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Where does Sovereignty Come from?

- Sovereignty exists because of Common Law
- The people in all Countries with the Common Law of England owe their Sovereignty to the Common Law.

In Canada, United States, Australia, New Zealand and all common law countries in the world THE PEOPLE ARE THE SOVEREIGNTY!
What is a Sovereign?

- Sovereignty is the Right to Rule.
- Sovereign can be a King or Queen
- Sovereign can be a group of people
- Sovereign can be a living soul
What is a Sovereign

- “Sovereign. A chief ruler with supreme power; a king or other ruler with limited power. An action is not maintainable against a foreign sovereign.” 44 L. T. Rep. N. S. 199.
“When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume, among the Powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness.” Declaration of Independence (1776)
“This law of nature, being coeval with mankind and dictated by God himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this; and such of them as are are valid derive all their force, and all their authority, mediately or immediately, from this original.” Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Laws of England (1765-1769), Section 2, page 41
“This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of divine Providence, which, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, hath been pleased, at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce its laws by an immediate and direct revelation.

The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the holy scriptures. These precepts, when revealed, are found upon comparison to be really a part of the original law of nature, as they tend in all their consequences to man's felicity.”

Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Laws of England, (1765-1769) Section 2, Page 41
“Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these.”

Every citizen & freeman is endowed with certain rights & privileges to enjoy which no written law or statute is required. These are the fundamental or natural rights, recognized among all free people.“ U.S. v. Morris, 125 F 322, 325.
"As general rule men have natural right to do anything which their inclinations may suggest, if it be not evil in itself, and in no way impairs the rights of others." In Re Newman (1858), 9 C. 502.
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“Sovereignty is the right to govern, a nation or state sovereign is the person, or persons in whom that resides....” Chisholm v Georgia 2 Dall. 440
Who are Sovereigns?

- In a Common Law (law of nature) country the Sovereigns are the People.
- Law of Nature is everywhere.
Who are Sovereigns?

“The words “people of the United States” and “citizens” are synonymous terms and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republic institutions form the sovereignty, and who hold the power, and conduct the government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the sovereign people, and every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of the sovereignty.” Dredd Scott v Sandford 60 U.S. 393
“The sovereign people through their representatives have created the Court and the Board, as well as the municipal council and have defined the rights and duties of each.” Re Casa Loma, (1927) 4 D.L.R. 645
Who are the sovereigns?

“The Parliament of Canada and the Legislatures of the several Provinces are sovereign within their spheres defined by the British North America Act, but none of them has the unlimited capacity of the individual.” Chief Judge Renfret, Attorney General of Nova Scotia v Attorney General of Canada, Lord Nelson Hotel Case, 31 Supreme Court Reports [1951]
“Translated into constitutional terms, it denotes that the sovereign power which resides in the people is exercised on their behalf by their representatives.” Australian Capital Television v Commonwealth, 66 Australian Reports 695
Who are the Sovereigns?

- “the powers of government in this country are derived from the people who are the ultimate sovereign.” Ridgeway v The Queen, 69 Australian Reports 484
Who are Sovereigns?

“...every individual was sovereign over himself...”
House of Lords T.N.L.R. No. 529 [1999] United Kingdom
"The people or sovereign are not bound by general word in statutes, restrictive of prerogative right, title or interest, unless expressly named. Acts of limitation do not bind the King or the people. The people have been ceded all the rights of the King, the former sovereign,......" People v Herkimer, 4 Cowen (NY) 345, 348 (1825)
"...at the revolution the Sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects ......and have none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the sovereignty." Chisholm v Georgia, 2 Dall. 440, at pg 471;
“People of a state are entitled to all rights, which formerly belong to the King by his prerogative.” Lansing v Smith, (1829) 4 Wendell 9,20 (NY).

“It will be admitted on all hands that with the exception of the powers granted to the states and the federal government, through the Constitutions, the people of the several states are unconditionally sovereign within their respective states.” Ohio L. Ins. & T. Co. v. Debolt, 16 How. 416, 14 L.Ed. 997.
“Citizens. (Cives) Of London, are either Freemen or such as reside and keep a Family in the City, &c. and some are Citizens and Freemen; and some are not, who have not so great Privileges as the others: The Citizens of London may prescribe against a Statute, because their Liberties are reinforced by Statute. 1 Roll. Rep. 105” Jacob A. New Law Dictionary, 1750 [emphasis added]
"governments are but trustees acting under derived authority and have no power to delegate what is not delegated to them. But the people, as the original fountain might take away what they have delegated and entrust to whom they please. ... The sovereignty in every state resides in the people of the state and they may alter and change their form of government at their own pleasure." -Luther v. Borden, 48 US 1, 12 L.Ed. 581.
Delegation

- Do I have the power to take your property and give it to your neighbor because he does not have food to eat, or for any other reason?
- If I do not have that power, then neither does the government
- If the government is doing anything like this, then it is because of a contract
"Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts." Yick Wo v Hopkins, 118 US 356, at pg 370;
“There is no such thing as power of inherent Sovereignty in the government of the United States. In this country sovereignty resides in the People, and Congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it; All else is withheld.” Julliard v Greenman 110 U.S. 421
The land patent is the muniment of title, such title being absolute in its nature, making the sovereigns absolute freeholders on their lands. Finally, the patent is the only evidence of the legal fee simple title. McConnell v Wilcox, 1 Scammon (ILL.) 381 (1837).

Many ignorant people (BAR member trolls?) claim that sovereignty is held by the group and not individually.

I was visited by the FBI and the Texas DPS in March of 2011 and they told me at that time that I am listed as sovereign in their system.
“But in considering the question before us, it must be borne in mind that there is no law of nations standing between the people of the United States and their Government, and interfering with their relation to each other. The powers of the Government, and the rights of the citizens under it, are positive and practical regulations plainly written down. The people of the United States have delegated to it certain enumerated powers, and forbidden it to exercise others.” Dred Scott v. Sanford, 19 How (60 U.S.) 393, 452, 15 L.Ed. 691 (A.D. 1856-1857) [emphasis added]
"The sovereignty of a state does not reside in the persons who fill the different departments of its government, but in the People, from whom the government emanated; and they may change it at their discretion. Sovereignty, then in this country, abides with the constituency, and not with the agent; and this remark is true, both in reference to the federal and state government." Spooner v. McConnell, 22 F 939 @ 943
“A delegate cannot delegate; an agent cannot delegate his functions to a subagent without the knowledge or consent of the principal; the person to whom an office or duty is delegated cannot lawfully devolve the duty on another, unless he be expressly authorized so to do.”

- 9 Coke, 77; Broom, Max. 840; 2 Kent, Comm. 633; 2 Steph. Comm. 119 [emphasis added]
“A delegated power cannot be again delegated.” 2 Inst. 597; Black's, 2d. 347; 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1300

“A deputy cannot have (or appoint) a deputy.” Story, Ag. s.13; 9 Coke, 77; 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1936

“the power which is derived cannot be greater than that from which it is derived” – Deritiva potestas non potest esse major primitiva. – Bouvier’s Law Dictionary 1856 Edition
"It is true that at common law the duty of the Attorney General is to represent the King, he being the embodiment of the state. But under the democratic form of government now prevailing the People are King so the Attorney General’s duties are to that Sovereign rather than to the machinery of government.“ Hancock V. Terry Elkhorn Mining Co., Inc., KY., 503 S.W. 2d 710 KY Const. §4, Commonwealth Ex Rel. Hancock V. Paxton, KY, 516 S. W. 2d. pg 867
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"The law of Congress... do not extend into the territorial limits of the states, but have force only in the District of Columbia, and other places that are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the national government."
Caha v. United States, 152 U.S. 211 (1894)

"The exclusive jurisdiction which the United States have in forts and dock-yards ceded to them, is derived from the express assent of the states by whom the cessions are made. It could be derived in no other manner; because without it, the authority of the state would be supreme and exclusive therein," U.S. v. Bevans, 16 U.S. 336, 3 Wheat, at 350, 351 (1818)
The Magna Carta is called “the great charter of English liberty”

The Canadian Handbook for Judges cites the Magna Carta on page 77;

“Magna Carta says; “We will not deny or defer to any man either justice or right””
“The Magna Carta is not a unilateral act, emanating solely from the spontaneous will of the King, as the Charters of the predecessors of John; neither is it a treaty; for we cannot say it was concluded between two legitimate and independent sovereignties; nor between two nations, nor is it a law. The Barons do not appear in it as subjects, for they are freed from their promise of fidelity, and the King, brought captive, placed before them, submitted to the conditions which the conquerors imposed upon him. Magna Carta is therefore a contract, but resembles a treaty concluded between two nations, in that one of the parties, in virtue of the law of war, can impose its will upon the other.”

Perlman v Piche and Attorney General of Canada, Intervenant, Re Habeus Corpus, 4 D.L.R. 147
Why do “We the People” set up governments in the first place?

- Protection against foreign enemies.
- Protection from each other.
- To administer disputes in a fair and impartial manner.
- The only legitimate function for government is to PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE!
God - King of Kings –
- Created “we the people”
- “We the people” –
  - created the government
- Government –
  - created corporations – subordinate to “we the people”.
Why is God in the Constitution?

- Our rights come from God.
- If our rights come from God, only God can take them away.
"...the individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a Citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the state or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him. He owes no such duty to the state, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life, liberty, and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the state, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under (a judicial power warrant ) a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their rights." Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43
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There at least two major classes of citizenship

- State
- Federal
"there is in our Political System, a government of each of the several states and a government of the United States. Each is distinct from the other and has citizens of its own." US vs. Cruikshank, 92 US 542,

"One may be a citizen of a State and yet not a citizen of the United States. Thomasson v State, 15 Ind. 449; Cory v Carter, 48 Ind. 327 (17 Am. R. 738); McCarthy v. Froelke, 63 Ind. 507; In Re Wehlitz, 16 Wis. 443." McDonel v State, 90 Ind. Rep. 320 at pg 323;

"There is a clear distinction between national citizenship and state citizenship." 256 P. 545, affirmed 278 US 123, Tashiro vs. Jordan
“Instead this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship.” Jones v. Temmer, 89 F. Supp 1226 (1993)

"Citizenship of the United States does not entitle citizens to privileges and immunities of Citizens of the State, since privileges of one are not the same as the other” Tashiro v. Jordan May 20, 1927, 255 P. 545 Cal. Supreme Court
"...the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States do not necessarily include all the rights protected by the first eight amendments to the Federal constitution against the powers of the Federal government." Maxwell v Dow, 20 S.C.R. 448, at pg 455;

"The only absolute and unqualified right of a United States citizen is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States," US vs. Valentine 288 F. Supp. 957
"Such construction ignores the rights of a state in virtue of its sovereignty to confer citizenship within its own limits, where the rights incident to such a status are not of the citizenship mentioned in the federal Constitution. It does not follow that, because one has all the rights and privileges of a citizen of a state, he must be a citizen of the United States. Such a distinction has long been recognized in this County." See Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. (U.S.) 393, 15 L.Ed. 691; Mitchell v. Wells, 37 Miss. 235.
"The rights of (original judicial) Citizens of the States, as such, are not under consideration in the fourteenth amendment. They stand as they did before the fourteenth amendment, and are fully guaranteed under other provisions." United States v. Anthony, 24 Fed. Cas. 829, 930 (1873).
"Civil rights under the 14th amendment are for Federal citizens and not State Citizens; Federal citizens, as parents, have no right to the custody of their infant children except subject to the paramount right of the State." Wadleigh v. Newhall, Circuit Court N. Dist. Cal., Mar 13, 1905

See The (so-called) Fourteenth Amendment is Unconstitutional video – it is actually a revision
The same thing exists in Canada.
The Charter adopted in 1982 refers to “Citizens of Canada” several times.
The courts have told us that “Laws of Canada” are federal laws.
  “Citizens of Canada” are federal citizens.
Canadians include State (provincial) Citizens and Federal citizens.
“Every Citizen of Canada…” Section 3 Charter of Rights and Freedoms

“Every Citizen of Canada…” Section 6(1) Charter of Rights and Freedoms

“Every Citizen of Canada…” Section 6(2) Charter of Rights and Freedoms

“Citizens of Canada…” Section 23(1) Charter of Rights and Freedoms

“Citizens of Canada…” Section 23(2) Charter of Rights and Freedoms

“The right of citizens of Canada…” Section 23(3) Charter of Rights and Freedoms
“Every citizen of Canada has the right to vote in an election of members of the House of Commons or of a legislative assembly and to be qualified for membership therein.” Section 3 Charter of Rights and Freedoms

“Notwithstanding anything in this Charter, the rights and freedoms referred to in it are guaranteed equally to male and female persons.” Section 28 Charter of Rights and Freedoms
“...it is evident that they [U.S. citizens] have not the political rights which are vested in citizens of the States. They are not constituents of any community in which is vested any sovereign power of government. Their position partakes more of the character of subjects than of citizens. They are subject to the laws of the United States, but have no voice in its management. If they are allowed to make laws, the validity of these laws is derived from the sanction of a Government in which they are not represented. Mere citizenship they may have, but the political rights of citizens they cannot enjoy...” People v. De La Guerra, 40 Cal. 311, 342 (A.D. 1870)
“SUBJECT, NATIONAL: CITIZEN may indicate being a member of a sovereign state, especially one showing democratic forms and usages, owing it allegiance, sharing in individual political rights. SUBJECT may imply a state of subjection to a person, such as a monarch, without much sense of membership in a political community or sharing in political rights. NATIONAL a more general word, may apply to anyone owing permanent allegiance to a nation and indicates one belonging to a broad category that includes both people who are legally citizens or subjects and also people who have not attained such legal status.” Webster's Third New International Dictionary, MERRIAM-WEBSTER INC., Publishers 1986
“Subject. - Constitutional Law. One that owes allegiance to a sovereign and is governed by his laws. The natives of Great Britain are subjects of the British government. 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, Rev. 4th Ed.
"In our opinion, it was not the intent of the legislature to restrict the operation of the statute to those only who were subjects of the United States government and exclude therefrom unnaturalized residents of foreign birth, whether white or black."

“Upon the other hand, the 14th Amendment, upon the subject of citizenship, Declares only that "all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States, and of the state wherein they reside." Here there is a limitation to person born or naturalized in the United States, which is not extended to person born in any place "subject to their jurisdiction."” Downes v. Bidwell (1900) 182 U.S. 244, 249-251, 45 L.Ed. 1088, 1092
“The persons declared to be citizens are, “All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction of thereof.” The evident meaning of these last words is not merely subject in some respect or degree to the jurisdiction of the United States, but completely subject…” Elk v Wilkins, 112 US 94, 101, 102, (1884)
"Merely being native born within the territorial boundaries of the United States of America does not make such an inhabitant a Citizen of the United States subject to the jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment. “ Elk v. Wilkins, Neb (1884), 5s.ct.41,112 U.S. 99, 28 L. Ed. 643.

"there is in our Political System, a government of each of the several states and a government of the United States Each is distinct from the other and has citizens of its own." . US vs. Cruikshank, 92 US 542,
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 1901. Dissenting opinion of Justice Marshall Harlan. “Two national governments exist, one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions, the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument”

Why do you think that Nancy Pelosi, as Speaker of the US House of Representatives says that they have to pass legislation so they can find out what it says?
- Bankster Thieves 1, 2, & 3
- Churchianity series
- Bankrupt Corporate (so-called) Governments
- BAR Members 1, 2, & 3
- D.I.Y. How NOT to Volunteer for the Selective Service
- Martial Law is here!
- D.I.Y. No Income Tax
- D.I.Y. Estoppel Certificates
- Everything is an Illusion
- Void Judgments
- D.I.Y. Kangaroo Courts 1, - 9
“[T]he term "citizen," in the United States, is analogous to the term "subject" in the common law.” State vs Manual 20 NC 122, 14 C.J.S. 4, p 430
US Citizens can murder their unborn children

"The unborn are not included within the definition of "person" as used in the 14th Amendment." Roe v. Wade US Supreme Court 410 US 13, 35 L.Ed. 2d 147, 1973
“And while the Fourteenth Amendment does not create a national citizenship, it has the effect of making that citizenship "paramount and dominant", instead of "derivative and dependant" upon state citizenship.” Colgate v Harvey, 296 U.S. 404, on page 427

See The (so-called) Fourteenth Amendment is Unconstitutional video – it is a revision
“Citizenship is a political status, and may be defined and privilege limited by Congress.”
Ex Parte (NG) Fung Sing, Federal Reporter, 2nd Series, Vol. 6, Page 670 (1925)
"The term resident and citizen of the United States is distinguished from a Citizen of one of the several states, in that the former is a special class of citizen created by Congress."
U.S. v. Anthony 24 Fed. 829 (1873)
Citizenship Classes

- "The (14th) amendment referred to slavery. Consequently, the only persons embraced by its provisions, and for which Congress was authorized to legislate in the manner were those then in slavery." Bowling v. Commonwealth, (1867), 65 Kent. Rep. 5, 29

- “No white person born within the limits of the United States and subject to their jurisdiction, or born without those limits and subsequently naturalized under their laws, owes his status of citizenship to the recent amendments to the Federal Constitution.” Van Valkenburg v. Brown, 43 Cal 43
“All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property.” 42 USC § 1982
Slavery was brought into America by the Roman Cult to create the mechanism by which everyone would become enslaved.

When the rights of the least of us are violated we are all diminished.

Al Capone was a gangster in Chicago during prohibition.

Al Capone was the first guy who was jailed for tax evasion, and now they jail all sorts of people for so-called crimes.

See the Debtors Prisons are Everywhere! video.
"Therefore, the U.S. citizens residing in one of the states of the union, are classified as property and franchises of the federal government as an "individual entity." Wheeling Steel Corp. v. Fox, 298 U.S. 193, 80 L.Ed. 1143, 56 S.Ct. 773

“A “US Citizen” upon leaving the District of Columbia becomes involved in “interstate commerce”, as a “resident” does not have the common-law right to travel, of a Citizen of one of the several states.” Hendrick v. Maryland S.C. Reporter’s Rd. 610-625. (1914)
“After the adoption of the 14th Amendment, a bill which became the first Civil Rights Act was introduced in the 39th Congress, the major purpose of which was to secure to the recently freed Negroes all the civil rights secured to white men... \( (N) \)one other than citizens of the United States were within the provisions of the Act.”

All of these Statutes are a cheap imitation of common law that essentially convert rights into privileges

“By this means, ....Citizens birthrights become of no affect and their rights are reduce to the inferior character of statutory Civil Rights (mere legislative privileges).” The Non-Ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, in the case (Dyett v. Turner, 439 P2d 266 @ 269, 20 U2d 403 [1968]), Judge AH Ellett of the Utah Supreme Court

At common law they are absolute rights

Statutes can and are changed

Statutes are ignored under certain circumstances
“subject, n. 1. One who owes allegiance to a sovereign and is governed by that sovereign's laws <the monarchy's subjects>.

“Speaking generally, we may say that the terms subject and citizen are synonymous. Subjects and citizens are alike those whose relation to the state is personal and not merely territorial, permanent and not merely temporary. This equivalent, however, is not absolute. For in the first place, the term subject is commonly limited to monarchical forms of government, while the term citizen is more specially applicable in the case of republics.” John Salmond, Jurisprudence 133 (Glanville L. Williams ed., 10th ed. 1947). Black’s Law Dictionary 8th Edition
“Finally it is to be noticed that the term subject is capable of a different and wider application, in which it includes all members of the body politic, whether they are citizens (i.e., subjects stricto sensu) or resident aliens. All such persons are subjects, all being subject to the power of the state and to its jurisdiction, and as owing to it, at least temporarily, fidelity and obedience.” John Salmond, Jurisprudence 133 (Glanville L. Williams ed., 10th ed. 1947). Black’s Law Dictionary 8th Edition
Residents, as distinguished from citizens, are aliens who are permitted to take up a permanent abode in the country. Being bound to the society by reason of their dwelling in it, they are subject to its laws so long as they remain there, and, being protected by it, they must defend it, although they do not enjoy all the rights of citizens. They have only certain privileges which the law, or custom, gives them. Permanent residents are those who have been given the right of perpetual residence. They are a sort of citizen of a less privileged character, and are subject to the society without enjoying all its advantages. Their children succeed to their status; for the right of perpetual residence given them by the State passes to their children.” The Law of Nations, Vattel, Book 1, Chapter 19, Section 213, p. 87
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“One does not necessarily become a non-resident by absconding or absenting himself from his place of abode.” 52 Mo. App. 291
Residence

“Residence. noun. The fact of being officially present; the statutory presence of an incumbent in a benefice.” Funk and Wagnals Standard Dictionary, International Edition Copyright 1965
"...it might be correctly said that there is no such thing as a citizen of the United States. ..... A citizen of any one of the States of the Union, is held to be, and called a citizen of the United States, although technically and abstractly there is no such thing." Ex Parte Frank Knowles, 5 Cal. Rep. 300,
"... (E)very taxpayer is a cestui qui trust having sufficient interest in the preventing abuse of the trust to be recognized in the field of this court's prerogative jurisdiction ..." In Re Bolens (1912), 135 N.W. 164.
“Slater's protestations to the effect that he derives no benefit from the United States government have no bearing on his legal obligation to pay income taxes. *Cook v. Tait*, 265 U.S. 47, 44 S.Ct. 444, 68 L.Ed. 895 (1924); *Benitez Rexach v. United States*, 390 F.2d 631, (1st Circ.), *cert. denied* 393 U.S. 833, 89 S.Ct. 103, 21 L.Ed.2d 103 (1968). Unless the defendant can establish that he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS possesses authority to attempt to determine his federal tax liability.” *UNITED STATES of America v. William M. SLATER* (1982) (D. Delaware) 545 F.Supp 179, 182.
US Citizen = Roman Cult = Slave

- “Chap. 854. – An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.”
- “The Legal Estate to be in Cestui Que Use” Chapter Fifty-Six in Sec. 1617, at 31 Stat. 1432
“Chap. 854. – An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.” which was Approved on March 3, 1901, by the Fifty-Sixth Congress, Session II, at 31 Stat. 1189, and at 2, where it says;

“And be it further enacted, That in the interpretation and construction of said code the following rules shall be observed namely:....

“Third. The word “person” shall be held to apply to partnerships and corporations, ...”, [emphasis added]
“Chap. 854. – An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia.” which was Approved on March 3, 1901, by the Fifty-Sixth Congress, Session II, at 31 Stat. 1189, and at Chapter three – Absence for Seven Years, in Sec. 252, at 31 Stat. 1230, where it says;

“SEC. 252. PRESUMPTION OF DEATH. - If any person shall leave his domicile without any known intention of changing the same, and shall not return or be heard from for seven years from the time of his so leaving, he shall be presumed to be dead, in any case wherein his death shall come in question, unless proof be made that he was alive within that time.”
15 USC § 44 Definitions; “Corporation” “shall be deemed to include any company, trust, so-called Massachusetts trust, or association, incorporated or unincorporated, which is organized to carry on business for its own profit or that of its members, and has shares of capital or capital stock or certificates of interest, and any company, trust, so-called Massachusetts trust, or association, incorporated or unincorporated, without shares of capital or capital stock or certificates of interest, except partnerships, which is organized to carry on business for its own profit or that of its members.”
“Yet still it was found difficult to set bounds to ecclesiastical ingenuity; for when they were driven out of all their former holds, they devised a new method of conveyance, by which the lands were granted, not to themselves directly, but to nominal feoffees to the use of the religious houses; thus distinguishing between the possession and the use, and receiving the actual profits, while the seisin of the lands remained in the nominal feoffee, who was held by the courts of equity (then under the direction of the clergy) to be bound in conscience to account to his cestui que use for the rents and emolments of the estate: and it is to these inventions that our practitioners are indebted for the introduction of uses and trusts, the foundation of modern conveyancing.” Tomlins Law Dictionary 1835 edition, Volume 2 under the definition of Mortmain
We are going to talk about some court cases that talk about race.

The court cases about race are used to talk about what was considered subjects.

Because of the so-called Fourteenth Amendment, all subjects became US citizens.

See The (so-called Fourteenth Amendment is Unconstitutional) video – it is a revision.

See the Slavery = Roman Cult video.

Slavery was introduced into America as a mechanism to enslave everybody.
"...but they are sovereigns without subjects, unless the African slaves among us may be so-called..." Chisholm v Georgia, 2 Dall. 440, at pg 471;
"... "No black, or mulatto person, or Indian shall be allowed to give evidence in favor of, or against a white man." People v. Hall (1854), 4 C. 399.

"The words, "Indian," "Negro," "Black" and "White," are generic terms, designating race. Therefore, Chinese and all other people not white, are included in the prohibition from being witnesses against whites." People v. Hall (1854), 4 C. 399.
“…excluding Chinese witnesses in suits to which white persons are parties, is affirmed.” Speer v. See Yup Co. (1859), 13 C. 73.

"The indicium of color is not an infallible test of the competency of a witness, under the act excluding blacks, mulattoes, and Indians, from testifying for or against white persons." People v. Elyea (1859), 14 C. 144.
"In a criminal action against a white person, a black or mulatto person--though the injured party--cannot, under the statute, be a witness against the defendant." People v. Howard (1860), 17 C. 63.

"The words "in favor of or against any white person," in the act prohibiting persons of one-half or more Indian blood, or Mongolian, or Chinese, from giving evidence, refer to the defendant alone in a criminal action. (Per Sanderson, C. J.)" People v. Awa (1865), 27 C. 638.
"The fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States does not conflict with the power of the legislature in the exercise of its discretion to exclude Chinamen from the right to testify in the state courts." People v. Brady (1870), 40 C. 198, 6 Am. Rep. 604, overruling People v. Washington (1869), 36 C. 658.
"Crimes Act, as amended in 1863, provided that no Indian, Mongolian or Chinese shall be permitted to give evidence in the courts of the state in favor of or against a white man," is not in conflict with constitutional amendment 14, which provides that persons born or naturalized in the United States are citizens, etc., that no state shall make any law abrogating the privileges or immunities of citizens, nor deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws; since the restrictions by such amendment imposed on states relate to substantial personal rights of liberty, property, etc., and do not extend to mere rules of evidence." People v. Brady (1870), 40 C. 198, 6 Am. Rep. 604, overruling People v. Washington (1869), 36 C. 658.
"The evidence of a Chinaman cannot be admitted to prove a white man guilty of manslaughter." People v. Harrington (1872), 1 C.U. 768.
"The right of trial by jury in civil cases, guaranteed by the 7th Amendment (Walker v. Sauvinet, 92 U. S. 90), and the right to bear arms, guaranteed by the 2nd Amendment (Presser v. Illinois, 116 U. S. 252), have been distinctly held not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed by the 14th Amendment against abridgement by the states, and in effect the same decision was made in respect of the guarantee against prosecution, except by indictment of a grand jury, contained in the 5th Amendment (Hurtado v. California, 110 U. S. 516), and in respect of the right to be confronted with witnesses, contained in the 6th Amendment." West v. Louisiana, 194 U. S. 258.
"The technical niceties of the common law are not regarded. . . .", 1 R.C.L. 31, p. 422. "A jury does not figure, ordinarily, in the trial of an admiralty suit. . . the verdict of the jury merely advisory, and may be disregarded by the court." 1 R.C.L. 40, p. 432. "[The] rules of practice may be altered whenever found to be inconvenient or likely to embarrass the business of the court." 1 R.C.L. 32, p. 423. "A court of admiralty. . . acts upon equitable principles." 1 R.C.L. 17, p. 416. "A libel of information [accusation] does not require all the technical precision of an indictment at common law. If the allegations describe the offense, it is all that is necessary; and if it is founded upon a statute, it is sufficient if it pursues the words of the law." The Emily v. The Caroline, 9 Wheat. 381
"The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States" US Constitution, Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2
This letter is in response to your correspondence to Alan Watson dated August 17, 2012 regarding the denial of your application for a Georgia driver’s license. As a preliminary matter, please know that the Department of Driver Services (DDS) intends no disrespect by addressing you using the conventions of formal business correspondence, and information provided to the DDS by the United States Postal Service suggests that the addressing of this letter in this fashion will expedite its delivery to you.

With regard to the content of your letter, the DDS agrees that your application for a driver’s license creates no contract between you and the State of Georgia. According to O.C.G.A. §13-1-10, “where, in the exercise of the police power, a license is issued, the license is not a contract but only a permission to enjoy the privilege for the time specified, on the terms stated; and it may be abrogated.” Unfortunately, the DDS respectfully must disagree with the balance of the contents of your correspondence.

First, various provisions of state and federal law require most drivers to possess a valid driver’s license to operate a motor vehicle, particularly O.C.G.A. §40-5-20. The exemptions from the statute are found in O.C.G.A. §40-5-21. None of the documentation provided with your letter suggests that you fall into one of the statutorily recognized exceptions. The DDS is prohibited from issuing a driver’s license to anyone whose driver’s license or driving privilege in another state is under suspension. O.C.G.A. §40-5-22(c). Operation of a motor vehicle without a valid driver’s license could be a violation of O.C.G.A. §§40-5-20 and/or 40-5-121, particularly since the contents of your lease suggest that you have been a resident of the State of Georgia for more than thirty (30) days. The term resident is defined in O.C.G.A. §40-5-1(15) as “a person who has a permanent home or abode in Georgia to which, whenever such person is absent, he or she has the intention of returning.”
The statute creates a rebuttable presumption of residency for anyone who meets the following criteria:

(A) Any person who accepts employment or engages in any trade, profession, or occupation in Georgia or enters his or her children to be educated in the private or public schools of Georgia within ten days after the commencement of such employment or education; or

(B) Any person who, except for infrequent, brief absences, has been present in the state for 30 or more days; provided, however, that no person shall be considered a resident for purposes of this chapter unless such person is either a United States citizen or an alien with legal authorization from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service." Id.

The lease submitted with your driver’s license application was executed on September 19, 2011. Anyone who is here legally and becomes a resident must obtain a driver’s license in Georgia within thirty (30) days. O.C.G.A. 40-5-20.

While the United States Supreme Court has recognized a fundamental right to interstate travel, this right has never included a fundamental right to drive. Miller v. Reed, 176 F.3d 1202, 1206 (9th Cir. 1999); Dixon v. Love, 431 U.S. 105, 112-116 (1977). Similarly, the Georgia Supreme Court has held that “the right to operate a motor vehicle upon the public highways of this state is not a vested right, but is merely a qualified right which can be exercised by obtaining a license from the state.” Johnston v. State, 236 Ga. 370 (1976). “[I]n Georgia, a driver’s license is not an absolute right but rather a privilege that may be revoked for cause. The right to continue the operation and to keep the license to drive is dependent upon the manner in which the licensee exercises this right. The right is not absolute, but is a privilege. While it cannot be suspended or revoked without reason, it can be constitutionally revoked or suspended for any cause having to do with public safety.” Nolen v. State, 218 Ga. App. 819, 820 (1995). Moreover, the Georgia Supreme Court explicitly rejected the argument that the driver’s license requirement established in O.C.G.A. §40-5-20 was not unconstitutional when applied to “a common law freeman exercising his right to travel on public ways.” Lebrun v. State, 255 Ga. 406 (1986).

With regard to your concerns about the requirement for collecting your social security number, the DDS has not compelled you to obtain a social security number in violation of your religious beliefs. Rather, you presented your card voluntarily in conjunction with your application for a Georgia driver’s license. This requirement is based upon federal laws enacted by Congress to facilitate the collection of child support payments from non-custodial parents and in the interest of homeland security. 42 U.S.C. §666(a)(13)(A); 49 U.S.C. §30301 note; 6 C.F.R. §37.01, et seq.
Federal law now requires all states to collect social security numbers when issuing such credentials. Id. The only exception to the requirement is for individuals who are not eligible for issuance of a social security number because they are aliens not authorized to work in the United States. O.C.G.A. §19-11-9.1(a.1)(1); 6 C.F.R. §37.11(e)(3).

We hope that this information is responsive to your inquiry, and we look forward to serving your licensing needs once the issue in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is resolved. Please note that you are eligible for issuance of a Georgia identification card under O.C.G.A. §40-5-100, et seq., if you need state-issued documentation of your identity in the meantime. I can be reached at (678) 413-8765 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

Jennifer Ammons
General Counsel
“The statute creates a rebuttable presumption of residency for anyone who meets the following criteria: .... however no such person shall be considered a resident for purposes of this chapter unless such person is either a United States citizen or an alien with legal authorization from the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.”

Jennifer Ammons, General Counsel, Georgia Department of Driver Services
Statutes

- Statutes do NOT apply to State citizens
- I cannot delegate authority to regulate you
- Statutes are for US citizens (government employees)
There have always been 2 classes of citizens:

“"The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens in the several States."” US Constitution Article 4, Section 2, Clause 1

“But the stranger that dwelleth among you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt;...” Leviticus 19:34

“"Love ye therefore the stranger; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt."” Deuteronomy 10:19

We call ourselves Christian????
“The rights of sovereignty extend to all persons and things, not privileged that are within the territory. They extend to all strangers resident therein; not only to those who are naturalized, and to those who are domiciled therein, having taken up their abode with the intention of permanent residence, but also to those whose residence is transitory. All strangers are under the protection of the sovereign while they are within his territory and owe a temporary allegiance in return for that protection.” Carlisle v United States 83 U.S. 147, 154 (1873)
Strangers have a Social Security/Social Insurance Number

“19 ¶Thou shalt not lend upon usury to thy brother; usury of money, usury of victuals, usury of any thing that is lent upon usury: 20 Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury:”
Deuteronomy 23:19-20

The bankster thieves will not loan their so-called money, unless you can prove you are a “resident”.
US Citizen

- Does not have access to first 8 amendments against powers of federal government
- No right to trial by jury
- No right to keep and bear arms
- No right to face accuser
- No right to give evidence against state citizens
- No right to common law indictment (Information ONLY)
- Mandatory military service
- Mandatory taxes
- May vote but it doesn’t mean anything – no political power
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Citizenship vs Nationality

- You can be a national without being a citizen.
- Citizenship is part of a political community.
Citizenship vs Nationality

DO NOT SIGN APPLICATION UNTIL REQUESTED TO DO SO BY PERSON ADMINISTERING OATH.

I declare under penalty of perjury all of the following: 1) I am a citizen or non-citizen national of the United States and have not, since acquiring U.S. citizenship or nationality, performed any of the acts listed under “Acts or Conditions” on the reverse side of this application (unless explanatory statement is attached); 2) the statements made on the application are true and correct; 3) I have not knowingly and willfully made false statements or included false documents in support of this application; 4) the photograph submitted with this application is a genuine, current, photograph of me; and 5) I have read and understood the warning on page two of the instructions to the application form.

Applicant’s Signature - age 16 and older

Father’s/Legal Guardian’s Signature (if identifying minor)

Mother’s/Legal Guardian’s Signature (if identifying minor)

Identifying Documents - Applicant or Father (if identifying minor)

[ ] Driver’s License [ ] Passport [ ] Military [ ] Other

Issue Date

Expiration Date

Place of Issue

Name

ID No.

Identifying Documents - Mother (if identifying minor)

[ ] Driver’s License [ ] Passport [ ] Military [ ] Other

Issue Date

Expiration Date

Place of Issue

Name

ID No.
PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

AUTHORITIES: Collection of the information solicited on this form is authorized by Titles 8, 22, and 26 of the United States Code, or not codified, including specifically 22 U.S.C. 211a et seq.; 26 U.S.C. 6039E, Section 236 of the Admiral James E. Clark, Jr. Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001; Executive Order 11295 (August 5, 1966); and other similar authorities.

PURPOSE: The primary purpose for soliciting the information is to establish citizenship, identity, and enrollment in the Passport System.

ROUTINE USES: The information solicited on this form may be made available as a routine use to other government agencies in adjudicating passport applications and requests for related services, and for law enforcement purposes. The information may be made available to foreign government agencies to fulfill passport obligations under the Passport Privileges and Immunities Act, U.S.C. 2287. The information may also be provided to foreign government agencies, international organizations, and the domestic public and private organizations to investigate, prosecute, or otherwise address potential violations of law or to further the protection of U.S. citizens and non-citizen nationals abroad. The information may be made available to designated by the U.S. embassies and consulates. For a more detailed listing of the routine uses to which the information will be subjected, see the Prefatory Statement of Routine Uses and the listing of routine users set forth in the system description, Passport Records (State-05) and Passport Records (State-26) published in the Federal Register.

CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO PROVIDE INFORMATION: With the exception of your Social Security number (discussed in the statement on Instruction Page 3), you are not legally required to provide the information requested on this form. Failure to provide this information may result in Passport Services’ refusal to accept your application or result in the denial of a U.S. passport.
“It is however, true that in all common-law countries it has always and consistently been held that the wife and minor children take the nationality of the husband and father. That is common-law doctrine.” In Re Page 12 F (2d) 135.

- Immigration laws ONLY apply to US citizens
- If I am joined in holy matrimony with a girl from Russia, she becomes an American National
“In doing this I shall have occasion incidentally to evince how true it is, that states and governments were made for man; and at the same time how his creatures and servants at first deceived, next vilified, and at last oppressed their master and maker. Let a state be considered as subordinate to the people and everything else be subordinate to the state.” Chisolm v Georgia 2 Dall. 440
"The individual, unlike the corporation, cannot be taxed for the mere privilege of existing. The corporation is an artificial entity which owes its existence and charter powers to the state; but the individuals' rights to live and own property are natural rights for the enjoyment of which an excise cannot be imposed."

Redfield v. Fisher, 292 P. 813, 135 Or. 180, 294 P.461, 73 A.L.R. 721 (1931)
“25 And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, Is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned? 26 When the centurion heard that he went and told the chief Captain; saying, Take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman. 27 Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? He said, yea. 28 And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, but I was free born. 29 Then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him; and the chief captain was also afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him.” Acts 22: 25-29
In order for a member of the Sovereignty to become subject to regulation in any way, they MUST agree to it.

As with any contract, it must be knowing, willing, and intentional.
"Governments descend to the level of a mere private corporation, and take on the characteristics of a mere private citizen...where private corporate commercial paper [Federal Reserve Notes] and securities [checks] is concerned . .... For purposes of suit, such corporations and individuals are regarded as entities entirely separate from government.” Clearfield Trust Co. v. United States 318 U.S. 363 (1943)

That is why you CANNOT pay their extortion
A “penal action” is an action on a penal statute; an action for recovery of penalty given by statute. *McNeely v. City of Natchez*, 114 So. 484, 487; 148 Miss. 268.

Where an action is founded entirely upon a statue, and the only object of it is to recover a penalty or forfeiture, such action is a “penal action.” *Gawthrop v. Fairmont Coal Co.*, 81 S.E. 560, 561; 74 S.Va. 39.
The words “penal” and “penalty” in their strict and primary sense denote a punishment, whether corporal or pecuniary, imposed and enforced by the state for a crime or offense against its laws. The noun penalty is defined forfeiture or to be forfeited for noncompliance with an agreement. The words forfeit and penalty are substantially synonymous. Missouri, K. & T. Ry. Co. v. Dewey Portland Cement Co., 242 P. 257, 259, 113 Okla. 142.

A “penal action” is one founded entirely on statute and brought with the sole object of recovering a penalty or forfeiture imposed as punishment for specific offense, while “remedial action: is one brought to obtain compensation or indemnity. Smith Engineering Works v. Custer, 151 P2d 404, 407, 194 Okl. 318.
A “penal action” is a civil suit brought for the recovery of a statutory forfeiture when inflicted as punishment for an offense against the public. Such actions are “civil actions,“ on the one hand closely related to criminal prosecutions and on the other to actions for private injuries in which the party aggrieved may, by statute, recover punitive damages. State ex rel. McNamee v. Stobie, 92 SW 191, 212, 194 Mo. 14
Whenever [the Uniform Commercial Code] creates a "presumption" with respect to a fact, or provides that a fact is "presumed," the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact unless and until evidence is introduced that supports a finding of its nonexistence.” UCC § 1-206 Presumptions [emphasis added]
“(a) In an action with respect to an instrument, the authenticity of, and authority to make, each signature on the instrument are admitted unless specifically denied in the pleadings. If the validity of a signature is denied in the pleadings, the burden of establishing validity is on the person claiming validity, but the signature is presumed to be authentic and authorized unless the action is to enforce the liability of the purported signer and the signer is dead or incompetent at the time of trial of the issue of validity of the signature.” Uniform Commercial Code § 3.308 Proof of Signatures and Status as Holder in Due Course [emphasis added]
“The following rules apply in an action on a certificated security against the issuer:

(1) Unless specifically denied in the pleadings, each signature on a security certificate or in a necessary indorsement is admitted.

(2) If the effectiveness of a signature is put in issue, the burden of establishing effectiveness is on the party claiming under the signature, but the signature is presumed to be genuine or authorized.” Uniform Commercial Code § 8.114 Evidentiary Rules Concerning Certificated Securities [emphasis added]
"But individuals, when acting as representatives of a collective group, cannot be said to be exercising their personal rights and duties, nor be entitled to their purely personal privileges. Rather they assume the rights, duties and privileges of the artificial entity or association of which they are agents or officers and they are bound by its obligations." *Brasswell v. United States* 487 U.S. 99 (1988) quoting, *United States v. White* 322 U.S. 694 (1944).
“He [the prisoner] has as a consequence of his crime, not only forfeited his liberty but all his personal rights except those which the law in its humanity affords him. He is for the time being a slave of the state.” 62 Va. (21 Gratt.) 790, 796 (1871)

“If a man be found stealing any of his brethren of the children of Israel, and maketh merchandise of him, or selleth him; then that thief shall die; and thou shalt put evil away from among you.”
Deuteronomy 24:7
"The state citizen is immune from any and all government attacks and procedure, absent contract." see, Dred Scott vs. Sanford, 60 U.S. (19 How.) 393 or as the Supreme Court has stated clearly, “...every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent.”

CRUDEN vs. NEALE, 2 N.C. 338 2 S.E. 70
"Taxpayers are not [de jure] State Citizens."
Belmont v. Town of Gulfport, 122 So. 10.
"State citizens are the only ones living under free government, whose rights are incapable of impairment by legislation or judicial decision." Twining v. New Jersey, 211 U.S. 97, 1908

"State Citizenship is a vested substantial property right, and the State has no power to divest or impair these rights." Favot v. Kingsbury, (1929) 98 Cal. App. 284, 276 P. 1083
State Citizens

“The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government.” City of Dallas v Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944
December 10, 1985

Ralph Milstead
Director
Department of Public Safety
State of Arizona
2310 North 20th Avenue
P.O. Box 6638
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

Dear Director Milstead:

It has come to my attention that numerous individuals in our state have rescinded all of their contracts with the United States federal government, the State of Arizona, and each of its political subdivisions, establishing themselves as freemen under the organic national Constitution of the Republic of the United States of America. Consequently, they may be driving without auto registration, driver's license, or any other evidence of contract.

Because many law enforcement personnel may be unaware of the contractual nature of auto registration and driver's licenses, it is conceivable that this situation may lead to confrontation between these individuals and law enforcement personnel.

I urge you to inform yourself and your personnel about this matter as soon as possible. If you would like to be briefed by someone knowledgeable on this subject, please contact me.

In the meantime, inasmuch as this procedure is entirely appropriate when properly carried out, I would like to be personally notified of every such instance of confrontation in order that the persons involved and the public officials involved may be apprised of the correct procedure and the appropriateness of their actions on the part of each concerned.

My office phone is 255-5261 and I am requesting to be notified of the names and incidents along with addresses and phone numbers of participants of any such confrontations arising from the exercise of a person's freeman status in order to evaluate the outcome of properly rescinded contracts.

Sincerely,

Wayne Stump
State Senator
December 10, 1985

Ralph Milstead
Director
Department of Public Safety
State of Arizona
2310 North 20th Avenue
P.O. Box 6638
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

Dear Director Milstead:

It has come to my attention that numerous individuals in our state have rescinded all of their contracts with the United States federal government, the State of Arizona, and each of its political subdivisions, establishing themselves as freemen under the organic national Constitution of the Republic of the United States of America. Consequently, they may be driving without auto registration, driver's license, or any other evidence of contract.

Because many law enforcement personnel may be unaware of the contractual nature of auto registration and driver's licenses, it is conceivable that this situation may lead to confrontation between these individuals and law enforcement personnel.

I urge you to inform yourself and your personnel about this matter as soon as possible. If you would like to be briefed by someone knowledgeable on this subject, please contact me.

In the meantime, inasmuch as this procedure is entirely appropriate when properly carried out, I would like to be personally notified of every such instance of confrontation in order that the persons involved and the public officials involved may be apprised of the correct procedure and the appropriateness of their actions on the part of each concerned.

My office phone is 255-5261 and I am requesting to be notified of the names and incidents along with addresses and phone numbers of participants of any such confrontations arising from the exercise of a person's freeman status in order to evaluate the outcome of properly rescinded contracts.

Sincerely,
"State Citizenship is a vested substantial property right, and the State has no power to divest or impair these rights." Favot v. Kingsbury, (1929) 98 Cal. App. 284, 276 P. 1083.
How can you lose Sovereignty?

- Ignorance of the law is no excuse
- Any time you get anything from the government, it is an implied contract and brings you into their jurisdiction.
Any time you REGISTER for anything, or make APPLICATION for anything from the government you are;

- Giving them a power of attorney to make legal determinations for you
- And represent you
- Making them “competent” in your affairs
- Telling them that you are a “person”.
- Converting yourself into a slave.
All statutes are written very carefully, and do not apply to members of the Sovereignty.

Members of Congress or Legislatures CANNOT write their own statutes

99% of the time the government is technically correct.
How can you lose Sovereignty?

- It is not up to the government to tell you that you are a member of the Sovereignty.
- The government lawyers make up a statute that properly applies to those entities that they have jurisdiction over.
- The burden is on us to assert our Sovereignty.
- Do you know who you are?
- Are you going to let some bureaucrat tell you who you are?
How can you lose Sovereignty?

- If a member of the Sovereignty gets unknowingly involved in something that operates as a contract by which he might lose his sovereignty, he has made a MISTAKE OF LAW AND FACT.
The Courts have ruled that the government is NOT the protector of the constitution.

If the government is not the protector of the constitution, then who is?
How can you lose Sovereignty?

- It is the people who are supposed to be protecting the constitution.
- How do We the People protect the constitution?
- We protect the constitution by challenging what the government does
  - through the courts
  - administratively
How can you lose Sovereignty?

- The burden is on YOU, (the Sovereigns) to know and understand the law and to assert their sovereignty.
How can you regain Sovereignty?

- All contracts MUST be entered into knowingly, willingly, and intentionally.
None of the contracts entered into with the government by which you might lose your sovereignty are willing, intentional, or knowing.
How can you regain Sovereignty?

- The Sovereignty of the people is unalienable and imprescriptible.
In order to regain your sovereignty, you must ASSERT your SOVEREIGNTY.

When you assert your Sovereignty you build a case with evidence you can use in Court at a future date should you need to do so.

Send all documents by Registered mail with a return receipt if possible.

See the D.I.Y. Estoppel Certificates video
How can you regain Sovereignty?

- The government liars (attorneys) may turn it over to a bureaucrat who may also respond off point.
- If the government were to admit that you were right, they would be admitting to TREASON, EXTORTION, GENOCIDE, and other indictable offenses.
- The government liars (attorneys) will probably not respond at all.
In order to be a true Sovereign, you MUST:

- be self reliant, you must not only talk the talk, you MUST walk the walk!
- be knowledgeable about the law and how it works.
- be prepared to take the initiative in Court if necessary.
- Make it known in no uncertain terms that you are all of the above.
Do You know who you Are?

- It is all about slavery
- It is NOT about race
- A “US citizen” or a “citizen of Canada” or a “citizen of Australia” is a slave.
- Either you are the King, or you are a slave, and there is nothing in between.
- If you participate in their “color of law” statutes, then you have agreed to be their slave.
- If you need some bureaucrat to explain the law to you, then you are incompetent and a slave
- It is ONLY involuntary servitude (slavery) that is not lawful
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Do you know who you are?

- "If a nation expects to be ignorant & free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was & never will be” Thomas Jefferson
Do you know who you are?

- Nobody said it would be easy, but it IS POSSIBLE.
"If Tyranny and Oppression come to this land, it will be in the guise of fighting a foreign enemy."
James Madison
Do you know who you are?

- What’s the alternative?