAKE AN OFFER OF PROOF FOR MY APPEAL". He sometimes will go in the back room altogether and leave the record on, or he will sit way back and listen while you make the record of your facts without the jury present. Another trick process word is "OFFER INTO EVIDENCE" they will let you go around for days and be denied because you don't say it that way  They are insane, but if you do use their words they know that they have to acknowledge that this is their process and they use it so you have to be able to use it too.

Another important phrase to use is, RUSH TO JUDGEMENT. After going around with them to a certain point and being blocked at all points, you say "ARE YOU TRYING TO RUSH ME TO JUDGEMENT?" WOW - it works - boy they sit back so fast and shut up you would not believe - you would think they were shot supposedly four times in a hearing saying that gets a reversal, but with us they don't give us anything, so I am not sure. But it is an important TOOL, you say this and it means they are preventing you from putting on your evidence as a lawful court and judicial due process requires, and for you to say this as they are doing it is like shooting them in their chair.

I hope people will write these things down in front of them when they are terrified in court - everyone is terrified in the court, even the attorneys, especially when you are bringing truth of this magnitude in there - we say where the truth meets the lie there is fallout - like a neutron bomb, you definitely stir up the hornets nest when you speak the truth in their courtrooms.

The rest of the Process for the People to Access the Courts is in the book we wrote. We learned these tools more recently and they are an "addition" to the information in the Sui Juris Book. This is what REALLY happens when you are in there, not what we think will happen or hope will happen. And learning these tools, you are prepared to meet this present evil face to face.

LEWIS MOHR  TRAIN OF THOUGHT #89  
See Texas Penal Code Section 1.07. DEFINITIONS - definition number 24 - "Government" is "the state." Every statute is written territorially and is written for "this state." I have suggested to all of you that the de factos are running an administration that provides 'government-like' services. The de facto administration is called "this state." And "this state" is a legal subdivision [see Texas Constitution Article 11, Section 1] of "the state," but I can find nowhere where it is defined that "this state" is a political subdivision of "the state."

Understand that legal is by contract and is in commerce. A political subdivision of "the state" de jure government would naturally be immune from suit by sovereign immunity. But a legal subdivision has descended into commerce and has obtained a EIN (Employer Identification Number) and a Dunn & Bradstreet number. To Wit: the taxing authority is NOT immune. The taxing authority has descended into commerce. It has an EIN and it most probably has a Dunn & Bradstreet number. The taxing authority is part of "this state." - it is a legal subdivision. The taxing authority IS NOT a political subdivision. Law is made up of words. And if you allow scum-bag satanic attorneys to twist the words and give the words meaning that the words do not have,,,,, well that is our problem.

The major problem is that the judges ARE ATTORNEYS and being that the court system is a private judiciary staffed by members of a closed shop union - well, we ain't got a chance -- but that does not mean we stop. We keep making the satanic scum always, always - always go into outright crime to beat us. Their hearts will get heavy and soon they will die. God says so. Don't believe me. Well, true story: A report the other day from the dad of a friend of mine who got 2 years for sitting on the curb where the cop told him to sit AFTER he was thoroughly searched and while the driver of the car was tested for DWI. My friend was told to get up and get out of the way for the walk the line test. He did so and the cop threw in a small gun wrapper of crack.

I saw it twinkle into the video for one microsecond, and no one else did. It was passed off as a sparkle on the video. All of us, I am certain, know about planting evidence. Well, the cop who threw down the crack calls his partner over to look at the suspicious gum wrapper in the street and they both agree it came from my friend. [Now remember, the next time you get out of your car at a Wal-Mart parking lot you will be held responsible for whatever is on the ground when you get out of the car.] He gets 2 years for possession of something that could barely be measured.

At a recent hearing about the appeal the cop who threw down the crack is called in for further testimony and he is out of uniform and limping severely. Judge asked him what happened. He says he was chasing a juvenile on a warehouse loading platform in the dark and ran off the dock and when he hit concrete he completely shattered his foot and ankle and lower leg bone. He is permanently and totally disabled for physical work and will never be a danger to the people of Texas ever again. Now if you think God will not balance the scales - well best just to not harm your neighbor. All of the de factos who harm the people to whom they own allegiance will be balanced.   
L -o-

Republic Defined  
What is a Republic?

Declaration of Independence  by John Trumbull

"Today the path to total dictatorship in the United States can be laid by strictly legal means, unseen and unheard by the Congress, the President, or the people....outwardly we have a Constitutional government. We have operating within our government and political system, another body representing another form of government, a bureaucratic elite which believes our Constitution is outmoded and is sure that it is the winning side.... All the strange developments in the foreign policy agreements may be traced to this group who are going to make us over to suit their pleasure.... This political action group has its own local political support organizations, its own pressure groups, its own vested interests, its foothold within our government, and its own propaganda apparatus."   Senator William Jenner (1954)

DEFINITION and explanation: What is a Republic?

Look up the word REPUBLIC in most any dictionary. Most likely, you'll find that a "republic" is a "government of elected representatives".

This is a deliberate deception.

I have an Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition. This work provides the proper explanation. First it says that the idea that a republic is a government of elected representatives is a "notoriously modern interpretation". The article continues, explaining that historically, a Republic refered to a government in which the sovereign held authority granted by the people and ruled according to law.

Note that this concept checks exactly with our own Declaration of Independence which states that the purpose of government is to protect the rights of the people, and that government derives its just powers from the consent of the people.

You now have the key ideas in hand: First, power is derived from the people, and second the government itself operates within and under the control of the law. In other words: In a REPUBLIC the People are the Masters and the government is subordinate.

When the Founding Fathers set our Constitution for us they based their work on this concept. The Constitution is a grant of authority from We the People to form a government. The government thus authorized is a LIMITED government, operating on authority granted from We the People. In every sense it meets the earlier, historical definition of a Republic.

The Constitution is the grant of authority for the government. The Constitution, then, is the Law of the People for the control of the Government.

You will hear many people say that we are a "democracy". Such was NOT the original intention. In a democracy, the will of the majority is law. Anything is allowed, provided that the majority approves. There are no checks and balances, and the rights of the individual are not protected.

Allow me two quotations on the subject:

James Madison, Federalist Paper 10:

"Hence it is that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention; have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have in general been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths."

U.S. Army Training Manual TM2000-05, 1928   
Democracy, n. "A government of the masses. Authority derived through mass meeting or any form of "direct" expression. Results in mobocracy. Attitude toward property is communistic - negating property rights. Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate, whether it be based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulse, without restraint or regard to consequences. Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy."

Our Constitutional fathers, familiar with the strength and weakness of both autocracy and democracy, with fixed principles definitely in mind, defined a representative republican form of government. They made a very marked distinction between a republic and democracy ... and said repeatedly and emphatically that they had created a republic.

Seek the Truth, and the Truth will make you free!

**Disclaimer:** We are just people that get together and exchange information.   
We are not a group or organization.   
We are not a company or corporation or association.    
We sell nothing and we charge nothing.