

# **THE GREATEST STORY NEVER TOLD**

**Until Now!**

**Written by Albert Lynn Barcroft**

**Edited by His Many Friends and Fellow Americans**

COMMON LAW COPYRIGHT OCTOBER, 1999

United States Postal Copyright February, 2000

All Rights Reserved

**PREFACE**

The book you are about to read is a compilation and result of 15 years of hard study, work, failures, and successes that I have personally experienced in my own fight to regain the birthright left to me by my forefathers. Those forefathers gave their property, standing in the community, and even their lives in order to leave to me those freedoms which had never before existed for the common man on this earth. Most of them suffered hardships that we today could not even imagine, and they did it all so that their children and posterity could have freedom forevermore. The gift they left us is the most wonderful and valuable gift ever given by Man; and, I have no doubt that it was inspired and coordinated by God himself. This book is dedicated to those brave men who gave all they had on this earth in order to leave the gift of freedom to their descendants. Although most of their descendants no longer even realize the great gift left to them, the sacrifices made by those heroes will forever be enshrined in the Freedom's Hall Of Fame as the framers of the most wonderful system of government ever devised on this earth. To those men go all the praise and credit for whatever freedom has existed, or still exists today! It is my full intention to honor those men in my actions and in these writings.

Among other things, this book will show you the secrets used by many Americans even today to avoid the traps of the Federal Government which have placed millions of Americans into a state of servitude to the United States and all of its sister companies and coparties. The book will show you in detail how to know if you are eligible to be a sovereign with no income taxes, and few, if any, property taxes (many of you are!). It will show you how to establish a bank account right in your hometown bank that the IRS cannot even look at, much less seize. It will show you how to stop being told (and punished if you don't listen and abide by the Code and regulations) whether or not to wear a seatbelt or stop at a stop sign in the middle of nowhere with no one else around. It will show you how to tell the IRS to 'go away', and then make them do it. If you qualify, this book will change your life so dramatically that you won't recognize yourself, either physically or spiritually, within six months after you have employed the secrets contained herein.

I have not used a social security number or paid any income taxes since 1987, when I started to learn the truth about my country and my Rights. I have recently learned that I have never even had a social security number. I have not paid a traffic ticket in almost thirty years (and I've had many issued), and I have never even seen the inside of a jail. At first, I fully expected to be jailed and disgraced,

but I was so fed up with the system that I frankly didn't care. I decided that if they could do the horrible things to me which they had done, they might as well pay for my room and board while they were doing it. To my great surprise, not only did I not go to jail, I wasn't even contacted by mail for over two years after I stopped filing the IRS returns. During that time I gathered an immense amount of information about the 'system' and how it works. I learned how to challenge any claims which the IRS might make against me, and how to defend against any criminal accusations aimed at me. The result was that, when they finally did come after me, I was ready and I won time and again. For several years [the early 1990's until the early 2000's), the IRS virtually abandoned the use of criminal prosecutions in its attempt to force tax compliance; however, in the last few years, they have re-doubled their frontal attack by the filing of criminal charges against any who fight them [unless the party resisting has his defense based upon solid ground]. The courts favor the IRS in a manner which could never be referred to as justice, and the jury pools are tainted from the outset. The few cases where a true American does prevail, the courts have found a very effective way of keeping the results from the public by the simple use of a ploy called a 'gag order'. This order forbids any information about a case from being released for public consumption, and forbids any of the parties or attorneys from even talking about it. It was intended for use only during a trial to maintain jury purity; but, like so many other things which started with good direction, this government found a way to prostitute the integrity of such an order, and use it to keep silent forever anything which might be detrimental to the assumed power of the government if it became public knowledge. That is precisely why you probably currently believe that the government wins every tax case, and that anyone who is not paying the income tax will surely wind up in prison.

In actions such as the unethical [if not illegal] use of the gag rule by Federal courts, real hope can be found by those people who are fighting the fight for truth, justice, and the American Way. It is very heartening to know that we have been able to push this de facto government into a position where it is forced to twist the law in order to maintain its position. This action alone tells us that the persons responsible for keeping this government in place know that they cannot be truthful and forthcoming with the American People and hope to maintain their power. It also points out that these leeches of society will do anything to keep their power over the people. They will lie, cheat, steal, and even kill to maintain the people's image of their power. Anytime that they are successful in terrorizing or intimidating an American, it will be plastered on the front page of every newspaper in the country,

and it will be the lead story on the TV newscasts. But when an American wins a battle, it is sealed off from the public like a contagious disease.

Recently, at a New Year's Eve party, a few of my friends started asking questions about my beliefs on paying taxes, being free, and America. After a couple of hours of discussions, one of my friends looked at me and said, "You know, Al, I really resent you. I go out here and work hard everyday, and I pay my fair share out of my earnings. You make more money than I do, and you don't pay anything, much less your fair share." This really set me back for a second. I never even thought about any of my friends resenting the fact that I was standing up to this tyrannical trust manifesting itself as the de facto government. After a few seconds of actually feeling shame, I started getting angry. How dare someone question my sacrifices! I looked this friend directly in the eye, and, with all the others at the party in dead silence, I said, "Steve, I wish you hadn't said that. I've let you off the hook for a long time, but now you've made this personal between us. My forefathers, just like yours, gave a lot to provide freedom for themselves and their descendants. My Great Great Great Great Great Grandfather, Samuel Huntington, signed the Declaration of Independence. He knew when he did that he would probably suffer great hardships as a result. He still followed his beliefs without concern for his own instant security, favoring instead long-term freedom for himself and his offspring. All of the other signers of the Declaration of Independence knew the extreme danger they placed themselves in with their signature and support, but all signed it anyway, and almost every one was either killed or had his property seized and died broke as a result of that signature. To those men, the most important thing a man could do was to deliver freedom to himself and his offspring as a birthright. They even warned us that eternal vigilance was the only way we could maintain this wonderful gift. And what have we done with this gift? We have apathetically given it away without so much as a whimper in the night, without a fight; and, basically to the same people that our forefathers threw out of control. Trying to fight to regain little parts of that once all-encompassing freedom is really very difficult today, because of people like you, Steve, who fall down and pay homage without question to this monster that would control everything. And why do you do that, Steve? Because you are getting 'Farm subsidies' and other 'handouts' from the system which would not be available if you didn't follow their every instruction without question. So tell me, Steve, when are you going to start doing "your fair share" toward maintaining this great country that your forefathers left you? I hope it's soon, because, frankly, the load is getting pretty heavy for

me to carry without a little help.” Needless to say, our conversation ended fairly abruptly, and we haven’t had occasion to talk since.

I point out this encounter to make the point that, even though I don’t pay income taxes (and several other taxes), I don’t have a free ride either. If you decide to follow the information given in this book to your own freedom, you will find that many of your friends will become very jealous of you. It will be particularly noticeable with those who would love to do exactly what you are doing, but they just don’t have the guts. They can read and understand that they are really not required to do the distasteful things that they do as ‘duties’ under this government; but deep down, in their hearts, they just know that they will ‘go to jail’ if they don’t follow the instructions laid out for them. The really sad thing is that they are already in prison of the worst kind – self-imposed. They can never escape it, because this government has stolen their minds and their free will, and made cowards out of them; and it would take the courage of their forefathers to seize back control. I am sorry to report that few still have that courage. But for those who do stand up and say, “I want what is mine, and I want to be free”, the rewards are so great that I cannot start to make you understand them. But you will pay ‘your fair share’. You will pay it in having to explain a thousand times over why Americans and citizens of the United States are different, and how our forefathers never intended that some ‘federal monster’ would again take over and rule our lives. You will pay it when you have to fight for the little things that the ‘slaves’(citizens of the United States) are given freely. But you will reap the rewards when you lay down at night knowing that you are a free Man, and that no king or government can lay claim to your body, soul, or property, because you are the ‘sovereign’, exactly as God and your forefathers intended that you should be. When you wake up and look at yourself in the mirror you can be proud of the reflection of a FREE MAN; and then, and only then, you will know why your forefathers were willing to give everything so that you and your children could enjoy this thing called FREEDOM!!

This book can be the first step in regaining your individual freedom. It is intended to give you a true and factual step-by-step account of where you are and how you got there. More important, it will give you the understanding needed to repair the damage that it has taken you a lifetime to suffer. Read this book like an instruction guide, check it for accuracy, but do not discount it just because it may seem ludicrous to you right now. If you fully research the book and its contentions, you will

find that what you have always believed to be true is, in fact, that which is truly ludicrous. You will also discover secrets, and how to use them, that only a precious few have heretofore enjoyed the benefits of. Most important, the principals and ideas contained in this book are true, factual, and usable. If employed properly, they are completely lawful, and you can use them with total confidence.

I CHALLENGE ANYONE TO DISPROVE ANY OF THE BASE CONTENTIONS, FACTS, OR CONCLUSIONS GIVEN IN THIS BOOK! However, this book is not intended as legal advice, and its contents are offered only as a learning tool. You must each decide your own fate and position in this world based upon the facts which you accumulate. It is my wish and hope that this book gives you aid in that process.

## **CHAPTER 1 – CITIZENSHIP OR SOVEREIGNTY?**

When most people who consider themselves Americans are asked about their citizenship, they realize, maybe for the first time, that they have never given the issue much thought. Oh sure, they

all know that they are citizens of the United States; and, if pushed, most also believe themselves to be Americans. But precious few understand what citizenship really is, much less what sovereignty is. Most think that it is bestowed upon them without any duties or responsibilities attached [except paying taxes], and that nothing they do can affect their status as an individual Man or Woman with Rights left for them by their forefathers, and guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America. If that's what you believe, hold on to your boots, because the Earth is going to shake under your feet. All of the assumptions that you have made concerning your citizenship or standing are going to be proven totally wrong, not by words, but by proof. The following facts are presented to you as historically correct evidence, and all will be supported by unquestionable evidence. Nothing in this evaluation is intended to be disrespectful or degrading (and certainly not racist) toward any group of people; however, in order to know and understand the truth about your heritage and your birthright, you must first understand how you got into the position that you currently occupy. So, we will start at the beginning, and follow the chain of events that has led us to the place where we stand today. Please keep an open mind until you have examined the facts without historical revision.

The united States of America actually came into being on July 4, 1776, with the signing of the 'Declaration of Independence', when the states declared :

*“That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be, Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved”.*

The Articles of Confederation, agreed to in 1777 and ratified in 1781, created the Union of the States, and delegated a portion of their sovereignty to this new Confederacy or Union . This confederation declared that:

*“And that the Articles thereof shall be inviolably observed by the States we respectively represent, **and that the Union shall be perpetual.**”(emphasis added)*

This Confederacy further declared in Article I:

*“The Stile of this Confederacy shall be **"The United States of America"**”.*

The 13 Colonies declared themselves to be “*Free and Independent States*”; and the People who created these “*Free and Independent States*” would likewise, of necessity, have been free and independent, otherwise, they would not have had the authority to enter into such an agreement and to have created a free and independent State. The British Crown, which had previously claimed the right of sovereignty over the 13 Colonies and its people, recognized that the independence and freedom of these States and the People thereof with the Paris Treaty of Peace of 1783, in the following quote from that document:

“His Brittanic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz., New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, to be free sovereign and independent states, that he treats with them as such, and for himself, his heirs, and successors, relinquishes all claims to the government, propriety, and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof.”

This passage represents an acknowledgement from the most powerful earthly sovereign of that time, King George III of England, that the *thirteen colonies/states* of the American Union of “The United States of America” were sovereigns of equal power with the king. Under the terms of their government [the Articles of Confederation, and later the Constitution for “The United States of America”], that sovereignty was extended from ‘*the people*’ of those colonies/states, meaning that those *people* were the sovereigns. Also, for future reference, please note that the *thirteen colonies* are listed by name [a point which will become evident as to its importance later in the book].

In order to create a more perfect Union, the People of “The United States of America” ordained and established the Constitution for “The United States of America”, creating a Union government and delegating additional portion of its sovereignty to the United States. This Constitution, in Article IV Section 4, guarantees to every State in this Union a Republican form of Government. To understand the nature of the overall agreement to join together in a Union, we must first understand what a Republic is. **Black’s Law Dictionary** (hereinafter ‘**Black’s**’) defines ‘Republic’ as:

“A commonwealth; that form of government in which the administration of affairs is open to all of the citizens. In another sense, it signifies the state, independently of its form of government.” It further defines ‘Republican government’ as, “A government in the republican form; a government of the people; a government by representatives chosen by the people.”

In other words, a republic is a government of which the People are the source and origin; and in which the People own and control everything, and the government serves at the convenience and by



the permission of the People that it governs. Hence the term ‘public servant’ is used when referring to the elected officials. Who among you believes that today’s politicians truly fit the meaning of ‘public servants’?

Understanding the true meaning of Republic, we can now see how America was formed. The sovereign people of each individual colony of the *Thirteen Colonies* actually owned everything. Remember, these people were rebelling from a repressive government in which the King owned everything, and their main intent was to become the ‘sovereign’, a position always held by the King [the Royal Family in the case of England] or ruler in previous governments. **Black’s** defines ‘sovereign’ as, “A person, body, or state in which independent and supreme authority is vested; a chief ruler with supreme power; a king or other ruler in a monarchy.” It was the main intent of these first Americans to keep for themselves and their posterity the things which had previously belonged to the King [or the Royal Family], and those things were vested in the king’s sovereignty. And that is exactly what they did. The individual states retained the right to determine who the free inhabitants of the states would be, except that paupers, vagabonds and fugitives from justice would not be included [a good reason why you should never go into court and claim *in forma pauperis* to keep from paying the court’s fees]. You must realize that, in order to be a colony sovereign in the 13 original Colonies (hereinafter also referred to as “American”), first, you had to be of the white race of people, second you had to be an adult male of 21 years or older, and third, in most states you had to be a land owner. The naming of these qualifications is not intended to insult the female sex or any other race, but it is necessary to understand the development of the sovereignty which may be available to you.

Understanding what a Republic and an American is, we can now further understand how America was formed, and where the real power was bestowed. The American owned everything, and he intended to keep it that way. He delegated to his Colony (or hereinafter also “state”) the power and jurisdiction to perform certain functions, all common law in nature. He kept most of the real power for himself and his posterity. He basically delegated to the state the jurisdiction to administer over him in a few, very limited, areas, but he maintained the bulk of the power for himself. He realized that in order to live in a society with other people, certain laws would have to be passed and maintained for the protection of the individual rights of the free inhabitant or sovereign. At the same

time, he had no intention of giving up his own personal freedoms. So he created a system whereby jurisdiction over him by the state could be attained only if he first broke certain laws that were duly established, all under the ‘Common Law’. Specifically, he had to intentionally damage the Life, Liberty or Property of one of his peers for the state to gain jurisdiction over him. Thus, the power that is currently assumed by the government over almost every phase of our lives was never given to the government over the American. So the question that needs to be answered is, “How did the Federal and State governments get the virtually unquestioned power over all of the people who now consider themselves to be citizens of the United States?” That is the question that you will soon know the answer to.

To fully understand the position that most of you are currently in, you must also understand the meaning of jurisdiction. **Black’s** defines ‘jurisdiction’ as, “A term of comprehensive import embracing every kind of judicial action.... It is the power of the court to decide a matter in controversy and presupposes the existence of a duly constituted court with control over the subject matter and the parties...” In other words, for jurisdiction to be claimed, control over both the subject matter at issue ( *i.e.* the crime or damage in dispute), and the parties that are involved in the dispute is necessary. As you will learn later, jurisdiction is a key factor in your rights, and the duties and requirements placed upon you by the government, or the trust acting as the *de facto* government.

Now that you have a basic knowledge of a few key terms, we can explore how we got where we are today. First, remember that all power in our Republic was passed from the sovereign People to the state. The American was the ‘sovereign’. All public property, and all power and authority, belonged to, and was owned by, him. He passed on part of that power to the state so that society as a whole could be protected. However, it is impossible to give away all of your power, because in so doing, you would negate any portion that you gave away, as there would be no power left to enforce the action taken by you. Think of a company in which the President hired a person and gave him full authority over all operations within the company. The President would still maintain more power than his new employee, because if he could not support his hiring with power, his new employee could not carry out his mandate in the face of challenge. So a good rule of thumb is that you must always maintain more power than anyone who acts under your authority. This rule applies to the government as well. The state receives all of its power and authority from the American; therefore,

it must remain secondary in power to that American. The people of the Thirteen Colonies became the original Americans upon the forming of the Union, also known as “the sovereign America People”; and the posterity of those original Americans make up the sovereignty and form the sovereign American People as they exist today. If you are not of the posterity of one of these people, then you are not an American, and you cannot be one of the sovereign American People.

Following the foregoing principals, we can easily understand how our forefathers established this government. First, the American bestowed upon the state certain limited powers and limited jurisdiction. Within those powers was the ability to make and enforce whatever laws, treaties, and contracts that were necessary to the welfare of the society for which it was established, as long as the subject matter was that for which jurisdiction was given. The state, fearing more powerful nations (such as England, France, Spain, etc.) formed a union with the other 12 independent states under which a common defense pact was agreed to. Within the Union, the 13 member Republics (hereinafter “states”) also agreed that they wanted to carry on free trade between themselves, that they would have a common currency, a postal department that would serve them all, and a means by which problems between them could be adjudicated without the need of war. The states realized that, as distasteful as it was to them (remember, they had just come out from under a totalitarian government), some form of ‘federal government’ would have to be established to oversee these functions, and to provide for the common defense. However, they were all sure that they didn’t want this new ‘monster’ in their own state, so they set aside a 10 mile square of land forevermore to serve as the ‘Seat of Government’. That area is known as Washington, D.C. This created “United States” was delegated its authority from the sovereign independent states, known also as the several States of the Union, and had no sovereign authority other than that which was delegated by these independent sovereign States. Therefore, the idea of making Washington, D.C. a state of the Union is completely ludicrous, and can never occur since the “United States” or District of Columbia has no sovereignty to delegate other than that given by the several States. The idea is advanced only by ignorant people who do not understand the foundation of America, or criminals who want to undermine the Republic. So the Union was formed by the respective independent states, under authority delegated by the Americans. Therefore, the same rule must apply - the states individually and collectively maintained more power than the new Federal Government (hereinafter “United States”).

The powers and authority delegated to the United States were clearly delineated and defined, but in a very short period of time, it became evident that this Confederacy or Union was inoperable because of its limited authority; so, the States set about to expand this delegated authority with specific limitations placed upon this additional delegation of authority of the United States. Eight years after its formation, in 1781, “The United States of America” had a list of written authority and limitation delegated upon it by the independent States in 1789 through a document known as **The Constitution for “The United States of America”** (hereinafter ‘Constitution’). Within the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution, every power given to the United States is clearly spelled out, and the limitations are exact. The Constitution has been held to be both a contract and the Supreme Law of the land by the Supreme Court. The contract is actually between the States, on behalf of the Americans, and the United States, and it is totally binding and all-powerful. The wording of the Constitution leaves no room for misunderstanding. For example, at Article IV, Section 4, it states, “The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion, and upon Application of the Legislature, or the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence.” From this Article, it is clear that each State is a Republic even after the Union was formed. Since the word Republic means a government ‘of and for the people’ in which everything is owned and controlled by the people, it becomes clear that nothing could be superior to that government except the people. Therefore, the United States could not be more powerful than the several States, and that is guaranteed in the Constitution. In Article X of the Amendments (The Bill of Rights), it states, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Remember, the Constitution is in full effect today as always since its inception. Yet today, our alleged states (STATES) clearly take their orders from the United States (UNITED STATES), and they continually bow to the presumed authority of the UNITED STATES. So how did this ‘supremacy’ of the Federal Government happen? That, too, you will understand shortly.

We will now look at exactly what happened in the forming of the United States. First, the party with all the power (the American) passed on a portion of his power to the state. Then the state passed on

a portion of its power to the United States. If we made a chart showing the power structure, it would look something like this:

American – First with unlimited power

sovereign -Source of all power

state - Second with limited power delegated by the People

Derives its power directly from American

United States – Limited power delegated by states

Derives its power from the states

As you can see from this chart, all power flows from the American. This chart can also be used to understand the Rights protected by the Constitution. The Constitution is a contract which involves these three levels of parties. It is actually granted by the States with the permission of the Americans, and it clearly limited the power of the United States, while reserving and guaranteeing massive Rights for the Americans. Most important to remember is that only these three parties are included in the Constitution. This fact will become very important to you as we follow the progression of the power grab by the United States of the next 200 years. Through it all, you must remember that the Constitution has remained in full force for the American, and it has actually changed very little in its content over the span of time since its signing.

Now that we understand how the United States was formed, let's follow through to see how the structure has changed over the last 220 years. For the first 80 or so years, everything remained pretty much the same as it started. The Americans of the time understood their power, and they knew that the United States was there to serve them. The jurisdiction that the United States had over the Americans arose only upon the breaking of one of the constitutionally passed laws under which a American granted jurisdiction to the State or to the United States in order that those laws might be enforced for the overall good of the society. Those laws all required that actual damage to another party or his property be done by the offending party, with intent, before any jurisdiction over the American was bestowed. That's right, with intent. Not a single crime could be committed accidentally. Without intent, the matter would be civil in nature. Today, that is not the case, as there are a number of 'offenses' which have criminal effect and punishment that can occur without any intent on the offender's part. There are also numerous 'crimes' today that do not involve damage of any kind. During that early period of time, the Americans understood that they were at the top of the 'pecking order', and the term 'public servant' truly applied to the elected officials who

served in the government. Also note that there were very few career politicians during that period, and most who served were good people from the community who gave a few years of their life to better their country. A far cry from the power crazed politicians we find running the United States government today. Today's politicians are paid more than over 99% of the people whom they purport to serve, not even counting their perks, and a very large percentage of them do not even know what it's like to make a living in the 'real world'. Virtually all use their power for their own personal gain. Did you ever wonder how a man can go to Washington broke or with very little money, stay there for twenty years drawing a salary that would barely pay their expenses in their upbeat lifestyle; then retire and leave Washington a multimillionaire? That scenario is not an exception; it's the rule for those who go to Washington broke. And for those who had money when they took office, did you ever hear of one losing any of his money while he was 'serving' his country?

The system established by the founding fathers worked very well and virtually without incident until the time of the Civil War. At that time, there was a very unfortunate condition in this country called slavery. Slaves at that time were not legally people; they had no Rights, and only whatever privileges that their owners saw fit to grant them on an individual basis. In short, these people were legally nothing more than property. Lincoln tried to free the slaves with the Emancipation Proclamation, but the Supreme Court ruled that effort to be unconstitutional, ruling that you could not free another man's property. So, at the end of the Civil War, an incredible situation arose. The slaves actually remained slaves. That's right; in fact, they became something called 'bounty'. Bounty is what a conquering nation seizes from a conquered nation. The slaves actually became the property of the United States as a result of its victory in the Civil War. (Here it should be noted that the Civil War was between the United States and the Confederacy, not the "North" and the "South"). The United States, as their new owner, allowed the slaves to start acting like free men; but, in fact, they were not. They had no standing in the society, and abuses were common. Finally realizing the problem and the plight of the slaves, the United States managed to pass the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution in 1867, two full years after the end of the Civil War. That Amendment stated, "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for a crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." So slavery was forever ended in this country. Unfortunately, the former slave's woes

were not, because simply freeing them did not create any new citizens. So almost a full year later, in 1868, after many more abuses to the former slaves, the United States was forced to pass the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution in order to afford the former slaves adequate protection and privileges with which to live their lives. The Fourteenth Amendment states, “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...”. So a new type of citizenship was born - that of a ‘citizen of the United States’ – or, a citizen of the District of Columbia, as the two are synonymous - under the authority of, and pursuant to, the Fourteenth Amendment.

Now ask yourself, over whom did the United States have jurisdiction? Certainly not the Americans (unless they had committed a crime under which limited jurisdiction was granted, and then only to the extent punishment for that the particular crime was involved). The only people of that period that the United States had jurisdiction over were the former slaves or immigrants from other countries who sought citizenship; because no sovereignty was available to those persons. The Americans were in no way affected by this new citizenship. The Supreme Court of the United States stated: “The rights of Citizens of the States, as such, are not under consideration in the fourteenth amendment. They stand as they did before the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, and are fully guaranteed by other provisions.” (see U.S. V. Anthony]. In short, they were sovereigns with rights guaranteed and protected by the Constitution. This new class of citizen was not sovereign. In fact, they were still subservient to the creator of their new status, the United States; and, therefore, became a ‘subject’ of the United States. Because the United States was the giver of this new citizenship, it could only give based on the power that had been delegated to it from the states. Therefore, it did not have the power to grant sovereignty because the United States had no sovereignty in and of itself; therefore, its power did not equal that of the American. It would be impossible for the United States to create a citizen more powerful than itself, so this new entity called a ‘citizen of the United States’ [now referred to as "UNITED STATES CITIZEN] occupied a position of power one rung below the United States, its grantor. To better understand this scenario, imagine that the owner of a company hired a president to run his company. The president in turn hired a vice-president to handle a share of the responsibilities. The vice-president then hired a supervisor to run a portion of the company. Could the supervisor be given enough power by the

vice-president to fire or overrule the owner of the company? Of course not, because neither the president nor the vice-president had that much power. So now the power chart looks like this:

American - most powerful

sovereign -Source of all power

state - Second in power

Derives its power directly from American

United States - Less powerful than the state

Derives its power from the states

citizen of the United States - No Constitutional Rights

Derives its power from the United States

Remember that the Constitution is a contract between three parties - the Americans, the states and the United States - with the principal purpose being to provide guarantees and protection of Rights to the Americans by drastically limiting the powers of the United States. Therefore, it covers the first three levels of this chart; but the citizen of the United States is on the fourth level, and is outside of the contract itself. The Fourteenth Amendment actually makes that very clear. At no point does it even purport to give Constitutional Rights to the citizens of the United States. In fact, it does quite the opposite. It states within the Amendment itself what privileges and immunities it bestows upon the citizens of the United States. It states, "...No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws...". Didn't the American already have everything referred to here in the form of Rights, not mere privileges and immunities granted by their creator? Would it not have been much easier to simply say that this new citizen had full Constitutional power, rather than to delineate the exact privileges and immunities he was given? Of course it would have, but the fact is that this new citizen did not have all the powers and Rights guaranteed by the Constitution to the American, because the United States did not have the power to delegate unto these new 'citizens', even if it had wanted to. To do so would have been to create something more powerful than itself, and that is impossible. So in effect, the citizen of the United States is not a Free Man at all in reality, but merely a subject of the government which created it. It has whatever



privileges and immunities which that government chooses to bestow upon it, and that government has the authority to change those privileges and immunities at its own discretion. The Americans of that time knew all these facts, and it was common knowledge that two classes of standing existed in this country. There was a "first class" sovereign known as an American who had inherent Rights given by God and guaranteed by the Constitution. There was also a second class of citizens known as citizens of the United States who had only whatever privileges and immunities that the United States chose to give them. This fact was common knowledge until well into the Twentieth Century, and many court cases can be found which address the two classes of authority or standing in America.

Within the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment, the right to due process and equal protection was passed to the citizen of the United States. Regrettably, the right to due process and equal protection to the citizen of the United States has been used to convolute the issue of the differences between the classes of people. Due process is contained within the Fourth, part of the Fifth, part of the Sixth, and part of the Eight Articles of Amendment to the Constitution (The Bill of Rights). These Rights had previously been reserved to the American; however, with the Fourteenth Amendment, the citizen of the United States was guaranteed a portion of these specific rights under the Constitution as a result of the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment. Therefore, when the trust courts (something you will learn later includes almost all of the courts that you have considered government courts in the past) make rulings affecting or relating to due process, it is usually confused with Constitutional Rights of the American; when, in fact, it is nothing more than a fulfillment of the provisions of the Fourteenth Amendment. The true result is that the First, Second, Third, part of the Fifth, part of the Sixth, all of the Seventh, part of the Eight, the Ninth, and the Tenth Articles of Amendment to the Constitution (The Bill of Rights) are not provided for the use of the citizens of the United States. Ever wonder how your gun ownership is restricted even though the Second Amendment to the Bill of Rights forbids it. Now you know. The second Amendment does not apply to citizens of the United States, and the restrictions to gun ownership and use apply only to citizens of the United States.

At this point, it is important to understand a fact which many may find distasteful and not politically correct. The foundation of America is the 'Declaration of Independence', and there was no

'America' prior to 1776, only a British Colony sitting upon the North American Continent. The Continent of North America, like the Continent of South America, was only a geographical location, not a political community. This will be really unpopular, but I still must tell you that the North American Indians who refer to themselves as "Native Americans", are not "Americans" at all, as we use the term in relation to sovereignty. They are 'natives' of the North American Continent, but they have no standing as Americans, because they were still separate nations from those which formed "The United States of America" in 1776; and, they later became defeated nations, with America being the 'conquering' nation. Later, by act of Congress, they became 'citizens of the United States', but nothing ever made them part of the sovereign American People. Even more unpopular, and a fact which may get me accused of being racist for simply stating the truth, is the fact that there are no 'Black Americans', meaning black people who are sovereign Americans, because their only basis of citizenship or standing is that of a citizen of the United States. Nothing ever bestowed any other citizenship or standing on the black people in America. Likewise, none of the people who are naturalized into this country as citizens of the United States will ever be sovereign Americans, because there is no power available to them which will create that status. They will remain citizens of the United States.

To better understand this 'citizen of the United States', we can look at old England (the government from which our forefathers rebelled). Under English law the King was the Supreme Sovereign. (Note here that when the King referred to himself as 'Sovereign', he used a capital letter for the word 'Sovereign', because he believed himself to be supreme to all. When our founding fathers referred to themselves as 'sovereign', they used a lower case letter 's', because they believed that God was the Supreme Sovereign.) There were actually three classes of common persons under the King. First, there were 'freemen'. These men were free in all respects except where the King or his assigns (the lords and landowners, also known as noblemen) were concerned. They could work at their chosen profession, live where they wanted, and travel as they pleased. All unless the King objected, in which case the King's wishes were upheld, regardless of what those wishes were. They could own property, subject, of course, to the fact that the King actually owned everything. What this meant, in reality, is that these people only owned the use of said property, and the tax levied by the King was actually a fee for using the King's property. Next, the 'serf' was the slave of the period. He was born into his role, and could not escape it. He differed from the slave in America

only in that he was forever bound to the land, and the lord of that land, rather than to an absolute master. Last, there was the 'indentured servant'. This was a 'freeman' who contracted into servitude for a particular period of time in return for something which he wanted or needed. Many of our forefathers paid their (and their families') way to America by serving as an indentured servant for a period of time.

The 'citizen of the United States' actually is very close in capacity and status to the 'freeman' of old England. That status is exactly what most of our forefathers were before they fled from England to America, so this is obviously not what the founding fathers envisioned an American as. But make a comparison, and you may be shocked. First, let's compare property rights. The freeman could own the use of property subject to the King's tax and his whims. Today, a citizen of the United States can own property subject to the tax (you will learn a little later that the 'States' as they exist today are actually just an extension of the Federal Government) and whims of the United States. In essence, you do not own land or property, but only the use of that land or property. Otherwise, if you were the 'sovereign', nobody could tax something you owned and take it from you if you failed to pay the tax. Just imagine someone trying to tax the King and take his land. Let's take your home as an example. Assuming you own your home and it is totally paid off, does it belong to you? Of course not. If it did, and you were the sovereign, no one could take it away from you because you didn't pay the rent on it (property tax). As it is, many of the older citizens of the United States are paying more taxes on their homes today than the payments were back in the 1950's and 1960's when they were paying for the home. If they don't, or can't, pay those high taxes, they lose their home. Does that sound like they own the home to you? Sounds like the King's men to me. And what about a 'whim' of the government to steal that land? What if the government decides it needs that land for some project? Did you ever hear of 'eminent domain'? **Black's** defines it as, "the power to take private property for public use by the state, municipalities, and private persons or corporations authorized to exercise functions of public character." This power granted to the state by the Fifth Amendment has been totally misused by the government, and has been used to punish persons whom the government had a vendetta against. Think about the fact that, if a certain kind of rat is found on your land, your land can be seized for the good of the rat. That's right, and it actually happened like that in California a few years ago when a 'rare' kangaroo rat was found dead on a man's property. So, who has more rights, a rat or a citizen of the United States? This man's (a

citizen of the United States) land was seized, and he was imprisoned for being suspected of killing the rat. Sounds like a King's power to me, and the King must have close ties to rats.

Just to be very sure that you don't really believe you actually own anything as a citizen of the United States, let's talk about one more area of ownership, your car. Do you own your car? If it is paid for, do you have the original title? The answer is, "no", you don't. I know that many of you think you own your car and that you have the title, but you're wrong. Get out your 'title' and look it over. You will see that at the top of it are the words, "Certificate of Title". **Black's** defines 'certificate as, "A written assurance, or official representation, that some act has or has not been done, or some event occurred, or some legal formality has been complied with....". In plain language, this document at which you are looking says that there is an 'original title' of ownership on your car, and you obviously don't have it. The one who does have it owns the car. That would, of course, be the State. Furthermore, there is no way for you to get the original title. That's because citizens of the United States are never allowed to own property, but only to use it as the King (government) sees fit. Is this beginning to sound more like old England to you yet? But, how did you with all the Constitutional Rights left to you by your forefathers and guaranteed by the Constitution get here? In a later chapter, I will explain the money scam which lead to the position described above. Keep reading!

In the 1930's, the lust for power at the Federal level reached a new high. The pompous fat cats running the United States Government at that time were very put off by the fact that they were 'servants' to a bunch of dumb farmers and laborers. They believed that they were the elite, and that their power should be unquestioned. They looked around and realized that there did exist a class of people to whom they did serve as virtual kings and queens. That class was those who were citizens of the United States pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment. For them, the Federal government ruled as a benevolent monarch, raising them from the depths of society to a position where they could exist. They were actually 'subjects' under that government. Remember that the word 'Citizen' or "citizen" never applies to the sovereign because he owes allegiance to no one other than God.

In 1935, the United States passed the Social Security Act, designed especially for these subjects. After all, these were the wards of the State, those who had been taken out of slavery and cared for by the benevolent master, because it was believed that they could not fend for themselves. Whether it was by design, or just pure luck, this new program struck a cord with the American people as a whole. Americans began to want the same perks and benefits that were designed for the second class citizens as a means to give them some chance of attaining a degree of happiness and security. The United States Government officials realized that this was the vehicle through which they could gain control over the sovereigns which had ruled over them for so long. They said simply, "Come on in, take our number, and be one of our subjects, and you can have everything that we give our other subjects." By the millions Americans came forth to take a Social Security Number, and, in effect, say that they no longer wished to be a sovereign, but that they wished to be ruled over and taken care of. The benevolent government agreed that it could do a better job of running their lives than they were doing, so it accepted the 'sovereigns' request to sell themselves into what amounted to voluntary servitude, much like the indentured servants of old England. Remember that the Thirteenth Amendment forbade slavery and involuntary servitude, but it did not even mention voluntary servitude. Remember that the Rights guaranteed to Americans by the Constitution cannot be bought, sold, traded, or taken away; however, we can contract to set them aside for a period of time in order to fulfill a contractual agreement with another party. Remember that many of the original Americans and/or their families came to this country under voluntary servitude contracts as 'indentured servants'. The government officials were careful not to point out to the Americans what their actions actually entailed, because they knew that few, if any, knew the price that would be paid for the benefits received. But, there is one good thing about voluntary servitude - there has to be a way out or it would become involuntary and, therefore, unconstitutional. You will learn how important this little 'flaw' is later in this writing.

This entire scenario is easily proven by a law enacted by Congress in 1964. It was called the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Many of you will still remember the effects of that law. It changed many of the ways in which the white man dealt, associated, and lived with the black man. Until that time, the black man not only was a second-class citizen, he was treated like one. He could not drink out of the same water fountains, go to the same schools, go to the same churches, eat in the same restaurants, and/or use the same restrooms as the white man, just to name a few of his restrictions. Yet he had

been a citizen of the United States for almost 100 years at that time. On the other hand, the white man gained nothing from the Civil Rights Act of 1964, because he already had everything it offered, and more, guaranteed to him in the Constitution as Rights. Unfortunately, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 did not make the classes of authority or standing equal, it only made them appear equal. The truth is that it only bestowed more privileges and immunities upon the citizen of the United States, but still offered no true Rights to that person. 'Civil rights' are not Rights at all, but simply new privileges bestowed upon subjects of the United States; all of which could be changed or completely taken away at the whim of the grantor, the United States. But it did have a more demonic and evil effect and purpose than any previous 'law' - it made the citizen of the United States appear to be synonymous with the American, thereby setting the stage to persuade the American to give up his birthright through outright trickery and deceit. Sadly, today, few Americans even know what their birthright is, and most will argue that they have not given up any of their Rights. The fact is that most Americans have already given up all of their Rights through contract, and the time to reclaim them is growing woefully short. This writing is a last ditch effort to give the knowledge to those who wish to regain their birthright the ability and knowledge to do so before that birthright is forever lost. With the loss of that birthright, one could also lose his mortal, and possibly immortal, soul. The choice is simple - do you want to be a citizen of the United States whereby you remain a subject to the whim of the government, or do you want to be an American, a sovereign, with all the powers left to you by your forefathers as the greatest gift that can be given on this earth in this life? The choice can still be yours. Make it wisely.

**If you are satisfied with the lot in life that the United States has planned for you, then there is no need to read the rest of this book.** However, if you want the true freedom that was left to you as an American, read on. But know that there are responsibilities associated with that freedom that many of you have never faced; and, to be free you must. Freedom is not for cowards - Freedom is for the brave at heart. Let the cowards remain subjects, and pray for them that the United States remains at least a fairly benevolent master.

## **CHAPTER 2 - OUR MONEY SYSTEM**

Understanding our money system is another necessary step in realizing the unbelievable position that Americans have been relegated to. To understand how our money system works, we need to go to its beginnings and follow its development through the years.

The money system today is actually a currency system only, and does not represent true worth. **Black's** gives the definition of 'money' as, "In usual and ordinary acceptance it means coins and paper currency used as circulating mediums of exchange, and does not embrace notes, bonds, evidences of debt, or other personal or real estate." You will soon learn that the 'Federal Reserve Notes' that we currently use as 'money' do not fit this definition.

The money system of today actually started with our original banking system. It was designed to help people protect their assets without having to risk their lives on a daily basis. Early in the formation of this country, the life of a wealthy person could be very hazardous. Let's say that you had discovered gold, thus becoming very rich. Where would you go to protect your wealth? Many tried to keep it close at hand, thereby trying to personally protect it from those who would steal it. This method proved to be very unsatisfactory in that many wealthy people became 'dead broke' when thieves and killers found them. So along came the banks which, with government approval and supervision, gave people a very viable alternative to being robbed and/or killed by those seeking to relieve them of their wealth. The original system was not only needed by the people of that day, it was pure and simple in its nature. Take the person who 'struck it rich' in gold. He could bring his gold to a bank. The bank would take the gold and issue him a certificate guaranteeing to give him back the gold at any time in the future that he wanted it. By doing so, he could protect his gold and his life, and he could still enjoy the benefits of his wealth. For this service, the bank would charge a small percentage or fee, and everybody was happy.

This system worked very well for many years. But at some point years later, the government realized a very interesting anomaly had developed. It seemed that, although the gold was available to the depositors at any time, nobody ever came back to claim their gold. Instead, they were all simply trading these 'certificates' issued by the banks, thus creating 'paper money' or 'currency'. These certificates proved to be much easier to carry, to hide, and to deal with in general than heavy, bulky gold. Better still, everyone would accept these certificates as money because they knew the

gold was setting in the bank waiting to be reclaimed. Thus, the current attitude toward the worth of ‘paper money’ which we hold today was begun.

At this point, it is very important to realize the real nature of currency or money. It is nothing more than a means by which a person can store his labor and materials for use at a future date. Let’s say that you are a person with nothing except your ability to build houses. You trade your labor to build a friend a house for something that he has which you need or can use. But what if your friend is a candlestick maker, and you don’t need any candlesticks? In order for you to build him a house, he would have to find someone who needed enough candlesticks to pay for the house, and who also had something which you needed in order to get you to build him a house. It could prove to be very difficult to find enough people who needed candlesticks and had something that you needed to pay you for building his house. So that’s where money comes in. Money is a place (or vehicle) where you can store your labor for future use. Instead of having to find several different people who need your particular service, and who have something that you need right then, each worker simply stores his labor in these certificates accepted by the society in which he lives at viable storage facilities for use at a future time. The candlestick maker then simply collects enough of the labor certificates from people who need his candlesticks to pay you for building his house. You can then use the certificates to buy whatever you want instead of searching for someone who needs one particular service. It is really a wonderful and ingenious method for allowing each person to use his personal skills and labor to exchange for the things he wants and needs.

Unfortunately, this system had a flaw. It was used to store true wealth, which equates to the labor of an individual. Basically, all labor done is placed into a big pool for the use of anyone who has established credit within that pool by placing his labor into the pool. The pool is backed by gold. Consequently, the only people who should be using the pool are those who have placed true value into the pool. That’s not the way it’s currently working. Sometime in the early to mid 1800’s, the United States Government discovered a way to steal a portion of all the labor that Americans provided and stored in the pool. The banks realized that nobody ever came back to claim any of the gold which backed the certificates. Instead, they were exchanging the certificates for what they wanted. It became clear that it would be very simple to print more certificates without any gold to back them. By doing so, the government could spend the new certificates exactly like they



represented either gold or labor, when in actuality, they represented neither. In fact, this action was nothing more than a means by which to steal a portion of all the labor performed by Americans on an ongoing basis.

It works like this. Let's say that you placed your labor into this pool (which, by the way, you have). By doing so, you actually 'bought into' the overall worth of the pool. To totally understand this method of theft, let's just talk about the gold in the pool. Let's say that there is \$1000.00 worth of gold in the pool. Let's say that you gave labor equal to \$100.00, and you were paid by certificates from the pool. At that point, you own 10% of the worth of the pool, so you get 10% of the certificates in the pool. Then somebody comes along and prints another \$1000.00 worth of certificates on the pool without adding any gold to the pot. Suddenly, the certificates which you possess are worth only 5% of the new pool, and your \$100.00 worth of labor is now redeemable for only \$50.00 in real value. The government has named this type of theft 'inflation', because they can't tell you what really happened. They don't decrease your \$100.00 value, they just increase the cost of all the other labor driven products in the pool that you might want to purchase by enough to cover what the government has stolen from the pool. This process is exactly what happened to the gold and silver certificates when the government started printing extra certificates without placing any new gold in the pool. For every \$1,000,000.00 worth of gold held in the United States Treasury, the government printed \$2,000,000.00 (or more) worth of certificates, effectively stealing at least 50% of the value of that gold; and, thereby, 50% of the labor which was funded and saved in these certificates. Not a bad deal for the government, but a real rip-off of the American.

The United States Government continued this method of theft well into the Twentieth Century. In 1913, Congress created the Federal Reserve Bank, a government institution designed to handle regulations for private banking, and to help keep inflation and deflation in line. Remember, in Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, it states, "The Congress shall have the Power...To coin Money, regulate the value thereof,..." Note that Congress does not have the power to assign the power to coin money to anyone else. Also note that the term 'coin money' is used. It says nothing about printing, but let's assume that the founding fathers just never thought of this method of storing labor; however, had our government never started printing money, we certainly would not be in the mess we are in today. There could be no debt, because true value (gold and labor) would be the

basis of every transaction. But even if the founding fathers had agreed that printing and coining were synonymous, they certainly never gave anyone the authority to said printing and/or coining other than Congress, and they did not give Congress the authority to assign these duties to anyone else. What happened was exactly that.

At this point, it is also important to understand the authority delegated to Congress, and reserved to the several states with regards to the coinage of money. Clearly, the several States are limited by Article I Section 10 of the Constitution with regards to legal tender when it states, “No State shall...make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a tender in Payment of debts...”. Obviously, there is no authority delegated to the states to use any tender other than gold and silver. That, however, is not the case with regards to the United States. The Congress was given exclusive legislative authority over Washington, the District of Columbia, the territories, and all possessions of the United States by the Constitution. That power is called “plenary”, and it is virtually absolute. There is no limitation as to the legal tender which Congress can establish for use within those areas that it governs by plenary authority. Therefore, Federal Reserve Notes can be legal tender without Constitutional conflict in those designated areas. Are you beginning to realize where you reside?

Sometime early in the 1930's, by the use of plenary power and after years of theft of the gold and labor pool by the government, a group of international bankers (hereinafter ‘Banksters’, so named not for collecting the certificates, but for the use of the power which arose as a result of owning the certificates which resembles very closely the methods used by gangsters in their actions) presented the United States Government with a demand for gold based on the gold certificates which it had issued over the years, and which they now owned. The government's years of theft had finally caught up with them, because there was not enough gold in the United States Treasury to redeem the certificates held by these Banksters. On that day, the United States became bankrupt. The timing could not have been worse for the United States. The greatest depression in modern history was in full swing. Hitler was in the process of coming to power in Europe. The world situation was very bad, and the leaders of the United States Government felt that to announce that the United States was bankrupt to the world would be totally disastrous. So a ‘behind closed doors’ agreement was reached with the Banksters who held the certificates, and the course of America was changed in a way which few believe is possible. The Banksters were offered, and they agreed to accept, full

ownership of the Federal Reserve Bank, moving it from the public trust into private ownership and control. Even more harmful and destructive than that, these Banksters were given the exclusive right to print all money in the United States from that date forward. These provisions were given force of law in an Executive Order signed by Franklin Roosevelt on March 16, 1933, and it remains our way of doing business still today. The repercussions of this single action are totally unbelievable, as every facet of our lives is directly affected in a negative way today as a result of this one deal.

The Federal Reserve Banking system is not federal at all. Although the Fed Chairman is appointed by the President of the United States from among the heads of the District Federal Reserve Banks, this is a private banking institution. The Federal Reserve Banks issue federal reserve “**notes**” to serve as legal tender. The issuance of these “notes” without being redeemable for anything of value allows the theft of the people’s labor.

This system of theft used by the Federal Reserve Banks to serve as legal tender in this country originated in ancient Babylon. The Babylonian “Due Bill” was written in clay tablets in the 3,000’s B.C. and showed what a purchaser owed to a merchant in exchange for goods. The Babylonian government would print these clay tablets and force merchants within their control to accept these “Due Bills” in payment for goods and merchandise under penalty of death. However, when it came time to pay the government, taxes had to be paid in gold, silver, or other items of value. Merchants stuck with these clay tablets could only pass them to others in purchase of other merchandise, identical to the system in use today except that today’s notes can still be used for payment of taxes. This system amounts to little more than theft of products by their own government and those who own and control the Federal Reserve District Banks. Now, it’s the private alleged Federal Reserve Banking system in cahoots with the United States government which is stealing from the American people.

First, let’s see how this directly affects our money in our daily lives. The power given to these Banksters to print money was, in effect, the power to rule. They were given the authority to print all currency which could be legally used in the United States at the cost of printing, which was a cost to them of something less than \$30.00 to print 100,000 bills, regardless of the denominations of the

bills. Not a bad deal for them - imagine being able to print 100,000 \$100.00 bills for \$30.00, and then go spend them at full face value. Now imagine being able to do that anytime you want to without regulation, and you will start to realize just how powerful these Banksters have become. What actually happens is that the Federal Reserve Bank prints all the currency in the United States at the cost of printing, or actually at no cost since the printing is paid for with federal reserve notes. They then loan that currency to the United States Government on interest bearing notes (Treasury Notes) at full face value. It gets better (or worse for you) because they never print the interest. That makes this a system of slavery wherein the citizens of the United States are sold into servitude to the Federal Reserve Bank by their lord and landowner, the United States.

More on that later. For now let's follow this action through. To help understand this process, let's say that you and I are the only people in the entire world working on the Federal Reserve System. Let's say that you're a farmer and I'm the only Federal Reserve Banker in the world doing business in this fashion. One day in the spring of the year, you come into my office and inform me that you need to borrow some money to get your crop in this year. I ask how much you need, and you tell me that you need \$100.00. I then ask you if you have any collateral. You say that you have your land completely paid for which you will put up as collateral for the loan. I agree, and I tell you that I will loan you the \$100.00 at 8% interest payable when your crop comes in. You agree. I get up, go in the back room, and print the money. Remember, that's all I have to do. You take the money into the community. The people in the community know I'm good for the money, so they accept my paper for what you need, and you get your crop in. It happens that this is the best farming year in history - the rains come right, the sun is perfect - and you have a bumper crop. You take your harvest into the community and sell it, and then you return to pay me. You lay the paper I printed on my desk. I pick it up and count it - there is \$100.00 face amount there. Remember, that's all I printed. I then ask you where my other \$8.00 (the interest) is. You tell me that you couldn't find any more of my paper, and ask if I would take some other form of payment? I tell you "no, I only accept my own money". I then seize your land for the remaining debt due, all legal and proper. This process is exactly what the Federal Reserve Bank has done. Right now, the government tells us that our national debt is over five and one-half trillion dollars. The debt was caused by the Federal Reserve Bank, because they printed the Federal Reserve Notes and loaned them to the government. However, there is less than two trillion dollars in circulation at this time, meaning the

rest of the debt is for interest, and those Federal Reserve Notes were never printed. Therefore, if the United States Government came to each one of us and seized every Federal Reserve Note in our pockets, then went to pay off the national debt, the Federal Reserve Bank would simply count the money and then demand the other three and one half trillion dollars in debt owed it. Thus, it is totally impossible to pay off the national debt under any conditions, and the debt must, by its nature, continue to grow. It is designed to steal all worth and power from the American people, rendering them into a permanent state of servitude. It has almost accomplished its goal as of this date.

You will also need to understand the actual make-up and worth of our currency, the Federal Reserve Note, in order to fully understand the truly demonic nature of the entire system which has been laid upon Americans. First, historically and Biblically, gold and silver have been the standard metal used as money or for a medium of exchange. Gold and silver are ideal for this purpose since they are easily molded into coins, easily passed, and antiviral and antibacterial; therefore they do not transmit diseases. Outside of its use for a monetary instrument gold and silver also has its own intrinsic value. It requires work or labor to harvest it, so therefore it actually represents labor realistically, not just artificially. Gold and silver are also the standard metal used for jewelry and has many other industrial uses, especially when combined with other metals and used as an alloy; therefore, gold and silver have intrinsic value. Thus, gold and silver certificates, those instruments on which this the American Dollar was based, had a basis of intrinsic value.

The government guaranteed to deliver to the bearer on demand a dollar's worth of either gold or silver for each dollar on the face of the certificate. That guarantee is what gave the American Dollar its value, and made it the most sought after currency in the world. But this new Federal Reserve Note did not (and does not) make any such guarantee. In fact, its very name is misleading, because it is not a note at all. A note must promise to deliver something on a particular date or under a particular condition; and therefore, a Federal Reserve Note is nothing more than a Babylonian "Due Bill". **Black's** defines "Note" as, "An instrument containing an express and absolute promise of signer (*i.e.* maker) to pay to a specified person or order, or bearer, a definite sum of money at a specified time"... Therefore, the gold and silver certificates issued by the government were, in fact, notes. For example, on the One Dollar Silver Certificate, this statement appears, "This certifies that there is on deposit in the Treasury of the United States of America One Dollar in Silver

payable to the bearer on demand.” On Federal Reserve Notes, no such promise exists. In fact, Federal Reserve Notes do not promise to do or deliver anything. They are purely instruments of debt. **Black’s** defines “Instrument” as, “...A negotiable instrument ... or a security... or any other writing which evidences a right to the payment of money and is not itself a security agreement or lease and is of a type which is in ordinary course of business transferred by delivery with any necessary endorsement or assignment.” **Black’s** gives one definition of “Debt” as, “A sum of money due by certain and express agreement.”

So how could our currency have become an instrument of debt? Remember that the United States went bankrupt in 1933 when the Banksters presented more gold and silver certificates than there was gold and silver on reserve in the treasury. That state of the bankruptcy of the United States has existed ever since. In bankruptcy, everything works on a negative basis, because there is a minus net worth involved. Also remember that a double negative becomes a positive. So when you receive an instrument of debt payable in a bankrupt system, it actually becomes a positive for use within that system. The Federal Reserve Note is actually an instrument created by the Federal Reserve Bank and loaned into circulation. It signifies that the United States Government owes a certain amount of dollars to the Federal Reserve Bank. Therefore, when someone hands you a \$20.00 bill (Federal Reserve Note), he has actually just transferred \$20.00 dollars worth of debt from himself to you. Because we live and function in a bankrupt society, the negative \$20.00 actually becomes a positive for use within that society. So you say, who cares, as long as I can use the \$20.00 Federal Reserve Note to buy my case of beer? The answer is, you should care, because you are basically ‘selling your soul’ to the Federal Reserve Bank.

These Banksters are already running almost every phase of your life, and you continue to allow them to dictate to you because you’re accepting their benefits under the bankruptcy. Imagine that you have a teenage child living with you. You have a set of rules that must be followed. The child has the option of following the rules or moving out and fending for himself; but, if he stays, he must follow your rules. When he breaks one of those rules, he is subject to your punishment. This scenario is exactly what happens to you under the current system. The Federal Reserve Bank has established what it considers to be a benevolent system of control which it administers if you choose to accept its benefits. The next chapter will deal with the exact particulars of this system, and how it

was developed. But important right now is that you understand that participation in this system has a very high price placed upon it in terms of giving up your birthright (*i.e.* your Rights under the Constitution), and almost every person reading this book has already given up those Rights through contract. Luckily, there is a way out. Your decision will be to decide if you really want to be free, or if you prefer the life of a slave with a benevolent master.

You may say that the situation described above is impossible, and that it could never happen in the good old U.S.A. Try to remember what happened in 1933. The United States had defrauded the American people to the point of driving itself into bankruptcy. Legally, there was only one creditor demanding payment from the United States, and that was the group of Banksters. So, in essence, that group had a lien against all the assets of the United States. Although we have not yet discussed the differences between the United States and the united States of America or the Union, these two entities have almost nothing in common. You will learn in a later chapter what each actually is. For now, just understand that there is a difference. The United States had used power which it was not authorized to use, and by doing so, had made it look like the Union (“The United States of America”) had gone bankrupt also. In truth, “The United States of America” had nothing to do with the bankruptcy of the United States, but the actions followed by all parties involved allowed the Banksters to treat the bankruptcy like it was the Union of States that had gone bankrupt.

So what are the assets of a nation? Its land and its people. The Banksters actually took a lien against the land and the people of the United States *i.e.* citizens of the United States, as compensation for what they were owed by the United States. They then looked at this new found windfall, and said to themselves, “We own everything, so should not these people living on our land be paying something for the privilege? Maybe some type of a sharecropper’s fee would be appropriate.” But then they realized that if they told the people that they owned everything, and that the people had become nothing more than renters in their own land, there would be rebellion. So they set about to devise a much more sinister plot to get what they felt were their just payments for the debt due them. They decided that they would set about to offer benefits, and anyone who wanted the benefits would agree contractually to help pay off the debt of the United States.

Being able to print all of the currency gave them a great advantage in controlling both the people as a whole, and more particularly, the Congress. Their first great act, in concert with Congress, was

the passing of the Social Security Act in 1935. On the surface, that Act was designed to help the ‘second class citizens’ (*i.e.* the citizens of the United States) to achieve a better quality of life. In reality, it was designed and administered in a way that would first convince the American that he would be better off as a citizen of the United States; and second, at a later date, convince him that there was no difference between an American and a citizen of the United States. The plan worked on both fronts. Early in the process, work programs were established for these second class citizens. Since many of the Americans were out of work at that time due to the Depression, these jobs were very appealing to them. Many Americans immediately seized upon the opportunity to become a citizen of the United States and start getting the benefits reserved for those subjects of the government.

As the years passed, the United States Government, in concert with the Federal Reserve Bank, created many new programs designed and provided for their subjects. At the same time, they started to collect from those subjects the debt owed to the Banksters by the United States. They did this with a vehicle called the income tax. Each time that they wanted to raise taxes, they would simply give, or say they were giving, another benefit. Of course, the benefits never even approached what they were taking, but the people loved getting ‘something for nothing’ from the government.

What few Americans, or for that matter, citizens of the United States, have ever realized, is that the United States Government actually had very little to do with either the benefits or the taxes. Those are areas controlled almost completely by the Federal Reserve Bank. More on that in the next chapter. But the taxes and the benefits began to grow, with each feeding the other. What was once a Republic started to operate as a “trust”, and the government in power became *de facto* in nature (a ‘de facto government’ is one which maintains itself with a display of force against the will of the rightful legal government and is successful in overturning the institutions of the rightful government by setting up its own in lieu thereof). The *de jure* government (‘de jure’ is descriptive of the government condition in which there has been total compliance with all the requirements of law) withdrew in the face of the overwhelming acceptance of this new way of doing business. The fact that the political leaders of the time allowed this to happen spoke to both their fear and the fact that their power was greatly increased as a result of the development of the false government. It just



seemed like the right thing to do at the time. All banks came under the power and control of the Federal Reserve Bank, and our entire system of credit, investments, and major employers came under that same control.

Today, it is very difficult, sometimes impossible, to buy a car, a house, to get a phone, an insurance policy, a driver's license, to get any kind of credit, to get most jobs, and a list of other items too long to name here, unless you first profess to be a slave to the Federal Reserve Bank (*i.e.* citizen of the United States) by placing your slave number (*i.e.* social security number) on virtually every document you sign. That situation exists because a trust now operates in place of the *de jure* government, and the social security number identifies you as a member of the trust entitled to its benefits (fully explained in a following chapter).

I've had many people tell me that they have never agreed to be a slave or a subject. They say they would never do that, and that they have not given up their Rights. Well, if they use a social security number, they are just totally wrong. Have you ever noticed that you are always required to write down your social security number, even if they already have it in front of them? For example, take the driver's license requirement of a social security number. You must write it on their form each time you renew your license. They tell you that it is so they can check to see if you owe any back child support. What a ridiculous lie!!! They have had your social security number for years, and it hasn't changed. Did they just forget what it was? Of course not - they just want you to say that you are still a willing member of their trust before you get their benefits. When you fill out a credit application, you are always required that you give your social security number. They will tell you that it protects against fraud, and that they don't have any other way of identifying you. What a load of bunk. I know people who have literally thousands of other peoples' social security numbers from previous contacts. Anyone whom you have worked for, has sold you a car, a house, entered your child into school, or any number of other contacts, has your social security number. Anyone who has ever taken an application of any kind on you has all the other necessary information to do a new application on you. So the use of a social security number has no effect on fraud, and it is a very poor way of identifying you.

So there must be another reason for its required use. The true reason for making you write the number down each time you sign something is that it renews, solidifies, and makes stronger the

original contract through which you became a member of the trust, thereby agreeing to voluntary servitude. Remember, they only have the power over you that you give them, because this government can govern only by the consent of the governed [especially in the case of an American]. The problem is that you have given them your consent for almost limitless power over you by taking the social security number [thereby contracting to be a 'citizen of the United States'], and you continue to reaffirm your decision with each new commitment to their trust *i.e.* each time you accept a benefit [use your social security number].

Remember, that as an American, no one, not even you, can take your Rights away. However, as an American, you are guaranteed the unlimited Right of contract. In other words, you can contract into and/or for almost anything. Under the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, involuntary servitude is forbidden, but voluntary servitude is not forbidden. Therefore, it is legal to contract yourself into a state of voluntary servitude. However, having done so, you also must be allowed to leave that servitude, or it would become involuntary and forbidden by the Constitution. That's why it is so important to the Federal Reserve Bank that you restate your desire to remain in voluntary servitude each time you apply for a benefit. Once again, you make that statement by simply writing down your trust membership number [social security number] and signing beneath it. When you want to reclaim your freedom, you will have to discontinue that action and stop using the trust number.

Just a little matter as a side issue here. We have all heard numerous versions of who killed President John Kennedy, and why. There is one possibility which I doubt you have heard. It happens to be the one that I believe, and I think more real evidence points there than any other place. Very shortly before his murder, President Kennedy decided to have the United States Mint start printing United States money again. That marked the first time in almost three decades that anyone other than the Federal Reserve Bank had printed any currency for the United States. The facts as to why he made this decision, and what kind of objections were raised and by whom, have been well-guarded secrets. But we do know what actually occurred. A very short time prior to his death, President Kennedy caused to be released into circulation four and one-half billion dollars in United States Notes printed by the United States Mint. The Federal Reserve Bank had nothing to do with these instruments. Immediately after Kennedy's death, President Johnson was sworn into office, and

almost immediately recalled the United States Notes just released. Today, the only evidence of these notes is in the hands of rare coin and currency dealers; however, these notes are available at a small premium, and you should go to a local dealer and purchase a \$2.00 United States Note printed in 1963. It may really help you understand and believe what really happened to Kennedy; and consequently, what has, and is, happening to you.

The facts are clear. A private corporation, owned by private individuals and operated to make profit, now prints every dollar of currency in the United States. The 'notes' that it prints are 'instruments of debt' showing that the United States owes the Federal Reserve Bank money as shown on the 'notes'. Since there is no worth associated with these 'notes', they can only be used in a bankrupt system, and anything purchased by them actually belongs to the creditor and creator of the 'notes', the Federal Reserve Bank. Anyone using these 'notes' gains a privilege or benefit from the use thereof, and is therefore indebted to the creditor who owns the worth behind the 'note'; once again, the Federal Reserve Bank. The Federal Reserve Bank has caused to be put in place a trust to administer over its interests, and to provide benefits for its members. Membership is readily provided; however, the cost of said membership is everything you own or ever hope to own. The rest of this book is dedicated to providing proof of this trust, and to showing you how to live in the society without remaining a subject of the King, *i.e.* citizen of the United States.

### **Chapter 3 - The Trust**

One of my first memories of theories raised by those in the “Patriot Community” (those folks who are constantly coming with new and improved ways to defeat certain aspects of the government, usually based around not paying taxes) is the proposition that the United States government in its *defacto* form is a corporation by nature. For many years, I subscribed to that line of thinking. When I first wrote this book, I believed that scenario to be true. I now understand that what most people currently equate as “the government” is, in fact, a trust. To be more specific, it is an implied, charitable, and/or resulting trust, foreign in nature, and operating as an insolvent commercial trader within the exterior boundaries of the individual states *i.e.* THE STATE OF TEXAS (or your state). Okay, so that is a mouthful, and you don’t understand a word I said. Let’s do this in pieces.

As you will recall from Chapter One, the Fourteenth Amendment was passed in 1868, providing a new form of citizenship to the newly freed slaves. To administer over that new citizenship and its members, a public trust was formed. A set of rules and regulations, generally called “codes” were passed and implemented by Congress under its plenary authority (that authority delegated over the District of Columbia, its territories and possessions) to provide protection and benefits to these trust members, as well as to place limitations upon their activities. In the period of time between 1868 and 1933, these codes were applicable only to members of the Fourteenth Amendment trust *i.e.* citizens of the United States. During that period of time, the *de jure* constitutionally created and bound government was still in place and operating effectively for the American. There were clearly two classes of authority or standing in this country, and it was easy to distinguish between them. Furthermore, everyone in both groups recognized and fully understood the differences.

The fall of the gold system in 1933 had a devastating effect on the *de jure* government. In fact, for all practical purposes, it brought the individual State governments down. Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution states, “No State shall...make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts...”. Do you know of any State today which can meet that standard? Of course not, because none do. Therefore, the *de jure* States

no longer exist, and a *de facto* government has replaced them. So exactly what has taken their place?

When the Gold system fell in 1933, two operating governing authorities were in place. First, the *de jure* government was operating for the American under constitutional authority. Second, the Fourteenth Amendment trust was operating for the citizens of the United States who had obtained their citizenship through, and depended upon, the Fourteenth Amendment for their standing in the society. This group included the newly freed slaves as well as anyone who had sought and received citizenship through the authority of the Fourteenth Amendment. This group would include immigrants coming here from other countries and seeking citizenship from the United States. The *de jure* government of the several States was dependant upon the Constitution; therefore, when the money system required by the constitution fell, the *de jure* government necessarily failed because it could not function under constitutional authority with no real money available. But the trust was not dependant upon the Constitution for authority; therefore, the fall of the money system had no effect on it. Basically, there is no provision within the Constitution which requires that either the United States or the District of Columbia make only gold and silver coin as tender in payment of debt. To the contrary, Congress was given exclusive authority over those areas to govern as it sees fit, including the creation of acceptable currency for use in those areas. In addition, the Gold and Silver standard did not apply to Americans; therefore, their standing remained unchanged.

Suddenly, there was a large group of people, the Americans, who had no governing authority; and, thus, had no services available for protection, adjudication of problems, and defense against foreign nations, among other things. There was, in fact, a large void in this country. The resulting effect was that the trust in place for the Fourteenth Amendment citizens (federal citizens) immediately began to fill that void by starting to provide services for the original Americans. By a process known as “operation of law”, the trust took over the responsibilities that the *de jure* government had been providing. “Operation of law” is a manner in which rights and liabilities devolve upon a person by the mere application to the particular transaction of the established rules of law, without

the act or co-operation of the party himself. In other words, by our behavior, acceptance, and failure to object, a new governing authority took over.

The new authority, referred to as the “trust” or “public trust”, realized its lack of authority over the American. After all, the American had done nothing wrong, he had not become bankrupt, and he still owned everything. A plan was devised whereby the American would voluntarily turn over authority to the trust. The first phase of that plan was implemented in 1935 with the Social Security Act.

The Social Security Act was devised and employed by the trust for its members, and appeared to be a very benevolent attempt on the part of the trust to provide for the basic needs of its members. Remember, the great masses of lower income people in this country, many of whom were already citizens of the United States, were in the midst of living through the Great Depression, which had been raging for six years. The basics necessary to sustain life were in question for many of these people. There were no jobs, no money, and many times, no food. To help combat this problem for its members, the trust issued numbers to each of its members which could identify them as a member of the trust, and establish certain benefits on their behalf. The benefits were very limited at first; however, a program called the WPA was placed into effect shortly after the passage of the Social Security Act for the members of the trust. Its function was to supply trust members with jobs so that they could feed and care for their families. This turned out to be a noble cause with dire repercussions.

My Father was the third oldest son in a family containing 22 children, 18 of which were living at home during the depression years. Although their heritage was as part of the sovereign American People, they were poor farmers. Drought spelled what almost amounted to their doom. My grandfather, along with the older boys, sought jobs to feed the family, but none were available. From 1932 until late 1935, this entire family lived on a grand total of less than \$2.00 per week. That didn't buy much, even then. They raised what they could, devised ways to kill rabbits and squirrels with rocks and traps, and fished a lot just to eat. My Father reported to me that he never remembered being

“full” during that time. Then came the WPA offering jobs that paid \$2.00 a day. That was an enormous amount of money to them at that time. As soon as they heard about it, my Father, grandfather, and two other brothers applied at the worksite for a job. Two separate and distinct tables were set up at the worksite location, one to apply for jobs and the other to apply for social security numbers. When my Father applied for a job, he was told to go to the other table, get a number, and then he could be hired. He followed the instructions, was issued a social security number on the spot, and began work that day. The Barcroft’s didn’t go hungry anymore, and my Father went to his grave believing that social security was the best single thing that ever happened to him in this lifetime, outside of his strong relationship with his God. I am extremely thankful that he died before I learned the true nature of social security.

After the WPA, the trust began adding other benefits, but there was a price to pay for each. Moreover, the trust was created and operated by the same kind souls who had forced this country into bankruptcy in the first place; and, it was (and is) their belief that everything in this country rightfully belonged to them because they held the debt. Based on that belief, these parties wanted to start collecting a sharecropper’s fee from each person living and working on “their land”. However, they feared, probably rightfully so, that, if they told the people that their land had been taken, and that they could no longer own anything, the people might rise up and take back what belonged to them, possibly hanging a few crooks along the way. So a plan was devised whereby each time more money was demanded from the members of the trust, new benefits or services would be provided. It was the plan to make these trust members so dependant upon the benefits offered by the trust that they would never consider leaving the trust; or, for that matter, even challenging the basic authority of the trust. Their plan worked to perfection.

By 1938, the plan to have the trust as the primary authority within this country had been fully integrated into the courts. The trust, fully commercial in nature, needed courts to rule based on laws of commerce rather than the common law. To do this, a contract was necessary. The contract, of course, was formed around the social security number, the benefits offered through social security, and the considerations required from the

members in exchange for the benefits. Those who used the number were accepting the benefits; therefore, the courts could operate under the presumption that anyone having a social security number was a member of the trust and under commercial contract; and, that commercial law was necessarily in effect. In 1938, Roosevelt released a document entitled *Restatement of the Law*, which outlines the different usages and effects of law after the bankruptcy of 1933. In 1939, in the landmark decision of **Erie Railroad v. Thompkins**, the Supreme Court officially made commercial law the rule in all federal matters stating that except in cases governed by the Constitution or treaties, state law (commercial law or CODE) would apply. Here, the Supreme Court acknowledged that there were still those who could demand common law and an Article III Court, but the great majority of the cases had already switched to commercial law. Therefore, the overriding presumption from that date forward was that every case before the court was commercial in nature, and should be governed by commercial law/CODE. Anyone coming in the common law would be required to rebut that presumption, and prove that he had a right to the common law *i.e.* that he was one of the sovereign American People with Rights guaranteed and protected by the Constitution, and that he was not under contract [did not have a social security number], before he could be granted a hearing under the common law. That system remains in effect today, except that now most of the courts do not even have the authority to hear common law cases. Effectively, the courts are obligated to make the presumption that any case before them is one of a commercial nature. When you come into most of the courts of today claiming that you have a right to a hearing in law, they simply cannot hear you. The matter is totally out of their jurisdictional authority. That's why you see so many frustrated would be protestors who run around claiming that the courts are corrupt or that they didn't receive a fair hearing. Their problem is always that they have gone into a trust court expecting to have the judicial authority of the Constitution applied. It's just not going to happen, because the court they are in is legislative in nature exercising the plenary power given by Congress under its authority of exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia (United States), its territories and possessions. These courts do not have the authority to hear constitutional issues.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> **Those who do not wish to be ruled by commercial law/CODE, should immediately request**



After 1939, there still existed the problem of a disparity between the people who were members of the trust, and those who remained outside the trust, many of whom were part of the sovereign American People. It was simply becoming unmanageable for the governing authorities. One class of people possessed Rights that the second class did not have, and the differences were readily apparent. The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was devised to change all that. Cleverly disguised as an act to give equality to different races of people, what it actually did was to raise the benefits [privileges] given to the trust members [citizens of the United States] to an approximate level with the Rights owned by the American. The idea was to make both classes look the same, convince the masses that a citizen of the United States and the American are synonymous, then gradually reduce the privileges of the citizen of the United States to a level more in line with the needs of the trust. The idea was that the American, as a party to the trust, would lose sight of his sovereign standing, and allow his Rights to be replaced with privileges under the contract. The plan has worked extremely well. If you don't believe that, just go out tonight and tell all your friends that there is a difference between a citizen of the United States and an American. Then make note of the number that even know what you're talking about. It won't be a long list. Then make a note of how many laugh at you or think you're nuts. That will be a much longer list.

In order to administer to its members, the trust needed some form of rules and regulations. Because most of its members were relying totally upon the trust, it was necessary to have some authority which would serve in the stead of actual law for its members. Such rules and regulations were created, and given the name "codes". Codes

---

**a jurisdictional hearing before any other action in any case. In that jurisdictional hearing, the overriding presumption that the man involved has a social security number or is otherwise under the authority of the United States must be rebutted. That is done by first proving one's standing [American, and not citizen of the United States] by showing that no social security number attaches to that man. Once that is done, the court loses jurisdiction, the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act [28 USC 1603-1611] applies, and the man has immunity from all charges.**

were established to govern the members of the trust only in their capacity as members of the trust; in other words, artificial beings created by contract or other means. Codes were never meant to govern a flesh and blood Man. As you will learn later, codes are still not used to govern the flesh and blood Man, although they are structured in such a manner as to make one believe they are doing exactly that.

We now look at how and where the trust exists, and exactly what nature of creature it is. First, its name is always very telling. Let's take the name, "The United States of America". That name was ascribed in the Articles of Confederation and refers to the Union, the States which joined together and were later incorporated by the Constitution. But when that name is changed to "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA", it takes on a different meaning. The way a proper name is written is with the first letter of each word being capitalized, while each succeeding letter is lower case. This rule applies unless the name represents an artificial entity such as a trust or corporation. In state law, the names of trusts and corporations must be written in all capital letters. Therefore, "The United States of America" is the name of the Union of States joined by the Constitution. So what does that make "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA"? That would be the artificial entity acting in the capacity of a trust, and doing business as a foreign commercial trader. Foreign? Yes, foreign, because it is an insolvent entity, witnessed by the fact that it uses only instruments of debt as medium of exchange and payment of debts, it is obviously foreign to the *de jure* "The United States of America". In real terms, the "States" because *insular possessions* of Washington, D.C.; therefore, Washington, D.C. "law" applied.

The trust is now accepted as the governing authority by well over 95% of the American People. Mention that you are an American, but not a citizen of the United States, and you will be immediately branded an idiot, a radical nut; or, worse still, a terrorist. The demonization process has worked to perfection, so to claim your Birthright, you will have to be well-informed and thick skinned. But the fact remains that the American still exists; and, if you can prove your Birthright, you can still claim the sovereignty that rightfully belongs to you.

---



## CHAPTER 4 - THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

This chapter is going to be very technical and legal in nature, but it is necessary to follow the legal maze that has been constructed as an obstacle to the American who wishes to understand the 'law' as it applies to him. To understand the so-called 'law', you must first understand where and how the 'law' is written. First, what most refer to as law is actually code. Remember that codes are intended and authorized to regulate the activities of members of the trust in their capacity as artificial entities. The body of those codes is found in the 'United States Code' (hereinafter "Code"), which is comprised of 50 different 'Titles', each with a different subject matter. Congress supposedly wrote and approved the Code, but it has not enacted all of the Code into positive law, as you will soon learn. Some of the "code" is *special law* which applies only to those who have agreed to honor that law (The Internal Revenue Code is a *Special Law*). The second part of the so-called law is found in the 'Code of Federal Regulations' (hereinafter "Regulations"). This is the body of rules and regulations written by bureaucrats which are supposed to 'implement' the Code. None of these rules and regulations were ever voted on by anyone, yet they are treated as law within the trust. In **California Banker's Association V. Shultz**, 39 L.Ed. 2d 820 & 830, the Supreme Court ruled that neither the Code nor the Regulations could stand alone as law. In that decision, the Court ruled that the Code was only "broad, authorizing language", and that the penalties attach only upon the violation of the Regulations thus prescribed. Therefore, in order for 'force of law' to exist, it takes both the Code and the implementing Regulations. Keeping this structure in mind will help you understand the confusing facts which you are about to discover. Please, try not to make any pre-judgments as to what you believe. Do your best to read the following pages with a clear mind, and you may see that the 'law' does not say what you have always believed it did. In the end, you will see that the 'law' means exactly what it actually says, regardless of what you may have thought it said.

If you ask the people in America today what or who they fear most, a large majority would answer the IRS. If you ask who or what the IRS is, most will tell you that it is the branch of the United States Government that collects taxes, and that it is a government agency under the U.S. Treasury Department. After all, isn't that what they say they are? Well, actually, no it's not. If you examine their paperwork very closely, you will learn some interesting facts. To begin with, their symbol states, "Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury". Seems clear on the surface,

but a closer examination reveals an interesting fact - nowhere does it mention the United States, and it does not state which 'Department of the Treasury' it is a part of. After all, don't all countries and most large companies have 'treasury departments'? In fact, nowhere in any of the IRS's literature, writings, letterhead, or designation are the words 'United States' or 'U.S.' found in relation to the IRS.

Well, certainly this is just an error. So all we have to do is to go to the Department of the Treasury of the United States (where they would like us to believe they gain their authority), and there the IRS will be found as an agency under that department of government. Wrong again! Title 31 of the United States Code is the Title devoted to the Department of the Treasury of the United States, and Chapter 3 of that Title is the organizational breakdown. There are 10 agencies or offices within the department, all listed. They are, (1) Department of the Treasury, (2) Treasury of the United States, (3) Bureau of Engraving and Printing, (4) Bureau of the Mint, (5) Federal Financing Bank, (6) Fiscal Service, (7) Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, (8) United States Customs Service, (9) Office of Thrift Supervision, and (10) Continuing in Office. Not a single word about the IRS. If you follow through the organizational breakdown of each of these agencies within the Department of the Treasury of the United States, you will find that the IRS is not even a sub-agency under any of those agencies. Is the IRS so insignificant that it does not even get a mention? Do you still believe it's just a mistake? If so, stick around, because there are a lot more mistakes.

Several inconsistencies immediately appear if a close study of the Code and the Regulations is undertaken. First, no Act of Congress ever created the Internal Revenue Service. If it were an agency in the government of the United States, one could easily find the Act which created it. The fact is that there is no such Act; and, when questioned about this fact, the IRS simply says that this is a frivolous argument because everyone knows they exist. They will refer you to their own manual (which has consistently been ruled to be inadmissible as evidence by the courts) where it states, (emphasis added) "... 'The Bureau of Internal Revenue' has been organized under the Act of last session\*\*\* Also it can be seen that Congress had intended to establish a Bureau of Internal Revenue, or thought they had ...". This statement in their manual refers to the session of Congress of 1862, in which the Congress created an 'Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue'. The same statement appears again in a similar publication in 1974, at **39 Fed. Reg. 11572, 1974-1 Cum. Bul.**

440.. The statement essentially admits that Congress never created either the ‘Bureau of Internal Revenue’ or the ‘Internal Revenue Service’. It only created an ‘Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue’. It clearly shows that the IRS itself cannot find anything whatsoever which actually created an agency called either the ‘Internal Revenue Service’ or the ‘Bureau of Internal Revenue’.

The truth is that every government agency was created by some official document, and that document is easily found in the official records. The **Federal Register** is the official record of everything that goes on in Congress, and every act that has been taken by Congress is recorded there. The only time the Internal Revenue Service is ever mentioned in the **Federal Register** is in 1976, **Federal Register, Vol. 41, September 15, 1976**, where it states, “The term ‘Director, Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms Division’ has been replaced by the term ‘Internal Revenue Service’.”. So according to the **Federal Register**, ‘Internal Revenue Service’ is only a term (not an agency), and Congress has never even considered making it a part of the United States Government. Are we to believe that something as powerful and all-encompassing as the IRS has its authority to operate so well hidden that even the directors of the ‘agency’ itself cannot identify where their authority to act comes from? You will find that this situation does not occur in any other ‘agency’ of the government. In fact, a true governmental agency is required to state its specific authority to operate on request. Why would the IRS be any different? Moreover, if they truly had the authority that they claim to have, why wouldn’t they just tell you where the authority arises from and be done with it? Authority cannot arise out of their own manual. The truth of the matter is that the Act which created that Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (which was the only office or agency ever created that could possibly be the IRS) was in 1862, and was repealed by the enactment of the Revised Statutes of 1873. The IRS says that the ‘Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue’ implied that Congress thought it had created a ‘Bureau of Internal Revenue’, and that Treasury Decision 6038 changed that ‘Bureau’ into the Internal Revenue Service in 1953. If that were the case, why didn’t Congress simply correct the error of not having properly created an agency with such expansive powers? To do so would take very little effort on Congress’s part, and would completely settle the issue. The whole idea put forth by the IRS as to its beginnings and its authority is patently false, because a Treasury Decision would not have the authority to create an

agency in the United States Government; and, even if it did, the fact would have to be confirmed in writing somewhere at the Congressional level; and, therefore, be found in the **Federal Register**.

The reason that the IRS is not established by an act of Congress is because it is a function of the trust, not the government. It was formed by those holding the debt against the United States as a means of getting their “sharecropper’s fees” from the people occupying what they consider to be their land. As you will discover later in this book, the money collected by the IRS does not go into the treasury of the United States; rather, it is for the private use of those who hold the debt against the United States, and the debt is not getting smaller.

Title 26 of the United States Code is also referred to as the Internal Revenue Code (hereinafter “IRC”). This is the section of what is loosely referred to as law that the IRS relies on when it is enforcing the ‘tax laws’. However, a close examination of the Title 26 shows that it has never been codified and enacted into ‘positive law’. Clearly, this is because it is a special private law intended for use only by members of the trust. Subtitle F of the IRC contains Chapters 61 through 80, and Sections 6001 through 7873, inclusive. Within those Chapters and sections contained exclusively in Subtitle F, are all of the enforcement provisions of the IRC. Subtitle F of the IRC clearly takes effect, and therefore, gives authority, only after the enactment of Title 26 of the United States Code; the day after, to be exact. The phrase, “shall take effect on the day after the date of enactment of this title” is used within Subtitle F in reference to when its provisions will take effect. The enactment of Title 26 has not occurred as of this date. This fact becomes clear in section 7851. In the case of Subtitle F, the entire subtitle does not take effect until the day after the date of enactment of Title 26. 26 USC 7851(a)(7) refers to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, so this section is not an ancient writing which has no meaning today. The Internal Revenue Code of 1986 claims, in Section 1, to have been enacted on October 22, 1986, as part of the ‘Tax Reform Act of 1986’ (many of you who were paying taxes prior to 1986 probably thought it was enacted long before 1986). The information is sparse and convoluted. For evidence of the fact that Title 26 has never been enacted, we have only to look at the Preface - 1988 Edition of the United States Code, signed by the then Speaker of the House of Representatives, Thomas Foley. In the second paragraph, it states, “...Titles 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 28, 31, 32, 35, 37, 38, 39, 44, 46, and 49 have been revised, codified, and enacted into positive law and the text thereof is legal evidence of the laws therein contained.

The matter contained in the other titles of the Code is prima facie evidence of the laws.” (By the way, ‘prima facie’ means good on its face until challenged) In the same edition of the Code, under the heading, “Titles of United States Code”, all 50 Titles of the Code are listed. Next to Title numbers 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, 28, 31, 32, 35, 37, 38, 39, 44, 46, and 49, an asterisk appears. No asterisk appears next to Title 26. At the bottom of the list appears the note, “ \* This title has been enacted as law. However, any Appendix to this title has not been enacted as law.” Here, it is clear that Title 26 has not been enacted as law. If that is true, then provisions of Subtitle F of Title 26 are not in effect; and since all enforcement is contained within Subtitle F, no penalties are available for failure to comply with Title 26. That is, unless you are a member of the trust; and, therefore, bound to the special private law.

The fact is that the Internal Revenue Service could never be created by an act of Congress, because, as a part of the government prescribed by the Constitution, it would be blatantly unconstitutional.

The maze begins to clear up as to what the IRS is and where it gets its power when we closely examine Section 7805 of the IRC. IRC Sec. 7805(a) states, (emphasis added), “Except where authority is expressly given by this title to any person other than an officer or employee of the Treasury Department, the Secretary shall prescribe all needful rules and regulations for the enforcement of this title, including all rules and regulations as may be necessary by reason of any alteration of law in relation to internal revenue.” This is the section which gives the ‘Secretary’ authority to write the needful rules and regulations for Title 26, the Internal Revenue Code. This person is obviously the same ‘Secretary’ that is empowered throughout the IRC to carry out all of the enforcement of the Title. The Code identifies this person as ‘The Secretary of the Treasury’, but it does not tell us which ‘treasury’ he is the secretary of. To understand exactly who this person really is, and where he derives his authority from, we must refer to the implementing regulations for this section (written by this particular Secretary) for a definition of exactly who he is. To do that, the government has printed what it calls the CFR Index, which is a cross-reference between the Code and the Regulations. The CFR Index lists, as some of the implementing regulations for this section, 27 CFR parts 250-252<sup>2</sup>. Under 27 CFR Sec. 250.11, ‘Definitions’, the definition of ‘Secretary’ is

---

<sup>2</sup> 2011 update – Earlier this year, the United States Government, under the guise of "national security", sealed this section of the code, meaning you can no longer see it or read it. It is now "Secret Law". It contains most of the method and necessary information needed to use the remedies provided for you. This



given as, “The Secretary of the Treasury of Puerto Rico.” This clearly refers to the ‘Secretary’ who is authorized by the IRC Sec. 7805 to make the rules and regulations necessary to the enforcement of Title 26. That same ‘Secretary’ is necessarily the person referred to throughout the IRC, who is given authority to perform the tasks of assessing and collecting taxes. This ‘Secretary’ obviously is not an officer in the United States Government, and these are his own words telling you that. WOW! How did that happen? Well, perhaps the motherland of the trust is Puerto Rico.

Remember the bankruptcy of the United States in 1933. In that bankruptcy, Banksters were the only recognized creditors. The Federal Reserve Bank was turned over to those Banksters when the United States admitted a verified debt to them. The right to print money and then loan it to the government was part of the turnover and proof of that debt. But the Banksters were not content with this ‘license to steal’ that was handed to them on a silver platter. Instead, they saw an opportunity to control everything, including the people. Because the nation was in bankruptcy, and the only form of currency available for use were instruments of debt (Federal Reserve Notes), anything bought with those notes became the property of the Federal Reserve Bank. Sounds crazy, but remember that a Federal Reserve Note simply says that the holder of the note owes the Federal Reserve Bank the amount of money shown on the face of the note. Imagine for a moment that you loan me some money, and that I signed a note to you saying that I would repay that money at a future date. Let’s say that I then took that note, and traded it to someone who thought it had value for a car. Since the note only signified that I owed you money, who would own the true value received from it? If it were I, then I would have traded something with a negative value (because I owed you the money used) for something with a positive value (a car). In doing so, I would necessarily have to commit fraud.

Each time that you use a Federal Reserve Note to ‘buy’ something, you trade something with a negative value (remember that Federal Reserve Notes only record a debt of the United States to the Federal Reserve Bank) for something with a positive value. The only party that can legally own whatever you purchased is the one who owned the value side of the Federal Reserve Note, the Federal Reserve Bank. However, since we are operating in a bankrupt system, we are allowed to

---

is Sections 194 through 399, it is massive, and the information is vital in understanding the scheme that this government has perpetrated upon its people. To verify, go on the internet to Electronic Code of Federal

‘use’ the thing purchased as if we had actually purchased it. But we can never gain true ownership of it with the use of Federal Reserve Notes. Clearly, the Federal Reserve Bank, with its Federal Reserve Notes, is the vehicle used by the Banksters to implement their quest to control the people whom they believe owe them a debt. The Federal Reserve Bank is the center piece of the trust. It provides all the tools for the collection of the debt owed by the United States.

Getting back to the ‘Secretary’, and where he gets his authority, it becomes clear that the ones who own everything, the Banksters, have placed their own ‘Secretary’ in charge of looking out for their interests. Have you ever wondered why the Federal Reserve Bank has never been audited by the IRS? No other company of its stature can make that statement. Have you ever wondered how Alan Greenspan (Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank) can come into Congress and dictate to Congress everything from interest rates to what questions he will and will not answer? Note that Congress never tells him what to do. Why? Simple; it’s the Federal Reserve Bank’s money, property, and power which this *de facto* government is ruling with and for. Naturally, their man is running the show.

So where does the IRS fit into all this? It is, in fact, a branch of the Federal Reserve Bank. That’s right, it is nothing more than a department of the trust which is operating under the assumption that it owns everything. Still don’t believe it? Go back to the definition of ‘Secretary’ which tells you that he is the Secretary of Treasury of Puerto Rico. Remember that the Banksters who own the Federal Reserve Bank are the only creditors of a bankrupt government, the United States. The United States was never given the power over the Department of the Treasury of the United States to do with as it saw fit, because that Treasury belongs to the Union (“The United States of America”), more specifically, to the American People. However, the United States owns and rules the territories as it see fit under plenary authority, and Puerto Rico is a territory. Therefore, it can cause that treasury department to do its bidding. In this case, the treasury department of Puerto Rice was turned over to the trust. Congress, using its unlimited legislative authority over the possessions and territories and following the directions of its new lord and master, the Banksters, simply wrote authority into the Puerto Rican Treasury Department, and then convinced the American public that the authority arose from the American Laws. That is why Congress cannot enact Title 26 (the

---

Regulations, then go to Title 27, then try to go to section 250.11. Then get very mad, because you are still

Internal Revenue Code) into positive law - it just does not apply to Americans, unless they have become members of the trust through contract.

By the way, Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States, but they are not Americans. As citizens of the United States, they are automatically members of the trust. Now do you get the picture as to who is required to file and pay taxes; or, for that matter, abide by any of the codes? Does the term/title 'citizen of the United States' take on any new significance to you now? Do you still want to be a 'citizen of the United States' *i.e.* a member of the trust? If so, keep reading, because the worst is still to come.

Most of you have probably already heard the term '*voluntary compliance*'. When you heard it, chances are you thought, "Yeah, if I want to go to jail." Well, the truth is that we are under a system of voluntary compliance. That does not, however, mean that you can either choose to pay taxes or not. It's not that simple. What *voluntary compliance* means is that you can choose to participate as a member of the trust, or you can choose not to participate as a member of the trust. There is nothing in the middle. If you want to be a citizen of the United States and receive the benefits designed especially for those members of the trust, then you obligate yourself by contract to abide by the rules of the trust. Part of those rules say that you must pay a percentage of anything that you earn to the trust. To do so, it is required that you file a return under penalty of perjury telling the trust how much you earned and how much you owe the trust. If you lie on that return, you are committing fraud, and you will be prosecuted under the applicable fraud laws, not under the IRC. That's right, you will most likely be prosecuted under the fraud laws contained in Title 18, not under Title 26. And, you guessed it - Title 18 has been enacted into positive law. Contracts are protected by real law. By the way, in order to file that return, you must put down your slave number (social security number) and sign below it because that is the number that proves you are a member of the trust; and, therefore, the trust is authorized to accept your money. Without that number, the trust has no authority to accept your payment, even if you want you give it. Placing the number on the form also restates your wish to remain in a contract for voluntary servitude to the trust. If you do not put your slave number down, your return is invalid, and the IRS will not accept any money from you. Why? Because if you are not a trust member, the trust would be committing

---

held accountable for these sections that you cannot access.

fraud if it accepted your money. The IRS has no jurisdiction over you, and it wants no part of you unless you are a member of the trust. Should you be an American, you are far too powerful for anything in this *de facto* government. So, the idea is to keep you from knowing how powerful you are, or could be if you claimed your birthright.

But, you say, what about the debt and bankruptcy? Good question, but once again, we were duped. The American People never gave the authority to the United States to print fake money and throw the nation into bankruptcy. Therefore, the bankruptcy and the debt have no standing with Americans. It just simply is not our debt. Imagine that you hire me to work on your car, and authorize me to buy whatever parts on your credit that are needed to fix the problem. But instead, I use your authority by going out and telling other people that I have your full authority to run all of your business affairs. I then run up unbelievable debt in your name, and I have no way to repay the debt. I may even go out and rob a convenience store trying to get money for the debt. It gets so bad that your only recourse is bankruptcy. What would you then say? Would you go quietly into the night and file bankruptcy, or would you be yelling that this was not your debt and you're not going to pay for it? Would you treat me like a king, or would you have me thrown in jail? Would you spend your entire wealth trying to pay the creditors which I created, or would you tell them, 'tough luck, you should have made sure of my authority before granting the credit'? Would you be willing to go to jail because I robbed a store to pay off the debt? I think we all know the answers to these questions.

What the United States did was no different. Read the Constitution and find one place where it authorizes the United States to do the things it did. Where does it authorize the stealing of true wealth through the printing of certificates with no worth? Where does it say that the American People turned over all their wealth to the United States for them to squander as they please? Where does it give the United States the right to put the American worth at risk in any form? Clearly, fraud, deceit, and outright theft has occurred in the United States Government for many years, and it's getting worse. That's because Americans have been duped into believing that they are citizens of the United States; and, as such, that the United States is all-powerful in their lives. Far too many Americans have become apathetic and passive where their Rights are concerned. Fortunately, this

is a mistake which can still be corrected by those who wish to regain their birthright, but it will take some intestinal fortitude on your part if you want to do so.

Have you ever heard the term “collateral damage”? Do you now understand what that term refers to? If not, pay close attention. The term is always used when non-military or non-police people are killed. What a strange term for people dying. Well, it’s not so strange once you understand its full meaning. When this United States went bankrupt, it was forced to collateralize the debt to keep the Banksters at bay. It did so with its only possessions – its land and its people. The only people under the authority and control of the United States were those in the trust, the citizens of the United States under the authority of the Fourteenth Amendment. It also held certain possessions with regards to land, that being the territories and enclaves within the several States. Those things it pledged as collateral for the debt. However, that was not enough for the Banksters. They sought ways to make the trust larger, including more land and people. A plan to trick Americans (explained in different parts of this book by other methods) into becoming unsuspecting members of the trust was devised. A plan to add more land to the pot was also devised. That was done primarily with the use of zip codes. Since the United States owned the federal enclaves within the several States, anything that could be turned into one of those enclaves would become part of the collateral. A zip code designates a federal area. The first two numbers of the code designate which federal judicial area you are in. In short, when you place a zip code after your address, you are establishing the fact that you live in a federal area, properly numbered as such. You also give your full consent for the use of your property as collateral for the federal debt. Thank you very much!

As for the IRS, if you are an American, it has only the power over you that you give it. If you give it no power, then it has no power over you. But remember, it is so well entrenched that you will have to be very sure of yourself to reclaim your freedom. It will do and say things which will scare the pants off of you; and, don’t underestimate them. The trust itself is comprised of treacherous leaches who have lived off of your efforts for over 50 years, and it will do anything to keep its power; and, the IRS is the most vile and evil arm of the trust. However, if you understand the real issue - that the American is the sovereign - you can defeat it. The jurisdictional issue rules over all else, even in the corrupt corporate courts which oversee the Code and Regulations today. None of the IRS agents

will want to butt heads with a sovereign who knows he's a sovereign. Just make sure that you have zero contracts with the trust before you have a confrontation.

The true definition and structure of the IRS is that of one branch of a trust whose purpose is to collect payment toward the debt owed by the United States from persons who have contracted with the trust to become members and accept said responsibilities; and to receive certain benefits and privileges from the trust. Their power comes from a contract, and it is virtually absolute with regard to the persons who are members of the trust.

You must never trust anyone who even works for the IRS or the ATF (Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, another branch of the trust). They are not 'just good people doing their jobs'. They are the embodiment of all that is wrong in America today, and they are inherently evil. Their job is to break down the American to the point where he no longer even knows what his power is, and to destroy the American way of life. Once that is fully accomplished, it is their duty to rule over the members of the trust in a manner fitting the slaves they have become. If you have friends working for the IRS or ATF, and they are ignorant of these facts, then they are ignorant and evil. If they get your trust, they will use it against you one day. If you do have friends that work for either the IRS or the ATF, get new friends.

**Author's update:**

**It should be noted that some 10 years after the first writing of this book, 27 CFR 250.11, that section of the code that tells you who the IRS is and from where their authority arises, along with all the other [very important to you] regulations between 27 CFR 194 and 27 CFR 399, has been restricted from public viewing. In other words, while it still exists and is part of the code for which you are held accountable, you cannot get a copy of it or read it *i.e.* it is now "*secret law/code*". This is a huge body of law/code that is now unavailable for study or use in the courts [unless you can get a copy of it]. It is also full information necessary to your remedy against the treasonous bastards who hide it from you.**

**Don't believe there is *secret law* in the United States? Search the internet for "Code of Federal Regulations". Then go to the "Electronic Code of Federal Regulations". Go to Title 27, then**

go down the list of sections. When you get to sections 194-399, it states [in red letters], "[Reserved]". Excuse me?? Is this not part of the code that I am held responsible to know? What this means is that we now have secret law within the United States. The last country to impose secret law was Nazi Germany.

If you can find a library with older books, you can still read and use this secret law. It is still in effect, and you are held accountable for knowing it.

You might want to give this some thought. That portion of the Code must be giving the "masters" a whole lot of trouble, and they are willing to do anything to protect their scam.

## **CHAPTER 5 - WHAT IS THE UNITED STATES**

I know that by now you must be wondering where all this is going. You have always believed that you were born and raised in the United States. Everybody knows that Texas and California and Virginia and the other forty-seven states are all part of the United States - right? Not so fast here. The truth is that the term or name United States has several different meanings. Even the Supreme Court said so. In a case entitled Hooven & Allison Co. V. Evatt, Tax Commissioner of Ohio, 324 U.S., 1944, the Court made the following statement, “the term ‘United States’ may be used in any one of several senses. It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations. It may designate the territory over which the sovereignty of the United States extends, or it may be the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution.” This is obviously not as simple as we were always led to believe. In the Internal Revenue Code (hereinafter ‘IRC’) as of May 15, 1990, at section 3121(e), certain definitions are given. First, the term ‘State’ is defined as, “The term ‘State’ includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.” Here, it must be emphasized that, because strict construction of the Statutes is required (meaning they must be read exactly as written), when the word ‘includes’ is used anywhere in the Code in a legal sense, it is a term of limitation, in that the only things included are whatever follows in that definition. Therefore, everything that is included in this definition must be listed after the word ‘includes’. But I thought these were territories, not States, and what about Texas and California and Virginia? Next, the definition of ‘United States’ is given as, “The term ‘United States’ when used in a geographical sense includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.” But what about Texas and California, and the others? This section then goes on to state, “An individual who is a citizen of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico (but not otherwise a citizen of the United States) shall be considered, for the purposes of this section, as a citizen of the United States.” Seems clear, right? But the purpose of this section is income taxes, and someone who is ‘otherwise a citizen of the United States’ is not a citizen of the United States under this section; and, therefore, not liable for these income taxes. Who could that be? How about an American who had lived in Puerto Rico long enough to be a citizen there also? For the purposes of income tax, he would not be considered a citizen of the United States. Very interesting, but let us continue.

Since the thing that more people object to about being a citizen of the United States is the income tax; and since that income tax is the major negative at this time of being a citizen of the United



States, we need to really understand how and why it works. To understand what the United States relates to when the subject of income taxes comes up, let's go to a place where we can easily look at a before and after picture of a territory which became a 'state' of the Union. First, let's go to the Public Law 86-70, the "Alaska Omnibus Act". Let's go directly to the portion of the law relating to the IRS. That section is 22(g), and it says, "Section 7701(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of 'United States') is amended by striking out 'the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii' and inserting in lieu thereof 'the Territory of Hawaii'." Wait a minute, why was Alaska part of the definition of the United States before it became the forty-ninth state of the Union; and why would they take Alaska out of the definition of the United States if it had just become a state in the United States? The next definition, found at section 22(h) says, "Section 7701(a)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of state) is amended by striking out 'Territories' and inserting in lieu thereof "Territory of Hawaii". (Here, you must remember that in 1958, the United States had only two territories, Alaska and Hawaii.) Based on that definition, Alaska was a State within the United States until it became one of the Union of States (Republics) known as "The United States of America", and then it was no longer either a State or a part of the United States. What a revolting development this is! We get even a clearer picture of what goes on when we look at Public Law 86-624, the "Hawaii Omnibus Act". We will go to the sections of the law which cover the information given for Alaska, that being section 18(i), where it states, "Section 7701(a)(9) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of 'United States') is amended by striking out 'the Territory of Hawaii'...". Section 18(j) states, "Section 7701(a)(10) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of state) is amended by striking out "the Territory of Hawaii'...". If that doesn't give you a clear picture, I don't know what could. Here, it is clear that when Hawaii became the Fiftieth state of the Union, it stopped being a state and left the United States. It was a part of the definition of United States, and that part was taken out. So what is the United States? It is Washington, D.C., the Territories, and the Federal enclaves within the Fifty states of the Union; more specifically, everything that is owned by the United States, and under the exclusive legislative control of Congress. The United States does not own Texas or California or Virginia or any of the other forty-seven Republics, and they are not part of the United States. Today, there are four Territories/States. They are Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands. These, along with Washington, D.C., make up the states of the United States. They are also automatically included as member states of the trust, because none are among the several

States of the Union, thereby possessing constitutional authority for its people. Still wonder why the IRS gets its authority from the Secretary of Treasury of Puerto Rico? Think about it.

What does all this mean to you? To discover that answer, we go to the Income Tax Regulations at 26 CFR Section 1.1-1. This is the section where the IRS would have you believe that you are made liable for the income tax. It states, “(a) *General rule.* (1) Section 1 of the Code imposes an income tax on the income of every individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States and, to the extent provided by section 871(b) and 877(b), on the income of a nonresident alien individual...”. 26 CFR 1.1-1(b) states, “*Citizens or residents of the United States liable to tax.* In general, all citizens of the United States, wherever resident, and all resident alien individuals are liable to the income tax imposed by the Code whether the income is received from sources within or without the United States...” So, this tells us who the income tax is imposed on, but we need to really understand who this person is. At 26 CFR 1.1-1(c) it tells us by stating, “*Who is a citizen.* Every person born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction is a citizen...” Notice how this wording mimics the wording of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution. If Texas is not a part of the United States, then I was not born, nor do I live, in the United States. I certainly don’t spend much, if any, time in Washington, D.C. or any of the territories, and I have never been naturalized there. I must not be a ‘citizen’ or ‘resident alien’ of the United States, based on their definition!!! So, according to the Code, who am I?

Let’s find out more about this interesting person called a ‘nonresident alien’ who does not appear to be affected in the same way by the income tax. To do so, we go to 26 CFR 1.871-2(a) where it states, “*General.* The term ‘nonresident alien individual’ means an individual whose residence is not within the United States, and who is not a citizen of the United States...” At 26 CFR 1.871-2(b) it states, “*Residence defined.* An alien actually present in the United States who is not a mere transient or sojourner is a resident of the United States for the purposes of the income tax...” Now this ‘nonresident alien’ sounds like me. So let’s see how this person is taxed. At 26 CFR 1.871-7, it states, “*Imposition of tax.* (1) This section applies for the purposes of determining the tax of a nonresident alien individual who at no time during the taxable year is engaged in a trade or business in the United States.... Except as otherwise provided in sec. 1.871-12, a nonresident alien individual to whom this section applies is not subject to the tax imposed by section 1 or section 1201(b) but,

pursuant to the provisions of section 871(a), is liable to a flat tax of 30 percent upon the aggregate of the amounts determined under paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section which are received from sources within the United States...” Since I don’t have any income from sources within the United States, it doesn’t sound like I owe any taxes! To further understand what this means, we go to 26 CFR 1.1402(b)-1(d) where it states, “*Nonresident aliens.* A nonresident alien individual never has self-employment income...such nonresident alien individual will not be subject to the tax on self-employment income, since any net earnings which he may have from self-employment do not constitute self-employment income...”. This nonresident alien really seems like he has all the advantages, and I sound like one of them.

**Black’s** defines “non-resident alien” as, “One who is neither a resident or a citizen of the United States. Citizenship is determined under the federal immigration and naturalization laws (U.S. Code Title 8).” Title 8 defines ‘alien’ as “any person not a citizen or national of the United States.” It further defines ‘national of the United States’ as “...(A) a citizen of the United States, or (B) a person who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States.” So, who is a nonresident alien of the United States? One non-resident alien of the United States is the American who has not naturalized as a citizen of the United States pursuant to the Fourteenth Amendment, and does not reside within the United States. If you find that hard to believe, follow the definitions very closely. First, does an American live in the United States? Some might, but most do not. Remember that the Fifty Republics known as “The United States of America” are not in the United States. Second, is he a citizen of the United States? Not unless he has entered into a contract to become one, and has not yet released himself from that contract. Does he owe permanent allegiance to the United States? As an American, he owns everything and he is the sovereign. The United States actually owes him allegiance, because the United States was created by the States of the Union to serve the American’s needs. It is very clear that if you are a fully empowered American living in Texas (or any of the other 49 Republics), you are, in fact, a nonresident alien to the United States; more specifically, to the trust. As such, the only income that you owe any income tax on is that which you get from the United States. If you were one of the big defense contractors, you would not want to be taxed as a non-resident alien, because most, if not all of your income would be from the United States. If you were a government employee, your income would be from a source within the United States, and you would probably want to be taxed as a

citizen of the United States rather than pay a flat 30% tax on all earnings from within the United States. But, if you're like most of us, you probably receive very little or none of your income from within the United States, unless it is by contract, which you can break. In that case, according to the Code, you owe no tax! But how could that be? If you are an American, you do not owe the debt which the United States ran up through totally unlawful actions. If you are a citizen of the United States *i.e.* a member of the trust, or if you reside within the United States, the corporate United States Government requires that you help pay the old debt to the Banksters. That's why you should be very careful about the use of zip codes in your address. If zip codes identify a federal zone, and you use a zip code within your address without a disclaimer, you are admitting to residence within a federal area. Therefore, you fall under the provisions of The Internal Revenue Code.

I have had many people ask, "if I don't pay my fair share, how will the government run?" That answer is simple. First, the government does not run on your income taxes. Those taxes all go to the Banksters as payment toward the old debt. Up until 1992, the backs of checks that you wrote to the IRS were endorsed "To Any FRB as payment of US Obligation". How did the Federal Reserve Bank, a private corporation, get your tax money? Also, find any place where the Federal Reserve Bank ever transferred any of these tax dollars back to the United States Government. It never happened. Moreover, this country is run on excise taxes, just like it has been run since its creation. Everything you buy has excise taxes on it, and these taxes go directly to the government. Remember, this country existed for almost two hundred years, and became the greatest nation ever on earth, without any income taxes. Nothing really has changed except a bunch of thieves found a way to steal the American Birthright, and this country would not fall apart if they were all executed tomorrow for their crimes against mankind, and we returned to a no income tax system.

But, you say, how does this affect my citizenship? The whole system that is attempting to steal your true birthright using this vehicle as the cornerstone of its attack on your freedoms. Your tax status is also the status assigned to you for the rest of this corporate, *de facto* government. So if you can remain clear of the IRS with regard to the income tax, you have also managed to reclaim your sovereignty, along with all your other Constitutional Rights. Remember, since Title 26 is special private law, you must be a member of the trust before its provisions can be enforced against you.

The tax system is more about total power for the persons running it than it is money. If they can control your pocketbook, they know you will follow. Remember that their power to tax you on your income comes only as a result of your membership in the trust. If you retain or regain your sovereignty, their powers against you are void. But anytime you use a social security number for any reason, you state that you are, and you want to remain, a member of the trust. You must remember that these are sneaky, undermining, back-stabbing scum buckets who will do or say anything to maintain their power over you. They have legally changed the meanings of words for their purposes in order to make you believe things which are not true. Just a few examples of this deceit follow. The word 'person' is thought by most people to mean someone just like themselves. However, the definition used in the U.S. Code is, "any individual, partnership, association, company, or other incorporated body of individuals or corporation, or body politic." Moreover, a "person" is a member of the trust, artificial in nature. So, when you refer to yourself as a 'person', you step into their world of false entities. Worse still, when they refer to you as a 'person', they definitely are not referring to the American you think you are; and, when you respond, you admit to being an artificial entity that is a subject to their rule with no Constitutional Rights. The Supreme Court said, in United States V. Fox, "Since in common usage, the term person does not include the Sovereign, statutes not employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." Remember that the one made liable to file income tax returns were 'persons' made liable.

Then there is the word 'shall'. Most of us have thought the word 'shall' when used in the Code meant that you are required to do whatever follows that word. Not so, according to the Supreme Court who, in Cairo and Fulton R.R. Co. V. Hecht, 95 U.S. 170, stated, "As against the government, the word shall when used in statutes is to be construed as 'may', unless a contrary intention is manifest." So in every place in the Code where you see the word 'shall', simply replace it with the word 'may', and then reread the sentence. You will find the meaning to be very different. Also, you will never find any place in the Internal Revenue Code that requires you to do anything. Anytime the word 'required' is used in the IRC, it is in the context of 'when required' or 'if required'. The reason for this is simple - it would be unconstitutional for the United States to 'require' an American to do anything without that particular American previously breaking one of the laws for which he surrendered jurisdiction. In other words, the command has meaning only to a member of the trust. If you wish to remain a member in good standing, you follow the request. So

every time that it appears that you are ordered to do something in the IRC, the word 'shall' or 'must' (the word 'must' has been ruled to mean 'may' also) is used instead of the word 'required'. The sorry Bastards! Unfortunately, this short list of words for which the meaning has been changed is non-exhaustive. The list is almost never ending, and more will become evident in this writing.

To answer the question of, "What is the United States?", we must put all of the facts that we have learned together. First, let's see what it is not. It is not the fifty sovereign Republics known as the United States of America. That becomes obvious in the small amount of information given you in this writing, and there is much more information to prove that fact. It is not even the *de jure* government established by the founding fathers to provide for the common defense and insure domestic tranquillity. That government spent, stole, and cheated itself into bankruptcy in 1933. What the United States is today is a part of a trust, referred to by our so-called leaders as "the public trust", which operates on behalf of the Banksters who hold the notes on the *de jure* United States under the bankruptcy of 1933. The entities now operating in the place of the fifty Republics are actually foreign, insolvent commercial traders doing business as an implied, charitable, or resulting trust under the name of "THE STATE OF TEXAS" (or one of the other states). The trust has no authority over anyone other than its members, it is insolvent because it uses only instruments of debt as its currency in payment of debt, and it is foreign to the *de jure* "The State of Texas" for those reasons. Therefore, as a Texas American, THE STATE OF TEXAS is a foreign state operating within the external borders of Texas to provide services for its members. This move was completed in 1939, and was marked by the ruling by the Supreme Court in the Erie Railroad case. This case marked the first ruling which abandoned common law in favor of commercial law, thus ushering in the era of the trust. The actions by the United States and the fifty several States give the appearance that everything changed, and that the American people are no longer the sovereign. That is the exact image that those in charge of the trust would like to portray to you; however, the truth is quite different. The Supreme Court, in Julliard V. Greenman, 110 U.S. 121, said, "There is no such thing as a 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." In Yick Wo V. Hopkins and Woo Lee V. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, the Supreme Court said, "Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law for it is the author and source of law." What these two cases tell us is that with the American lies

sovereignty; and, therefore, his power is the source of law. That law cannot, then, be used to undermine and control the one whose power supports it. Numerous other cases support this fact. What it all comes down to is the simple fact that the United States IS NOT the sovereign with regard to the American, as those who control it would have you believe. What also becomes clear is that the United States has become the sovereign to the trust members *i.e.* citizens of the United States, and their power over those citizens is almost absolute. In fact, their power greatly resembles that of King George III of England at the time of the American Revolution. Many, if not most, Americans have contracted themselves into a state of voluntary servitude by becoming members of the trust, much like the subjects of the King in old England. Here, the good thing is that they can reverse this situation by canceling the contract, thereby becoming the sovereign once again. The bad thing is, not very many of them will.

By the way, this corporate United States even has its own flag, which many of you honor regularly. It looks like the American flag with a yellow fringe around it. It is military in nature, and is the symbol of the trust. It should not be honored by an American, because it represents that which would destroy America. Officials will tell you that the flag with the yellow fringe is the ceremonial American flag. Don't believe it's true. If that were true, there would be a testimony to that fact in writing. The truth is that such a flag does not even appear in a flag book of nations. That's because the flag is a commercial flag of the trust; and, as such, it has no place in a book of national flags. Go to any flag book or authority, and they will tell you that everything on a flag has a specific reason and meaning. Then try to find any situation where the American flag has any yellow fringe around it. The yellow represents the color of the character of those who honor and support it. Remember that any change in a flag changes the meaning of the flag.

Americans have become weak, pitiful excuses of men, without the courage to follow in the footsteps of their brave forefathers. Apathy controls unless it is our ox that is getting gored at the particular moment. What no one seems to understand is that the goring of any American's ox is the goring of every American's ox. Our strength is in our unity, and in the wonderful 'Supreme Law' left to us by our forefathers called the Constitution. Within that document lies all of the power and authority that we need to remain free, independent people. The problem is that the United States has tempted our people with the easy life, with few worries, and a master who will take care of most of the

worries that might bother us. It seems that none of us want to take responsibility for ourselves anymore. We would rather have a master to solve our problems, tell us what to do and how to live our lives, care for us when we get old, take care of our family members when they can't provide for themselves; and, in general, make or approve every decision before us. If you want someone else to do that for you, stop reading now and return this book for a refund. That is not what being an American, and being free, is about. It is about making your own decisions and living with the consequences or rewards of those decisions. It's about deciding for yourself whether or not you need to wear that seatbelt, and then living (or dying) with the decision. It's about providing for your own old age, and helping your family members through theirs without help or interference from any master. It's about earning your own living, and keeping what you earn without someone coming and telling you that you should be paying 'your fair share' of somebody else's bill. It's about doing anything you want to do as long as you do not damage someone else's life, liberty, or property. It's about accepting fair and just punishment when you do intentionally damage someone else's life, liberty, or property. If that sounds like you, keep reading. If not, stop reading now and just continue being a slave. That's all you're good for, and you don't deserve your birthright! American or member of the trust, it's your choice.



## CHAPTER 5 - THE COURTS

The court system of today is geared strictly for citizens of the United States *i.e.* members of the trust. That's right, if you are an American with full Constitutional powers, the courts have virtually no jurisdiction over you, and nothing to offer you. It's true that they will take jurisdiction, or attempt to take it under the presumption that you are a member of the trust; but the facts are clear in that no authority exists for the trust courts of today to take jurisdiction over an American, unless by contract. That's because all courts as you know them today are commercial in nature. Yes, even matters considered "criminal" are commercial matters in the courts of today. Ever wonder about the term "charge" in relation to an offense? The courts are commercial because they operate by contract under the national bankruptcy. So how did you get there?

Since the courts operate commercially under contract, there is an overriding presumption that anyone who enters the court is a member of the trust; therefore, under contract for the court to adjudicate the problem being presented. Silence is consent, so when you come forward and answer to the court, the presumption that you are a trust member contracted to the court is verified, and the court has gained jurisdiction. If you successfully rebut the presumption that you are a trust member, the court cannot gain jurisdiction, and it must rid itself of you in the fastest possible way. None of these courts are authorized to hear Article III cases, because the States have fallen because there is no real money to back them [Article I Section 10 of the Constitution]. Therefore, if you are an American who has not waived his constitutional rights by contract, you are immune from the jurisdiction of these courts unless you have intentionally damaged the life or property of someone else.

The courts are all trust courts, and their main function and duty is to protect the interests of the trust at all costs. They enforce the statutes and codes, and statutes and codes are intended for use by the trust and its members; in other words, special and private in nature. I realize that this is a big bite to swallow, so I will attempt to break this down into a simpler form.

Remember that all power flowed (and flows) from the American (American) down to the State, and then further down to the United States. The powers given are specific, and they have changed very little in the 200 plus years since they were established. The jurisdictional authority passed down

was very limited as it applied to Americans, and almost unlimited as it applied to anyone else with whom the United States might be dealing. This was all well thought out, and it was exactly what the founding fathers intended. They wanted the United States to deal with the foreign countries with full authority, because that would be the best way of providing for the safety and convenience of the individual Republics which it represented. They wanted very little authority passed to the United States over the Americans, because they had full intentions of remaining the sovereign. Remember, the main purpose of the Federal Court System; and, therefore, the Federal Laws, was to adjudicate problems between the States, settle controversies in which the United States was a party, settle matters between Americans and foreign states or its citizens, and to govern in the very limited areas of jurisdiction for which authority was given over the American. The other purpose of the Federal Laws was to govern federal citizens.

So what is a federal citizen? In essence, there is no difference between a federal citizen and a citizen of the United States. Simply, it is that person who resides within the trust and its possessions, who cannot or does not claim Sovereignty in one of the 50 Republics of the Union. A prime example of a federal citizen of today who has no choice would be the Puerto Ricans. Puerto Rico is a territory of the United States. In plain language, that means that the United States owns Puerto Rico. As such, it became a part of the trust as a result of the 1933 bankruptcy. Its citizens are citizens of the United States (trust members), but they are not Americans. They do not have Constitutional Rights, but they do have 'civil rights' under the terms of trust membership. In other words, they have the privileges and immunities provided by the Fourteenth Amendment, but not the true Rights guaranteed by the Constitution for Americans.

The United States had to have laws with which to govern the growing numbers of federal citizens. These citizens increase every time a new immigrant applies for and is granted admission into the United States. No state allows these new immigrants passage into this country, so they all come as a result of Federal authority. Therefore, the citizenship which they seek, and many eventually are granted, is federal citizenship, *i.e.* citizen of the United States. It is awarded by first granting limited membership into the trust by the issuance of a social security number, and later by bestowing full trust benefits. They can never become Americans, and they will never have full Constitutional

powers, because you either are an American from your birthright, or you will never be. Virtually all of the federal laws are written to govern the federal citizens.

Only the laws which specifically address issues for which jurisdiction was specifically given in the Constitution affect Americans. Those issues all are known as ‘Common Law’ issues. In other words, actual intentional damage has to be inflicted upon another person’s life, liberty, or property in order for jurisdiction to be taken over an American. But federal laws, using plenary authority, have no Constitutional limits other than due process placed on them, can grant jurisdiction to the government for any reason that the government wishes. Those ‘laws’ can be changed at will with very little effort (many times by nothing more than a bureaucrat writing a new regulation), and the intention of the perpetrator is not an issue; so that a person can commit a ‘crime’ without intending to do so, or knowing that he has done so. Laws such as these give the government almost total control over the people. Unfortunately, because there is no limit as to the legislative authority of Congress over its possessions, the power to govern was easily transferred to the trust with regards to its members. That is why most who are reading this book are currently bound by the private law of the trust, which is being administered and enforced by someone other than the *de jure* federal government.

Common laws do not require an elaborate court system because they could easily be decided in the local communities by the people, as they are clear and virtually indisputable. But the rules and regulations of the trust are anything but clear, and disputes are what make the system work. They are aptly named codes, meaning that some special action to unlock the secrets contained therein is necessary to understand the meanings. The trust operates totally in commerce, and it operates under bankruptcy. Therefore, everything it does is aimed at protecting the creditors’ collateral. Thus, the primary thrust of the codes is to give creditors an unfair advantage over the debtor, and to protect the collateral.

Here, we must remember that people are the primary collateral; therefore, the first duty of the trust is to protect the people in a manner consistent with the needs of the trust. That’s why a number of codes that tend to limit the individual freedoms that most of you believe you have are constantly enacted. As an example, let’s take the seat belt law. Clearly, there is no purpose for the seat belt

law as it refers to common law, because there is no greater or lesser danger to another party whether you are wearing a seat belt or not. However, the trust is depending upon your continued contributions to the maintenance of the trust, and wearing a seat belt could easily extend the period of time in which you could remain a productive member of the trust. Not wearing a seat belt could cause you to become an instant drain on the trust. Therefore, you are assessed a penalty if you are caught not wearing a seat belt. It's just a little insurance premium to protect the trust's collateral.

Criminal matters work in almost the same manner. Charges are brought against an accused. Note term "charges" is actually commercial in nature. Under the commercial trust code, what appears to be a clear-cut case of murder can be twisted around to make the killer appear to be the victim; and what would otherwise be the 'Right' to act in your own best interest can be taken away for 'the good of the many'. Actually, it's all for the good of the trust.

The original courts knew that two different classes of authority were present in the Union; and, they knew that each class had to be treated differently. One had to be given Constitutional Rights, and the other did not. After 1933, with the trust assuming virtually all of the duties previously handled by the *de jure* government, the courts were handling trust cases under the codes almost exclusively. Trust members were much easier and safer for the courts to handle, because they were subject to the trust membership rules, and had no real power or rights other than those passed by the Fourteenth Amendment. Therefore, the consequences of ruling improperly were very minimal.

It became clear that it would be in 'everyone's' best interest if the government could classify all people as members of the trust, thereby not having the worry about changing procedures and rules on a case-by-case method. Obviously, it would be much preferred if all could be treated as citizens of the United States. But, how could that be possible? The answer came about in the actual paperwork required for the court's records. At the top of each document filed in a court case, there appears what is called the 'styling of the cause'. This includes the exact names of the parties, and their respective position of plaintiff and defendant. In the names came the answer that the government was looking for. An individual American's name (sometimes referred to as his 'Christian Name') is written in proper English with a capital letter at the beginning of each name, and lower case letters for the remainder of the name (*i.e.* Jimmy Wayne Smith); and, initials are not

used for first or middle names. A corporation's name is spelled using all capital letters (*i.e.* GENERAL ACCEPTANCE CORPORATION OF TEXAS). (In case you did not already know, corporations are artificial entities, and are creatures created by, and therefore subject to, the code). Because an American has the unlimited power to contract, he can easily enter into a contract to become, or act as, an artificial entity for a specific reason. In the court system being applied today, we all become an artificial entity (corporation) by contractual agreement as soon as we respond in any fashion to the court using the name of our artificial (corporate) entity (*i.e.* JIMMY WAYNE SMITH). In doing so, we state to the court that we are there acting on behalf of our corporate entity instead of as a living man. In all cases, the styling will be in all capitals, and responding with anything other than a jurisdictional challenge by 'Special Appearance' will give jurisdiction to the court, because it will be stating that you wish to be treated as a citizen of the United States under the trust rules (code) for the duration of the proceedings. In a criminal case, when the charges are read, you can be assured that the styling of the cause is in all capitals; therefore, if you make a pleading, you are asking the court to take jurisdiction under a contractual agreement for the duration of the cause, and the court will rule by commercial law (trust code). You will also note that, in most cases, there will be a corporate United States flag (with the yellow fringe) hanging in the courtroom, indicating that you are in a commercial tribunal to be governed by trust law. Here, there are some things which you need to be aware of. First, many of the offenses for which you may be criminally charged are not laws for which an American can be held liable. For instance, Willful Failure to File (an income tax return). But let's say that the government has indicted you for willful failure to file, and you are brought before a federal judge for arraignment. He will read (or have read) the charges which the government is bringing against you. At the end of the reading, he should ask you if you understand the charges. You should always immediately challenge both the jurisdiction of the court and the jurisdiction of the 'agency' making the charge. Before a court can hear a case, it must have jurisdiction over both the person and the subject matter. Personal jurisdiction is a geographical district over which the court has jurisdiction. If you are an American and you do not live in the United States, or you did not commit the alleged offense in the United States, then the court does not have personal jurisdiction over you. Subject matter jurisdiction refers to the type of charge and the issues involved. For instance, a Federal court only has subject matter jurisdiction over an American in the area of those specific powers delegated to it by the Constitution, all of which are 'common law' in nature. You have a fair chance of the case being dismissed immediately if you properly

challenge jurisdiction. However, because of the structure in place today, the court will make the presumption that you are a member of the trust, and will attempt to rule accordingly. The problem you will face is that the court you are in, and the judge you are before, does not have the authority to hear causes or make rulings under Article III Section 2 of the Constitution, and that is where your remedy lies. He can only adjudicate Fourteenth Amendment issues *i.e.* trust issues. He actually serves as an adjudicator of the facts under the trust for its members. If you are there, the presumption is that you are a member of the trust, thus you name in all upper caps and the presumption that you are required to follow the trust rules. The overriding presumption also assumes guilt, and proof can be established by the existence of passive acts. (In common law, innocence is presumed and proof must be established by a willful affirmative act). For example, under the trust codes proof of a crime can be established by the fact that you failed to file a tax return. That lack of action could never lead to a conviction of a common law crime; however, under the rules of the trust, that failure is a crime and can result in prison time. Once again, the focus of the codes is to protect the creditors of the trust, while the focus of the common law is to protect the rights of the real man.

In the trust courts, if the judge moves past your jurisdictional challenge, you still have a Right to understand the exact law that you are being charged with violating under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In the case of 'Willful Failure to File', if you are an American, wouldn't it be a little hard to understand how your servant (the government or the trust that replaced it) can bring a charge against you for something that you never gave it jurisdiction over? A 'Bill of Particulars' (which you have a Right to demand) giving the exact law that you are charged with violating may lead to a quick ending of the action against you. If you truly are not a member of the trust, an action of a commercial nature against you is like the owner of a company being brought into court and sued by one of his low ranking employees for not following a rule which that employee made up without any authority to do so. (I do hope no one reading this finds that to be okay!) Here is this *de facto* government which gets its power from you coming to you and charging you criminally with failure to follow a rule that it set up without your approval or authority. Remember, all of this government's power flows down from you. Since the trust gets its authority from the government, the same holds true for it. The truth is that, by the terms (due process) of the Fourteenth Amendment from which their power is derived, they must tell you the exact law which

you are accused of violating. If you understand the issues, it will be impossible for them to give you a law that says you are required to file anything, and the case should be dismissed. But, if you plead, “Not Guilty”, then you have not only given jurisdiction for the duration of this cause to the court, you have also admitted that there is a law which applies to you. Basically, you’ve admitted that you are a member of the trust. After that, it is purely a question of fact - did you file or did you not file? You are no longer ‘innocent until proven guilty’, you are now a slave asking for your master’s understanding and mercy. Remember, under commercial law, the presumption is guilt.

To help you find the trees in the forest, imagine that you were brought before a judge and charged with reading a book entitled, “Capitalism, the Right Way”. Imagine that after the charge is read to you, you are told that the penalty if found guilty of this crime is 20 years hard labor. Now, imagine that you are in a Dallas County, Texas, courtroom with a United States Federal Judge in front of you and he says, “How do you plead, guilty or not guilty?”. How would you answer the question? What you might want to do is ask, “So what’s the problem, even if I did read the book?”. What if the judge then told you, “You are accused of breaking a law under the laws of the Red Chinese government. We have a treaty with them, and I need for you to plead, guilty or not guilty?” What would you say? If you plead not guilty, and you had read the book, you would be committing perjury (a crime punishable under American law), as well as admitting that this was a law which applied to you. If you plead guilty (because you had read the book), then sentencing would be all that’s left to settle. This seems ridiculous, but this is exactly what the court system today does to Americans. It charges them with a crime from the laws of a foreign state, the trust, which does not apply to them; and does it in such a way that it is very difficult for the unwary to escape the consequences that were never meant to apply to them. What you should do is to refuse to plead until jurisdiction has been fully proven, and you understand what specific law it is that you have broken and how it applies to you (you have a Right to know and understand this); and, you should object strenuously, and continue to do so, if the judge tries to enter a plea for you. Once the plea is entered, it becomes much harder to challenge the jurisdiction of the court. If the judge still enters a plea ‘on your behalf’, you should immediately file an interlocutory appeal by special appearance. This appeal may have to go all the way to the Supreme Court, but it should be ruled in your favor; because the Supreme Court has already ruled on this issue several times. Once, in Hagens V. Lavine, 415 US 528, 533, N5, the Court said, “Where jurisdiction is denied and squarely challenged,

jurisdiction cannot be assumed to exist ‘sub silento’ but must be proven.” In any event, you have no other choice, because they don’t treat disobedient slaves very well; and, to do anything else is admitting to being a slave.

Let’s further examine the courts which you are likely to be brought before. It is common that most of the lower level judges don’t even realize what they are doing in regard to the jurisdictional issue. They almost all believe that, if you live in their precinct or geographical area (or what they assume is their geographical area), they automatically gain total jurisdiction over you. Take for example a common traffic ticket. There are so many flaws in that instrument that it’s unbelievable. First, it is the enforcement of a code, so the first presumption is that everyone who gets a traffic ticket is a member of the trust. For the most part, that is correct, because in most states you now have to give your social security number in order to get a driver’s license. This practice is blatantly illegal, even by the Federal Code. In the U.S. Code Title 42, section 408(a)(8), it states, “Whoever...discloses, uses, or compels the disclosure of the social security number in violation of the laws of the United States; shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined under Title 18 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.” So we must find a place in the Code which makes forcing the disclosure of the social security number in order to receive a driver’s license unlawful. For that, we go to Title 5, section 552(a) under the heading of “DISCLOSURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER”, where it states, “It shall be unlawful for any Federal, State, or local government agency to deny to any individual any right, benefit, or privilege provided by law because of such individual’s refusal to disclose his social security account number.” These two statutes right out of the United States Code make the action of refusal to issue a driver’s license because of one’s refusal to give his social security number a felony committed by the state and/or its employees. States rely on Title 42 section 405(C)(i), which states, “It is the policy of the United States that any State (or political subdivision thereof) may, in the administration of any tax, general public assistance, driver’s license, or motor vehicle registration law within its jurisdiction, utilize the social security account numbers issued by the Secretary for the purpose of establishing the identification of individuals affected by such law, and may require any individual who is or appears to be so affected to furnish to such State (or political subdivision thereof) or any agency thereof having administrative responsibility for the law involved, the social security account number (or numbers, if he has more than one such number) issued to him by the Secretary.” Note several



things here. First, this is a policy, not a law. Second, it does not override any other law; if it did, it would use the term ‘notwithstanding’ such other law. Third, it uses a capital ‘S’ in the spelling of the word ‘State’, indicating that it is referring to the ‘States’ of the United States *i.e.* the Territories. Next, it clearly says that this applies to any “individual who is or appears to be so affected ...”. Obviously, there must be people applying for drivers’ licenses who would not be affected by this law. I wonder who they are. Last, this section comes before the section in the Code making it a felony to deny a driver’s license because of one’s failure to disclose his social security number, so Congress was not intending to end that mandate with this policy. The truth is that Americans do not even appear to be so affected, if they know they’re Americans. The problem that presents itself here for the government is that if you do not use your social security number to get the driver’s license, then the contract placing you into a state of voluntary servitude is not reverified, and you probably don’t need a driver’s license to travel on the highways while in control of an automobile. Thus, the presumption is automatically made that anyone applying for a driver’s license must be part of the collateral, or he would not need to ask for the privilege to drive. The problem here is that many of the so called law enforcement officers don’t realize that Americans are not bound by the trust code unless they are members of the trust, and an American can be constantly harassed if he tries to travel around the country without a driver’s license. Also, no other form of identification is made available for Americans wishing to use this form of travel. Most of the ‘Law Enforcement Officers’ are so ignorant that they actually believe that they are protecting freedom; when, in fact, they are the front-line tool being used to undermine the freedoms of every true American.

But let us move forward assuming that you have gotten a driver’s license by using your social security number. You then get a traffic ticket. The lower courts call this a criminal offense. The problem is that, in most of the States, it is a civil statute which is being enforced. In Texas, as an example, all the traffic laws are found in Vernon’s Civil Statutes. Yet, THE STATE OF TEXAS attaches criminal penalties to the violation of same. However, the maximum penalty available to the courts in Texas for most traffic offenses is a \$200.00 fine. Nowhere in the law is any jail time provided for a traffic offense. Yet the county jails are full of people who have done no more than failed to pay a traffic fine. Does this amount to debtor’s prison? The truth is that it does. However, as a member of the trust, you have submitted to these rules. The courts will tell you that a fine is not a debt, but they cannot show you any way that they have a legal right to put you in jail for

any traffic offense, even under their ungodly Code. There are even UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT (the trust court) cases which say that the penalties imposed cannot exceed the maximum penalty provided by law (which even one hour of imprisonment does), but they continue to lock people up anyway. Why and how does this happen?

The overriding question is how can the courts get away with these rulings? As I told you earlier, Americans can only be tried under common law. Under federal common law, the federal courts only have jurisdiction given them by the Constitution. **Black's** defines 'federal common law' as, "A body of decisional law developed by the federal courts. The application of this body of common law is limited by the *Erie doctrine* and by the Rules of Decision Act, which provides that except for cases governed by the Constitution, the treaties of the United States, or acts of Congress, federal courts are to apply state law." Think about that definition. Common law only applies in cases governed by the Constitution. But I thought all cases were governed by the Constitution. Not a case involving a member of the trust with rights only under the Fourteenth Amendment, *i.e.* a citizen of the United States. That is why common law is almost lost - virtually every case in the courts today is for a trust member, or someone who thinks he is and doesn't object to being treated like one.

This system started in 1939 with the supreme Court case of Erie Railroad Co. V. Tompkins, 304 US 64. In that case, the Supreme Court ruled that state law (commercial or trust law) would be the standard of the federal court system from that date forward in all cases except those governed by the Constitution. That completely changed the course of the federal judiciary, and ushered in the Uniform Commercial Code (hereinafter UCC) as the standard for all future cases. The UCC is an Admiralty Maritime law which is supposedly reserved for courts outside of America; but through the deceit and confusion, has become the 'law of the land'. What actually happens is that you leave America when you step into an 'Admiralty' courtroom which applies the UCC. The UCC is the law under which all of the statutes, codes, and regulations dwell; but, it is still not applicable to an American. That is why all courts must get you to agree to be treated as a citizen of the United States or subject to its jurisdiction *i.e.* a member of the trust, or they have no jurisdiction. There are many who believe that simply stepping through the rail gate which separates the viewing area (audience) from the actual court area gives the court jurisdiction over your person; and, basically admits the contract. The hiring of a BAR attorney definitely submits to the jurisdiction.

Regardless, the UCC is contract law in its strongest, most evil form, for it strips the American of all his God given, Constitutionally protected Rights, and judges him as an artificial entity, a corporation, and a slave. The UCC does not recognize or account for the fact that the sovereignty lies with the people. It only looks at ‘facts’ according to Admiralty (Commercial) law. However, it does protect itself, and in so doing, gives the American the sword he needs in court. At UCC 1-103.6, it states, “The Code is complimentary to the Common Law, which remains in force, except where displaced by the code. A statute should be construed in harmony with the Common Law, unless there is a clear legislative intent to abrogate the Common Law.” With regard to an American with full Constitutional Rights in place, there can be no legislative intent to abrogate the Common Law without an act of Treason on the part of the legislature, because the legislature was never given the authority to abrogate the Common Law with respect to Americans. So what the UCC attempts to do is trick an American into giving up his Rights through contract (does that sound familiar?). At UCC 1-207.9, it states, “When a waivable right or claim is involved, the failure to make a reservation thereof, causes a loss of right, and bars its assertion at a later date.” As we have already learned, almost any right is waivable by contract, so this is a very encompassing and damaging section. In reality, it means that anything which is claimed against you becomes a real liability to you which cannot be refuted after the initial claim has passed. **YOU MUST CLAIM YOUR SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY UNDER THE FSIA AT FIRST INSTANCE.** That principal was restated in a Supreme Court decision earlier this year [2012] when a person who had been indicted and arraigned for the illegal filing of a 1099 OID attempted to reverse his position and claim sovereign immunity after he had entered a “not guilty” plea. The Supreme Court ruled that sovereign immunity must be claimed at first instance. You must get prepared before they come after you.

As a matter of reality, you cannot use the code [the UCC is part of the code] for any reason other than to exclude yourself from it without taking a benefit from it; thereby tying yourself deeper into the system. The only two sections of the code that I have found that is acceptable for a sovereign to use is 28 U.S.C. 1602-1611 *et al* [the Foreign Sovereign immunities Act]; and 26 U.S.C. 508 (D), a church. Both of these section were codified to be exculpatory of the code. In other words, they take you out of the code, so yo cannot receive a benefit from the code.

When you are brought into court for any reason, the court will take ‘silent judicial notice’ of the fact that you have entered into one or more of these contracts which bind you in your corporate self to the jurisdiction of the trust court *i.e.* that you are under the jurisdiction of the United States. It will be very difficult to deny jurisdiction. There is, however, still a way to deny the court jurisdiction. You<sup>8</sup> must immediately declare immunity pursuant to the FSIA, and demand a jurisdictional hearing. You should enter a certified copy of the *public record* of your Affidavit of Sovereign Authority into the record immediately. Remember, in code, the *public record* is always right and can never be ruled wrong. If the court refuses to let you enter it into the courts record, take the stand and give testimony. Read your document into the record from the stand. The court will then have no choice but to admit the document into the record.

Once the document is entered into the record, the question as to who you are is a settled issue – you are the sovereign. The *public record* says so, After that, you must only prove by a preponderance of the evidence that you are not in contract that would cover your sovereignty. Any contract that could cover your sovereignty necessarily must be under the authority of a social security number. Therefore, you ask yourself two questions under oath: 1) Do you have a social security number?; and 2) Have you ever had a social security number? The answer o both question being “no”, you have made you case. Stick to it through cross-examination and you will walk out of the courthouse in a short period of time a Free Man. They will never bother you again unless you use the number again. If you do, heaven help you because nobody else can.

There is one other great asset provided to you by this ungodly code that is intended to strip away your freedoms, and it is the main tool which is used against you. Remember that an unrebutted Claim stands as truth in this system. You can use that to your advantage, because it works both ways. Basically, you are what you say you are. You can claim to be almost anything you want to be; and, if you do so by sworn affidavit filed in the *public record*, it stands as unquestioned truth unless rebutted by a sworn affidavit challenging it. Since no one on the other side is going to swear to anything, you can claim virtually anything you wish. A black man from South Africa who has been in this country one day can claim by sworn affidavit to be a white, native born American; and, absent an opposing affidavit, that statement would stand as a proven fact in these trust courts. Therefore, if you understand the system, you can turn it around to fit your needs. So, it is very easy

to prove in court that you are a fully Constitutionally empowered American. You simply put it in sworn affidavit form, file it in the *public record*, submit it to the court, and dare anybody to challenge it. Don't worry, no one will. **I do not say, nor even suggest, that you should lie in a sworn affidavit.** I simply use the example above to show the power of the *public record*. Anything can be proven.

But, you ask, if these are truly facts, how could it have ever come to pass that these Banksters have been able to gain and keep all this undeserved power. The American people have become mice that are either too scared, too ignorant, or too apathetic to do anything about the theft of their Rights and their country. For the most part, they have sold their liberty and freedom for a loaf of bread (or a six pack of beer). How sad, but some are beginning to wake up and realize what was given them, and they want it back. For those, the years ahead will be challenging, but very rewarding. For the others, they should remember that slave owners are not always benevolent, and they can change at their own will. These would-be slaves should take a look back in time at the hundreds of societies, including our own, in which the people gave their hearts, souls, and lives trying to free themselves from tyrannical, totalitarian rule. What they fought and died for – moreover, what our founding fathers fought for, died for, and left us as our birthright – we now hand back to the ‘masters’ without so much as a whimper. What a disgrace! Our founding fathers must be tossing wildly in their graves.

## Chapter 6 – A Remedy Still Exists

As mentioned earlier, the courts today are run by the trust, for the trust, and with the primary duty to protect the trust at all costs. There are no Article III Courts left. An Article III Court simply cannot exist in a debt system. It is impossible. The Supreme Court in, **Ex Parte Bakelite Corp’n** 279 U.S. 438, distinguishes between the nature of Article III Courts and other courts in that opinion with the following statements:

“While Article III of the Constitution declares, in section 1, that the judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in ‘such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish,’ and prescribes, in section 2, that this power shall extend to cases and controversies of certain enumerated classes, it long has been settled that Article III does not express the full authority of Congress to create courts, and that other Articles invest Congress with powers in the exertion of which it may create inferior courts and clothe them with functions deemed essential or helpful in carrying those powers into execution. But there is a difference between the two classes of courts. Those established under the specific power given in section 2 of Article III are called constitutional courts. They share in the exercise of the judicial power defined in that section, can be invested with no other jurisdiction, and have judges who hold office during good behavior, with no power in Congress to provide otherwise. On the other hand, those created by Congress in the exertion of other powers are called legislative courts. Their functions always are directed to the execution of one or more of such powers and are prescribed by Congress independently of section 2 of Article III; and their judges hold for such term as Congress prescribes, whether it be a fixed period of years or during good behavior.”

“These Courts, then are not constitutional Courts’ which the judicial power conferred by the Constitution on the general government can be deposited. They are incapable of receiving it. They are legislative Courts created in virtue of the general right of sovereignty which exists in the government or in virtue of that clause which enables Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory belonging to the United States. The jurisdiction with which they are invested is not a part of that judicial power which is defined in the 3d article of the Constitution, but is conferred by Congress in the execution of those general powers which that body possess over the territories of the United States. ...These Courts, ..., are legislative rather than constitutional courts, ...which are not cases or controversies within the meaning of Article III, but are merely in aid of legislative or executive action, and therefore outside the admissible jurisdiction of courts established under that Article. ... [at page 452]...The Court of Claims is such a court. It was created and has been maintained, as a special tribunal to examine and determine claims for money against the United States.”

Clearly, the Supreme Court draws the differences between constitutional and legislative [code] courts in this opinion. Other opinions, such as the one found in **National Mutual Ins. Co. v. Tidewater Transfer Co., Inc.**, reiterate and support this

opinion. In **O'Donoghue v. United States**, 289 U.S. 516 the Supreme Court of the United States held that the district courts are territorial “legislative” courts, created by virtue of Article I, or under Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution. The Supreme Court stated:

“This court has repeatedly held that the territorial courts are ‘legislative’ courts, created in virtue of the national sovereignty or under Art. IV, Section 3, cl. 2, of the Constitution, vesting in Congress the power ‘to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States’; and that they are not invested with any part of the judicial power defined in the third article of the Constitution. And this rule, as it affects the territories, is no longer open to question. Do the courts of the District of Columbia occupy a like situation in virtue of the plenary power of Congress, under Art. I, Sec 8, cl. 17, ‘To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular States and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States . . .’? This inquiry requires a consideration, first, of the reasons upon which rest the decisions in respect of the territorial courts.”

The FSIA was passed to provide remedy for those whom have a Right to an Article III hearing. Under its grant of authority, Congress was required to provide for remedy for the sovereign American People under threat of Treason. After some 40 year in the wilderness, Congress passed the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976 as revised in 1996 [“FSIA”]. For the first time since the bankruptcy of 1933, one of the sovereign American People was provided with a reasonable vehicle through which he could receive remedy from the trust; and, the remedy could be achieved in a court close to his place of abode. **In essence, the FSIA is a codification of Article III Section 2 of the Constitution; and, was passed by Congress so that judges in courts of code could hear the immunity bestowed under Article III Section 2 of the Constitution, thereby keeping said code judges out of Treason to the Constitution.** I realize that it is hard to understand how the FSIA could provide any remedy against the trust to an American, because it, like most other laws and codes, was written in a manner intended to hide its true purpose [to protect the Congress from a charge of Treason].

The reason that the FSIA can be used without taking a benefit from the code, thereby owing consideration, is that it is *exculpatory* in nature. Use of it takes one out of the code entirely. It simply states that there is no authority to bind this sovereign to the code or its jurisdiction.

Many of you will have difficulty with the terms used in the FSIA with relation to yourself. For instance, to take advantage of this FSIA, you must first be a “foreign state”. How many that reading this book believe that they are a foreign state? I know I didn’t.

Here again, we must visit the Act itself to figure out exactly what the term “foreign state” means in relation to the FSIA. The FSIA is codified at Title 28, Sections 1602-1611. First, we need to understand Title 28 Section 1603, which states:

For purposes of this chapter –

(e) A ‘foreign state’, except as used in section 1608 of this title, includes a political subdivision of a foreign state or an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state as defined in subsection (b).

(b) An ‘agency or instrumentality of a foreign state’ means any entity –

(1) which is a separate legal person, corporate or otherwise, and

(2) which is an organ of a foreign state or political subdivision thereof, or a majority of whose shares or other ownership interest is owned by a foreign state or political subdivision thereof, and

(3) which is neither a citizen of a State of the United States as defined in section 1332 (c) and (d) of this title, nor created under the laws of any third country.

(c) The ‘United States’ includes all territory and waters, continental or insular, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

(d) A ‘commercial activity’ means either a regular course of commercial conduct or a particular commercial transaction or act. The commercial character of an activity shall be determined by reference to the nature of the course of conduct or particular transaction or act, rather than by reference to its purpose.

(e) A ‘commercial activity carried on in the United States by a foreign state’ means commercial activity carried on by such state and having substantial contact with the United States.

Now, let’s break down what a foreign state is in relation to the FSIA. Here, you must understand that the statutes are subject to “strict construction”, meaning that they mean exactly what they say, and nothing else [otherwise, there would be constitutional confusion]. Section 1603 (a) says that a foreign state includes a political subdivision , or



an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state. Therefore, under strict construction of the statute, the definition of a foreign state does not include the state itself, only a political subdivision, or an agency or instrumentality thereof. Tricky, huh?

Section 1603 (b) defines what constitutes an agency or instrumentality of a foreign state with relation to the FSIA. It says that one must be a “separate legal person, corporate or otherwise”. Do you fit that description? I know I do.

Next, one must be an “organ” of the foreign state. An “organ” is defined as, “of or having to do with an *organ*; inherent; inborn, constitutional; organized, systematically arranged; in law, fundamental; as the *organic law* of the United States is the Constitution”. Sounds like the people who organized and formed the organic law (Constitution) of the United States. Do you fit that? If you are the descendant of one of those people, and you claim your inheritance, you do.

Last, it states that you must be neither a citizen of a State of the United States as defined in 1332 (c) and (d) of Title 28, nor created under the laws of any third country. When we look at Section 1332, it defines states as the Territories, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Once again, strict construction applies. Are you a citizen of any of the Territories, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico? [If you have a social security number, you are] Next, were you created under the laws of any third country? [this is the part that eliminates Frenchmen or Englishmen or anybody except Americans] If not, and you answered yes to the first two questions, then you qualify under the definition of a “foreign state” as defined in the FSIA.

What does that mean to you? It means you can claim *sovereign immunity* from the courts of the United States and of the States pursuant to Title 28 Section 1604, which states:

“Subject to existing international agreements to which the United States is a party at the time of enactment of this Act a foreign state shall be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States and of the States except as provided in sections 1605 to 1607 of this chapter.”

Note that there is an exception to that sovereign immunity if you act in a fashion that would activate Section 1605-1607 of Title 28. Without going into the exact details of the exception, it can be summarized by simply saying that if you participate in commercial activities within the United States, or if you damage another parties life or property, you loose your immunity. Any form of business with the aid or use of a social security number will activate this exception, and your sovereign immunity will be gone. For your convenience, Title 28, Section 1605:

Sec. 1605. General exceptions to the jurisdictional immunity of a  
foreign state

-STATUTE-

(a) A foreign state shall not be immune from the jurisdiction of courts of the United States or of the States in any case -

(1) in which the foreign state has waived its immunity either explicitly or by implication, notwithstanding any withdrawal of the waiver which the foreign state may purport to effect except in accordance with the terms of the waiver;

(2) in which the action is based upon a commercial activity carried on in the United States by the foreign state; or upon an act performed in the United States in connection with a commercial activity of the foreign state elsewhere; or upon an act outside the territory of the United States in connection with a commercial activity of the foreign state elsewhere and that act causes a direct effect in the United States;

(3) in which rights in property taken in violation of international law are in issue and that property or any property exchanged for such property is present in the United States in connection with a commercial activity carried on in the United States by the foreign state; or that property or any property exchanged for such property is owned or operated by an agency or instrumentality of the foreign state and that agency or instrumentality is engaged in a commercial activity in the United States;

(4) in which rights in property in the United States acquired by succession or gift or rights in immovable property situated in the United States are in issue;

(5) not otherwise encompassed in paragraph (2) above, in which money damages are sought against a foreign state for personal injury or death, or damage to or loss of property, occurring in the United States and caused by the tortious act or omission of that foreign state or of any official or employee of that foreign state while acting within the scope of his office or employment;

except this paragraph shall not apply to -

(A) any claim based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function regardless of whether the discretion be abused, or

(B) any claim arising out of malicious prosecution, abuse of process, libel, slander, misrepresentation, deceit, or interference with contract rights; or

(6) in which the action is brought, either to enforce an agreement made by the foreign state with or for the benefit of a private party to submit to arbitration all or any differences which have arisen or which may arise between the parties with respect to a defined legal relationship, whether contractual or not, concerning a subject matter capable of settlement by arbitration under the laws of the United States, or to confirm an award made pursuant to such an agreement to arbitrate, if (A) the arbitration takes place or is intended to take place in the United States, (B) the agreement or award is or may be governed by a treaty or other international agreement in force for the United States calling for the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards, (C) the underlying claim, save for the agreement to arbitrate, could have been brought in a United States court under this section or section 1607, or (D) paragraph (1) of this subsection is otherwise applicable.

(b) A foreign state shall not be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States in any case in which a suit in admiralty is brought to enforce a maritime lien against a vessel or cargo of the foreign state, which maritime lien is based upon a commercial activity of the foreign state: Provided, That -

(1) notice of the suit is given by delivery of a copy of the summons and of the complaint to the person, or his agent, having possession of the vessel or cargo against which the maritime lien is asserted; and if the vessel or cargo is arrested pursuant to process obtained on behalf of the party bringing the suit, the service of process of arrest shall be deemed to constitute valid delivery of such notice, but the party bringing the suit shall be liable for any damages sustained by the foreign state as a result of the arrest if the party bringing the suit had actual or constructive knowledge that the vessel or cargo of a foreign state was involved; and

(2) notice to the foreign state of the commencement of suit as provided in section 1608 of this title is initiated within ten days either of the delivery of notice as provided in paragraph (1) of this subsection or, in the case of a party who was unaware that the vessel or cargo of a foreign state was involved, of the date such party determined the existence of the foreign state's interest.

(c) Whenever notice is delivered under subsection (b)(1), the

suit to enforce a maritime lien shall thereafter proceed and shall be heard and determined according to the principles of law and rules of practice of suits in rem whenever it appears that, had the vessel been privately owned and possessed, a suit in rem might have been maintained. A decree against the foreign state may include costs of the suit and, if the decree is for a money judgment, interest as ordered by the court, except that the court may not award judgment against the foreign state in an amount greater than the value of the vessel or cargo upon which the maritime lien arose. Such value shall be determined as of the time notice is served under subsection (b)(1). Decrees shall be subject to appeal and revision as provided in other cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction. Nothing shall preclude the plaintiff in any proper case from seeking relief in personam in the same action brought to enforce a maritime lien as provided in this section.

(d) A foreign state shall not be immune from the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States in any action brought to foreclose a preferred mortgage, as defined in the Ship Mortgage Act, 1920 (46 U.S.C. 911 and following). Such action shall be brought, heard, and determined in accordance with the provisions of that Act and in accordance with the principles of law and rules of practice of suits in rem, whenever it appears that had the vessel been privately owned and possessed a suit in rem might have been maintained.

Now, just exactly what does the FSIA do? First, it does not provide an Article III Court for your use. There are simply none of those left. What it does do is provide remedy parallel and equal to Article III. Let's face it, since the sovereign American People never transferred authority over them to the government except in an instance where they damaged the life, liberty, or property of another, the courts of the United States could have no jurisdiction over them except where a contract activated the authority [by consent], or where damage to another's property was involved. That's exactly what the FSIA provides – immunity except in those cases.

The FSIA has actually codified the era prior to 1940, so that a statutory remedy equal to the Article III remedy available before the trust took over can be provided to one of the sovereign American People [who are the only ones entitled to such remedy]. While it is not exactly Article III remedy, it serves the purpose very well. If you are drawn into the

commercial system where you had no commercial involvement, you can invoke the FSIA, claim sovereign immunity, and the court will have no jurisdiction.

**WARNING!!! Follow these steps ONLY if you are one of the sovereign American People. Otherwise, you will land in jail, or worse.**

## CHAPTER 7 - WORDS AND TERMS

**This chapter is really more for those who choose to not claim their sovereignty and remain in the system. In other words, for those who choose not to give up their social security number. However, there are things of value here for the sovereign as well.**

To start this chapter, you should understand one principal because it applies to everything you do. Remember, **you cannot mix Law and CODE**. You cannot use code case law to prove Law, nor can you use Law to make demands in a court of code.

For example, many “patriots” file a Title 42 Section 1983 lawsuit [or other lawsuits under the code] in which they claim Rights under the 4th or 5th Amendments, or other parts of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. When they do that, the judge simply takes silent judicial notice that an idiot is appearing before him, rules against the patriot, and leaves the patriot to run around yelling unconstitutional. It was totally constitutional because it was handled totally outside the Constitution by the patriot’s consent. He’s the one who asked the court to take jurisdiction. The patriot made a basic mistake that he never realizes, the judge is not required to educate him, and the gap between what is and what we think it is grows wider.

That leads us to the use of other words and terms, which can also have the same effect. We have touched very slightly on the use of terms by the trust to create the impression that a falsehood is actually true. Since this is one of the most frequently used and most effective methods of getting Americans to say and do things which they would not ordinarily say and do, we will devote this entire chapter to a few of the most widely used terms which few Americans know the meaning of. We will revisit the terms already explained in previous chapters just to emphasize the importance of understanding the exact legal meaning of every word and term that is used in the Code and Regulations. Keep in mind that the United States Government still operates under the authority of the Constitution, and it operates in a Constitutional manner with Americans. Its codes and regulations say exactly what they mean, even though you may think they are saying something totally different. You have heard the saying, “ignorance of the law is no excuse”. It isn’t; and, if you want your Rights as an American, you must understand what the law says, and how it applies to

you. If you don't know what the laws (Code and Regulations) say, you cannot possibly avoid their traps, and you will find yourself bound as a member of the trust, and subject to its rules.

First, let's look at one of the most damaging terms, and one which even most of the so-called Patriots do not understand - that being the word/term 'of'. I have read numerous 'Patriot type' books in which the author claims to be a 'Citizen of America' or a 'Sovereign Citizen of the 50 Sovereign states under the Constitution and the laws of the united States of America'. These writers are really trying, I hope, to set themselves apart from the United States, and that is to be admired. Unfortunately, they are steering many would-be Patriots down the wrong path. They are so close, but closeness only counts in horseshoes and grenades (more in grenades), and this totalitarian trust called the UNITED STATES, and the courts that rule with commercial law, are non-forgiving. In **Black's**, the definition of 'of' is very clear. It says, "A term denoting that from which anything proceeds; indicating origin, source, descent, and the like; as, he is of noble blood. Associated with or connected with, usually in some casual relation, efficient, material, formal, or final. The word has been held equivalent to after; at, or belonging to; in possession of, manufactured by; residing at; from." Therefore, a 'citizen of the United States' has as his origin and source the United States, and he actually belongs to the United States (as a subject belongs to a King). Likewise, a 'Citizen of America', or a 'Citizen of the 50 Sovereign states' would have his origin and source founded in the 50 sovereign States. But as we have already learned, the 50 sovereign States have as their origin and source the American *i.e.* the American. Remember, a 'sovereign Citizen' could not be of a 'sovereign State', because only one can own the land, and the first 'sovereign' owns everything; therefore, the one who is of the other could not own anything within that relationship.

Now, let's examine the word "Citizen". In **Black's**, the following definition is given: "One who, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, or of a particular state, is a member of the political community, owing allegiance and being entitled to the enjoyment of all civil rights". Do you still want to be a "Citizen"? First, to whom does a sovereign owe anything, much less allegiance? Do you want to have "rights", or be entitled to "civil rights? Remember, "civil rights" are not rights at all. That is simply the name given the *privileges and immunities* granted the citizen of the United states in the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment. In other words, a "Citizen" is a subject belonging to the United States.

The American is the real sovereign from which all power flows, and the state (and the United States) is actually of the American. Remember, our forefathers created a government “of the people, by the people, and for the people”. That little phrase truly describes the *de jure* government for Americans. The American is of his God and his parents, and nothing or nobody else. God gave the Rights, and his forefathers guaranteed them through the Constitution which his parents passed on to him. They were not “civil rights”, just plain old Rights. Please do not believe that this is unimportant nit-picking. It is anything but. This trust, and those running it, will do anything to keep you under their control. The use of words is one of their chief weapons.

In the Internal Revenue Code (IRC), the legal definitions are intentionally changed from their commonly used meanings in order to confuse the American into believing that he is ‘required’ to do things that, in fact, he is only required to do if he has first become a member of the trust. First, the use of the word ‘person’ in the technical, legal sense created by the government is very misleading. If someone asked the average American if he is a person, he would probably answer ‘yes’. If he did, he would be tying the knot on his slavery that much tighter. **Black’s** defines ‘person’ as, “In general usage, a human being (*i.e.* natural person), though by statute the term may include labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers.” Notice that by ‘statute’, person never means ‘a human being’, and that the word is a ‘term’. These are all artificial entities. What this definition means is that when the IRS refers to you as a person, and you reply, you are agreeing to being treated as a trust member, a corporate entity (artificial person) for the proceeding in question, and the overall contract with the trust is reverified. That’s because their only connection to you is through the trust membership, and the statutes (codes) are for use only in regards to trust members, and they do not affect an American.

Go straight to the portion of the IRC that refers to a ‘person made liable’ as someone who is required to file an income tax return. At no place in the IRC is there a definition of ‘person made liable’, and the IRC never tells you how a person can be ‘made liable’. The ‘person’ is obviously your artificial being (when it applies to you), and you make it liable by filing a return under penalty of perjury stating that this artificial contractual entity owes the IRS money. By signing that return under penalty of perjury, your corporate entity became a ‘person made liable’, and you accepted the



responsibility of seeing that it follows the Code. Failure to do so can result in criminal charges against you under commercial law, because you accepted responsibility for this artificial entity's actions. This would equate very closely to a bookkeeper for a large corporation being held criminally liable for 'juggling the books' to make the corporation look better or avoid certain responsibilities. In other words, you have just claimed to be a corporate entity as a member of the trust, and the trust has accepted your claim as true; therefore, you are now subject to commercial law, and the income tax.

Now let's look at the definition of 'income'. The Supreme Court said, in **Eisner V. Macomber**, 252 US 189, "...it becomes essential to distinguish between what is and what is not 'income', according to truth and substance, without regard to form. Congress cannot, by any definition it may adopt, conclude the matter, since it cannot by legislation alter the Constitution, from which it derives its power to legislate, and within whose limitations, alone, that power can be lawfully exercised...". Here, it becomes clear why the IRC does not give a clear definition of income - it can't! It would be unconstitutional to call payment for an American's labor income, and then place a tax upon it. In numerous court cases, income is defined as a profit or gain of a corporation, or a capital gain. Never is it defined as payment for an American's labor.

It becomes very clear through both the codes and the implementing regulations that the only 'income' in the form of 'wages' or 'compensation for personal services' that is taxable is that of a federal employee. To be more specific, the 'taxing statutes' refer to 'gross income', or 'wages', or 'compensation for personal services'. To examine the text of how these taxes came about, we must go back to 1939; and there, we examine an act which is today obscure in that most Americans have never even heard of it. Here, we must understand that every statute which has been enacted relating to income tax since the 1939 Internal Revenue Code is still effective and in force today unless it has been specifically repealed by a later statute. This system is used by the trust to make it much more difficult for an American to discover what the law actually requires of him. The government prints the codes that it does not want you to fully understand only one time, usually very vaguely, and then relies upon the fact that it was never repealed to hold you accountable for it. By not including all of the codes, regulations, and definitions in each new rendition of the Internal Revenue Code (or for that matter, many other codes), the perception can easily be left that the code

says something, which, in truth, it does not say. Remember that the IRS will never tell you whether or not you are a ‘person made liable’. That’s because only you can determine that you are a “person made liable”. They know that, in truth, you are not such a person unless you choose to be a trust member through voluntary actions, but they want you to believe that you are mandatorily made liable without any action on your part. Shortly after the enactment of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, Congress passed a bill known as the ‘Public Salary Act’. Within this bill, we can find the exact way that the trust has deceived the American people into believing that the income tax was intended for them. Within this unrepealed (and, therefore, in effect today) Act, the definition of ‘wages’ and ‘compensation for personal services’ is given. At Title 1, Section 1, of the Public Salary Act of 1939, it states, “Section 22(a) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the definition of ‘gross income’ is amended after the words ‘compensation for personal services’ the following: ‘including personal service as an officer or employee of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or an agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing.” Remember that the word ‘including’ in the codes means that only what follows in the list is a part of the definition. Taking all these facts into consideration, it becomes clear that ‘wages’ or ‘compensation for personal services’ are terms which relate only to money paid to federal government (trust) employees for their services rendered thereunder. That is why the IRS will never give you an answer if you ask for a precise definition of ‘what is income’, or ‘how one can be made liable’. If they told you, you would immediately know that you do not owe them a return or any taxes, unless you are a federal employee or trust member. By never including the definition of income in any statutes after 1939, the IRS can be reasonably sure that the average American will never truly know its meaning.

Next, let’s examine exactly what a nonresident alien individual is. **Black’s** defines ‘alien’ as, “A foreign born person who has not qualified as a citizen of the country...”. **Black’s** defines ‘non-resident’ as, “One who does not reside within jurisdiction in question; not an inhabitant of the state of the forum. Special rules govern service of process on non-residents.” Now, remember that Texas and California and the other 48 states of the Union are not in the United States - so were you born in the United States? Do you live in the United States? If not, you may be a nonresident alien to the United States and the IRS. If you are an American, you most likely are a nonresident alien to both the United States and the IRS, unless you have gained residency as a member of the trust. Doesn’t it make you wonder what those ‘special rules’ that govern service of process on these

nonresident aliens might be? I wonder if that could have anything to do with jurisdiction, or the lack thereof, over an American. After all, the American is only subject to very limited jurisdiction, and any service of legal papers would necessarily have to fit under that limited jurisdiction. That is in direct contrast to the citizen of the United States who is subject to whatever jurisdiction that the trust places on him. This person's source is from within the United States, and his duty is to the trust and its set of codes and regulations, including the filing of a tax return.

About that 'penalty of perjury' thing, the United States Code, at 28 USC 1746, gives the proper wording to be used for unsworn statements under penalty of perjury as follows: "(1) If executed without the United States: 'I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (Date) (Signature).'" "(2) If executed within the United States, its territories, possessions, or commonwealths: 'I declare (or certify, verify, or state) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on (Date) (Signature).'" Do you find it to be a bit strange that if executed within the United States, the laws of the United States of America do not apply? And who would execute something outside of the United States using the laws of the United States of America if it were not an American in America? Now look at the penalty of perjury declaration on any IRS form, such as the 1040. It says, "Under penalty of perjury, I declare that I have examined this return, including accompanying schedules and statements, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, it is true, correct, and complete." Which of the declarations does this form fit? It fits number two, if executed within the United States, because it does not account for the laws of the United States of America. In other words, it is not governed by the Constitution; and, therefore, anyone signing this document cannot be protected by the Constitution. By signing this form (or any form with this declaration) you tell the world that your principal citizenship resides within the United States because of your membership in the trust, and that you place yourself as a subject under the jurisdiction of the trust, *i.e.* a citizen or resident of the United States. Remember that an unchallenged claim or statement becomes proven under commercial law; and since no one is going to challenge who you say you are, the signing of this document alone makes you a citizen of the United States and a member of the trust by contract, and thereby subject to and of its codes and regulations.

To refresh your memory, the words ‘shall’ and ‘must’ have been ruled by the supreme Court to have the same meaning as the word ‘may’ when used in the statutes to avoid any Constitutional misunderstandings or misapplication. The word ‘required’ is always used if the action is something that the code makes mandatory. In **Black’s**, several court cases are used to give the definition of ‘may’, ‘shall’, and ‘must’. That definition states, “**MAY**. An auxiliary verb qualifying the meaning of another verb by expressing ability, competency, liberty, permission, possibility, probability, or contingency. **US V. Lexington Mill & E. Co.**, 232 U.S. 399, 34 S.Ct. 337, 340, 58 L.Ed. 658. Word ‘may’ usually is employed to imply permissive, optional, or discretionary, and not mandatory action or conduct. **Shea V. Shea**, Okl. 537 P2d 417, 418. Regardless of the instrument, however, whether constitution, code, deed contract or whatever, courts not infrequently construe ‘may’ as ‘shall’ or ‘must’ to the end that justice not be the slave of grammar. However, as a general rule, the word ‘may’ will not be treated as a word of command unless there is something in the context or subject matter to act or indicate that it was used in such a sense. **Bloom V. Texas State Bd. of Examiners of Psychologists**, Tex.Civ.App. 475 S.W.2d. 374, 377.” In another supreme Court ruling, **Cairo and Fulton R.R. Co. V. Hecht**, the Court said, “As against the government, the word ‘shall’ when used in the statutes is to be construed as ‘may’, unless a contrary meaning is manifest.” Similar language can be found in many lower court rulings, such as **George Williams College V. Village of Williams Bay**, NW 2nd 891, where the court stated, “‘Shall’ in a statute may be construed to mean ‘may’ to avoid constitutional doubt.” Just think how easy it would be for the code to simply use the word ‘required’ each time it used the word ‘shall’ in the codes; if, in fact, the action was ‘required’. The writers of the code knew exactly what they were doing when they wrote them, and they knew that there was no way to ‘require’ an American to do any of the things that are implied to be required; so, they simply used convoluted language to make you believe that you are required to do something that, as an American, you could never be required to do.

To really understand exactly how the ‘legal’ language is being used to deceive the average American, let’s look at the definitions for these three words, “may’, ‘shall’, and ‘must’ in **Webster’s Dictionary**. The definition for ‘may’ is, “expressing possibility, permission, contingency, uncertainty, hope.” The definition of ‘shall’ is, “used to make compound tenses or moods to express futurity, obligation, command, condition, or intention.” The definition for ‘must’ is, “to be obligated, by physical or moral necessity...to express compulsion, obligation, probability,

certainty...”. These definitions (with the possible exception of ‘may’) express totally different meanings than the courts have ruled the ‘legal’ meaning to be. How many Americans own and regularly use a legal dictionary when deciding what their obligations and duties are to the United States Government? If you want to retain (or regain) your Rights as an American, you might want to consider buying regularly using a good legal dictionary, so that you’ll know what the government is telling you to do, and whether its mandatory or optional. In fact, if you never claim your sovereignty, you need to know what the government is saying to you.

The word ‘individual’ is used repeatedly in the Code and Regulations. **Black’s** gives the definition of ‘individual’ as, “As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons.” Surprise! When the Code refers to an individual, it’s really talking about an artificial person, not an American.

The IRS will tell you that the sections of the IRC which makes you liable to file a tax return and pay the resultant tax are 6011 and 6012. IRC Section 6011, titled as “GENERAL REQUIREMENT OF RETURN, STATEMENT, OR LIST”, states, “GENERAL RULE. When required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary, any person made liable for any tax imposed by this title, or with respect to the collection thereof, shall make a return or statement according to the forms or regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Every person required to make a return or statement shall include therein the information required by such forms and regulations.” IRC Section 6012, titled as “PERSONS REQUIRED TO MAKE RETURNS OF INCOME”, states, “GENERAL RULE. - Returns with respect to income taxes under subtitle A shall be made by the following: (1)(A) Every individual having for the taxable year gross income which equals or exceeds the exemption amount...”. Now, let’s examine these two sections more closely. First, this refers to a ‘person’. We now know that, in the statutes, this term refers to a corporate or other artificial entity. It uses the term, “when required by regulations”. Notice that it does not tell you of whom it is required, or even that it is required at all. Then it states, “Every person required to make a return or statement shall include therein the information required by such forms and regulations.” It does not require anything. It then says that if such person has ‘gross income’ for the taxable year. We now know

that ‘gross income’ refers only to wages of federal employees, and the profit or gain of a corporation. The only command given is where it says, “Every person...shall include therein the information required by such forms and regulations.” Clearly, knowing what we know about the word ‘shall’, this ‘command’ simply says that we ‘may’ include this information if we want to, even if we are a ‘person made liable’.

So let’s rewrite this statute in everyday language that we all understand. It would look something like this to an American.

Sec. 6011 “GENERAL REQUIREMENT OF RETURN, STATEMENT, OR LIST”

“GENERAL RULE. When required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary, any corporation made liable for any tax imposed by this title, or with respect to the collection thereof, may make a return or statement, according to the forms or regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Every corporation required to make a return or statement may include therein the information required by such forms and regulations.”

Sec. 6012 “CORPORATIONS OR ARTIFICIAL PERSONS REQUIRED TO MAKE RETURNS OF INCOME”

“GENERAL RULE. - Returns with respect to income taxes under subtitle A may be made by the following: (1)(A) Every artificial person having for the taxable year wages from the Federal Government which equals or exceeds the exemption amount...”.

Now that we understand these few terms, let’s re-examine the section of the Regulations that the IRS says makes us liable for the income tax. First, at CFR 1.1-1, we find, “Income tax on individuals. - (a) *General rule.* Section 1 of the Code imposes an income tax on every individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States and, to the extent provided by 871(b) and 877(b), on the income of a nonresident alien individual.” Under (b) of the same section, it states, “*Citizens or residents of the United States liable to tax.* In general, all citizens of the United States, wherever resident, and all resident alien individuals are liable to the income taxes imposed by the Code whether the income is received from sources within or without the United States.” Under (c) of that section, “*Who is a citizen.* Every person born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction is a citizen.” (Does that sound like the 14th Amendment to you?). Now let’s rewrite this regulation with our new knowledge of the meanings of words and terms.

## CFR 1.1-1

“Income tax on Artificial Persons . - (a) *General rule.* Section 1 of the Code imposes an income tax on every artificial person who is a subject of the United States and, to the extent provided by 871(b) and 877(b), on the income of a nonresident alien artificial person.”

(b) “*Subjects of the United States liable to tax.* In general, all subjects of the United States, wherever resident, and all resident alien artificial persons are liable to the income taxes imposed by the Code whether the income is received from sources within or without the United States.”

(c) “*Who is a subject.* Every child of a subject born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction is a subject.”

The truth is that an American could have a child born within the United States, and that child’s primary standing would still be that of an American, not a citizen of the United States. Just as a citizen of England could have a child born in another country, and that child’s primary citizenship would still be that of an English subject.

At CFR 1.871-7 (a), it states, “*Imposition of tax.* This section applies for purposes of determining the tax on a nonresident individual who at no time during the taxable year is engaged in a trade or business in the United States...a nonresident alien individual to whom this section applies is not subject to the tax imposed by section 1 or section 1201(b) but, pursuant to the provisions of 871(a), is liable to a flat tax of 30 percent upon the aggregate of the amounts determined under paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section which are received during the taxable year from sources within the United States.” At CFR 1.1402(b)-1(d), it states, “*Nonresident aliens.* A nonresident alien individual never has self employment income...such nonresident alien individual will not be subject to the tax on self-employment income, since any net earnings which he may have from self-employment do not constitute self-employment income.” Wow! This looks like a pretty lucky guy here - he owes the government (trust) nothing, regardless of how much he makes. It goes on to say, “For the purpose of tax on self-employment income, an individual who is not a citizen of the United States, but who is a resident of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or, for the taxable years beginning after 1960, of Guam or America Samoa is not considered to be a nonresident alien individual.” Think about that statement. If you are not a citizen of the United States, but you are just a resident of any of the territories, you are subject to the income tax. But note that it does not even mention what happens if you are not a citizen of the United States, but you are one of the

sovereign American people. That person obviously is a nonresident alien to the United States; and, therefore, to the IRC. Are you beginning not to be so intimidated by the IRS yet?

Another point which needs to be emphasized here is the use of capitalization of letters as a means of indicating to whom a code or regulation is referring. Although this is not exactly a use of terms, it falls into the same general category. Please understand that the capitalization of letters is used precisely by the trust to indicate to whom or what the codes are referring. First, take the word (c) Citizen as used in legal and lawful writings. If you will look at any accurate copy of the Constitution, you will see that the word Citizen is used many times in the original Constitution and the first Ten Amendments. The word “Citizen” was used here well before the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, or even the Statutes at Large were written; and, the word had a different meaning than that of today, see **Bouvier’s law Dictionary, First American Edition, 1838**, for the original meaning of the word “Citizen”: “One who, under the constitution and laws of the United States, has a right to vote for representatives in Congress and other public officers, and who is qualified to fill offices in the gift of the people...” Notice that a “Citizen” did not “owe allegiance to the United States; whereas, it the current definition, that has changed. Each time that word is used, it starts with a capital ‘C’. The reason is that it is referring to the sovereign, the owner of all land within the jurisdiction of the Constitution. This is a real man, a natural person, the landowner, the sovereign. However, when we get to the Fourteenth Amendment, the word citizen begins with a lower case ‘c’. This is because the person referred to here is a subject, not a proper, natural person with Rights given by God and guaranteed by the Constitution. Now, note that every time the word citizen is used in the Code and/or Regulations, it is spelled with a lower case ‘c’ (with the possible exception of when it is the first word in a sentence). That’s because the Code and/or Regulations affect only members of the trust in their artificial capacity; and, with the use of this single tool, the United States Government, on behalf of the trust, clearly tells you whom it is talking to. If you want to assume the words are meant for you, they will let you, and then hold you responsible for following the Code and Regulations correctly. Anytime that the word ‘of’ is used before the word ‘citizen’, it would be correctly spelled with a lower case ‘c’; because a subject of anything (except God) could not be the sovereign.



Just as important is the capitalization of the names of the (S)states involved in and under the Constitution. In the 'Declaration of Independence of the united States of America', the founding fathers used a lower case 'u' in the word united. That is because the 'united States of America' was not a title, but simply a statement of the states (Republics) which were united in the Union. As such, united is only used as an adjective for the states which were united under the Constitution. When the Federal Government enters the picture, the names 'United States' and 'United States of America' are changed to "UNITED STATES" and "UNITED STATES OF AMERICA", and are used to identify the trust which is exercising its authority. Therefore, anytime in the codes where the word 'State' is used, it identifies a corporate name or entity. Anytime the word 'state' is used, it refers to one of the 50 sovereign Republics, and since it does not refer to a particular 'State', or the entire group of 'States', it is not a proper name; and, therefore, it is not capitalized. Anytime the word 'State' is used in the codes, it is referring to a corporation *i.e.* one of the Territories; and, therefore, is a proper name and is capitalized.

In a different, but just as invasive, arena, the corporate (trust) STATES set up under the corporate UNITED STATES, take almost as much undeserved power as the Federal Government. Their power flows directly from the UNITED STATES or UNITED STATES OF AMERICA. The entity which refers to itself as 'THE STATE OF TEXAS', or the 'THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA', etc. is the trust exercising its commercial activity within the external boundaries of the sovereign states. They, too, use words and terms to rob the American of his Rights. For example, if most people were asked if they owned property, they would answer yes. If you pressed for details of the kind of property that they owned, most would break it down into two types of property - personal and real. Unfortunately, THE STATE OF TEXAS (or any of the fifty names) operates under the same commercial law as, and under the authority of, the UNITED STATES. Therefore, the designation itself of 'personal property' tells you that the corporation owns that property. Take a car for example. If you buy a car, and pay for it in full, you get a title of ownership for that car - right? WRONG! You get a certificate of title, stating basically that there is a title, but you don't have it. The one who has the title owns the car. That would be THE STATE OF TEXAS (or any of the fifty names). The licensing fee that you pay each year on that car is actually a fee for the use of someone else's car. You can never own the car, because THE STATE OF TEXAS has claimed sovereignty

over you as a trust member, and only the sovereign can actually own property. What you actually own is the use of the car, and you continue to pay a fee for that use.

Real property works the same way. The term 'real property' actually means 'owned by the STATE'. Think about it - if you actually own the home in which you live; and, therefore, you are the sovereign, how could anyone assess you a rent each year (property tax) and then take your home away from you if you don't pay it? Obviously, whoever does that has taken the role of sovereign, and that means that you are not the sovereign. But your forefathers left you a birthright in which you are the sovereign. This loss of sovereignty can only happen to you if you have contracted to have your standing as an American set aside in favor of a membership in the trust. I'll bet you didn't know when you did that. Basically, anything for which you are taxed in a mandatory fashion does not belong to you, *i.e.* with you as the sovereign; but, rather the STATE is the sovereign and supreme owner, giving it the right to tax in order to be compensated for the use of its property. Otherwise, you would be receiving unjust enrichment (the use of somebody else's property for which you have no right). Can you imagine someone trying to tax a king in his own kingdom? It would be a good way to commit suicide!

From the two examples above, numerous other Rights have been seized from you by the trust that would own everything. For instance, the Right to travel. The STATE (trust) has turned that into a privilege called 'driving' or 'operating a motor vehicle' for which a STATE license and fee is required. They now are trying to also require that you be a citizen or subject of the United States before you can attain one of these licenses, and to prove it by providing your trust membership number, as referred to as a social security number. In truth, an American does not need a 'license' to travel on the highways and byways of his own land in an automobile, but because of the corrupt and/or ignorant 'law enforcement' (trust enforcement) departments and officers around the country, it can become very stressful and even dangerous for an American to claim his Right to travel freely. It's hard to believe, but they actually let these trust enforcement officers run around with guns shooting and arresting people. Their authority is restricted to members of the trust, but most are too ignorant to understand their limitations as to their jurisdiction. Although the law and the Constitution are both on the side of the American, the 'bad guys' have the bullets, and they will use them to enforce the code which doesn't even apply to Americans. The problem is that they, like

most other people in this land, don't even know what the 'law' is, and they may kill you to prove a point. If you make it into court, and there make the right argument, you will eventually prevail; but do not be confrontational with the officer on the road.

One last term that really puts an exclamation mark on this whole subject matter is the term 'dual citizenship'. This term applies to someone who holds citizenship in two different countries. So, are you a dual citizen? Most people in America would answer that question, "No", but if they also claimed to be a citizen of the United States, their answer would be incorrect. **Black's** defines 'dual citizenship' as, "Citizenship in two different countries. Status of citizens of the United States who reside within a state; *i.e.* persons who are born or naturalized in the U.S. are citizens of the U.S. and the state wherein they reside." Note that the word 'state' is spelled with a lower case 's'; and therefore, refers to one of the 50 Sovereign states of the Union. This one definition tells you, without a doubt, that Texas (or any of the other 49 states of the Union), is a different country than the United States. If you remain a dual citizen, you are subject to the laws of both countries. The United States is a foreign country to any of the 50 sovereign States; and its laws are necessarily foreign to an American who is not also a citizen of the United States. . Case closed!

## **CHAPTER 7 - THE GOVERNMENT AND THE CHURCH**

This chapter may not be for everybody reading this material who is interested in retaining or regaining his/her Rights as an American. I want to make it very clear that you do not have to be a Christian in order to be an American. Being one, however, can make it much easier to live and operate in the trust world without a social security number. I would strongly suggest that it would be a mistake of monumental proportions to try to fake being a Christian in order to receive the benefits that come as a result of that belief pattern, much in the same magnitude as choosing to be a citizen of the United States instead of an American; and, that's only the consequences in this worldly lifetime. So, if you are not a Christian, you may want to skip this chapter.

The church has been referred to as a 'sanctuary' for hundreds of years. Even today, many refer to the church as a sanctuary. But the truth is that there are two types (formations) of the "Christian"

Church. Both types are recognized within the United States Code; more specifically, within the Internal Revenue Code. That likeness is about all the two have in common except that they both claim to worship Christ. The first of the two types of churches is found at Section 501(c)(3) of the IRC, where it states, “ **List of exempt organizations...**Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary or educational purposes, or to foster national or international sports competition (but only if no part of its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earning of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation (except as otherwise provided in subsection (h)), and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office.” I printed this entire subsection so that you might better understand who or what this/these ‘church(es)’ is/are in relevance to the rest of society, and what the rules this/these church(es) must abide by in order to keep status as an exempt organization.

First, please take note that this ‘church’ is a corporation. That’s right, each church wishing to be tax exempt under 501 (c)(3) of the IRC is incorporated. What that actually means is that their origin and source is of the government *i.e.* the UNITED STATES; therefore, there is a list of rules which must be obeyed in order to maintain that status. The UNITED STATES is actually the ‘grantor’ of this church’s being. So, where does God fit in? Very carefully, if at all, is the correct answer. As you will note from the code itself, this church is very limited in its ability to do certain things. For instance, it cannot become political in any way. That seems a little ridiculous to most people. After all, don’t most religious people want to consult their religious leaders about possible candidates for public office? And, don’t most Christians want to have a say in who represents them? Well, if the church’s leaders are discovered making political statements or giving assessments on who would be a good representative and why, the church can lose its exemption. This very thing happened to a Baptist Church in Massachusetts in 1992. The minister said from the pulpit that a vote for Bill Clinton would be a mortal sin, and the IRS pulled his church’s tax exempt status as a result. Any of you who watch the 700 Club on TV probably followed that story; but that church still has not gotten its exemption back. But what if God did in fact direct this minister to tell

his flock to vote for a particular person, or not to vote for a particular person? In a real Christian Church, would the government be able to tell the minister not to obey what he believes God told him to do? Well, if he does not disobey God in this case, his church loses its tax exemption.

Now, you ask, why would any church obligate itself to such ungodly rules? That answer, too, is simply - MONEY! The church gets a large portion of its income from people who wish to deduct their gift (tithes, offerings, donations, etc.) from their own personal tax return at the end of the year. Many other major contributions are made for the explicit reason that they can be deducted directly off the giver's tax return; and, many times, can throw that person into a lower tax bracket in the process. That means that such a contribution can very well wind up actually making the giver money as a result of the lower bracket. If the church could not accept tax deductible contributions, their revenues would fall sharply. Consequently, the churches actually prostitute many of their principles just to maintain this exemption. But, you say, "Not my church. We follow God, and the government has nothing to do with the way we run our church's affairs." There is a way that you can know for sure if that is true. Simply ask your church for a receipt so that you can deduct your contributions from your tax return; and, if you are given one, your church has its foundation based upon the trust, not upon God.

In the Bob Jones University case, the Supreme Court ruled that a contribution to a 501 (c)(3) church was always tax deductible because it was, in fact, a government subsidy. Could that mean that your money that is given to the church is actually going to the government? Well, as a matter of fact, yes it could mean exactly that. You see, that church [that offers tax deductions to its contributors] is actually a corporation, and it has as its origin and source, the trust doing business as the UNITED STATES. Therefore, anything going to the church is really going directly into the trust account; and, is therefore, tax deductible. It's tax deductible because it's being paid directly into the trust system at its origin.

Now, you ask, just which church is this that we're talking about? It's just about every church that you have ever thought of as being a church. It's the Baptist, the Methodist, the Catholic (as we know it in this country), the Church of God, and most of the others which you can think of with a very few notable exceptions that we will cover later. If you belong to one of these churches, and

you don't believe what I'm telling you, go to your pastor or church accountant and ask to see the form that is filled out and sent to the IRS every three months. It's 13 pages long! It covers everything from who gave contributions to exactly what is done with the contributions. It probably says something about you in there. Then ask to see a list of the corporate rules that the church is required to follow in order to keep its tax exempt status. If you are told that there is no such thing, you are being lied to [call the IRS and get a copy of the regulations]. Remember, there are always rules that must be kept in order to maintain a corporation. If you don't believe that, file a corporation and see. Also, remember that your church leaders are not going to want you to know the whole truth about what they are being forced to do in order to keep the tax exempt status.

What all this means is that the church that you thought was independent and of God, is actually very dependent and of the trust. This church actually represents the equivalent of what the Church of England represented to our forefathers. It is the church of, by, and for the government. It is also represented in the New Testament by the Pharisees. Remember those guys who were always trying to collect taxes from Jesus. It's the same people in a new costume.

There is another church, but few even know of its existence. It is found in the IRC at 508 (c), where it states, "(c) Exceptions (1) Mandatory exceptions: Subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to, (A) churches, their integrated auxiliaries, and conventions or associations of churches...". This section is referring to the filing requirements for 501 (c)(3) organizations, and it clearly says that churches are an exception (not an exemption) to the law. Note that in 501 (c)(3), the church there is a corporation. If your church files a tax return, it is a corporation, and it is not the church referred to in 508 (c). The church referred to in 508 (c) is obviously unorganized and definitely not a corporation; and, as such, it is outside of the jurisdiction of the IRS and the UNITED STATES. No filing is or can be required of it, because it stands alone outside of the trust jurisdiction. It can truly be God's Church, and it is formed on the very basis that Jesus set out while on Earth. It is the sanctuary that we have always heard that the church is supposed to be, and it is a resting place and safe shelter for those who seek refuge from the tyrannical government now in place.

You may wonder what churches fall under this umbrella. There are, in fact, many; but probably only a few that you have heard of. The most noted church or group that you would recognize is the

Amish. Most of you know that the Amish are well known for not partaking of the ‘system’ or its ways. What many don’t know is that they don’t pay taxes of any kind [they won’t take social security numbers, so they cannot pay taxes], and they are only subject to the jurisdiction of the government if they break one of the ‘common laws’ for which jurisdiction was surrendered by our forefathers. The fact that they don’t use modern tools or equipment has nothing to do with the sovereignty they enjoy in their everyday lives. In fact, there are many churches which are a product of Americans who have been studying the law as it applies to them and their freedoms. Those Americans have found a refuge in the unincorporated 508 (c) church where they can live their lives, both spiritually and literally, without the trust’s interference. For those people, the 23rd Psalms will take on a whole new meaning. Matthew 23 can also be read with a whole new meaning and understanding. Once you understand what a 508 (c) church is, go back and read these verses, and you will receive a new and wonderful understanding.

The proof of the above is abundant. A 508 (c) church can open a bank account that nobody, not even the IRS, can even look at. Remember, the 508 (c) is an exception to the law (in other words, it’s outside the law), not an exemption that the code gives as a privilege. Anything the 508 (c) church owns cannot be taxed or seized by the government. It resides in a different jurisdiction.

## **CHAPTER 8 – THE BEST KEPT SECRET**

In 1933, this country was thrown into bankruptcy, as detailed in an earlier chapter. At that point, there were only two things left that had value – the land and the people. This government, fearing for its very existence, decided to use its people to ‘bail it out’ of the jam. So it took the good names of the people themselves and created instruments of worth through pledging those people into a state of servitude to the trust. As such, the citizens of the United States became nothing more than collateral for the debt owed by the United States to the Banksters. On its face, such an act would violate the Constitution and leave the actors subject to charges of Treason, so these deceivers came up with a clever solution to the problem. They took all the birth certificates of the people (the birth certificates belong to the STATE which created them), and formed corporations using the names found on those certificates (and the persons to whom they attach) as the basis and

worth of the corporations. When the corporations were formed, the names of the living men and women, and the new corporations were exact except that the corporation names were spelled with all capital letters, indicating the difference between the corporation and the living man who was supplying the true worth behind the corporation. The trust accepted the collateral, then set about to systematically insure that all men and women would cease to use their natural being, and would instead use the new, artificial being created and owned by the STATE. The trust then attached its number [the social security number] to its collateral for easy identification.

If you have trouble believing the facts in the preceding paragraphs, think about when the last time was that you received any formal letter, document, contract, IRS statement or billing, court papers, or anything of any official capacity from any governmental agency or body, or from any corporation, which did not have your name spelled with all capital letters. If you want to really be convinced, ask your bank, credit card company, the IRS, any court, or any other official corporation or government agency to use your name properly spelled (capitals and lower case letters) on any official documents referring to you. They will refuse. They will probably tell you that the computer will not let them use lower case letters in a name [which is probably true]. After you have proven this to yourself, ask yourself why. Surely the spelling of your name in all capitals could not be that important. The truth is that it is all important.

Through the use of this system, the STATE has created corporations which it, in fact, owns. If you use your proper name (capitals and lower case spelling), the STATE does not own that, because it was never given power over the flesh and blood man. By owning all of the corporations which do business within the STATE, the STATE can write whatever rules and regulations it desires, and there is no Constitutional conflict, because a corporation is not protected by the Constitution. He trust is a paper state, in which the *public record* is everything and cannot be wrong. The Rights guaranteed by the Constitution to the Americans can never be realized, because everyone is acting through his corporation by consent [contract]. Therefore, those who would otherwise be Americans having Constitutional protections and guarantees, become nothing more than



corporations owned by the STATE. Moreover, the American who has become a citizen of the United States can do so only as an artificial entity [corporation]. Thus, he becomes property owned by the STATE when he declares himself (or allows the STATE to declare him) a citizen of the United States or subject to its jurisdiction.

What really occurs when an American becomes a corporation *i.e.* citizen of the United States, is that two parallel entities exist simultaneously with each other. One, the *nom de guerre*, goes about performing all the business functions. The other, the living man, sits idly back believing he is in control. The STATE deals only with the *nom de guerre* over which it has total domain, because it is the creator and owner of that property. The STATE never gains jurisdiction over the living Man *i.e.* American.

The courts are now all commercial in nature, as discussed earlier. That means that everything is related directly to the equity in property which is at issue in the cause before the court. Knowing that the courts are commercial, we can easily see why they must require that the name be in all capitals in the styling. The courts can deal only in equity, and there is no definable equity in a living man. Therefore, the courts can have no jurisdiction over a living man. Unfortunately, citizens of the United States are artificial entities, not ‘living men’, so the courts can assume unquestioned jurisdiction over citizens of the United States. Remember, the overriding presumption in every court is that you are a citizen of the United States or subject to its jurisdiction [with a social security number to prove it] any time you enter the court.

As in all of the tyrannical actions taken by this *de facto* government, the remedy for the ruthless and deceitful actions taken by it can be found only through a proper Claim of sovereign authority, and the invoking of the FSIA. Any other remedy within the code only moves you deeper into the grasp of the code.

When you become a party to any action which draws you into a court, your first act should be to file a certified copy of the *public record* that identifies you as a sovereign. To do that, you need to file an “Affidavit of Sovereign Authority” in which you Claim

your Birthright as *one of the sovereign American people* i.e. a direct descendant of those people in the original Thirteen Colonies who declared their Independence from King George III of England, took up arms against him in defense of their Claim, forced the Paris Treaty of Peace I 1783 in which King George III recognized those specific people as sovereigns equal to him; and, pledged that his heirs and the international sovereign community would forever honor their sovereignty.

That Claim makes you a “foreign state” within the definition and meaning of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976, as revised 1996.

Once you have established your capacity as one of the sovereign American People, therefore a “foreign state” under the FSIA, the court loses all jurisdiction over you [unless your action falls under the exceptions given in Section 1605 of Title 28]. If you have filed a counterclaim [which you are fully authorized to do], then only the counterclaim will be heard, because the action brought against you must be dismissed.

It is important that you understand that the authority and capacity that you must rely upon comes only from the Thirteen Original States, and your Claim must be that you are a descendant of one of the original “We the People”, or you will be ignored, and you will be ignored.

## **Chapter 8 – America’s Royal Family**

This chapter is dedicated to putting what you have already learned into perspective. It is being added to the original book over a year after the release of the book, so there will be many copies in the hands of people that do not contain this section. Therefore, I wish to stress that this addendum is only an attempt to help you better understand what you have already learned.

I’m sure that many of you are already convinced that I’m a real nut. Now I start talking about a “Royal Family” in America. Everybody knows that, in America, everyone is equal, and no royalty exists – right? Once again, not so fast. Let’s examine the facts.

Most of us understand the general concept of the Royal Family of England from our high school and college history classes. There, the members of the Royal Family are the “sovereigns”. As we have already discussed, that means that they are the only people who can own land (or anything else). What you may not know is that in virtually every country in the world, there exists a “sovereign class” similar to the British Royal Family. In every case, the sovereign people of the culture got their sovereignty in one of only two ways. Most were born to it, meaning it was part of the birthright passed to them from their parents. The others claimed and seized it through war or insurrection, or the willingness to defend the claim. There are no other ways to obtain sovereignty. Nobody gives it away freely.

To better understand sovereignty, imagine that you move your family to England today, and you and your family live in England for the rest of your lives. Then your children’s children, and their children, continue to live there. How long will it be before your family becomes part of the Royal Family? What form or application would you have to fill out to be granted entry into the Royal Family? What test would you have to take in order to gain entry? The answer: there is no form, application or test for entry into the Royal Family. They are not looking for new members.

So, how do you become a member of the Royal Family? The answer is simple – you don't. Even if you marry a member of the Royal Family, you don't become a member. The children of that marriage could be members of the Royal Family, but only if they claimed the lineage of your spouse. In other words, technically, your children could never be members of the Royal Family unless they disavowed your lineage and took on the lineage of the Royal Family.

Instead of becoming a member of the Royal Family, could you become a British subject? Of course you could. There is an application for that status. Once a British subject, would your children also be British subjects? If they were born after you became a British subject, the answer is yes. This status is virtually identical to that of citizen of the United States in all relevant respects.

You may ask, “why would anyone want to become a member of the Royal Family, anyway?”. The answer is simple. They are the only people who can own land and property. They are the “sovereigns”. Everyone else is a “subject” of the Master(s), and gets use of the land as a privilege extended by the Master, for which they pay a fee known as tax. We have already learned about privileges and how they can be given, and then taken away.

You may be asking yourself what this has to do with you. Everyone knows that there is no “Royal Family” in America. Here, we're all equal. That's what our Founding Fathers did away with – all that royalty stuff. The Founding Fathers intended that every man, woman, and child would be of equal status, and there would be no “Noble Class”, in this great county called America! If that's your thought pattern, you need to go back and examine the facts and events more closely.

When our Forefathers signed the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, exactly what did they do? They said to the King of England that he had been controlling that thing called sovereignty over them, and that they intended to take it for themselves. Pure and simple. They told him that they would fight him for it. They did, in fact, fight him

for it; and, they won. In the Paris Treaty of 1783, King George III recognized the people of the Thirteen Colonies/States as sovereigns equal to him. Through war, our Forefathers gained control of their own sovereignty. The big question is, what did they do with that sovereignty once they had taken it from the King of England. To understand that, we must fully understand exactly what they took.

Where was the sovereignty held at the time of the signing of the Declaration of Independence? It was secured within the Royal Family of England. The King was simply the head of that family, or the “Supreme Sovereign” of the time. When the King died, he was quickly replaced by another sovereign, also a member of the Royal Family of England; in fact, normally the member in line from birth. Remember, all members of the Royal Family were/are sovereigns, in that they can all own land. So what our Forefathers took for themselves was not the King’s power. Rather, it was the power held by the Royal Family – sovereignty itself. On the same line, what our Forefathers did away with was the King’s power, not sovereignty. Sovereignty was kept for themselves and their descendants.

Once our Forefathers had seized sovereignty from the Royal Family, what did they do with it? The popular conception held today is that they passed it out to anyone and everyone who showed up on these shores. The bureaucrats and power brokers would have you believe it was vested in the government. The facts simply do not support either idea. If we go forward some 12 years, to the signing of the Constitution (Declaration) for the united States of America, we gain great insight into what our Founding Fathers actually intended, and did.

First, look closely at the Preamble to the Constitution. It begins with the words, “We the People”. The question arises, who were “We the People”. Did this phrase refer to ALL the people who were living in America at that time? Absolutely, unquestionably, no, it did not. As an example, there were obviously American Indians living in America at that time. Were they included in “We the People”? No, they were not. They were, in fact, recognized by most at that time, and for the next 100 plus years, as enemies of “We the

People”. They certainly were not afforded the Rights bestowed by the Constitution, or they could not have been killed and had their land taken from them without recourse or remedy. Were the slaves of the time part of “We the People”? Obviously not, and the facts that we all know concerning that situation make a discussion of whether or not the slaves were included totally unnecessary. So, who were “We the People”? It becomes obvious that “We the People” were the Americans of the day. At that point in time, only Americans could vote, so from there we can conclude who “We the People” were/are. They were white male landowners.

The balance of the Preamble gives what basically amounts to a “mission statement”, or statement of intent. It lays out what the authors wanted to accomplish; and, last, but not least, who they intended all these Benefits and Rights for when it states, “...and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity...”. Who were they doing this for? Themselves and their Posterity! Nobody else was included. At no point did they say that anybody born on these shores would be endowed to receive these Rights and Benefits. In fact, they obviously did not intend that, because there were many living there at the time that were not given those Rights and Benefits. Did they say that the beneficiaries would change with the next generation to include everybody born or naturalized here? Did they ever give Congress, or anybody else, the authority to add new “members” to this very exclusive group called “We the People”? If not, how were new People to be added to the group? There was only one way provided – by birth with one of “We the People” as a parent!

Now go back and look at the Royal Family of England. Do you see any resemblance? How did/do the Royal Family of England expand its membership? By birth. Where did our Founding Fathers take their power from? They took what the Royal Family of England had. Does it now start to make sense to you that our Forefathers actually changed very little about the system? The main change was simply the beneficiaries.

When you look at citizenship issues in the United States, you see a great many people coming to these shores from other parts of the world. When they come here, many wish

to become “citizens”. The United States accommodates great numbers of these people each year. Millions have applied for, and been granted, citizenship of the United States based on application, learning certain criteria, and testing. When they become a “citizen of the United States”, do they also become an American, a “sovereign”? If they do, it’s a well-kept secret. Have you ever heard any of them referred to a “new sovereigns”? Isn’t it strange how the term “sovereign” is never used anymore, and the status of the American is seldom even mentioned? Do you find this situation to be troubling?

Allow me to advance a few possible questions for your consideration. What if there was an American Royal Family? What if its power was passed from father to son just like it is done in virtually every country in the world, and just like it has been done for thousands of years? What if there was a second status of citizenship for the common man, just like in every other country in the world, and just like there has been for thousands of years? What if the Royal Family was very jealous of its birthright, and didn’t want to share it with anyone else? What if the Royal Family turned over the reins of government to a group of servants sworn to protect the Royal Family’s interests above everything else, much like is the case in England? What if those servants found a way to deceive the Royal Family into believing that they were nothing more than common men, and were subjects of the servants instead of vice versa? What if those servants then tricked the Royal Family into turning over their birthright through a series of contracts instituted by the use of fraud and deception, without full disclosure and fair consideration? Do you think that, if these things happened and the Royal Family found out, there would be a way for the Royal Family to regain its rightful property and status?

Consider the status of a citizen of the United States. He is ruled by codes and regulations created by bureaucrats who are supposedly public servants. Most of these “rules” are never even voted on, but are placed into “law” by an official who wasn’t even elected to office. The citizen of the United States is not sovereign because he cannot own the land. Instead, he can negotiate for the use of land for which he pays a large fee (tax) to begin, and continues to pay a lesser fee (tax) for as long as he wants to use the land. He has the same set of rules for all his property, even though he probably doesn’t realize it. Now,

think about it. How does he differ from the class of “freemen” that most of our forefathers were before coming to America from England? I submit that the King’s total dictatorial power over every issue has been eliminated, or at least reduced somewhat; but, other than that, there is very little difference.

We know that sovereignty exists somewhere in this country. It has to. Someone owns the land. Is it “We the People” who own the land? If not, who? The government would have you believe that it is the sovereign which owns the land; otherwise, it could not levy taxes against it. Show me any place where sovereignty was ever taken from “We the People”. Show me any place where “We the People” ever turned over sovereignty to the government, or anybody else except their Posterity. You can’t do either, because neither happened.

I recently researched a number of Texas Attorney General opinions concerning land patents. In virtually every opinion, the Attorney General refers to the title going back to the sovereign. Keep in mind that this is the State of Texas Attorney General, so his opinion only deals with circumstances and events which took place after the State of Texas was in power. Yet they refer to the sovereign. That means that there were recognized sovereigns after the State of Texas became part of the Union. So what became of these sovereigns? Might I suggest that nothing happened to them; that in fact, they passed on their sovereignty to their children just like it had been passed to them? Might I be so bold as to further suggest that their children, or their children’s children, were deceived into believing that “all men are equal” in America, and in so doing were conned out of their rightful inheritance and Birthright? If anything did happen to end sovereignty by the People, or to take sovereignty from the People, wouldn’t it be well-noted in history? After all, wouldn’t that be a pretty important event? It would completely undo everything that our Forefathers fought and died for. There must be some record of such an event! What this all leads to is the inevitable conclusion that the government never really gained sovereignty over the land, at least not where the American is concerned. What the government has is, at best, colored title.



The truth is that nothing happened to the sovereigns or the sovereignty. It is exactly where our Forefathers placed it – in the hands of their Posterity! Nothing ever happened to change that. What did happen was that a group of non-productive thieves and con-artists figured out a way to steal all the power left by birthright to the Posterity of the Founding Fathers. They found a way to contractually obligate the true sovereigns to a life of servitude under them. But they have yet to find a way to actually steal that sovereignty from its rightful owners, the Americans, once the American knows who he is and the power he possesses.

We see evidence of the government's tactics every day in the news. For example, think about "hate crimes legislation". Does that give you reason to stop and think. The term "hate crimes" is a product of the government's attempts to tell us that we are all the same, and anyone who thinks otherwise should be avoided, ridiculed and punished. He certainly should not be associated with. And this entire idea relates back to what? Racial differences. Isn't that the basis for all "hate crimes" legislation? Hasn't the government spent the last 40 years, and billions upon billions of dollars trying to convince – to brainwash – us all into believing that there are no differences between us? They talk about the color of one's skin, and try to make you believe that the issue is a pigmentation in the skin. This tactic keeps most Americans from even looking at the real issues. Hasn't the government, through its virtual total control of the media, demonized everything and everybody that even suggested that there might be a difference between people based on who they are and where they come from?

Make no mistake about it. It is not the Black man, or the Mexican or Spanish man, or any other race of people that the government is interested in protecting with this "hate crimes" legislation. It is the government's hold on the American that it wishes to protect and solidify. By demonizing everybody that evens mentions that there might be some differences between people, it keeps the great majority of Americans who have been defrauded into servitude through contract as a citizen of the United States, from searching for the truth of their Birthright for fear of being called a bigot, racist, or hate monger.

Anyone who wants to talk about differences between people will immediately be thrown in one of those categories; even though the issue is status, not race.

We must all understand that all this to do about racism and bigotry has almost nothing to do with race. It has to do with status. It has to do with inheritance. It has to do with lineage. But the only thing it has to do with race is that there were no black signers of the Declaration of Independence or the Constitution. There were/are no black Americans. To state that fact makes me no more a racist than to say that my Father was white. It's simply a fact, but it has been demonized to the point that most don't dare even approach the issue. That's by design, and it's how we've all been drug into a state of servitude by those who should be our servants. More incredible, it's how the black man has been kept in a state of servitude throughout the years.

The real tragedy lies in the fact that the black man, and all other minorities in this country, have been held down and kept in a state of slavery by those who were claiming to give them freedom. It was never the plan of this government to free the black man. It was the plan of this government to use the black man to place the white man in a state of servitude right along with the black man, and call it "equality". It has done this by insisting that everybody is equal, and that we must all "do our fair share" and "follow the rules just like everybody else has to". The underlying idea is that we should readily accept that the government is all-powerful and benevolent, and believe that it is always acting in the best interest of the People. If you believe that, you're wasting your time reading this book.

In all the civil rights marches of the 60's and 70's, did you ever hear one black man demand to become an American? Did you ever hear one black man demand to become a sovereign? If you did, I missed it. What I heard was Martin Luther King whining that all men were equal and should be treated equal. He continually insisted that all men should walk together as one. What he never said was that all men should be sovereign – never once did I hear that. He either didn't understand the issues, or he wasn't acting in the best interest of his own people. Because what has already come to pass is almost exactly

what he asked for. Almost all men are now equal – they are all slaves to the government! To this day, I have never heard one black leader demand sovereignty as Americans. The day that black men march on Washington demanding to be sovereigns, and demanding that the Constitution be changed to include them – that’s the day that I will march by their side. But as long as their main focus is to be my equal by bringing down my status to that of citizen of the United States just so we can be equal, I will fight with my last breath to retain my status as sovereign. If that means we can’t be equal, so be it!

I find it very amusing that nobody is attacking the British Royal Family about being “equal” with all the other people in England. In fact, have you heard such an outcry from any other country in the world? It seems the only people under attack for being sovereign are “We the People”, the American/sovereign. Maybe that’s because of the way the American got his sovereignty. That could throw a real scare into the power mongers of the world if the American once again understood and seized his sovereignty. Other people might also get ideas. After all, our guys did throw a powerful King out.

Well, you have my thoughts. You must decide if you believe that there is an American Royal Family; and, if so, if you are in it. I’ve made my decision, and I believe all the facts are in my corner. Now I must go about reclaiming what is rightfully mine.

## **CHAPTER 9 - How To Use This Book**

What you have just finished reading is not intended to make you ‘all-knowing’ about the issues raised herein. Neither is it intended as any kind of ‘legal’ advice; and, if you do decide to use what you have learned in the book, it will have to be on your own responsibility and at your own risk because the road can sometimes be treacherous and hard to follow. What the book is intended to do is give you a firm basis from which to start. If you will research the material which you have just read, you will find that it is accurate beyond a reasonable doubt (the same standard used to sentence a murderer to death). Hopefully, Americans will start to realize how much they have given up in the name of nationalism, or in order to gain a little security for the short term. Benjamin Franklin said that any man who would give up a little liberty in order to gain short lived security deserved neither liberty nor security. I believe that.

Our biggest problem is that we Americans have become complacent about anything the government does. We were raised to believe that ‘our’ government would never lie to us, and that the United States Government always acts in the best interest of America. Nothing could be farther from the truth. This government acts only in its own best interest. It has now gone so far as to have you believe that Americans no longer exist, because they have been replaced by citizens of the United States. It has allowed an oppressive foreign trust to assume the responsibilities of the government. It has even led you to believe that being a citizen of the United States is a great honor, that it is equivalent to being an American, and you should be proud of the title. The truth is that the only one who benefits from getting Americans to become and remain citizens of the United States is the UNITED STATES (the trust); because, once that transition is accomplished, the trust gains total control over those who previously had control over the United States. It’s like getting the owner of a company to believe that the supervisor of the night shift is his superior, and that he must abide by that supervisor’s orders. If you don’t like taking orders from your (public) servants, if you believe that you can better make the decisions that affect your life and the life of your family than can anyone else (especially someone in Washington, D.C. who first serves the trust), and/or if you just want to reclaim the freedom left to you by your forefathers as your birthright, now is the time to start reversing the damage and regaining your life as a free American.

Just exactly how do you start to reverse the damage? To start with, you should purchase a **Black’s Law Dictionary** (you can purchase one at any good bookstore for around \$65.00). You must always

remember that words have a precise meaning, they mean exactly what they say, and those in the trust who would steal your Rights know and use their exact meaning in a way they hope you will not understand. The problem is that the legal meaning is usually not the meaning that you have always assumed attached to most of the key words that they use. When you look up a word in **Black's**, look up the same word in Webster's, and you'll find that many times a totally different meaning will be manifest. Perhaps more important, Black's gives the meaning of many legal terms, and cites decisional cases that defined many words and phrases. But, whatever you do, **NEVER, NEVER, NEVER** assume you know the meaning of any legal word, term, or direction. That's exactly what the trust depends on and expects you to do, and that's how those in the trust fool you into believing things that just are not true, thereby controlling you without any authority whatsoever over you except that which you give them.

After you have your **Black's**, start reading the instructions of any and all government forms that you are asked to fill out in full. Do a little research before you fill out the form to find out what 'law' or code that you are 'complying' with. I think you will be shocked to learn that none of the forms that you have always believed were required are, in fact, required. I think that, if you read and understand the underlying code and regulation for which you are complying, you will learn that (a) it does not apply to you (if you are not a member of the trust), or (b) it is not mandatory. Use your **Black's** to look up all words of command, *i.e.* must, shall, required, etc., and then apply the meanings of those words exactly as they are used in the context of what you're reading. You will find that none of the instructions require you to do anything if you are an American. Each instruction will be conditioned so that it will appear to give you a mandatory order, but none will when you apply the proper meaning to the words used therein. If these instructions did, in fact, require an American to do anything prior to having been arrested, indicted, and/or convicted of one of the 'common law' crimes for which jurisdiction was passed, they would be unconstitutional on their face. Remember, there is no longer any common law courts in the United States; rather, they are all courts of code. Since these 'masters' of the language who write these codes, regulations, and instructions never do anything that could be even remotely unconstitutional, you can be sure that nothing they put in writing will order an American to do anything. Therefore, when you read these instructions, do not assume that you know what they are telling you to do; in fact, do not assume that they are even talking to you. Instead, read for the meaning that would be constitutional, and you will

easily discover the true statement made in each writing that you receive from the government, or any agency or would be agency thereof.

To claim your sovereignty/Freedom, there is only one filing necessary. That is your “**Affidavit of Sovereign Authority**”, your Claim of Birthright. That document should make your Claim as one of the sovereign American People *i.e.* a direct descendant of one of those people in the Thirteen Original Colonies who claimed their Independence, took up arms against England and King George III, were victorious, and were recognized as sovereigns equal to King George III in the Paris Treaty of Peace, A.D. 1783. That document should be filed in the *Public Record* by filing in the county records of your county; and, you should get a certified copy of that page of the *Public Record* to present as proof of your sovereignty in any future encounters or conflicts.

Once you are recognized as a sovereign, nothing need be filed ever again. The King has no requirements placed upon him for his actions. So, the process of making your authority known is the only procedure that needs to be followed; and, that should be followed **ONLY** to avoid misunderstanding.

Let’s look at the idea that most of us, including myself, developed while trying to free ourselves. The single most prevalent force [enemy] that drove most of us where we are today is the IRS. After we started looking for ways to avoid their unwanted invasion into our lives, we started finding other problems in the system in which we had lived that were so onerous as to require that we at least contemplate action to correct what we all saw as a problem. Many of us were driven by our religious/spiritual beliefs, while others simply craved freedom. Since valid information on the issue of the system that actually controlled our everyday life is very well hidden by the use of words [specifically the definitions given to words]; and, we all were desperately searching for truth, those eager to take advantage of the situation rapidly appeared with “the silver bullet”, usually for a price. Others wrote books that proclaimed to reveal the “secret” way to become Free. Most, if not all of those “teachers” knew nothing of what they spoke or wrote about; but, they did learn that holding themselves out to have special knowledge made them popular, caused people to respect them, and, most of the time, was very lucrative. It became a money fueled industry.

Meanwhile, newcomers to the “movement” were immediately pushed to these so-called gurus. They were told, first by current followers, and later by the guru himself that, in order to survive the journey to Freedom, they must follow a certain path. Of course, only this guru knew what that path was. In the early going, these paths were very simple. Wrong, but very simple. But as more and more gurus popped up, it became necessary for each to develop a method that set him apart. So came the tidal wave of “this is the only way to be Free”, this is the “Silver Bullet”. The methods got more and more complicated, and included numerous filings that needed to be made to everybody from the Queen of England to Ambassadors in foreign countries to the Post Master. We were told that you could declare debts void unilaterally, that you could cancel mortgages and keep the property, that you could claim refunds from the IRS when you had paid nothing in, that you could “Accept for Value” and “Exempt from Levy” unilaterally, and the list goes on and on. In each case, there was a certain procedure that had to be followed to the letter, and only one guy knew it; but, for a small price, he would tell you. He would also supply you with everything you needed to file, and an extensive list of people or offices to file it with. What needed to be done became more and more exotic and complicated, because once we started understanding what was actually being attempted, it became clear that we were being taken for a ride. But if it was complicated enough, the average person could not figure out how badly he had been taken.

Even a larger scam [which I personally bought into completely] was the idea that because you were born in a certain place you were sovereign [a premise for which there is absolutely no authority]. Following that was the ridiculous idea that being a “American” of Illinois, Texas, Florida, or any other State made you sovereign; and even more ridiculous, made you an American. Let’s examine this idea. First, the people of the original Thirteen Colonies rose up against King George III, declared their sovereignty, defended that sovereignty, and were recognized as sovereigns equal to King George III in the Paris Treaty of Peace in 1783. Sovereignty was vested in those people, nowhere else. Those people, the sovereign American People, created the states and the United States. They passed very limited powers to the United States over themselves in the Constitution. They did not pass their sovereignty to anybody except their kids [see Preamble to the Constitution]. So how did Congress create a new state, Texas let’s say, and pass to the citizens of that State the sovereignty of the sovereign American People. If you think that happened, show me how. While the new states entered on equal footing with the original Thirteen, sovereignty did not lie with the

states. It was vested in those people single out in the Paris Peace Treaty, and they never surrendered it or passed it out in any fashion save for their children.

Now, let's examine what was happening. Charlatans [or idiots as the case may be] saw a chance to capitalize on a situation nobody understood. They would pick a particular area, research it, and come up with a theory somewhat different from anybody else. Remember, the best lie is 99% true. Then they would write a book, go on talk shows, give seminars, and most wound up selling the "templates" that were necessary to file in order to defeat the system and be Free. Of course, they all told you that you could keep you social security number and enjoy the benefits even after you had reclaimed your Freedom. They did that not because it was true, but because nobody would pay them for their advice if thy told them the truth – that you must give up the social security number, thus the benefits, if you ever want to be Free. Most of the gurus wound up in prison [where they belong], along with many of their followers.

But these gurus, much like the system they purportedly tried to escape, were successful in doing one thing -- they convinced most people that the path to Freedom was long and hard, required special knowledge, and many, many filings [which, of course, they would furnish for a price]; but, that you would not have to give up the benefits you enjoy from the system. That premise, in and of itself, cannot be achieved; thus, it is a self-defeating proposition. If you accept the benefits of the system, you are simply required under criminal penalty to pay the consideration. The consideration is *voluntary compliance* with the system. Once you have agreed to *voluntary compliance*, nothing else is voluntary. **Your *voluntary compliance* is memorialized when you take a social security number.**

Now think about how illogical it is to believe that you must make numerous filings stating that you don't have a number, or that you are not in contract, or that you have no duty to file a tax return, and on and on. What does a King have to prove to rule? In England, what does the Royal Family have to prove in order to be recognized as sovereign? The answer is the same for both questions – their Birthright. How would either do that? By the public record. That what it's there for. Do you believe the King/Queen or the Royal Family need to send a notice to the IRS [or whatever they call it in England] stating that they are not required to file? Do they need to go outside the country to an



Embassy and file a form with the Ambassador stating that they have not become a British subject? See how ridiculous that sounds just saying it. All they need to do is point to the public record showing who they are in any case of mistaken identity. What makes you believe you need to do more? You are either sovereign or you are not. If you are sovereign, you should not act like a subject. Subjects file notices, excuses and requests for permission to their superiors. Exactly who do you believe your superiors are if you are sovereign? God, nobody else. Go pray.

Think about it before you run out and file that zero return, or a lien in the code, or a document that purports to act as your authority within the code, or make a claim that you have a “Strawman” who is acting on your behalf. Those are all simply cleverly disguised methods of relieving you of your money, and they are ridiculous. **THEY WILL NOT WORK** except to entangle you deeper into the system; or, in some cases, send you to prison.

The only reasons not to reclaim that which is properly yours are fear, apathy, and/or you like being a slave. If those are your reasons for not acting, then I have nothing to offer you, and I don't have time to worry about you. If, on the other hand, you are moved to reclaim what our forefathers left to you, I will do everything in my power to help. I promise you that your actions, trials, and tribulations will be well rewarded if you complete the task at hand.

A side note, here, is the fact that I know that many of you who are reading this book are currently (or you have in the past) used ‘off-shore’ bank accounts in an attempt to hide your finances from the IRS. That can be a very risky proposition. First, hiding your money can easily be construed as conspiracy to defraud the United States Government. Again, that falls under Title 18 of the United States Code, and that Title has been enacted as positive law. If you are sovereign, there is no need to hide anything. Also, sending your money out of the country is very, very risky, and many of you have probably already lost large sums of money doing exactly that. There are numerous con-games out there just waiting to rip you off. However, if you utilize the information in this book properly, you can have an ‘off-shore’ bank account right in your own hometown bank. That’s because the term ‘off-shore’, when used in this sense, simply means outside the jurisdiction of the UNITED STATES and the IRS. If you are sovereign, everything you have is outside the jurisdiction of the United States. Better still, no treaty can give the IRS access to your money, which can happen when

you're dealing with governments from around the world. I have such an account presently, and I have had the accounts from around the world in the past which you may currently be pursuing; and I can say without fear of contradiction that my local bank is far superior to any situation you will find in other countries. You have daily control of your money, and you are protected by all the same insurance and safeguards that you have grown accustomed to. By the way, there's nothing wrong with accepting those protections because our forefathers set up this government to serve our needs. This is one way that it can fulfill its purpose.

For those who choose to remain a slave, I have no sympathy, because it is outside my ability to understand why anyone would choose slavery over freedom. You may feel safe and warm today, but you are leaving a terrible legacy for your descendants, and your own future will not be so bright if those of us who are currently fighting this battle ever decide that it's just too much trouble for us. The only reason that you still have as many 'rights' as you have today is because there are a lot of us that are fighting to keep those Rights, and you are the unworthy beneficiary of both your forefathers' and our sacrifices. So if you like the 'welfare system', you're right where you belong. If you don't like the 'welfare system', you should be aware that you are the main recipient.

I pledge to do my utmost to help any American reclaim what is his. As for the slaves among you, go pick the Master's cotton. You don't deserve the gifts left to you.

I invite criticism, and I ask that you share with me anything which you consider, or find to be, inaccurate in this book. I have thoroughly researched all the material contained herein over the last 20 years, but the other side continues to make changes on a regular basis. While those changes cannot affect the base idea contained in this book, some do affect the way that we must attack different problems. Any and all true help will be appreciated.