
FREEDOM
from
GOVERNMENT



How To Reclaim Your Power

by: Trent Goodbaudy

FREEDOM FROM GOVERNMENT – HOW TO RECLAIM YOUR POWER

SPECIAL KINDLE EDITION

Copyright © 2012 Trent Goodbaudy

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means-electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, scanning, or other-except for brief quotations in critical reviews or articles, without the prior permission of the author.

Published in Portland, Oregon by PDXdzyn. PDXdzyn is a trademark of Trent Goodbaudy. PDXdzyn titles may be purchased in bulk for educational, business, fund-raising, or sales promotional use. For information, please send email to info@pdxdzyn.com.

Printed in the United States of America.

ISBN: 1468196340
ISBN-13: 978-1468196344

ALSO BY TRENT GOODBAUDY

YOU DON'T WANT TO READ WHAT THIS MAN HAS TO SAY!

IMAGINE IF YOU COULD KNOW THE ANSWERS TO JUST
THE IMPORTANT THINGS ABOUT THIS LIFE, WOULD
YOU SPEND YEARS SEARCHING FOR THEM?

TRENT'S PHILOSOPHY ABOUT LIFE IS UNPARALLELED, AND HIS VIEWS ARE
UNCONVENTIONAL. IF YOUR AUDIENCE IS LOOKING FOR ANSWERS TO LIFE'S
TOUGHEST QUESTIONS, TRENT HAS DONE AN EXCELLENT JOB OF ANSWERING
THEM AND AT THE SAME TIME PROVIDES REAL, SENSIBLE ADVICE FOR IMPROVING
OTHER ASPECTS OF LIFE AS WELL.

TOPICS COVERED INCLUDE; THE MEANING OF LIFE, WHY WE ARE HERE, WHO GOD
IS, WHY THERE IS SO MUCH EVIL IN THE WORLD, MAKING THE RIGHT CHOICES,
PRECOGNITION, WHAT WE ARE MADE OF, CONNECTING TO YOUR HIGHER POWER,
SPIRITUALITY, SECRETS OF RELIGION AND GOVERNMENT, AND SO MUCH MORE.

AVAILABLE NOW ON AMAZON.COM
IN BOTH PAPERBACK AND KINDLE EDITIONS

WWW.YOUDONTWANT.COM

DEDICATION

This book is dedicated to all those willing to take a stand for something that they believe in, and act with personal responsibility, integrity, honor, and diligence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	INTRODUCTION	2 - 4
1	MYTHS, AND WHAT NOT TO DO	6 - 13
2	LAWYERS AND REPRESENTATION	14 - 21
3	THE DARK HISTORY OF OUR LEGAL SYSTEM	22 - 45
4	RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY	46 - 76
5	ARE YOU A MAN OR A PERSON?	78 - 98
6	THE STORY OF THE INCOME TAX	100 - 252
7	PRESUMPTIONS OF LAW	254 - 268
8	REMOVING PRESUMPTIONS	270 - 281
9	TRUST LAW, AND THE ROLES WE PLAY	282 - 288
10	GOING TO COURT	290 - 315
11	DEALING WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT	316 - 324
12	CONCLUSION	326 - 328
	ABOUT THE AUTHOR	330

WARNING!

THIS BOOK DOES NOT OFFER LEGAL ADVICE.

IF YOU ARE LOOKING FOR LEGAL ADVICE, I WOULD RECOMMEND YOU SEEK LEGAL COUNSEL. THIS BOOK OFFERS IT'S READERS LEGAL INFORMATION, WHICH IS NOT LEGAL ADVICE, AND THE READER SHOULD INVESTIGATE AND BE VERY FAMILIAR WITH LEGAL CONCEPTS AND PROCEDURES OF THE COURTROOM IN ORDER TO BE SUCCESSFUL WITH THE CONCEPTS COVERED IN THIS BOOK.

BY PROCEEDING, YOU ARE ACCEPTING 100% RESPONSIBILITY FOR ALL OF YOUR ACTIONS (A VERY IMPORTANT FIRST STEP TOWARDS TOTAL FREEDOM OF THE BEING, AND TRUE LIBERATION OF THE SOUL).

INTRODUCTION

We all have a tendency to believe what we are told, but it is healthy to be open to new ideas and suggestions, to evaluate our beliefs and values, and to adjust them periodically so that we all may live better lives.

I am sure that you have not had the same experiences that I have endured (although similar perhaps). I have had many experiences where I believe I was treated unfairly (to put it mildly) by law enforcement and agents of the court, and as a result I have made it my life's work to find out exactly where they get their power, why corruption is so rampant, why it seems like the courts are more of a business than they are there to provide justice, and how to not only fight back, but to actually reverse the power structure to give the power that they currently have back to its rightful guardian... which is us, the inhabitants of this land.

Most of us are so scared that we would not dare bring up things that the court or other public servants don't want to hear in our correspondence and interactions with them. Of course, no one wants to go to jail, but we cannot continue to live in fear either. We cannot let the threat of jail keep us from claiming dominion of our persons. We must purge all fear of government from our being, because that is how we are controlled. We must be able to stand, communicate, and expose the fraud that is occurring, and above all maintain 100% responsibility and integrity to what is right.

Even if they put me in jail, I would look at a jail experience as an opportunity to help others and educate them, imagine if everyone in jail started using tactics from this book... the system would overload and completely collapse literally overnight! Or at least during the next morning's arraignments!

Just remember, if you are not having fun... you aren't doing it right! Always have fun, stay calm, collected, and be reasonable but do not compromise your values or integrity, after all, that is all we really walk into court with anyway.

How many of us have wondered just where that "peace officer", aka "public servant", (I like to call them "policy enforcers") got so much power? When did it become ok for them to arrest our forward progress or movement and threaten us, ask for identification and try to trick us or intimidate us into letting them search us, or quite often something even worse? (Usually this happens for no reason or for a manufactured reason, because the department

likes to see arrests and makes money from them.) Why do they think that they can treat us the way that they do? How many of us even know all the laws and code and statutes that apply to us at any given time? How did it get so complicated and how can we find a way to simplify it to actually have a fighting chance?

To understand the answers to these questions we must take a look into our past, and that is what we must understand to realize where we are today, and what direction to go in the future to maintain our freedom.

We really can have no first-hand idea of the magnitude of the suffering mankind has endured; except for the current generation, or perhaps a generation or two before now. Time has a way of making us forget. And if we could get into a time machine and see exactly what mankind has endured, even just 500 years ago we would see that there were some very dark times in our past, and the same systems of control remain today, but have adapted, and the suffering of mankind continues even today.

This suffering of mankind almost always has to do with the rich and powerful wanting to control people, and their quest to obtain more wealth and more power. The sad fact is that they have succeeded at enslaving mankind throughout history. I sincerely hope that you can take something away from this book to use in your own life, enjoy this book, and please know that it is written only out of unconditional love for all of the people of Earth.

CHAPTER 1 - MYTHS, AND WHAT *NOT* TO DO

To begin, and get a few things out of the way right away; I wanted to clarify what this book *will* help you to achieve, and also what it will *not* help you to do.

If you are looking for a magic combination of words that will make the judge run out of the courtroom screaming, this book will not be able to help you in that way. On the other hand; if you are looking for the real history of our legal system and a fundamental understanding of where we are, how we got here, and how to fix it, than you are on the right path, and this book was written just for you.

You see, as I will explain in a later chapter, the most important thing that we need to change is in our thinking and in breaking our programming internally, and then the external obstacles will fall into place.

A courtroom experience will be a breeze for you after studying this book, not from magic; but simply from being

informed, along with your comprehension, clarity, and integrity.

Once you know how everything works as far as court and dealing with public servants, it is easy to reestablish your sovereignty with their own procedures and language. It will be easy to navigate through any court proceeding with the best chance at achieving your desired outcome. It can be as simple as pointing out (at any time and at any phase, I might add), that you have recently learned that there is a fraud that is being perpetrated, and that your own set of moral values will not allow you to continue to take part in the fraud. You will be able to explain why fraud is taking place, and *that* likely will make the judge happy that someone is *finally* doing it right way He still might want to run out of the room screaming, but if you leave your emotions out of the courtroom, you have a far greater chance of communicating, staying in honor, maintaining your integrity, and taking back the power of your birthright through negotiation. Not through fighting or anger, but through love for your fellow man and knowing that to finally take responsibility for your estate and your person is the greatest thing we can ever do for ourselves.

If you want to use this book to learn how to get away with murder, theft, rape, or any other action where you have done harm to another; this book is not for you. On the other hand, this book was written to teach you how make the harassment by government stop, the coercion, the unconstitutional checkpoints, the warrantless detentions, searches without cause, prosecution of people for victimless statute and code violations, illegal taxation,

and make virtually all abuses of power by the government come to a screeching halt. This book is meant to give the power back to the people (where it belongs), and help the government learn that they are truly servants to the nobility of this country, which is each of us.

Remember, if you are not having fun... you aren't doing it right! Always have fun, stay calm, collected, and be reasonable but do not compromise your values or integrity, after all, that is all we really walk into court with anyway.

I would now like to take this opportunity to mention some other myths that have been floating around out there and things that you really should *not* ever do in court. The first one is not something that you would do in court, but rather something you would do that would usually be everyone's first instinct; and that is, when the court needs you to settle a matter, you should never hide or evade.

This is not honorable and our honor and integrity are our most valuable weapons. You may be able to hide and evade the court for a time, but this is not a sustainable solution for us freemen. We can't just stop using the system, we just have to be smart about it. I promise you that ignoring them will *not* make them go away, didn't we try that already anyway? Isn't that how we got to where we are now, through our severe case of apathy?

There is something that a very wise man named Winston Shroul likes to say, and that is "You should never go to court unless you have already won." We need to make sure

that we answer to any charges or complaints and file your motions and affidavits in defense as soon as you can, to always remain honorable.

We really do not want to go to court, court is a last resort for parties that could not reach a suitable agreement out-of-court. The court is not your forum, and you put yourself in jeopardy every time you go there. You see, statutory courts and district court are exclusively for public servants, and as a free man or woman you do not belong there. Period. While we are on this topic, I should mention that there is one court that that we can (and may even find it necessary to) use for remedy when harm has been done to us by public servants and other entities. This court is called Civil court, and this is the court where lawsuits are filed. In a perfect society, we would not need Civil court either. Because as sovereign individuals, we know that we accept 100% responsibility for everything in our reality, there are no victims when we are all truly living as sovereigns. Civil court and getting remedy will be covered in depth in a subsequent chapter, but for now I will get back to what not to do in front of a judge.

Maybe you have heard that the gold fringe on the flag in the courtroom stands for admiralty jurisdiction, or that the judge is really the grim reaper... collecting and warehousing souls. And while this might be true, what good would it do to bring this up as an argument in your favor in front of a judge (unless you are trying to get them to find you a spot at the nearest mental facility)? Also, never make a "legal" vs "lawful" argument in court. This is an irrelevant argument and will get you nowhere. In the

end it makes no difference anyway, you are not there to argue or fight, you are there to end and win the proceeding.

Never argue in court that you follow "common law" and equate it to "God's law" of "do no harm" and "no victim = no crime", because in court the term "common law" refers to "case law" (previous rulings that the court takes into account to rule on current matters), and once again you may only secure a spot at the nearest mental facility. There is no such thing as a "common law" right to travel. However, you do have a God given right to travel, or a "natural" right, or even unalienable right.

Using the term "common law" to describe a God given right when talking to a policeman or judge is like trying to go into a restaurant and trying to order something that is not on the menu. We really don't want to look like an idiot, or give them a way out. They have YEARS of experience.

The "understanding" versus "overstanding" myth is another common misconception. I would even go so far to say that some of these myths very well could be disinformation that is actually put out there to throw us off. When it comes to "understanding" versus "overstanding"; it is ok to say that you don't understand, but to say that you "overstand" makes you sound like you are crazy. Understanding does mean that you accept liability... you can say that you understand but do not ACCEPT their offer, and not sound crazy. By all means, do not ever give them your consent.

Another good thing to not do in a courtroom setting is to abandon logic when it comes to using dictionary definitions - if the meaning of a particular word really matters, you should define it yourself to the court so that everyone knows what you mean. When we think of this, we might think of Slick Willy Clinton arguing the definition of what "is" is. The word "is" can be used in MANY different contexts, you need to be clear, concise, and simply disprove their arguments by providing your own explanation.

In court you need to stay focused on the matter at hand, you need to learn to use communication and reach an agreement between the parties, be intellectual. I will say once again that there really is no magic combination of words that will make everything go away. But, don't use the term "trust" to describe your claim in court, always use the term "right".

And I really hate to say it, but case law does not matter. Case law may bind a judge to rule a particular way, and they can be useful to bring up in court as evidence in your favor; but you do not know the particular circumstances surrounding a particular case, and the odds that your case involves the same exact circumstances are virtually non-existent.

What about the one where we could just convene our own courts? This would be a dream come true if we could just do away with the current system and start up our own new court system.

Sounds great doesn't it? Well, there is a problem with convening our own courts; and this is known as the difference between judgment and enforcement. Sure, you can convene your own courts, and reach your own judgments. But only the established courts can enforce a verdict so we are stuck with them until we can implement a better alternative. For example, you are crazy to think that you would be able to get away with arresting a judge.

On a last note while I am talking about myths I wanted to mention something called the "four corner rule" myth. And this also has been rumored online that if something is in a box on a document, it is excluded from the document by the box that is drawn around it. To clarify; when something on a legal document is drawn in by a box, it is not an exclusion rule. We need to use our brains, if it won't directly help your case, you don't need it.

The "four corner rule" does exist, but it means the pretty much the exact opposite of the myth. Black's law dictionary defines the "four corner rule" as "the documents meaning is to be counted from the entire document and not from its isolated parts, with no extraneous (facts outside the document) evidence; should be used to interpret a document. Quite the opposite from the myth that anything in a box on a document means that it doesn't exist.

This is actually for your protection and allows enforcement of contracts that stand by themselves. The "Exclusion" rule has nothing to do with this either, the exclusion rule has to do with inadmissible evidence such as

heresy. This is not a valid court argument. We want to use real court motions, documents, and legal contracts that actually hold water and cause us to win by default. We can accomplish most anything that we need through the courts inability to assume full commercial liability.

CHAPTER 2 - LAWYERS AND REPRESENTATION

We all know of the reputation that lawyers have in general, but most of us believe that we still need them anyway. I am going to shatter that myth right now, and I will also please ask you to reconsider hiring an attorney for the reasons listed below, but you are the one that will make the final decision on whether you do or not. I can only think of one reason that I would hire an attorney, that would be if I were initiating a lawsuit against a public servant for violating my rights in court or on the side of the road, and enforcement of my fee schedule, which is a section of my notarized official notice of intent and claim of right which I will show you in a later chapter.

Please take into account the following before hiring an attorney for a criminal matter, or any other matter.

First we must ask to what or whom is an attorneys first duty? Perhaps it would help if we consult the latest (2009) Corpus Juris Secundum (C.J.S.) legal encyclopedia, volume 7, section 4 for the answer:

§ 4 ATTORNEY & CLIENT

7 C. J. S.

→ His first duty is to the courts and the public, not to the client,⁵⁵ and wherever the duties to his client conflict with those he owes as an officer of the court in the administration of justice, the former must yield to the latter.⁵⁶

peculiar in its relation to, and vital to the well-being of, the court.⁵⁷ An attorney has a duty to aid the court in seeing that actions and proceedings in which he is engaged as counsel are conducted in a dignified and orderly manner, free from passion and personal animosities, and that all causes brought to an issue are tried and decided on their merits only;⁵⁸ to aid the court

The office of attorney is indispensable to the administration of justice and is intimate and

Now that we know that an attorney's first duty is to the courts and the public and not even his own client, this is disturbing but not a deal-breaker yet... let us dig a little deeper. So our attorney's first duty is not to the client, maybe next we should ask what the actual legal relationship between an attorney and his client is. We refer again to the C.J.S. Legal Encyclopedia, volume 7, section 2, and find:

§§ 2-3 ATTORNEY & CLIENT

7 C. J. S.

and the term is synonymous with "attorney."¹⁴ Therefore, anyone advertising himself as a lawyer holds himself out to be an attorney, an attorney at law, or counselor at law.¹⁵

general use; but in some states the office of solicitor in chancery is a distinct and separate office from that of attorney at law.²⁰

→ If one appears before any court in the interest of another and moves the court to action with respect to any matter before it of a legal nature, such person appears as an "advocate", as that term is generally understood.¹⁶ The phrase "as an advocate in a representative capacity," as used in the statute regulating the practice of law, implies a representation distinct from officer or other regular administrative corporate employee representation.¹⁷

→ A client is one who applies to a lawyer or counselor for advice and direction in a question of law, or commits his cause to his management in prosecuting a claim or defending against a suit in a court of justice;²¹ one who retains the attorney, is responsible to him for his fees, and to whom the attorney is responsible for the management of the suit;²² one who communicates facts to an attorney expecting professional advice.²³ Clients are also called "wards of the court" in regard to their relationship with their attorneys.²⁴ ←

In England and her colonies a "barrister" is a person entitled to practice as an advocate or counsel in the superior courts.¹⁸ A "solicitor" is a person whose business it is to be employed in the care and management of suits depending in courts of chancery.¹⁹ In the great majority of the states of the Union, where law and equity are both administered by the same court, it has naturally come about that the two offices of attorney at law and solicitor in chancery have practically been consolidated, although in the federal equity practice the term "solicitor" is in

§ 3. Nature of Right to Practice

While it has been broadly stated that the right to practice law is not a natural or constitutional right, but is in the nature of a privilege or franchise, the practice of law is not a matter of grace but of right for one who is qualified by his learning and moral character.

Library References

Attorney and Client ⇨14.

The right to practice law is not a natural or constitutional right.²⁵ Nor is the right to practice

Wow, now this is getting a little more disturbing. So, as a client; you are applying for advice and direction... that

doesn't sound too awful, but did they really have to go and call me a "ward of the court"? I don't like the sound of that.

Perhaps now it would serve us well to find out what it means to be a "ward of the court", I think I have heard that term used before, but never in a good way. I surely would not want to consider myself a ward of the court, that makes it sound like I belong to them or something sinister.

→ **Wards of court.** Infants and persons of unsound mind placed by the court under the care of a guardian. *Davis' Committee v. Loney*, 290 Ky. 644, 162 S.W.2d 189, 190. Their rights must be guarded jealously. *Montgomery v. Erie R. Co., C.C.A.N.J.*, 97 F.2d 289, 292. See *Guardianship*.

Ok, now this is starting to get upsetting. I do not consider myself to be an infant, and I have doubted my sanity before, but I am pretty sure my mind works soundly, and as a free sovereign adult living in the land of the free I do not need the care of a "guardian".

Something else that you may want to know about attorneys and jurisdictional issues. If you need to challenge jurisdiction you may want to read the following:

→ **In propria persona** /in prɔwpriə pɜrsɔwnə/. In one's own proper person. It was formerly a rule in pleading that pleas to the jurisdiction of the court must be plead *in propria persona*, because if pleaded by attorney they admit the jurisdiction, as an attorney is an officer of the court, and he is presumed to plead after having obtained leave, which admits the jurisdiction. See *Pro se*.

Conclusions of law:

When you hire an attorney, you become a ward of the court and a second class citizen and you admit the jurisdiction of the court in the matter at hand.

You can't hire an attorney if you want to challenge jurisdiction.

If you want to challenge jurisdiction, the only way you can do it is as a "sui juris" and/or "in propria persona".

Are you convinced yet? If not, think about the following facts about lawyers:

From the time that they begin law school, they are trained to obey their master. And as we see in the previous pages, we are not that master; the courts are.

They only assume limited liability. In other words, when you get to sentencing phase, they say "I did the best I could", but you are still the one assuming full liability (or responsibility) for serving the sentence... not your attorney.

They are *all* members of the BAR Association, it is rumored that the BAR stands for "British Accredited Registry", and while I am not sure of that, I know that it is extremely hard to find out what it actually stands for. It is strange to me that all of the judges and prosecutors I have asked have all refused to reveal the true jurisdiction that

they operate in, and this means that the BAR association is in fact, another secret society.

All attorneys and lawyers vow a superseding oath to their master, not to you. Their loyalty is not with you.

They always allow the proceeding to continue, even though they are fully aware of the fraud being perpetrated, and they continue to collect a paycheck (as a matter of fact, they are compensated by the court for appearing in court above what they charge you and regardless of outcome).

A lawyer never argues that you are the beneficiary, or that you are a man not a person, you will never be able to get them to contest the roles that have been hijacked in the courtroom, you will never get full disclosure out of them either.

It is in their title for crying out loud! An attorney (ah-turn-ee), their job is to get all the facts from you to convict you, then turn ALL of that information over to the PROSECUTION in the form of discovery! They may act like they are helping you, but frequently they file no motions, no affidavits, and no evidence other than what you *make* them do.

The court is like a casino, you have a chance of winning, but that actual chance is very small (less than 3%), so because you think you have a chance to win... you keep playing... until you lose it all.

When it comes to lawyers, we also need to also learn the difference between "represented" status and "Inherent Rights".

How "pro se" literally means "represent myself" which is impossible - you ARE yourself; that the goal of the court is to keep everyone in a "represented" status, not telling you that you are not in a court of constitutional judicial due process in law.

You STAND - in the court, Our courtrooms and Public record, Claiming Living Breathing Un-a-lein-able God Given Sovereign Authority, Exercising and Establishing BY YOUR PRESENCE the lawful jurisdiction.

Wherever the King planted his flag and no other higher claim could be supported, there he was sovereign. That judge is a public servant along with the rest of the "members of the court". Do people think the King asked permission of his court to do ANYTHING? And it was the state that had to prove any claim against him and the people had to be witness to it (court and public record) to act against him.

The idea is the same, the sovereignty was established as being the authority of the PEOPLE in a REPUBLIC (NOT a "democracy which is the collective "fiction" calling itself the "people")In that system, Inherent Rights are nonexistent, all consensus based, not law based, the system in place now. Corporate based, NOT the Bill of Rights mandated process.

We are guaranteed a REPUBLIC in which the PEOPLE are the authority over their lives until they commit some real crime then the state has a lawful process that must be adhered to in processing that person. NOTHING short of that is lawful to restrict freeborn natural people.

Right now the state/corporate interests are operating as the sovereigns, giving themselves "legal rights" that appear to be "rights" like living beings can only claim. Case law establishes that no attorney can make a human claim for another human.

We have one testimony from an attorney who quit admitting to the client that she could not defend his rights before the court Sui Juris. Rarely will attorneys tell people the truth, or anything that empowers them to help themselves.

The attorney system is designed to keep the people dependant on the attorney, NOT to learn for themselves what is happening. The word "attorn" means "turn upside down" "turn over" as in "to the King, all the property" and that is what they do today... the "state" being the "king" now, the people without lawful process in administrative "kings courts" or corporate "jurisdictions" - all totally outside of the constitutional restrictions placed originally on government against the people to protect us.

We have to restore it IN THE PROCESS when we go into the court, in each state. WE ACTIVATE THIS, OR EXERCISE IT BY DOING IT !!! TALK DOES NOT DO IT.... It has to be

IN that sworn setting ON the public record YOU speaking your truth for yourself and everyone else, not compromising for any reason).

Where you STAND is where you make your lawful truthful claims, in a courtroom ON the public record, with witnesses to your claim. There is NO HIGHER AUTHORITY THAN CREATOR. Our Freedom is our Inheritance, Birthright of Freeborn Natural People. It is up to US to stop compromising our birthright and posterity. It is called STANDING.

Do I need to ask again if you should you hire an attorney? What do you think? I say "ABSOLUTELY NOT!"

CHAPTER 3 - THE DARK HISTORY OF OUR LEGAL SYSTEM

This chapter is about the dark history of our legal system, and how it has evolved and morphed through the years to become the system of law that we all now live in. With all the frivolous laws and victimless "crimes", it leads one to ponder what the actual limitations on government really are, and when they will stop bleeding us through taxation, penalties, and more recently torture, warrantless invasive searches, unlawful detention, and terrorism of the people by the government in general.

Few of us can even comprehend that there might be a small, select group of people that manufacture the society that we live in, every aspect of the government, and of our lives, and create a fertile breeding ground for corruption at every level. Even less are aware that a handful of "think tanks" produce our society, make laws, set taxes, and control the money and even the military. More and more people however, are beginning to feel that there is something wrong, but may not know exactly what it is. You look at the world around you, and your neighbor is nice,

your co-workers are nice and seem to be good people, people want to have a nice society where everyone can live in peace. People really just want to have a nice life, and be free of wars. So where is this influence of control coming from? If you think about the methods that have been common throughout history, it might make you thankful that we live in the present. You might think that today we don't have it so bad, but if we continue to do nothing it will continue to get worse until there is nothing that anyone can do to escape. We can make it better, not only for ourselves, but let us not curse the next generations with the enslavement of mankind simply because we were too busy trying to make more money, or because we were more comfortable on the couch watching football. We need to reclaim our dominion from these corrupt government and religious institutions and reign in control of the mega-corporations or things will just keep getting worse. We need to trust in our fellow man and change the way that we live, for the benefit of all.

A kingdom of ideas

Once upon a time there was a city called Rome. For over five centuries it was a republic and even much more beautiful due to the fact that it was run by the people, who got along well and had a kingdom that worked and most were happy. And then one day it became a kingdom of new ideas, when a family came along from seemingly out of nowhere. They were the Julian family with Julius Caesar and his adopted nephew Augustus, and then the Piso family, who were the Flavians.

The days came when blood filled the streets of Rome that Tacitus recalled as the "days of horror". Titus knocked down the temple in Jerusalem and put up an arch in Rome. In the eyes of his son Vespasian was a god, and Eusebius, Saint Augustine and Gerome founded a world of fiction with Constantine the Great. Deception and imperialism became the order of the day, and in its wake there followed a trail of land grabbing, inquisitions, crusades, and the medicating of the people.

Teaching a falsehood about a historical Christ underpinned three structures that became the three biggest fictions: they were law, religion and science. Certain entities on earth would have control of them, and now the law aspect is out of control and must finally be dealt with by us. Philosophers and so many men of wisdom have been murdered, many places have been burnt down and destroyed where knowledge was stored... and elite families ran a Roman world of make-believe.... so that the people would live in a kingdom of ideas.

Rome had many things to offer, many services, and many things that the powerful still do today to mislead and satiate the masses. They would look after the gentiles. They built the Coliseum and gave the masses bread and circuses. They gave us their maxims and their architecture. And they gave everybody the Julio-Gregorian calendar, but good people realized that Rome was really taking over the world, and the world resisted it. The Bolsheviks made Russia take it, and England was forced to take it 1751, and it grew, and the whole world set their clocks to it. And they gave us the alphabet; it went on computer keyboards everywhere, even as far as the Japanese with their Kanji, Katakana and Hiragana: they had ROMAJI.

They gave us the Latin language, used in major world tongues - English and Spanish, with French, Portuguese, Italian, Dutch, and German. They gave us an economic system called capitalism. They gave us fictional Judeo-Christian religious systems that are neither Jewish nor Christian, with thirty thousand denominations of Christianity all registered as corporations. They gave us a political system of Christian democracy which is mob rule. They gave us counterfeited science. They gave us Law of the High Seas, which is Uniform Commercial Code or Canon Law, or Maritime Law, also called Roman Law. And so now the western world operates under a law of the Vatican who are in the GOD business (Guns, Oil, Drugs). The Vatican has become the biggest corporation on earth of many-fold arms offering the most profitable services: war, people trafficking, conquering countries, making fictional Federal

Reserve money, taxation, murdering, plundering, and of course indoctrinating, and medicating us.

They were in bed with the banksters and the Rothschilds. Amschel Rothschild went kissing the Pope Carlo in Naples and looked after Vatican money since 1823. The bankers, the Club of Rome, the Jesuits, Knights of Malta, the Trilateral Commission, the Bilderbergs, and the Council on Foreign Relations, all are arms of the Vatican. It's all rigged. How many people have perished under the dark priesthood of the cult of Rome, with the Bible in their left hand and the sword in their right. They employed the worst methods of torture, roasting testicles in burning oil and burning out the victim's eyes with hot pokers, all the way to spiritual torture today in the courts around the "free" world. They directed the inquisitions, and as well as the public market, and they control the black market and everything underground today. While harming people and doing everything that is vile and perverse, the inquisition is still alive and well, and lives on in the courts, calendar, the language, the economy, the religion, the politics, the false science, the law, counterfeit money, taxes, false history, Big Pharma, drugs and war. They told us they are serving Christ which turns out to be anti-Christ. The Vatican is Babylon the Great, the mother harlot of all her Protestant organizations incorporated that sit under her bloodstained skirts, and all her corporations and people pay massive amounts to the Catholic Vatican.

To engage us in war they had to start trouble. They had to invent things that wouldn't otherwise exist like terrorism, through the CIA and MOSSAD. The CEO of the

Vatican corporation is the Pope and cardinals. They can also be referred to as black magicians. These sorcerers set up a system of ownership of all property and souls that exist on earth through their Papal Bulls and Trusts. What's written on them goes. They sealed these Papal Bulls, put a spell on them and put them in their vaults.

Man, Know Thyself

We are born into this world free and Sovereign. Where did we go wrong? The moment we are born these agencies line up to have us sign and register and give away our sovereignty. For thousands of years Rome has been making slaves of mankind. The time has come to be free forever from the inventions of the most powerful empire the world has ever known. The greatest documents in history are the English Magna Carta and the American Constitution; they are true testamentary Trusts because the people were signatories to them. The people set up these Trusts and agreed to them. But the Vatican has set up its own Trusts, which have been signed by Popes in the privacy of their own abode to the exclusion of all else (in other words, in secrecy), and without our consent. We did not agree to them. The history may be obscure but the general picture is that these bloodlines have been at it for thousands of years, behind different corporations that have morphed over time. They go back to the time of Akhenaton and the Hyksos in Egypt and track back to Babylon. Rome is more recent in comparison.

The Vatican is the product of Akhenaton, the Hyksos, the Julians and the Flavians, and Constantine. It is a hand in glove operation of bankers and religion. They've always

gone after and persecuted the enlightened few, true scientists, and people who urge the race to grow up and remember who they are and reclaim their dominion. Once upon a time in Rome slaves were employees, and the scene changed form over time. Africans were shipped over to the Americas to work on plantations. Slavery is still alive and well today. Furtively and by stealth, we chattels were sold to the slavery of Rome.

In the 1400s and 1500s the Vatican set up their Trusts, things called Cestui Que Vie Trusts that corporatized free spirits, through Papal Bulls. A Papal Bull is made with the blood of a kid. It implies a true human child. (When the Queen gave her royal assent to sign the UK over to the Lisbon Treaty she signed goat skin, which was sealed, bound in blue leather, and sent to Rome. Documents are lodged in Rome.) It cannot be written just on paper, it does not yield the same life. It is done on parchment or velum, the skins of living creatures. It gives it life and makes the spell binding. The Papal Bull made the very first Trust ever created when Pope Boniface VIII in 1302 created the first Express Trust. This was Unum Sanctum. The three subsequent Trusts derived their power from this one. It says on it 'the entire world and all the souls in it are ours' (belonging to the Catholic Church).

A Trust means just that, "to trust another with one's property". What happened was when the religious Crusaders left their palaces and went to Jerusalem they entrusted their best friend or sometimes others to look after their estate and handed it over to them in trust pending their return. The trusted friend became the

Trustee and ended up claiming the property calling it a Claim of Right.

When the crusaders came back home, they got no support from the courts and couldn't get their property back. And this was the Unum Sanctum. They sealed it, cursed it with a spell and put it in their vault. Do you have a Papal Bull where you've cursed the whole world and claimed to possess it? Does anyone think it's ok to pull that crap? No? But they do. They ask us to register, and when we are born, our informant parents tell the government we have been born: they inform on us, and the government registers us and gives us a number. And that number follows us for the rest of our lives. Or it lasts for 75 years if you live longer. Without telling us, the governments used that to create a Trust which we become attached to. Register: "regis" means the king who you handed your dominion over to, and entered into a contract with. When "nations" "require" their national citizens "By Law" to register their children, once registered, the number on the birth certificate is the number of these three Cestui Que Vie accounts (Trusts). 'Cestui' is Latin for the number 'Six', and there are three of these Cestui Que Vie Trusts set up on us: therefore 666, the Mark of the Beast, we are just an animal to them.

We are made of carbon, all humans, animals, plants, all living creatures. A carbon atom is made up of six protons, six electrons and six neutrons. The Bible talks about the number of a man: "And the number is Six hundred and sixty six". "Cestui Que Vie" is the name of your enslavement. We haven't known the meaning of our birth

certificates. We defaulted, and monstrous governments came all around. And now courts do commerce with our fictional name, when they send us a summons to their place of business to offer us a service of adjudication. But in the Law of the Land, otherwise known as Common Law, a Magistrate or Judge has no jurisdiction, or no jurisdiction greater than your own, as all men are equal under the law. And there came an awakening that Plato called the anamnesis, the time that we would remember who we are. Before long a message began to spread around the planet: a message that we were really sovereign, and we have been all along, and we are better off without their services, and we must know that. We must know that we don't need to contract with those private corporations. This message is spreading. People have had enough. In diverse ways on different levels they are starting to get it and many freemen on the land people are telling this system exactly where to stuff their services. They are beginning to understand as sovereigns that they don't need to consent to them. To restore justice and law to the world we have to reclaim our dominion by reclaiming our position and title.

In actual fact you are the sole beneficiary and shareholder of your registered corporation created upon the registration of your birth with your registered birth certificate as PROOF that you are certified as a citizen, and also certified to be able to perform in the capacity of government at some future time. Citizens may also perform functions of government, and it is always your choice to decide if you want to perform a function of government (personally I prefer to be paid for any work I perform) and I do not have to tell anyone about my

business for taxation or any other purpose unless you are a party to my business, or I am actually doing business with you. Otherwise it is my private business, and my records are private. You are the general executor of your entire estate (and no you do not need to be dead to have an estate, we all have one). It is vital to understand who you are.

Souls lost at sea

The Trusts claim all the property on the planet, all the people (the cattle) and all their souls. The "Holy See" is salvaging the souls lost at sea, and so they administer their Maritime Law. These are the three Trusts that you and your property are owned under:

1) ROMANUS PONTIFEX was created by Pope Nicolas V in 1455. It is the first testamentary deed and will and crown over the land. It deprives you of all your real estate, land titles and titles to your property. In this system you don't own your titles, you never will. You don't own anything. What you have is right of use. That's what the title means.

2) Next, the AETERNI REGIS came in 1481, from Pope Sixtus IV. It means 'The Eternal Crown'. This takes away your personal property and makes you a slave. The commonwealth was born here. In the Incipit of the Papal Bull, it says: "For a perpetual remembrance".

3) CONVOCATION, the third Trust, came in 1531, which claims your soul. We have all been baptised into the Catholic Church, via the Birth Certificate. It's a ritual. This ritual they perform in hospitals, because since around

about 1870s to 1931 owing to Abraham Lincoln and the banksters, hospitals are military facilities. You are born in a ward; you are in their eyes a ward of the State. Unless you rebut this it stands and they get away with it. This trio of Trusts all correspond to the Tiara that the Pope wears since the time of Pope Boniface in 1302.

We have been contracted with these Trusts since the moment our birth was registered. We are the beneficiaries of the Trusts and the government is the Trustee. This is why they can come along and seize your home and take your children away, and can store you away in jail like merchandise in a warehouse. You are stock and they claim ownership of the world, and they do because nobody has challenged them and their Papal Bull and Trusts.

The Cestui Que Vie Trusts apply around the world, through the UN, through the Rothschilds, through the Geneva Convention and all the conventions that say they make us "free". Pope Boniface first wore the double crown. The Triple Crown that came along was the Tiara that stands for the three Trusts that steal your estate, property and soul. You can free yourself from this enslavement if you learn how to collapse these Trusts. And tell them you don't require their services; we've had enough.

As if we don't own our property and have to pay real estate taxes to the kingdom?! Take the title Real Estate: does the word 'real' not mean ROYAL? In Spanish (Latin) it does. "Familia Real" is Royal Family. The English word "real" meaning authentic doesn't mean the same in Spanish. It's slavery. The population got dumbed down,

and every day there would be a new tax. Register your car, pets, this and that. When you walk into court, you are in trust law. When you walk into a court you are lost at sea, don't understand what's going on, the jargon, and why you lose - and find no justice there. It's cruel, cruel, cruel.

Someone goes into court with a lawyer to represent him, to prove that he or she is a Ward of the State - and the lawyer is working for the Cestui Que Vie accounts. The Prosecution is, the Clerk is, and so is the Judge. The person is lost, and he needs a Cestui Que Vie account and someone to help him and manage his affairs which are his stolen wealth. The Aeterni Regis claims the property they have stolen from us. A birth certificate in the United States that's registered with the Security and Stock Exchange Commission in New York makes you a shareholder.

Your birth certificate is worth a minimum of 15 million dollars. They have robbed us of our real wealth. The whole system is run on the presumption of your being lost at sea - incompetent. So they administer your Trusts for you unless you write to the Attorney General and tell him you have come of age and that you are going to be the General Executor. This puts you in the control seat and not them. Why do they have a Holy See? To look after the Lord's affairs here on earth, because Constantine the murderer established his Church of St Peter and the system of tax, based on the Apostle Peter being given the keys of the kingdom by "Jesus" back in 325. They put words in Jesus' mouth, those famous words "Give unto Caesar what is Caesar's". So you pay Peter's pence, to support the papal see. God didn't give a rock to Peter to warrant the paying

of taxes. The law God gave us was love and peace, not a Law of the High Seas that renders you lost at sea and incompetent and a Ward of the State, because you were born in a military facility, that's a hospital run by the Knights Hospitallier.

The Columbia Picture

When the 1481 Trust, Aeterni Regis, was created it was about eleven years before Christopher Columbus set off with three boats full of Conquistadores when he 'discovered America' - conquered a land which did not belong to them. They were blessed by Rome and the Catholic Church. He signed the Treaty of Tesadillos when he came back, in 1493. This gave the whole of the Americas to the Columbus families. These elite families and Vatican Church families shared it out between them. The elite families own the Vatican. The name 'Christopher' means bearer of Christ. Columbus is the Holy Dove.

Keep them in prison with pills

The elites are running this type of system: **Privileged International Government Prison Estate National System Private International Legislative Law. We are living in PIG PENS with PILLS.** It is a prison estate nation system and they give us pills. The **PIG** has all the industrialists, elite families and monarchies administering the **PENS** and **PILLS**.

Receiving a fine for refusing to show your driver's license or getting a summons to court, they are bringing you in by summoning your corporation. You are the sole beneficiary and shareholder of it - your Trust. You have to rebut that

for them not to fine/jail you. You need to let them know soon enough. Like: "I'm here by special appearance to have the case dismissed against my corporate name. Who in this courtroom is in breach of Trust?"

The court operates in presumptions; presumptions that, until they are rebutted, stand. For example; they give you a license to drive. Yet travelling is our inalienable right. It should not have to be granted by a license or a passport. Who said we are not allowed to travel? But words on a passport that speak for Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II grant you allowance to pass freely without let or hindrance. Why would you need that if you are free? Her pirating family is the most murderous in history, together with the Rothschilds.

Giorgio Vasari in the Bay of Naples painted a picture of the Vatican with an army of 200 ships crusading against the Turks. What's the Pope doing with 200 military ships? What's he doing in a photo blessing the army? He wouldn't want you to see those pictures. Go shed blood for God, shed. The pirates of the high seas and the inquisitional officers that torture us when we start to think haven't gone away. Their officers of the Inquisition come to summons you.

The Mafia comes a calling

In 325 Emperor Constantine the Great wrote a document to Pope Sylvester saying that Peter was the apostle for Jesus and that he gave Jesus the kingdom of the earth, upon which he built his rock. Because the Rock of Peter was in Rome, Rome claimed this contract with humanity

and they would administer its affairs. This claim included asking for and collecting taxes; they claimed these taxes also on the basis of Constantine's Donation, which was a fictional document. To this day they are extorting taxes and providing a "service" like the Mafia that comes knocking on your door, like the Mafia in Italy who have killed people who have resisted them. We'll protect you, but if you don't take the offer, we have somebody who can beat you up too.

Forty years after Constantine, Julian the Emperor said: "Those Christians, they are slit-throats". The classic mafia of Italy goes right the way back to the Vatican. What was portrayed in the movie *The Godfather* was truth not fiction. But at least you have fair Mafia bosses in Italy, who respect the other godfather's borders on the other part of town. The cardinals of the Vatican however are evil sorcerers who don't want most of it, they want it all. We pay taxes to Rome and the insane elite Khazarian-Venetian-Black Nobility families such as the Saxe-Coburg Gothas who are the Windsors, and to bankers and bullion brokers. People in uniform; policemen, sheriffs, army soldiers killing, bailiffs going knocking people's doors with summonses to attend court to go to a hearing, a sacrament of penance and indulgences - are the many servants of the Kingdom of Rome. Income Tax was implemented roughly around 1914, or shortly after the First World War, and after the implementation of the Federal Reserve Bank, Woodrow Wilson introduced tax as a temporary measure just to help pay for the war and America's (a corporation) so-called defense.

Those poor soldiers that died fought for a corporation. That temporary measure is still in force. We go to work and sometimes half of that is tax that goes to Rome. But people assume it goes to the treasury. Well that's the Federal Reserve system that runs the IMF and runs effectively all the countries of the world except countries like Libya, Iran, North Korea, Venezuela, The Sudan, countries where the west have their Halliburton and Blackwater-style mercenaries. Those poor boys going out to fight have been indoctrinated since Kindergarten. Everyone is taught that they have to grow up to get a job and serve and pay taxes, and be educated in this Roman system – and to go off to fight for your "country" when it's time to "fulfill your duty".

Those boys don't have time to think, because if they did they would understand what's really going on. Immensely rich powerful families pull the strings of these un-evolved people, and conscript them to go kill for Halliburton and Blackwater in Iraq and train people as police and army officers, sheriffs and bailiffs, judges and magistrates in their putrid system that's about to collapse once the money dries up. There's no need to fear the crashing of the economy. For stability, we need that Federal Reserve currency to go! It has been underpinning all of the crooked evil deeds done on this planet.

The Anglo-American world power has its birth in Rome. It counterfeited the system of the ancient mystery schools which were not always bad. People had a vow of silence for reasons of protection of the beautiful truths. The counterfeit that those elites made of it became your Skull and Bones and counterfeit Freemasonry and Templar's and

the countless others, all run by the Vatican. They too use vows of silence but it is secrecy. There's a difference. The elite families that control the Vatican corporation of the apostle Peter are psychopaths.

The Vatican and the Superior General of the Jesuits sit at the top of the pyramid of control behind the scenes, and then there are the Crown and the psychopathic royals who think they have a divine right to rule the rest. But the Queen serves the Pope. Under her come the think tanks and world financial control and world resource control, population control, and us the debt slaves at the bottom that are being bled. When we go to work we are taxed and pay half of it to the government. The Vatican is the most powerful entity on this planet, except in Temple Bar.

Temple Bar

Temple Bar (note the ecclesiastical name) is a holiest of holiest temple that sits on nameless land in a square mile in the City of London, the only land in the world without a title and the only piece of land in the world that is over and above the Vatican. It's the only place on earth that the Vatican does not claim as its own. It was granted to the Knights Templar. Temple Bar runs the show. Who are they? They are the private guilds administering the legal system in our courts. (Priests of Ba-al.) This is the place where all sorts of crimes are thought up and administered to the proletariat masses. In that place there is an 'Outer and Middle Temple'. It parallels Jerusalem – there is a middle and outer Temple there, which is the 'holies of holies'.

The Inner Temple granted to the City of London is the New Jerusalem. It's based on the system of slavery brought back from Jerusalem by the Templars. The ones in the outer temple are the goyim and get thrown the teachings of exoteric religion, a made up story that Jesus Christ is the only savior there ever was that kept the masses ignorant and enslaved in the Outer Temple. Although they have tentacles all over the earth, three very small Roman corporate-controlled city states run the show: Washington DC is the war and military mechanism; the City of London deals with the finances of the whole planet through the Bank of England and Federal Reserve; and Vatican City deals with our spirits, the poisoning of people's minds, and scientific propaganda. They have the title, the Cestui Que Vie accounts, for the all the Americas.

"Let he who shall be deceived, be deceived."

Rome has its motto in 'He who would be deceived, let him be deceived'. They run the courts and that's why courts are ecclesiastical (of or relating to a church). When you walk into a magistrate's court you think you are going there to get justice. No. You are getting an adjudication service. We in dominion need to tell them we don't need those services. Under Magna Carta it is your right to ask for a jury. Dominion of Earth is Mankind's birthright! (*Genesis 1: 28*). We need to learn how to reclaim our dominion in law, or we will keep getting the same thing we have been getting, and if we don't do something fast, we risk never being able to change it as they continue to tighten the stranglehold they have on us every chance they get.

In a courtroom, codes and statute are the lowest form of law... meant for UNITED STATES corporate "employees" (otherwise known as slaves), and they really ONLY apply to persons or individuals acting in the capacity of a government official, or as a government agent.

The forms of law that we want to invoke in court are trust law and contract law, which are the highest forms of law and when used properly in court, supersede all statutory law, code, or any other acts. Now that we know only to use trust and contract law in court, we must learn what every trust is composed of. Every trust has a trustee (the one trusted with holding of the property), an executor (executes, signs), and a beneficiary (for now, this is you).

In any courtroom, the court clerk is the trustee. The judge is the administrator of the trust. The Prosecution is the executor of the trust, and also the one with all the liability, and the one who created the writ to summons you to court.

When you walk in to court, you are presumed to go in as the beneficiary of the Cestui Que Vie trust. They get you into court because they want to create a Constructive Trust. Now, they know you are already enslaved to the system by virtue of your name, because the first thing they say to you for the record is "What is your name?"

The moment you certify that you *are* that name, and agree to be that name, by your own consent, they've got you; you animated the Cestui Que Vie trust by bringing LIFE to it. They want you to appear in court and to accept that you are that name to find a beneficiary, which is you.

Does beneficiary mean it benefits you? The aim is to then to switch roles with you so the prosecution becomes the beneficiary and gets you to execute your own sentence. The court gets a sizeable amount of money, roughly \$160,000 for the creation of each Constructive Trust of the Cestui Que Vie trusts when you go to court.

They send people to jail because they are getting commissions. They consider you a corpse: "Corpse" – corp from "Corporation" - your name is in all CAPITALS which is a fiction, it's a corporation. And again that's connected to the Cestui Que Vie trusts. Because of the Convocation Trust they own your soul which is another reason to consider you dead.

EVERYTHING that goes on in court is ecclesiastical. It works on a sacrament of penance and indulgences. You're born a sinner, that's why you're a dirty criminal in the courts. They have inserted themselves there as God's agents bringing you in for a hearing to administer your sins. A sacrament of penance is "Penance is a sacrament in the new law instituted by Christ in which forgiveness of sins committed after baptism is granted through the priest's absolution to those who with true sorrow confess their sins and promise to satisfy for the same."

It's called a sacrament, not simply a function of ceremony because it is an outward sign instituted by Christ to impart grace to the soul. As an outward sign it comprises the actions of the penitent in presenting himself to the priest, the accusing himself of his sins, and the actions of the priest in pronouncing absolution and

imposing satisfaction. The whole procedure is usually called from one of its parts confession and it is said to take place in the Tribunal of Penance because it is a judicial process in which the penitent is at once the accuser, the person accused, and the witness'. You are accused by a pro se-cutor. "Pro se" means on your behalf; and the Latin "cutis" means skin. He is your impersonator going to court with a summons and saying he is REPRESENTING the human flesh and blood person in the corporate fiction, accusing that person of sin.

The sacrament of penance means you are the accuser, the accused, and the witness. The priest pronounces judgment and sentence. The grace conferred is deliverance from the guilt of sin, in the case of mortal sin, from eternal punishment, hence reconciliation with God.

Finally the confession is made, not in the privacy of the penitent's heart, or to an ordained priest, but to an Ordinary, a Judge, a Magistrate, with requisite jurisdiction with the power of the keys i.e. the power to forgive sins which Christ granted to his church. This is all going on in the court rooms in the western world without our consent! The priest is the Judge with the treasury of credits in heaven.

Remember how the Judge is the Administrator of the Trust? The Judge is God and administers those credits, those treasures – those trusts. And when he administers them, it is penance. That means you pay (a "penalty"). It happens in the confession box – "to do penance" when you confess your sins; or crimes in court when you go to

confess them and accuse yourself, and pay penance/penalty. It runs as a church does. Many court buildings have architecture like churches with arched doors. The Royal Court of Justice in London is one. You need to know who the characters are to win; the tricksters are very clever with their magic.

A Magistrate or a Judge, is an Ordinary, which is an officer of the church who, by reason of office, has ordinary power to execute the church's laws. A Clerk is a Cleric. A Court (Cortio) is an Oratory where you go to confess your sins. "We're going to have a *hearing* today, forgive me Father for I have sinned". "Would the accused stand before the Judge, please." "Your Honor". All this theatre goes on, and it's all fictional. It's mind control, tyranny and blasphemy.

They send you a Warrant, because it is a seal of a Writ. Writ comes from "ritus", a holy "rite"- a prayer, a religious observance. A Writ is a form of indulgence, a scrivener notary. Scrivener comes from the words "scrivo" meaning "to write" and "veneii" meaning "indulgence". The Catholic Encyclopedia definition of an indulgence is the full or partial remission of temporal punishment due for sins which have already been forgiven. The indulgence is granted by the Catholic Church.

After the sinner has *confessed* – in a *hearing* – and received Absolution. The belief is that indulgences draw on the treasury of merit accumulated by Christ's super abundantly meritorious sacrifice on the cross and the virtues and penance of the saints. They are granted for

specific good works and prayers. You've been naughty, not through Common Law which is injury, loss, or harm but through fictional Canon Law, law of the High Seas, Maritime Law, Commercial Law - and courts administer the sacrament of indulgences for the sin of breaching one of their commercial rules. But there's this treasury in heaven and Christ has given this wonderful sacrifice. This fictional historical lie of Christ spewed out by the universities and churches underpins all their magic.

Saturn in the Courthouse

Because of the BAR Association, judges and magistrates are priests of bail (Ba-al) (priests of Saturn, the Black Sun, or Satan). They dress like priests because they are the black ministers of this satanic Latin-Saturn-Atun. This is why judges and magistrates wear black. They are Ordinaries. An Ordinary is an officer of the Church who by reason of office has Ordinary power to execute the Church's laws. It is all ecclesiastical. They are *still* working for the Inquisition. They are the grim reapers reaping our souls and warehousing them, because they claim them (through the Convocation Trust).

The Church speaks Latin, a dead language, so they give you a whole bunch of Latin words when they summons you to court because the Inquisition is still on, only because we haven't stopped it... but we're stopping it now. And they dress in black ceremonial robes because it is Satan's church ('Satan', otherwise known as or referencing Saturn, a planet that naturally has a strong negative energy, the negative energy is not 'evil'; it is simply negative in natural terms, which is neither good nor bad). This is not the devil

of the Christians because that's a fiction, but the negative magnetic energy of Saturn, considered in astrology to be a malefic. They have always known how to harvest negative saturnine energy. The Church has terrorized minds with their filthy mind control and indoctrination, instilling fear into our very souls with the nasty threat of eternal damnation in the fires of hell. The pedophilia and sodomy in the Church is a reflection of the intent of the devastation of souls and resultant suicides.

We all need to reclaim our dominion by taking claim of that Trust, by writing to your Attorney General and telling him that you have arrived on the scene, have come of age, and no longer need their services to administer that Trust. It is a breach of Trust for them to do it. They are getting away with it because we don't know about it. This awakening and this consciousness that is coming with the internet and all the information enables us to see that this world is not the way the institutions have painted. It is exactly the opposite of what they say. The kingdom of ideas that Rome (Babylon) is, is a house of cards that is ready to topple over. This system is about to end.

CHAPTER 4 - RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES, AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Before we go any further, we need to define a few not only relevant, but necessary legal terms that we have used and will be using throughout this book. The following are definitions of these terms so the information may be clear to the reader. These terms are not interchangeable.

Privilege - A privilege is permission - granted by a higher authority to carry out an activity. When gaining a privilege, one must often give up a natural right. Example According to the U.S. Constitution, people have a right to travel public roads in their private vehicles. However, when they enter into a contract with the state to receive a drivers license, they exchange their constitutional right to travel for a state-granted privilege to drive, and are thus subject to the stipulations of the state (auto insurance, realm of integral registration, etc.).

Rights - Rights are natural states of being, whether recognized or unrecognized, that all humans inherently

possess. (For example, the right to procreate or grow food is obvious, but not necessarily recognized by documentation.) Some rights are recognized in the U.S. Constitution, such as the right to travel. Rights are nullified (given away) when they are exchanged for privileges, such as when one enters into a contract with the state through a marriage or drivers license. When natural rights are exchanged for privileges granted from an outside source, one becomes a non-sovereign, or a subject of the authority who has given the privilege.

Civil Law - Civil law is the structure that organizes, controls, punishes and rewards individuals who have given up their rights in exchange for privileges.

Common Law - Common law, a law of sovereigns, is based on the idea of self-responsibility and natural rights. It is recognized under the Constitution as the natural state of being. Only in the last century has common law been methodically exchanged for civil law.

Sovereignty - Sovereignty is the state of being that is achieved when one operates only under common law, or has taken total self-responsibility for their lives.

Spiritual and Emotional Sovereignty

First off, spiritual sovereignty is the result of emotional sovereignty. In addressing the idea of emotional sovereignty we will indicate how spiritual sovereignty can be attained.

Some definitions of emotional sovereignty follow. First of all, it means liberation, freedom. A state of emotional sovereignty is obtained when a person recognizes, both intellectually and emotionally, that he/she is the total creator of his/her reality and has sole responsibility for him/herself.

These concepts sound like simplistic metaphysics, for many lecturers and others espouse them. However I am going to take you deeper into the areas where you likely have not attained emotional sovereignty, areas where there is a disguised play being acted on the stage, and the playbill says one thing but the message the play carries says another. I will point out contradictions in the generally accepted philosophies on government and the true meaning of freedom in your country, in your own thinking, and in the systems that have been set up to enslave us. And even though we claim we are a free people, we are actually perpetuating exactly the opposite.

The concept of sovereignty has been discussed, debated and questioned throughout history, from before the Roman empire through to the present day. There are many points that will be brought up that, taken separately, may look as

if they are not connected. However I am going to link them to show you just how deep your sense of non-sovereignty is and how oppressive, ancient, and obsolete this system that we live in really is.

Sovereignty and the Constitution

We need to discuss things that the majority of people in the United States of America are currently very closely tied to, most notably, issues of an educational, political or religious nature. Many feel that these ideas are some of the cornerstones of our existence. As an example, many individuals speak very highly of the Constitution of the United States and how it guarantees freedom for all people. Yet some things have happened since 1776 that have gradually pulled the wool over our eyes, so that we are being told one thing but in reality the opposite is being played out.

Now, in no way would I be pointing a finger; in no way am I saying that you're bad or wrong. All the systems set up on our planet, dating back thousands of years, were taught to you by your forefathers, who had been grappling with these same issues themselves for a long time as well. Thus, this is in no way a judgment of you. But we are out of time, we must act quickly, with firm and absolute resolve. This is a time when we can enslave ourselves more deeply or where we can finally achieve our sovereignty. Within the coming years we will decide the direction we wish to go, it is up to *US*.

Ways We Enslave Ourselves

There are many things occurring within your reality right now that keep you enslaved. To use a very simple analogy; in our society we have set it up so that marriage is a socially sanctioned institution, and usually legally sanctioned as well. If you operate within the parameters of marriage, you are led to believe that you have certain privileges. Now, it is a fact not well known that when you enter into a contract such as marriage, indirectly there are related issues that will apply as a result of a legal marriage.

When you sign anything that has to do with a state or a local government, there are times when you actually relinquish certain rights. When you sign a marriage contract, you give up your right to educate your children the way you see fit, giving the state authority to educate them and even remove them from you if necessary. Thus you give up your right to educate your own children (depending on the laws of each individual state).

These things are not clearly understood when one enters this contract - but it's important to note that nobody is trying to "get" you. Because of your own deep-seated emotional beliefs, you have created covert ways to keep yourself stuck in these dysfunctional emotional beliefs. What is covert is what you're doing to yourselves. Do you follow so far?

Another example, one written into our Constitution, is the right to drive. However, when you apply for a drivers license, you give up your right and are thereby granted a

privilege. But because you exist under the Constitution, you have a right to drive.

I would like to clarify that your Constitutional right to drive is basically a right to travel on the roads. The Supreme Court has ruled that this includes one's personal automobile.

Because that is your right, you don't have to do anything to exercise it other than to exist. However, when you enter into a contract (a drivers license), you relinquish that right and subject yourself to laws that are made regarding the privilege you are now given. As teenagers you are taught that you take drivers education, apply for a license and then you can legally drive. Of course, when you get your license you are then subject to the laws about automobile insurance, vehicle registration, the laws of the road, etc. Your traveling then becomes a privilege instead of a natural right, correct? You're not taught that you have a choice.

Another example is common-law marriage -- marriage in the eyes of God (never mind the piece of paper) - retaining your rights to educate your children. Or you can sign a contract and thus no longer educate your own children. You and your spouse become legally bound to each other and are given certain supposed privileges. You are never told that you have a choice, it is taken for granted that you get married and sign the papers. There is seldom conscious thought about alternatives that may better serve your situation.

When you go for your first drivers license, you are not told you have a choice under the Constitution, which our forefathers wrote and which we all have a part in. You are not told you have a choice either to retain your natural rights as a citizen or to sign away those rights in exchange for certain privileges and all the laws those privileges are subject to. If you retain for instance, your common-law rights (your natural rights under the Constitution), even if you are caught by a policeman for speeding there may be a hassle but constitutionally you still have the right to travel. You can be fined or punished only when you have given away your rights in exchange for privileges; then you are bound by the laws.

Not having a drivers license, according to the law, does not give you the right to violate the safety laws. According to the Supreme Court you are still subject to the speed laws and other rules of the road. The punishment for not having a drivers license differs from state to state. In Arizona, it is simply a fine. In other states it can be jail. So there is a wide variety in the type of crime as well as punishment. A misdemeanor in Arizona could be a felony in another state. So, if you are going to drive without a license plate or without a license, you must be prepared to explain, preferably without emotion, your reasoning and philosophy. You must also always be prepared for the unexpected night in jail, possibly your car being towed, and you must know what to do in these cases and what your remedy is.

The Best Philosophy - 100% Responsibility

The point that I wish to make is that when you give up your power to another person or an institution to keep yourself in line, you have given up your sovereignty. Let us give you an example using a more responsible philosophy. Let's say that we want to drive cars on the roads. A better approach is one of total self-responsibility, meaning if you hit someone, you are responsible. If you are hit by someone else, you are responsible for that, too. If they are in some type of automobile dispute, each person involved takes responsibility for his position. There would never be any victims.

In a case like this, what we call our civil law is not applicable. Civil law (the way our system is set up) ensures that someone is a victim, that someone must be held responsible because no one is willing to take responsibility for themselves. Our system reinforces the idea that someone is at fault, and therefore there must be someone to punish - because we are unable or unwilling to take total responsibility for our own reality. Thus victimhood is continually perpetuated. How many times a day do you see an automobile insurance commercial on television where the injured person says, "It wasn't my fault. Don't I deserve something for my pain and suffering?" This is the attitude, the dynamic, that is constantly being perpetuated.

I recognize that we may not be able to change overnight - it may be too much of a shock. However, right now the majority of people are unaware that they are even perpetuating the cycle of fear, non-responsibility, blame

and victimhood. Imagine what it would be like to drive daily and 100% of the time know that you are creating your reality, know that everything that happens to you is created by you for a very specific reason. If you get into an automobile accident, if you hit someone, you take responsibility for it. Even if you are hit from behind, for instance, you recognize that it is within your reality only because you have drawn it there.

Imagine a society that holds these beliefs. It would have no victimhood; it would be a society totally willing to take responsibility for everything that happens to it. We are working toward this, but because we have not recognized the trap we have set up for ourselves, it is almost as if we are running on a treadmill trying to get down the street. Once we recognize how deep the structure is that we have created, we will be able to start actively changing it.

Anger Is Not Taking Responsibility

Some of us have already been doing this. However, some of the ways we are trying to change it, to get out of the structure, are really dragging us deeper into it. Let's say you have someone who studies the Constitution and realizes that there is a contradiction between what was set up and what is going on now. Let's say this person has a lot of victimhood energy. They become angry about the situation and because they are not willing to look at the source of their anger - their own inner victimhood, their own relinquishment of their sovereignty - they externalize the victimization and see the system as the perpetrator.

You then have someone who is angry and decides they're going to buck the system. Let's say they refuse to register their car, get automobile insurance or a drivers license. In their anger, their intent is to make a statement - to cause trouble. This creates resistance toward the very structure they are struggling to pull away from. All it does is balance the intensity of the structure. It will not free them but keep them chained to it. The person never looks at the real reason for the anger - the relinquishment of personal sovereignty - but instead blames that loss on someone else. You can never be sovereign if you blame anyone else for anything. And whenever you do, the structure is kept in place.

There are many individuals who feel they are engaged in good causes when they are acting in anger. But I will tell you that anger will never solve the structural challenges of our society. It can never break the structure. The question is, what will break the structure? First an intelligent understanding of the structure itself, why it was created and how it is kept in place. After that it will be necessary to process any anger, martyrdom or victimhood that you feel, and be willing to act from your own integrity - not from anger or an intent to make a statement, but because it's the only thing you can do in your integrity.

There are people at present who are starting to hear the voice of their conscience, who are processing their victimhood, who are beginning to see the true nature of the structure and how it was put there. And when they realize this in their own conscience, they can no longer keep it intact. They must follow their own integrity. In that choice

to follow integrity - cleanly, clearly, with no anger - the structure begins to change. The issue is not the structure that is enslaving you, but the fact that you have allowed it to enslave you. If you can begin to understand why you've allowed this, why you've forgotten you put it here to begin with, then true sovereignty is right around the corner.

Process Inner Reality, Then Change Outer Choice

The entire insurance system - not just automobile insurance, but life insurance, health insurance, malpractice insurance, the entire spectrum - is an automatic relinquishment of sovereignty. I would think that anyone daring to create their own reality would be unable to participate in the insurance scheme. And I would also say that if you 100% absolutely believe you create your reality and know it, you cannot participate in the insurance idea. I'm bringing this up because it seems to be one of the easiest first steps to take. If someone is ready to regain their sovereignty, to take back their power, it would seem to me that facing this insurance issue would be a good place to start. You just stop paying your premiums.

I must caution everyone however, that if you are going to begin down this road, you must be very clear within. I would never suggest that someone stop paying their premiums, because if they still fear an accident, they will draw the accident to their doorway. They will not go through the process of healing by withdrawing the insurance. What I mean is that you will not heal this issue by withdrawing your insurance first and then processing. You will heal it by processing it to the point of integrity which leads you to withdraw your insurance. I am sure that

we have all heard of people in situations who had to maintain irresponsibility because they have insurance that would not pay if they were found responsible.

This is exactly the way insurance is supposed to work. You are rewarded when you're not responsible. If someone is afraid, they haven't fully processed this thing about being responsible. If they maintain their insurance, that automatically keeps them in the state of irresponsibility. It seems to me you have got to take that step first.

It is important to recognize that our reality is not changed by changing the external things in order to get to the internal things. Our reality is changed by changing the internal things, which then affects the external things.

If someone maintains their insurance because they're afraid they're going to get in an accident or be punished if they're caught without it, it might help them to process the fear of the accident or punishment before they stop paying their premiums; that it will be much more effective if they first process the reasons why they feel they need this protection. Some may find it easier to find those issues by taking the step and saying, "The insurance isn't doing me any good. it is keeping me from my sovereignty," and stopping the insurance, allowing those issues to come up even more clearly?

Some people may choose to do it that way. Just remember, if you remove the physical thing [the insurance], you will simply transfer your inner feelings to something else. It won't solve or change anything.

The distinction, then, is that if someone is not on the path, the insurance shouldn't be removed; if they get on the path, then that's another matter. This brings up another point about creating our own reality, the locking of one's house and car. Obviously, if we create our own reality, then we have to create being robbed. It is amazing that someone could give their power to one piece of metal on a door that when locked makes them feel safe. What I am suggesting is that you should process the fear of being robbed before you leave the door unlocked.

Because if you process the fear first, one day there will be a welling of emotion, a feeling, a shift. The realization will come emotionally that they do not need to lock the doors anymore. That will not come in the same way if the attempt is to change the external before the internal.

Recognize that we as human beings are very adept at transferring issues, meaning that if they start leaving their doors open they're going to manifest the fear of invasion in another area of their life. It will always be there in various forms until they process the internal dynamics.

I am certainly not disagreeing with you or with any decisions you have made in the past or the future. Obviously they've worked for you. As a whole, my recommendation is to deal with it internally before doing it in the external world.

Dealing with Victimhood

Try to take a day and notice every time you are not being totally 100% responsible for your reality. Try to notice whenever you fear being a victim. If you are completely honest with yourself, you're going to see it often that day. A lot of it is a quite unconscious patterning that is in some ways dormant, meaning that it doesn't affect you negatively. There are many individuals who put a lot of energy into the idea of victimhood. Those individuals might have a very difficult time with some of the concepts we are talking about because it requires you to give up ever seeing yourself as a victim.

That means recognizing whenever you reward yourself for pain, suffering, or anything that is not of service to you in a positive, exciting way. Recognize what you are doing, such as letting the insurance companies pay your medical bills only because you were not to blame. You are rewarded by an outside entity if you are not to blame - that concept is totally incompatible with the ultimate concept of common law and of spiritual and emotional sovereignty.

These structures are in place and thought of as law, and we are struggling against them to change them, but most of can't even see what we are struggling against. The challenge now is to begin, in the darkness, to make out the shape that we have created to enslave ourselves. I cannot express to you how powerful the changes will be when we all begin relinquishing these old structures. We will do this layer by layer. Sometimes you may think you're at the end,

but there will be another five layers to go. It's a very deep process we have created to protect ourselves, always having believed that we need to be taken care of, protected, told what to do.

Processing with Comfort

There is an old saying that may have become a premise in our lives "If you're not part of the solution, then you're part of the problem." In other words, as long as someone is contributing to that structure - a system opposed to our sovereignty - they are part of the problem. It seems pretty polarized. Ultimately, there are no problems; it's all growth/challenge. Everything is actually neutral.

But this idea is actually too dualistic from my point of view.

For example; let's say a "friend" is involved in a quiet court case about their refusal to get a privilege license from the government to run a business. They would like to say that it doesn't feel like they are doing it in anger, although four years ago when they challenged the drivers license issue there was anger and conspiracy and all that this involved. This time it's simply that they cannot agree to pay the government protection money like the Mafia demands for not harassing you. Operating a business is an inherent right, not a privilege. Should someone who operates a business renew their license, or should they first process the decision and reasoning before they take that step?

My recommendation is to totally and absolutely feel comfortable processing before any steps are taken, because if it is done with uncertainty or fear, it will add to the strength of the structure instead of helping to dissolve it. That is the way I see it; but I am certainly open for disagreement.

I think there has to be a certain amount of processing that occurs anyway, because this structure has become so ingrained that we have to face the fact that when someone is ready to take back their personal power, to regain their sovereignty, one of the possibilities is jail.

Becoming Sovereign Includes Integrity, Education and Discernment

My "friend" could serve time in jail on this business license issue, because it is a "crime" they have committed. In some states, the drivers license issue could lead to jail. There is also jail for the insurance issue in some states. So people have to get to the point where they recognize the consequences of their actions on both sides - the consequences of having given up their sovereignty and continuing and perpetrating this state - and the consequences of taking their sovereignty back.

I cannot say there isn't going to be a gray area between the black and the white where the transformation will occur. The consequence for bowing down to the system is that you keep the structure intact. There are definitely consequences for pursuing the sovereignty idea, because you may be punished. However, what it all comes down to is acting from your integrity. In your own inner searching,

when you find what your integrity is guiding you to do, your sovereignty lies in following that.

As you are soul-searching, one of the key ideas is educating yourself on the Constitution and as much law as you can; educating yourself beyond the textbooks that the structures provide for you, because the textbooks are written within the structure. You must educate yourself from the source. That is where one of the big challenges lie, because many of you have not been able to tell the difference between textbooks written by the structures and "clean" information from the source that leads you into sovereignty. It is a process of discernment.

Victimhood In Daily Life

I don't want to sound harsh, but our social brainwashing is phenomenal. For instance, individuals who call themselves patriotic Americans have certain beliefs "Patriotic Americans pay their taxes." However, when you research it you will find that the taxation system as it exists now is not only contrary to the Constitution but is in some ways actually illegal. As a matter of fact, the tax system is not even part of the Constitution. The States never ratified it.

Why do you think early Americans had the Tea Party? Because of taxation without representation. If you do your research, you will find that the taxation system as it is set up now is illegal. As I mentioned in the previous paragraph; the Sixteenth Amendment was never ratified.

So the premise that patriotic Americans pay their taxes is a distortion of the original intent of the Constitution. The second premise is, "All good Americans go to war when they are called." Think about this; can you ever be of service to yourself or to your country if you are doing something that you believe is wrong? Individuals who unquestioningly follow that premise may be in direct opposition to what they feel. A corollary to the second premise, "All good Americans go to war to fight the enemy," declares that you can be a victim, that there is an enemy, and that there is someone out there you must defeat. This idea of good and bad, enemies and heroes, will not free you from the structure. Instead it keeps you enslaved.

Now, examine day-to-day things. For instance, there are laws that make you wear a helmet when driving a motorcycle - protecting you - because it is assumed that you are not capable of protecting yourself, of being responsible for yourself. So something is imposed upon you. There are hand-gun laws (an attempt to control) because there is the belief in perpetrators and victims. This belief is constantly fed. Keeping drugs illegal is another false attempt to protect "innocent" people.

All of these systems we have set up prevent us from understanding what sovereignty really is. Sovereignty is taking total, 100% responsibility for yourself as an individual, for your community and for your planet as a whole.

The Constitution Always Leads to Sovereignty

So far I have been talking about present-day issues. Maybe it would help if I discussed some of the history of sovereignty. For instance, the founders of this country - George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson - were all Masons.

A great distrust for Masons has grown among many of the patriot movements around this country and among people who claim to be seeking their own sovereignty. They take issue with the Masons because of the latter's involvement with the Trilateral Commission conspiracy and so forth. There is a dichotomy that has developed. Perhaps we should examine the intentions of the Masons, of the Founding Fathers and what is pertinent to the founding fathers' understanding of our sovereignty and what they expected to accomplish with the Constitution.

Our Founding Fathers were very, very clever. It's not visible to the eye, but the way the Constitution is written, if it collapses in upon itself, if it is perverted in any way, it will eventually turn around and work for your sovereignty instead of against it.

An example of this, recently in Arizona the automobile insurance law was changed, and recent statistics show that only 50% of the people have insurance. To register your car now you must actually produce proof of your policy rather than just state that you have it. If you cancel it and are stopped by the police for any reason, they are told to take your license plates. This will occur over the next 12

months as people's registrations come up for renewal. Of course, insurance rates in this state have skyrocketed. The only response I can see to this whole process is that by the end of this year there are going to be so many people ticked off that they will demand their sovereignty. Thus the perversions of this issue will result in an increase of sovereignty, not a decrease.

The more oppressive the structure becomes, the more individuals are going to feel the pressure. The more they will be spurred on to do their own research and the more they find out about their rights and their "privileges", then the more they will begin exercising their rights. It's not going to come by rejecting privileges; it's going to come by exercising rights. You see the difference?

Was the Founding Fathers' shrewdness totally conscious on their part? Let's say they didn't understand it to the point where they could explain it to you. It was a sensing - a knowingness and a guidance. They believed very firmly in what they were doing. It's necessary to understand that there is no bad guy in any of this. The Emancipation Proclamation, the abolition of slavery, has caused some of the shifting in a non-conscious way. We had a group of people who once had special laws written for them, and when they had to be integrated into society, the structure of the laws needed to change. Often the laws were written as an adaptation to a circumstance that had a lot of pressure around it. This adaptation was never checked and balanced with the Constitution; it was a pressured, in-the-moment expedient.

Again, there's no bad guy here. It's just layer upon layer upon layer of distractions that have solidified the structure itself.

We must recognize that our forefathers were struggling with some of the same issues then that we are now, and they had not resolved the idea of property rights. It was basically the same as it is now the strongest one - the one with the most toys - wins.

Ownership is based on what you can seize, in terms of history. Recognize that when people feel they have to take something from someone else, they must in some way believe themselves to be lacking; they must in some way be deficient in their sovereignty. When one is truly sovereign, coexisting with other sovereigns, there are no property disputes, there are no ownership problems. To describe this type of reality is very difficult, because to some people it sounds like communism. But that is not at all what I am speaking of.

Forefathers Taught Victim/Aggressor Roles

Unfortunately I cannot tell you that our forefathers had wonderful and wise ways of dealing with these things, because they didn't. We learned what we are experiencing now from them. We learned from them that the strongest rule, that some are victims and others are aggressors. Even to this day, in the collective human soul there is the belief that we don't own this planet. This belief is what has delayed us for so long in taking a global stand environmentally and socially. We still don't believe we own the planet or that we exist and co-create with the planet on

equal terms. We have no concept of our own sovereignty. In an attempt to figure out what sovereignty is, we take from others.

It seems to me that our misperception of our own sovereignty may be exactly what our leaders have wanted us to believe. There seems to be an assumption by those in power that we are inferior, like the Caucasian assumption about Blacks.

Rights and Privileges

I would like to define the difference between rights and privileges. These words are not being used interchangeably. Privilege is something that is granted to you from another source. Right is inherent by your existence, innately. For instance, you have a right to celebrate God. But you're given the "privilege" of worshipping God when you go to church and pay your dues.

If there is an assumption by government that we exist as a privilege, this contract, whether it be a contract between us as a citizen with the government or individual agreements with each contract, it is similar to the drivers license issue. It would be absolutely exercised from our side without conscious knowledge of the consequences.

I have used the term implied consent. Because since we believe our existence is a privilege, then our interactions with the government are subject to the laws of that privilege in the masses' belief system, and some of those laws we may not even be aware of.

It is like having a drivers license and the commonly held belief that driving is a privilege granted by a higher authority. This "higher" authority grants us the privilege of using the roads, using an automobile, etc. By accepting that privilege, we have implied our consent; therefore we must agree to have insurance, registration and not let someone else use our car who does not have those things. All of this happens because we have accepted the privilege rather than exercised our inherent right.

All this confusion and restriction when we already have the right to travel automatically guaranteed through the constitution. And so it is like the government has read our unconscious minds and know that we think our existence is a privilege. Therefore when we ask, "Why are you doing this?" they say, "We have the right".

And yes, this is true, because we have implied our consent by playing out the role of a helpless species. That's one way of looking at it. If you were sovereign, no one could have rights over you, but since you're not active sovereigns, someone assumes rights over you. There's always hierarchy in a non-sovereign atmosphere, but in a sovereign atmosphere there is never a hierarchy.

As a species, we have the right to interact with each other and to live as free men and women, to know our heritage. We have a right to explore all levels of consciousness and reality. Sadly, we have set up privileges to protect ourselves from some of the scary things because deep down we feel non-sovereign. And as we built this

elaborate structure (based on privileges and not rights), we start distorting our own version of the entire universe. Those rights just mentioned are always active, but if you are not sovereign, you can't interface with them. Therefore, you will act out your right to interact with others through the privilege structure that has been set up, which is equal to our belief systems.

To put this in another way, you will always act out your right to travel, but because we are not yet sovereign, we must act out that right according to the structure of the privileges. Therefore, we act out our right to travel through the privilege of a license, insurance and registration. This is a very significant point I am making here. Your rights will always be there, but you can't see them. You can't know your rights unless you are sovereign. Therefore, you must act according to the non-sovereign privileges, which seem as if they are given to you by someone else. Therefore, because we believe we are not sovereign and can be victimized, we will act on our rights through that belief system and the structure that allows us to be victims.

We all are, in fact, always in touch with our rights. We have just cloaked them, we've twisted them, we've distorted them into privileges and have come to believe that privileges are rights, when they are really two different things. The only framework within which we could interact has been one of inequality, hierarchy, manipulation, control or fear because those are the very structures upon which our society is built.

Obviously, one of the things that keeps us from claiming our sovereignty is our religious structure. This concept that God is sovereign and that we are his subjects; this is what they wanted us to believe.

A true sovereign will NEVER have subjects. If the religious structure broke apart, every other structure would collapse. No other structure could support itself after that.

Throughout history, we have called people "subjects". We have called a baron or king a "sovereign", and they have had subjects. However, to some degree we are also interlinked. In only one sense am I saying that we could never truly be sovereign unless everyone else in our reality bubble were also. That doesn't mean everybody in the entire world, but everyone with whom you interact. This is one way of looking at it. The sovereign king can never truly be sovereign, in the sense that he can't be sovereign if he's dealing with inequality.

To clarify; let's say I am truly sovereign and my friend is not. What if I see him as a complete sovereign, even though he is playing the role of a subject?

We would see him as a complete sovereign because it's all the sovereignty you can allow yourself to see. Recognize that there's not a point of 100% sovereignty, just like you can't limit yourself to the amount of love you can feel today. There's no end to sovereignty. So your ability to see sovereignty reflected in other people is limited by how much you can see in yourself. It's ever-expanding. Thus you may look at your friend and see a total sovereign. He

may not feel sovereign; you are simply mirror reflections for each other. As the entire planet plays out the sovereignty issue, you will help each other. You're all intricately intertwined, though you would like to think you're not. You're not dependent on the other person for your attainment of sovereignty, but at the same time their reflection of sovereignty to you is crucial. Obviously this transformation is very much a part of claiming your sovereignty.

Sovereignty Techniques

Techniques to claim your sovereignty is such a widespread issue right now - through religion and politics and economics and relationships. So, where do we start? What can we do in particular to start on this road to being truly sovereign?

Each person will be different, but you can start by identifying the areas of your life in which you are blatantly non-sovereign. Look at those. Understand why that is so. I will give you some hints. First, look at your religious structure. Look at your political structure, your economics and your education system. Then look at your legal system. These suggestions themselves are likely to open a can of worms. Each person will go through the process of attaining sovereignty in his/her own way. I would suggest that you spend lots of time learning as much as possible, examine all your beliefs with a critical eye, and to try and obtain and study any research material you can. There are schools that teach these principles (and I am not referring to metaphysical schools; I am referring to schools that teach common law). That's a start for some people. There's

no structure to follow to become sovereign, because it's not anything you've ever experienced. We are creating the structure as we go, we are all part of a very exciting time right now. This is such an exciting and wonderful time to simply be alive, and it is even more exciting to know that we can create a new system based on what we have learned from the old.

Right now your head is probably spinning with all of the possibilities that this sovereignty thing has to offer, and perhaps you might be starting to like the idea of becoming sovereign and want to begin taking steps. But you have found blocks to changing things in your life and you know that you are not truly sovereign, and it seems so different and foreign and maybe even the idea of assuming full responsibility for your actions has you scared. I promise you that the possibilities that I can see as soon as we change this oppressive system; happiness, freedom, and peace will come to those that are currently suffering.

At various times we may find ourselves in a position of using certain rationales to renew a driver's license. And one might also think that it is very difficult to be sovereign without your own piece of land.

Here is a case where if you forced this on the physical level you would not accomplish anything, because the internal ideas must first be processed.

That was my frustration. I found myself wanting to take too large a step, which may have been self-sabotage on my part. Because to some degree the self-sabotage would be

the reinforcement of my identity as a failure. But if you are willing to take specific steps to achieve sovereignty, just do what you can. You have likely already accomplished some very valuable things internally, and this will make external manifestation natural. Eventually you need to be concerned about your external reality though, because ultimately to be sovereign you must take physical action.

When you do begin to initiate actions that display your sovereignty externally, remember there is never a need to force it. Force implies resistance; resistance is what makes force necessary. I would always simply suggest that you do what you can. What we are attempting to do with this sovereignty idea is to stop keeping the dynamic of polarity in place. Therefore, when you go inside to process and then take the steps from your realizations, you are not using force. Force is not needed; thus there is no resistance. It is much more thorough, much more transformational. Do what you can. Keep processing. There are small steps being taken. Recognize that the shift in your own belief system is extremely powerful, not only for you but for mass consciousness in general.

Let's give you an example. Let's say you went to war. Which has more impact - 100,000 men burning their draft cards out of protest or 100,000 men shifting their consciousness? It is tempting to say that burning draft cards has more impact, but that is not the case. Those people who burned their draft cards may be burning them out of anger or fear, not necessarily out of a change in consciousness.

If 100,000 men burn their draft cards and don't go to war, you might be thinking that it might not be as effective as a change in consciousness, even though 50, 000 of those men may actually continue to participate in the war (if that's possible with the change in consciousness)? I used to think that the physical demonstration of burning the draft card, for example, was the most important step that could be taken. But really the change in consciousness of the draftees is much more important than the physical action of burning the draft card.

The change in consciousness is much more impacting than you can possibly imagine. Let's say there are 100,000 people burning those draft cards. Maybe some men are burning them because they are mad at their fathers, consciously or subconsciously. They don't care if they go to war; they're just mad at their fathers, and this is a way to vent that anger. If they're doing it out of anger they may have no idea why they are angry. If they delve into it, that's when they start changing their consciousness. Someone who gets a drivers license after being educated about rights, privileges and sovereignty has taken an immense step - because now he's not doing it out of denial or ignorance. Instead he is doing it with a shift of consciousness, doing it consciously.

Let's say that 100,000 men burn their draft cards because of a change in consciousness. But in this little story let's say they were forced to go to war anyway. Having those 100,000 men with that change of consciousness in the army will have a tremendous impact on the mass consciousness of the army itself. I think we

saw that in the Iraqi conflict and that may have manifested as very few deaths on one side. Even though there were lots of Iraqi deaths, there could have been ten times that number.

There was most certainly a shift in consciousness in terms of the troops that went to Iraq. Many went not because they believed in the conflict, but because they felt in some way that their energy, their consciousness, would be useful. Therefore, to judge a man for going to war when you do not know his motivations actually helps to maintain the structure of dysfunction rather than disintegrate it.

If the consciousness shifts in these 100,000 men before they go off to war, they're not going to burn their draft cards out of anger. Instead they are going to realize precisely what step binds them to the Military. It is not the draft nor the induction, but the taking of the oath. Which they do voluntarily. The insidious thing is that the government and the Military do not point that out. They tell you that it's the induction that turns a Civilian into a Military person.

To clarify what I mean, as there may be some confusion, and this is a very important point. You are led to believe, just like with the drivers and marriage licenses, that when you get that draft card and you are inducted, you must serve. However, you are never committed to serve until you raise your hand and take the oath, and the taking of the oath is voluntary, because being forced to take an oath makes the oath itself invalid. And so, there have been men who have not taken the oath and thus were dismissed from the induction and didn't have to serve. Yes, it caused quite

a commotion, but they were ultimately dismissed. The oath that you take to get into the military is a voluntary oath, and we have not known that. The marriage license is also a voluntary procedure, as is the drivers license. Paying taxes is a voluntary procedure. But you have led yourselves to believe they are not, and that is what is insidious.

So, now we know that emotional sovereignty means understanding your reasons and motivations and healing those denied parts of you, which will eventually lead you to take 100% responsibility for your reality - and the result of that is spiritual sovereignty. You are on the path. You will create it. Have patience and trust yourselves.

CHAPTER 5 - ARE YOU A MAN OR A PERSON?

The issue of "person" is of primary importance since under color of authority (which is unconstitutional regardless of the target populace) statutes and laws are made to affect "person(s)", not a "citizen" or "sovereign". As stated previously, the sovereign is the highest authority and is supreme to all other law except the laws of the Creator.

The basic premise that no government made by man has the actual and real authority to make and impose laws on the sovereign which conflict with his unalienable rights has been well supported so far. It has additionally been supported that the only responsibility of the individual - the sovereign - is that he must not interfere with the rights of his fellow people. Therefore, barring any damage to another's rights and property, the sovereign is free to exercise his rights as he sees fit.

But, what of this legal "person" to which so many laws apply? Who and what is a "person"?

Are you a "person" in the eyes of the law?

It is a well-founded principle of law that a statute must state exactly what it means and mean exactly what it states.

"When the words of a statute are unambiguous, the first canon of statutory construction - that courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there - is also the last, and judicial inquiry is complete." Connecticut National Bank v. Germain, 503 US 117, L. .Ed 2nd 391(1992)

And, this decision which clearly means that any vagueness is in violation of due process and, therefore, statutes must be written clearly so that the men and women of common intelligence all derive the same meaning.

"A statute which either forbids or requires the doing of an act in terms so vague that men and women of common intelligence must necessarily guess at its meaning and differ as to its application, violates the first essential of due process of law." Connally v General Const. Co., 269 U.S. 385

It is also well founded that that any term used is taken as used in its ordinary sense since it is the sovereign citizen who reads and interprets law. Thus, any technical term - or a term with several meanings - must be clearly defined within the law or the section of the regulatory document the law is part of.

In everyday common use we use the word "person" to mean a natural born man or woman. However, in law there are many different meanings peculiar to this term. Because the word has many different meanings in law, it must be treated as a technical term or having technical import with its meaning clearly defined in the section or statute being read.

The most common definition of "person" given in statutes is that "person" is construed to include an individual, a trust, estate, a partnership, an association, a company or corporation, or some derivation of this definition. Thus, person may have varying definitions in law that are not necessarily the common use meaning.

Therefore, we must ask exactly what is a "legal person" since one of the terms used by governments and courts in our country is "legal person".

Legal person: a body of persons or an entity (as a corporation) considered as having many of the rights and responsibilities of a natural person and esp. the capacity to sue and be sued. -- *Merriam- Webster's Dictionary of Law. (1996)*. (Note: *Legal person is not a natural person but has many of the same rights, etcetera, as a natural person in the eyes of the law.*)

Person. 1. A human being (a "natural" person). 2. A corporation (an "artificial" person). Corporations are treated as persons in many legal situations. Also, the word "person" includes corporations in most definitions in this dictionary. 3. Any other "being" entitled to sue as a legal

entity (a government, an association, a group of Trustees, etc.). 4. The plural of person is persons, not people (see that word). - *Oran's Dictionary of the Law, West Group 1999.*

Person. An entity with legal rights and existence including the ability to sue and be sued, to sign contracts, to receive gifts, to appear in court either by themselves or by lawyer and, generally, other powers incidental to the full expression of the entity in law. Individuals are "persons" in law unless they are minors or under some kind of other incapacity such as a court finding of mental incapacity. Many laws give certain powers to "persons" which, in almost all instances, includes business organizations that have been formally registered such as partnerships, corporations or associations. *Duhaime's Law Dictionary.*

PERSON, noun. per'sn. [Latin persona; said to be compounded of per, through or by, and sonus, sound; a Latin word signifying primarily a mask used by actors on the stage.] -- *Webster's 1828 Dictionary.*

(Note: Webster's treats "person" as a created persona or false identity. This goes along with the 1996 dictionary in that it treats a legal person as a natural person for purposes of suits, etc.)

"PERSON. This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly-synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, and title or status. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes. 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 137.

2. It is also used to denote a corporation which is an artificial person. 1 Bl. Com. 123; 4 Bing. 669; C. 33 Eng. C. L R. 488; Wooddes. Lect. 116; Bac. Us. 57; 1 Mod. 164." Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1856, Revised 6th Edition

Is it possible, then, that "legal person" is actually a legal fiction that is subject to government administrative laws and does not apply to the sovereign individual? If "person" does apply to the sovereign, then "person" must be defined as the sovereign or the "sovereign" as the person. Remember we are talking of legal terminology, not common everyday meanings.

How does the United States Code (USC) define a "United States person"? This is found in Title 26 (USC 26), Subtitle F, Chapter 79, Section 7701(a), one of the few times "person" and "United States person" are defined:

"(1) Person. The term person shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation."

And, in Section 7701(a)(30), defining United States person:

(30) United States person The term "United States person" means -

(A) a citizen or resident of the United States,

(B) a domestic partnership,

(C) a domestic corporation,

(D) any estate (other than a foreign estate, within the meaning of paragraph (31), and -

(E) any trust if - (then requirements for establishing US control over the trust)

One might think that since "individual" can mean a "person" in law that the sovereign - since he is an individual - is therefore a "person" in law. But, "individual" also has various meanings in law, including a trust, estate, a partnership, an association, or a company or corporation.

"Individual 1a. Of or relating to an individual, especially a single human: individual consciousness. b. By or for one person: 2. Existing as a distinct entity; separate:" American Heritage Dictionary, 4th Edition, 2000.

Entity - "1. Something that exists as a particular and discrete unit: Persons and corporations are equivalent entities under the law." (Am. Her. Dict., supra)

Thus, an individual may be a natural born human being but it may also refer to a corporation, an estate, or some other government created "entity" known as a "person" in law. Because it may refer to other than a natural born human, then definition of "individual" must be provided for clarity, just as the definition for "person" must be provided. Both have technical import.

Besides, one can look long and hard - and fruitlessly - to find a law, regulation, or statute that specifically uses "individual" or "Citizen" in a specific law and specifying application of the law, such as "The individual will..." or "The Citizen is required..." It would seem the term is too ambiguous to use even by Bar attorneys writing the laws.

Or, they knew when writing the laws such use would be contrary to the Constitution and, therefore, unlawful. The intent with this is to mislead and get voluntary - or forced -

compliance by the People who have not been fully informed.

Logically, a natural man or woman is not the same as the individual in the above definition of "person" since corporations and other government-privileged entities can be taxed but the individual (natural man) cannot. Government privileged entities are corporations, franchises, associations, trusts (if supervised by the government), government granted partnerships, government created "persons" as individuals, and other government granted associations.

This is clear in this excerpt from the below decision and supports that "individual" may be used to indicate a natural born citizen as being separate from meanings including corporations:

"The individual, unlike the corporation, cannot be taxed for the mere privilege of existing. The corporation is an artificial entity which owes its existence and charter powers to the state; but, the individual's rights to live and own property are natural rights for the enjoyment of which an excise cannot be imposed."
Redfield v Fisher, 292 P 813, at 819 (1930)

Let's use a bit of logic here. No level of government may make any law repugnant to the Constitution. But, yet, every level of government makes laws applying to "persons".

We have found that "persons" may be natural people or entities created by man, including the government itself. "Person" may also be an individual while an "individual" may be naturally created by our Maker; created by man (as

in man creating governments); or created by corporate governments as a corporate government created entity.

Since no level of government may make laws infringing upon the natural unalienable rights of people born in the 50 States, then it is logical the "person" named in law cannot be a natural man who is an individual - it MUST refer only to corporate government created entities or "persons". Thus, the premise must be a "legal" person is a legal fiction in laws and not applicable to the natural person, citizen, sovereign, or individual man or woman born naturally within one of the many States.

Does this premise hold true? Is it permissible to use "person" to allow a statute/law to be applied to a citizen of the United States of America, the sovereign? This has come up many times in the past:

"And The Government admits that often the word 'person' is used in such a sense as not to include the sovereign but urges that where, as in the present instance, its wider application is consistent with, and tends to effectuate, the public policy evidenced by the statute, the term should be held to embrace the Government." United States v Cooper Corp., 318 US 600 (1941)

"It would require clear and unequivocal statutory language to persuade me that Congress intended to grant a remedy to all except one of those who were injured by trust prices - the 'all' including every natural and artificial person, every corporation and association,¹ foreign and domestic..." (Mr. Justice Black, dissenting, US v Cooper...)

"Since in common usage, the term "person" does not include the sovereign, statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." United States v. Fox, 94 USS 315,

"There is an old and well-known rule that statutes which in general terms divest pre-existing rights or privileges will not be applied to the sovereign without express words to that effect.

And - The Act does not define 'persons'. In common usage that term does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing it will ordinarily not be construed to do so." United States v Mine Workers, 330 US 258 (1947)

"[I]n common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, [and] statutes employing the phrase are ordinarily construed to exclude it." United States v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600, 604 (1941); accord, United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 1947). "Particularly is this true where the statute imposes a burden or limitation, as distinguished from conferring a benefit or advantage. United States v. Knight, 14 Pet. 301, 315 (1840)." Wilson v Omaha Indian Tribe, 442 U.S. 653 (1979)

Then, there is this case. In *Will v Michigan State Police, 105 L. Ed. 2nd 45 (1988)*, the issue of using the word "person" in statutes/laws again came up, this time in a deprivation of rights case based on 42 USC, Section 1983. The question was whether the word "person" in the USC section could mean the State of Michigan. The original case was dismissed by the trial court, which stated that the term "person" did not include the sovereign State of Michigan.

The Michigan Appellate Court upheld the trial court, and the Michigan Supreme Court upheld the Appellate Court. Will then filed a writ of error to the United States Supreme Court, and the court again made it perfectly clear both that the term "person" does not include the sovereign and that in order for the sovereign to be bound by the statute, the

sovereign must be "specifically" named. *Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58 (1989)

Why the focus on *Will v. Michigan*? Read the below very carefully. Pay particular attention to what *entity* is being treated as the sovereign.

Note: If one cares to see why courts are not to interpret law or the Constitution, read the decision in "*Will v Michigan...*" It would be difficult to encounter more screwed up thinking than in this decision, a decision made to protect the State from suits made by people against the State and based on *42 USC, Section 1983*.

Also, read the decisions in which there is strong disagreement with Justice White and the court. Include in your reading *Owen v City of Independence*, 445 U.S. 622 (1980), Paragraph (a), Pp 635-636 which states that the language in 42 USC, Section 1983 "...is absolute and unqualified, and no mention is made of any privileges, immunities, or defenses that may be asserted. Rather, the statute imposes liability upon 'every person'...who under color of law or custom, "subjects, or causes to be subjected...to the deprivation of rights..."

Now to an excerpt from the *Will* case:

"Moreover, we disagree with JUSTICE BRENNAN that at the time the Dictionary Act was passed "the phrase 'bodies politic and corporate' was understood to include the States." Post, at 78. Rather, an examination of authorities of the era suggests that the phrase was used to mean corporations, both private and public (municipal), and not to include the States."

But it does not follow that if municipalities are persons then so are States. States are protected by the Eleventh Amendment while municipalities are not, *Monell, 436 U.S., at 690, n. 54*, and we consequently limited our holding in *Monell* "to local government units which are not considered part of the State for Eleventh Amendment purposes," (*Justice White, Will..., supra*)

(NOTE: See definition of Bodies Politic below.)

The fact is that justices either do not understand the 11th Amendment and, in many instances, have used it erroneously - or through a false or misleading interpretation, have attempted to provide state governments' and the people making them up immunity to claims made against them.

Below is the language used in the 11th Amendment. Please determine how it gives a state government and officials immunity to lawsuits for violations of rights or any other violation. If you cannot understand the language used, then neither can the justices of the Supreme Court. If the amendment is that ambiguous, then the amendment must be repealed for vagueness.

"The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State."

Doesn't the amendment merely prohibit the judicial power (jurisdiction) of the United States in any suit in law or equity started by a citizen of one state or a foreign state

against a State? Doesn't the 11th Amendment in fact limit the judicial power of the United States when a citizen of one state or a foreign State sues a state? In other words, such cases are deemed to NOT be under federal jurisdiction.

Is it not clear then that the 11th Amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with providing official immunity of any state government or any official therein from being sued by a Citizen of the State?

Jurisdiction lies with the state when a Citizen sues the state. State governments and the officials making up the government cannot be made immune to lawsuits for violations of rights and other criminal activities. The truth is that administrative laws give people the foundation for suits and the filing of criminal complaints against offending officials. (*See Title 18, Sections 241 and 242 - and others dealing with fraud, extortion, mail fraud, theft, and racketeering - and Title 42, Sections 1982, 1983, 1985, and 1986*)

Rights, including the right to sue for damages done against the sovereign, reign supreme over any level of government. The right to sue any individual or corporation (persons) - even if a government or agent of the government - SHOULD and must remain supreme whether judges, attorneys in and/or advising the government, and government officials like it or not.

Interpreting or enforcing that officials have immunity renders the Oath of Office all officials must subscribe to

meaningless. Furthermore, any action giving any person or organization immunity effectively voids the Constitution and the Bill of Rights reflected in the first ten amendments, along with voiding all of the laws of our creator.

Official immunity to laws would place us in a quandary. If officials are exempted from the supreme Law of the Land because of being an official in government, then are they not outside the supreme Law of the Land? Does this not mean that they are NOT constitutional Citizens and are therefore agents of a government foreign to that established by the Constitution?

This is tough to understand but in the case of Justice White's thinking - and all others who protect officials at every level - the state (as a government) is being treated as something separate to the People. This is a gross misinterpretation. The state is the People (A political unit consisting of an autonomous state inhabited predominantly by a people sharing a common culture, history, and language - *American Heritage Dictionary, 4th Ed., 2000*). But we do have what is called the state government.

The state government, however, is a bunch of people who are citizens of the state given the honored (once upon a time) task of protecting the rights of each man, woman, and child who make up the State. Never mind for now that few people in such governing bodies (bodies politic and corporations) are "honorable".

If it is a separate organization, such as the US Government being a corporation independent of the state

with its employees being franchises of the corporation, then so also must state governments be considered and treated as a corporation independent of the People. And, it is. As such, it or any of its agents may be sued as an entity - a person - by the People or charged by the People for criminal activities or damages to them. This applies to every corporation as all are classed as "persons" (entities not of natural creation) in law contrary to Justice White's thinking.

Thus, either government officials are still Citizens of one of the many States and subject to the Constitution uniting the States, the applicable State constitution, and the laws governing the administration of governments or they are non-citizens (government created franchises) without the protection of the Constitution. Either way, there is no immunity from charges being made against them or from lawsuits by the People.

Anyway, the above definitions and case cites are used to show 'persons' can be either natural or artificial entities. This is most important for the people and the officials who represent the people to understand.

Bodies politic

This is treated as an individual subdivision since "bodies politic" can be an extremely misleading term. It is used by state legislatures with the assumption made by the people that it means all the people "as individuals" rather than the people forming the body politic as a single whole. I.e., each man, woman, or child is NOT a "body politic" with the inclusion of all people indicated by "bodies politic."

Normally, the body politic is thought of as: *"The people of a politically organized nation or state considered as a group."* *The American Heritage Dictionary, 4th Ed., 2000; Bouvier's Law Dictionary; and others)*

We must consider the concept of "body politic" very carefully as it is extremely misleading and misunderstood by the majority of people.

First, what is a "body"? Going back a bit in history, "A Dictionary of Law - 1893, A Dictionary and Compendium of American and English Jurisprudence" defines "body" thusly:

"Body. Compare Corpus. The physical person. The natural body or such as is formed by the laws of God, as distinguished from an artificial body or such as is devised by human laws. 1 Bl. Com. 467."

"Artificial body. A number of individuals considered collectively, usually organized for a common purpose: as, a legislative body. An artificial body or that devised by human laws. 1 Bl. Com. 467. An artificial body can do only what is authorized by its charter or by law; a natural person or body, whatever is not forbidden by law. Paul v. Virginia, 8 Wall. 177 (1868)."

Then, from Bouvier's Law Dictionary:

"Body. A person" (See above definition for Bouvier's definition of "person")

Thus, in law, a body was considered on a physical person - a natural person formed by the laws of God - and distinguished it from an "artificial body", specifying that an artificial body is devised by human laws. And, as such, it can only do what is authorized by its charter or by law.

Then, from Bouvier's of 1856, the definition of BODY POLITIC is:

"[1] government, corporations. When applied to the government this phrase signifies the state.

2. As to the persons who compose the body politic, they take collectively the name, of people, or nation; and individually they are citizens, when considered in relation to their political rights, and subjects as being submitted to the laws of the state.

3. When it refers to corporations, the term body politic means that the members of such corporations shall be considered as an artificial person."

Thus, in 1856, the "body politic" was government and other corporations since governments are established as corporations. Putting this into perspective, originally the "body politic" is not the individual people living in a state, except when considered as a political unit - the whole.

This has not changed. "Body politic" does not refer to the individual human being who is naturally created by birth as a Citizen (See [2] immediately above) but is instead the whole of the people making up the government or a government created entity. This makes sense in that politic indicates a political action; therefore, the body is formed by acts of man and are not natural creations - they are artificial "persons". In other words, God did not say "And let there be the state of Oregon." And, Lo and Behold, the state of Oregon was created. Instead, God created Man

and then Man created the political body (body politic) known as the State of Oregon.

Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary (1913) goes along with this when it defines "body politic" as "of or pertaining to civil government; political; as, the body politic." It further clarifies with this:

"A number of individuals spoken of collectively, usually as united by some common tie, or as organized for some purpose; a collective whole or totality; a corporation; as, a legislative body; a clerical body."

The American Heritage Dictionary, 4th Edition, 2000, fully supporting the above analysis defines body as:

"3a. A human; a person. b. A group of individuals regarded as an entity; a corporation."

To put this in as simple of terms as possible, a "body politic" is nothing more than an entity created by Man through political means. It never ever refers to the individual sovereign Citizen who is a "natural body" or natural person.

The individual humans or natural "bodies" can band together and create a political and artificial "body" given the task of protecting the rights of the individual. The unit thus formed is the "state" with an artificial body known as a state's government, an artificial person known as corporation.

Thus, all "bodies politic" refer to artificial persons and never to natural individual people. This means all laws made by the "body politic" can be applied only to any and all artificially created bodies but not to natural bodies who live in accordance with God's laws and under the common law of non-interference with the rights of other natural bodies.

The Supreme Court has shown that "person" does not and cannot apply to the sovereign when used in statutes. The sovereign is above any artificially created entity. Therefore, the word "person" can only be applied to artificially created entities or "bodies politic", whether corporate, partnerships, or other unincorporated associations.

Note though, that the sovereign can form associations outside any government permission. We have the right to develop any associations we wish and do not need government "permission" to do so. Thus, it is highly probable that the phrase "other unincorporated associations" is unconstitutional.

Therefore, because "person" has many different definitions and body (or bodies) politic is specific to artificially created bodies or persons - and never includes the sovereign - laws, rules, and the like cannot be applied to the sovereign unless the sovereign is specifically named. Recall these decisions:

"Sovereignty, itself, is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government,

Freedom From Government: How to reclaim your power

sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts." Yick Wo v Hopkins and Woo Loo v Hopkins, 188 US 356 (1886)

"All codes, rules and regulations are applicable to the government authorities only, not human/Creators in accordance with God's laws. All codes, rules and regulations are unconstitutional and lacking in due process..." Rodriques v Ray Donovan (U.S. Department of Labor), 769 F. 2d 1344, 1348 (1985)

The Supreme Court cases above have never been overturned. It is well founded that the decisions made by the US Supreme Court are binding on all lower courts unless they are overturned. .

"If the legislatures of the several states may, at will, annul the judgments of the courts of the United States, and destroy the rights acquired under those judgments, the constitution itself becomes a solemn mockery . . ." United States v. Peters, 5 Cranch 115, 136.

This has not happened to date and, thus, the decision in Yick Wo, and the numerous decisions from other cases, stand and reflect natural rights whether secured by the Constitution or not.

If he had such power, said Chief Justice Hughes, in 1932, also for a unanimous Court, *"it is manifest that the fiat of a state Governor, and not the Constitution of the United States, would be the supreme law of the land; that the restrictions of the Federal Constitution upon the exercise of state power would be but impotent phrases . . ."* Sterling v. Constantin, 287 U.S. 378, 397-398 (emphasis added)

And this excerpt from the case of *Cooper v Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, (1958)*:

"A State acts by its legislative, its executive, or its judicial authorities. It can act in no [358 U.S. 1, 17] other way. The constitutional provision, therefore, must mean that no agency of the State, or of the officers or agents by whom its powers are exerted, shall deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. Whoever, by virtue of public position under a State government, . . . denies or takes away the equal protection of the laws, violates the constitutional inhibition; and as he acts in the name and for the State, and is clothed with the State's power, his act is that of the State. This must be so, or the constitutional prohibition has no meaning." Ex parte Virginia, 100 U.S. 339,347. Thus the prohibitions of the Fourteenth Amendment extend to all action of the State denying equal protection of the laws; whatever the agency of the State taking the action, see Virginia v. Rives, 100 U.S. 313; Pennsylvania v. Board of Directors of City Trusts of Philadelphia, 353 U.S. 230; Shelley v. Kraemer, 334 U.S. 1; or whatever the guise in which it is taken, see Derrington v. Plummer, 240 F.2d 922; Department of Conservation and Development v. Tate, 231 F.2d 615."

And also from the Cooper case:

"Every state legislator and executive and judicial officer is solemnly committed by oath taken pursuant to Art. VI, cl. 3, 'to support this Constitution.' Chief Justice Taney, speaking for a unanimous Court in 1859, said that this requirement reflected the framers' 'anxiety to preserve it [the Constitution] in full force, in all its powers, and to guard against resistance to or evasion of its authority, on the part of a State' Ableman v. Booth, 21 How. 506, 524." (Quote copied from Cooper v Aaron, 358 U.S. 1, 1958)

Thus, the sovereign people reign sovereign over the government of states (including political subdivisions) and the United States while states retain sovereignty over and independent of all other states and the United States. That past and perhaps present justices of the Supreme Court do not understand who or what is the sovereign does not take away from the fact that - in this country - the people are the sovereign.

This means, People, that you as natural men and women are supreme over city, county, state, and the United States

governments. So, act like it. Just as serfs could not make laws affecting kings, nor can governments who are made by the people and in servitude to the people make laws affecting the sovereign people.

CHAPTER 6 - THE STORY OF THE INCOME TAX

In all of history there has been but one successful protest against an income tax. It is little understood in that light, primarily because the remnants of protest groups still exist, but no longer wish to appear to be 'anti-government.' They do not talk much about these roots. Few even know them.

We need to go back in time about 400 years to find this success. It succeeded only because the term "jurisdiction" was still well understood at that time as meaning "oath spoken". "*Juris*", in the original Latin meaning, is "*oath*". "*Diction*", as everyone knows, means "*spoken*". The protest obviously did not happen here in the USA. It occurred in England. Given that the origins of our law are traced there, most of the relevant facts in this matter are still applicable in this nation.

So come with me as I fire up the time machine, and travel with me back to when the Holy Bible had just recently been put into print. Up until that time, only the churches and nobility owned copies due to the extremely high cost of paper. Contrary to what you have been taught, it was not the invention of movable type that led to printing this and other books. That concept had been around for a very long time. It just had no application. Printing wastes some paper. Until paper prices fell, it was cheaper to write books by hand than to print them with movable type. The handwritten versions were outrageously costly, and were procurable only by those with extreme wealth: churches, crowns and the nobility. The wealth of the nobility was attributable to feudalism. "*Feud*" is Old English for "*oath*".

The nobility held the land under the crown. But unimproved land, itself, except to hunters and gatherers, is rather useless. Land is useful to farming however, so that is how the nobility made their wealth. And no, they did not push a plow. They had servants to do it. The nobility would not sell their land, nor would they lease it. They rented it. Ever paid rent without a lease? Then you know that if the landlord raised the rent, you had no legal recourse. You could move out or pay. But what if you could not have moved out? Then you would have a feel for what feudalism was all about.

A tenant was not a freeman. He was a servant to the (land)lord, the noble. In order to have access to the land to farm it, the noble required that the tenant kneel before him, hat in hand, swear an oath of fealty and allegiance

and kiss his ring (extending that oath in that last act to the heirs of his estate). That oath established a servitude. The tenant then put his plow to the fields. The rent was a variable. In good growing years it was very high, in bad years it fell. The tenant was a subsistence farmer, keeping only enough of the produce of his labors to just sustain him and his family. Rent was actually an "*income tax*". The nobleman could have demanded 100% of the productivity of his servant except . . . under the common law, a servant was akin to livestock. He had to be fed. Not well fed, just fed, same as a horse or cow. And, like a horse or cow, one usually finds it to his benefit to keep it fed, that so that the critter is productive. Thus, the tenant was allowed to keep some of his own productivity. Liken it to a "personal and dependent deductions".

The freemen of the realm, primarily the tradesmen, were unsworn and unallieged. They knew it. They taught their sons the trade so they would also be free when grown. Occasionally they took on an apprentice under a sworn contract of indenture from his father. His parents made a few coins. But the kid was the biggest beneficiary. He would learn a trade. He would never need to become a tenant farmer. He would keep what he earned. He was only apprenticed for a term of years, most typically about seven. The tradesmen did not need adolescents; they needed someone strong enough to pull his own weight.

They did not take on anyone under 13. By age 21 he would have learned enough to practice the craft. That is when the contract expired. He was then called a "journeyman". Had he made a journey? No. But, if you

pronounce that word, it is "Jur-nee-man". He was a "man", formerly ("nee"), bound by oath ("jur"). He would then go to work for a "master" (craftsman). The pay was established, but he could ask for more if he felt he was worth more. And he was free to quit. Pretty normal, eh?

Yes, in this society that's quite the norm. But 400 some years ago these men were the exceptions, not the rule. At some point, if the journeyman was good at the trade, he would be recognized by the market as a "master" (craftsman) and people would be begging him to take their children as apprentices, so they might learn from him, become journeymen, and keep what they earned when manumitted at age 21! The oath of the tenant ran for life.

The oath of the apprentice's father ran only for a term of years. Still, oaths were important on both sides. In fact, the tradesmen at one point established guilds (means 'gold') as a protection against the potential of the government attempting to bind them into servitudes by compelled oaths.

When an apprentice became a journeyman, he was allowed a membership in the guild only by swearing a secret oath to the guild. He literally swore to "serve gold". Only gold. This means he swore he would only work for pay! Once so sworn, any other oath of servitude would be a perjury of that oath. He bound himself for life to never be a servant, save to the very benevolent master: gold!

Incidentally, the Order of Free and Accepted Masons is a remnant of one of these guilds. Their oath is a secret. They would love to have you think that the 'G' in the middle of

their logo stands for 'God.' The obvious truth is that it stands for "GOLD" - [some say "Generation".]

Then the Bible came to print. The market for this time wasn't the wealthy. They already had a handwritten copy. Nor was it the tenants. They were far too poor to make this purchase. The market was the tradesmen - and the book was still so costly that it took the combined life savings of siblings to buy a family Bible. The other reason that the tradesmen were the market was that they would also be taught how to read as part of their apprenticeship. As contractors they had to know how to do that. Other than the families of the super-rich (and the priests) nobody else knew how to read.

These men were blown away when they read Jesus' command against swearing oaths (Matthew 5:33-37). This was news to them. For well over a millennia they had been trusting that the church; originally just the Church of Rome, but now also the Church of England - had been telling them everything they needed to know in that book. Then they found out that Jesus said (Matthew 5:34), "Swear not at all... *oaths*". Talk about an eye-opener.

Imagine seeing a conspiracy revealed that went back over 1000 years. Without oaths there would have been no tenants, laboring for the nobility, and receiving mere subsistence in return. The whole society was premised on oaths; the whole society CLAIMED it was Christian, yet, it violated a very simple command of Christ! And the tradesmen had done it, too, by demanding sworn contracts of indenture for apprentices and giving their own oaths to

the guilds. They had no way of knowing that this was in fact prohibited by Jesus. They were angry. "Livid" might be a better term. The governments had seen this coming.

What could they do? Ban the book? The printing would have simply moved underground and the millennia long conspiracy would be further evidenced in that banning. They came up with a better scheme. This became known as the "Reformation".

In an unprecedented display of unanimity, the governments of Europe adopted a treaty. This treaty would allow anyone the State-right of founding a church. It was considered a State right, there and then. The church would be granted a charter. It only had to do one very simple thing to obtain that charter. It had to assent to the terms of the treaty.

Buried in those provisions, most of which were totally innocuous, was a statement that the church would never oppose the swearing of lawful oaths.

Jesus said, "None."

The churches all said (and still say), "None, except . . ."

Who do you think was (is) right?

The tradesmen got even angrier! They had already left the Church of England. But with every new "reformed" church still opposing the clear words of Christ, there was no church for them to join - or found. They exercised the

right of assembly to discuss the Bible. Some of them preached it on the street corners, using their right of freedom of speech. But they could not establish a church, which followed Jesus' words, for that would have required assent to that treaty which opposed what Jesus had commanded. To show their absolute displeasure with those who'd kept this secret for so long, they refused to give anyone in church or state any respect. It was the custom to doff one's hat when he encountered a priest or official.

They started wearing big, ugly black hats, just so that the most myopic of these claimed "superiors" wouldn't miss the fact that the hat stayed atop their head. Back then the term "you" was formal English, reserved for use when speaking to a superior. "Thee" was the familiar pronoun, used among family and friends. So they called these officials only by the familiar pronoun "thee" or by their Christian names, "George, Peter, Robert, etc." We call these folk "Quakers", which was a nickname given to them by a judge. One of them had told the judge that he would better "Quake before the Lord, God almighty." The judge, in a display of irreverent disrespect replied, "Thee are the quaker here."

They found that pretty funny, it being such a total misnomer (as you shall soon see), and the nickname stuck. With the huge membership losses from the Anglican Church - especially from men who'd been the more charitable to it in the past - the church was technically bankrupt. It wasn't just the losses from the Quakers. Other people were leaving to join the new "Reformed Churches". Elsewhere in Europe, the Roman Church had amassed

sufficient assets to weather this storm. The far newer Anglican Church had not.

But the Anglican Church, as an agency of the State, cannot go bankrupt. It becomes the duty of the State to support it in hard times. Parliament did so. It enacted a tax to that end. A nice religious tax, and by current standards a very low tax, a tithe (10%). But it made a deadly mistake in that. The Quakers, primarily as tradesmen, recognized this income tax as a tax "without jurisdiction", at least so far as they went. As men unsworn and unallied, they pointed out that they did not have to pay it, nor provide a return. Absent their oaths establishing this servitude, there was "no jurisdiction". And they were right. Despite laws making it a crime to willfully refuse to make a return and pay this tax, NONE were charged or arrested.

That caused the rest of the society to take notice. Other folk who had thought the Quakers were "extremists" suddenly began to listen to them. As always, money talks. These guys were keeping all they earned, while the rest of the un-sworn society, thinking this tax applied to them, well; they were out 10%.

The Quaker movement expanded significantly, that proof once made in the marketplace. Membership in the Anglican Church fell even further, as did charity to it. The taxes were not enough to offset these further losses. The tithe (income) tax was actually counterproductive to the goal of supporting the church. The members of the government and the churchmen were scared silly. If this movement continued to expand at the current rate, no one in the next

generation would swear an oath. Who would then farm the lands of the nobility? Oh, surely someone would, but not as a servant working for subsistence. The land would need to be leased under a contract, with the payment for that use established in the market, not on the unilateral whim of the nobleman. The wealth of the nobility, their incomes, was about to be greatly diminished. And the Church of England, what assets it possessed, would need to be sold-off, with what remained of that church greatly reduced in power and wealth. But far worse was the diminishment of the respect demanded by the priests and officials. They had always held a position of superiority in the society. What would they do when all of society treated them only as equals?

They began to use the term "anarchy". But England was a monarchy, not an anarchy. And that was the ultimate solution to the problem, or so those in government thought. There is an aspect of a monarchy that Americans find somewhat incomprehensible, or at least we did two centuries ago. A crown has divine right, or at least it so claims. An expression of the divine right of a crown is the power to rule by demand. A crown can issue commands. The king says, "jump." Everyone jumps.

Why do they jump? Simple. It is a crime to NOT jump. To "willfully fail (hey, there's a couple of familiar terms) to obey a crown command" is considered to be a treason, high treason. The British crown issued a Crown Command to end the tax objection movement.

Did the crown order that everyone shall pay the income tax? No, that was not possible. There really was "no

jurisdiction". And that would have done nothing to cure the lack of respect. The crown went one better. It ordered that every man shall swear an oath of allegiance to the crown!

Damned Christian thing to do, eh? And I mean this quite literally.

A small handful of the tax objectors obeyed. Most refused. It was a simple matter of black and white. Jesus said (Matthew 5:34): "swear not at all." They opted to obey Him over the crown. That quickly brought them into court, facing the charge of high treason. An official would take the witness stand, swearing that he had no record of the defendant's oath of allegiance.

Then the defendant was called to testify, there being no right to refuse to witness against one's self. He refused to accept the administered oath. That refusal on the record, the court instantly judged him guilty. Took all of 10 minutes. That expedience was essential, for there were another couple hundred defendants waiting to be tried that day for their own treasons against the crown.

In short order the jails reached their capacity, plus some. But they were not filled as you would envision them. The men who had refused the oaths were not there. Their children were. There was a "stand-in" law allowing for that. There was no social welfare system. The wife and children of a married man in prison existed on the charity of church and neighbors, or they ceased to exist, starving to death.

It was typical for a man convicted of a petty crime to have one of his kid's stand in for him for 30 or 90 days. That way he could continue to earn a living, keeping bread on the table, without the family having to rely on charity. However, a man convicted of more heinous crimes would usually find it impossible to convince his wife to allow his children to serve his time. The family would prefer to exist on charity rather than see him back in society. But in this case the family had no option. The family was churchless.

The neighbors were all in the same situation. Charity was non-existent for them. The family was destined to quick starvation unless one of the children stood in for the breadwinner. Unfortunately, the rational choice of which child should serve the time was predicated on which child was the least productive to the family earnings.

That meant nearly the youngest, usually a daughter. Thus, the prisons of England filled with adolescent females, serving the life sentences for their dads. Those lives would be short. There was no heat in the jails. They were rife with tuberculosis and other deadly diseases. A strong man might last several years. A small girl measured her remaining time on earth in months. It was Christian holocaust, a true sacrifice of the unblemished lambs. (*And, we must note, completely ignored in virtually every history text covering this era, lest the crown, government and church be duly embarrassed*).

Despite the high mortality rate the jails still overflowed. There was little fear that the daughters would be raped or die at the brutality of other prisoners. The other prisoners,

the real felons, had all been released to make room. Early release was premised on the severity of the crime. High treason was the highest crime. The murderers, thieves, arsonists, rapists, etc., had all been set free. That had a very profound effect on commerce. It stopped. There were highwaymen afoot on every road. Thugs and muggers ruled the city streets. The sworn subjects of the crown sat behind bolted doors, in cold, dark homes, wondering how they would exist when the food and water ran out.

They finally dared to venture out to attend meetings to address the situation. At those meetings they discussed methods to overthrow the crown to which they were sworn! Call that perjury. Call that sedition. Call it by any name, they were going to put their words into actions, and soon, or die from starvation or the blade of a thug. Here we should note that chaos (and nearly anarchy: "no crown") came to be, not as the result of the refusal to swear oaths, but as the direct result of the governmental demand that people swear them! The followers of Jesus' words did not bring that chaos, those who ignored that command of Christ brought it. The crown soon saw the revolutionary handwriting on the wall and ordered the release of the children and the recapture of the real felons, before the government was removed from office under force of arms. The courts came up with the odd concept of an "affirmation in lieu of oath". The Quakers accepted that as a victory. Given what they had been through, that was understandable. However, Jesus also prohibited affirmations (Matthew 5:36,37), calling the practice an oath "by thy head." Isn't it funny that the Bible could

foresee the legal concept of an affirmation 1600 years before it came to be. Quite a prophecy!

When the colonies opened to migration, the Quakers fled Europe in droves, trying to put as much distance as they could between themselves and crowns. They had a very rational fear of a repeat of the situation. That put a lot of them here in the United States of America, enough that they had a very strong influence on politics. They could have blocked the ratification of the Constitution had they opposed it. Some of their demands were incorporated into it, as were some of their concessions, in balance to those demands. Their most obvious influence found in the Constitution is the definition of treason, the only crime defined in that document. Treason here is half of what can be committed under a crown. In the United States treason may only arise out of an (overt) ACTION. A refusal to perform an action at the command of the government is not a treason, hence, NOT A CRIME. You can find that restated in the Bill of Rights, where the territorial jurisdiction of the courts to try a criminal act is limited to the place wherein the crime shall have been COMMITTED.

A refusal or failure is not an act "committed" - it is the opposite, an act "omitted". In this nation "doing nothing" cannot be criminal, even when someone claims the power to command you do something. That concept in place, the new government would have lasted about three years. You see, if it were not a crime to fail to do something, then the officers of that government would have done NOTHING - save to draw their pay. That truth forced the Quakers to a concession.

Anyone holding a government job would need be sworn (or affirmed) to support the Constitution. That Constitution enabled the Congress to enact laws necessary and proper to control the powers vested in these people. Those laws would establish their duties. Should such an official 'fail' to perform his lawful duties, he would evidence in that omission that his oath was false. To swear a false oath is an ACTION. Thus, the punishments for failures would exist under the concept of perjury, not treason. But that was only regarding persons under oath of office, who were in office only by their oaths. And that is still the situation. It is just that the government has very cleverly obscured that fact so that the average man will pay it a rent, a tax on income. As you probably know, the first use of income tax here came well in advance of the 16th amendment. That tax was NEARLY abolished by a late 19th century Supreme Court decision. The problem was that the tax was not apportioned, and could not be apportioned; that because of the fact that it rested on the income of each person earning it, rather than an up-front total, divided and meted out to the several States according to the census. But the income tax was not absolutely abolished. The court listed a solitary exception. The incomes of federal officers, derived as a benefit of office, could be so taxed. You could call that a "kick back" or even a "return". Essentially, the court said that what Congress gives, it can demand back. As that would not be income derived within a State, the rule of apportionment did not apply. Make sense?

Now, no court can just make up rulings. The function of a court is to answer the questions posed to it. And in order

to pose a question, a person needs 'standing.' The petitioner has to show that an action has occurred which affects him, hence, giving him that standing. For the Supreme Court to address the question of the income of officers demonstrates that the petitioner was such. Otherwise, the question could not have come up.

Congress was taxing his benefits of office. But Congress was ALSO taxing his outside income, that from sources within a State. Could have been interest, dividends, rent, royalties, and even alimony. If he had a side job, it might have even been commissions or salary. Those forms of income could not be taxed. However, Congress could tax his income from the benefits he derived by being an officer.

That Court decision was the end of all income taxation. The reason is pretty obvious. Rather than tax the benefits derived out of office, it is far easier to just reduce the benefits up front! Saves time. Saves paper. The money stays in Treasury rather than going out, then coming back as much as 15 or 16 months later. So, even though the benefits of office could have been taxed, under that Court ruling, that tax was dropped by Congress. There are two ways to overcome a Supreme Court ruling. The first is to have the court reverse itself. That is a very strange concept at law. Actually, it is an impossibility at law. The only way a court can change a prior ruling is if the statutes or the Constitution change, that changing the premises on which its prior conclusion at law was derived. Because it was a Supreme Court ruling nearly abolishing the income tax, the second method, an Amendment to the Constitution, was

used to overcome the prior decision. That was the 16th Amendment.

The 16th Amendment allows for Congress to tax incomes from whatever source derived, without regard to apportionment. Whose incomes? Hey, it doesn't say (nor do the statutes enacted under it). The Supreme Court has stated that this Amendment granted Congress "no new powers". That is absolutely true. Congress always had the power to tax incomes, but only the incomes of officers and only their incomes derived out of a benefit of office. All the 16th did was extend that EXISTING POWER to tax officers' incomes (as benefits of office) to their incomes from other sources (from whatever source derived).

The 16th Amendment and the statutes enacted thereunder do not have to say whose incomes are subject to this tax. The Supreme Court had already said that: officers. That's logical. If it could be a crime for a freeman to "willfully fail" to file or pay this tax, that crime could only exist as a treason by monarchical definition. In this nation a crime of failure may only exist under the broad category of a perjury. Period, no exception.

Thus, the trick employed by the government is to get you to claim that you are an officer of that government. Yeah, you're saying, "Man, I'd never be so foolish as to claim that." I will bet you \$100 that I can prove that you did it, and that you will be forced to agree. Did you ever sign a tax form, a W-4, a 1040? Then you have done it.

Look at the fine print at the bottom of the tax forms you once signed. You declared that it was "true" that you were "under penalties of perjury". Are you? Were you? Perjury is a felony. To commit a perjury you have to FIRST be under oath (or affirmation). You know that. It is common knowledge. So, to be punished for a perjury you would need to be under oath, right? Right. There is no other way, unless you pretend to be under oath. To pretend to be under oath is a perjury automatically. There would be no oath. Hence it is a FALSE oath. Perjury rests on making a false oath. So, to claim to be "under penalties of perjury" is to claim that you are under oath. That claim could be true, could be false. But if false, and you knowingly and willingly made that false claim, then you committed a perjury just by making that claim.

You have read the Constitution, right? How many times can you be tried and penalized for a single criminal act? Once? Did I say once; only once? Yes I did. Now you know that you cannot even be placed in jeopardy of penalty (trial) a second time.

The term "penalties" is plural. More than one. Oops. Didn't we just agree that you could only be tried once, penalized once, for a single criminal action? Sure we did. And that would almost always be true. There's a solitary exception. A federal official or employee may be twice tried, twice penalized. The second penalty, resulting out of a conviction of impeachment, is the loss of the benefits of office, for life. Federal officials are under oath, an oath of office. That is why you call them civil servants. That oath establishes jurisdiction (oath spoken), allowing them to be

penalized, twice, for a perjury (especially for a perjury of official oath). You have been tricked into signing tax forms under the perjury clause. You are not under oath enabling the commission of perjury. You cannot be twice penalized for a single criminal act, even for a perjury. Still, because you trusted that the government would not try to deceive you, you signed an income tax form, pretending that there was jurisdiction (oath spoken) where there was none.

Once you sign the first form, the government will forever believe that you are a civil servant. Stop signing those forms while you continue to have income and you will be charged with "willful failure to file", a crime of doing nothing when commanded to do something!

Initially, the income tax forms were required to be SWORN (or affirmed) before a notary. A criminal by the name of Sullivan brought that matter all the way to the Supreme Court. He argued that if he listed his income from criminal activities, that information would later be used against him on a criminal charge. If he did not list it, then swore that the form was "true, correct and complete", he could be charged and convicted of a perjury. He was damned if he did, damned if he did not. The Supreme Court could only agree. It ruled that a person could refuse to provide any information on that form, taking individual exception to each line, and stating in that space that he refused to provide testimony against himself. That should have been the end of the income tax. In a few years everyone would have been refusing to provide answers on the "gross" and "net income" lines, forcing a NO answer on the "tax due" line, as well. Of course, that decision was

premised on the use of the notarized oath, causing the answers to have the quality of "testimony".

Congress then INSTANTLY ordered the forms be changed. In place of the notarized oath, the forms would contain a statement that they were made and signed "Under penalties of perjury". The prior ruling of the Supreme Court was made obsolete. Congress had changed the premise on which it had reached its conclusion. The verity of the information on the form no longer rested on a notarized oath. It rested on the taxpayer's oath of office. And, as many a tax protestor in the 1970s and early 1980s quickly discovered, the Supreme Court ruling for Sullivan had no current relevance.

There has never been a criminal trial in any matter under federal income taxation without a SIGNED tax form in evidence before the court. The court takes notice of the signature below the perjury clause and assumes the standing of the defendant is that of a federal official, a person under oath of office who may be twice penalized for a single criminal act of perjury (to his official oath). The court has jurisdiction to try such a person for a "failure". That jurisdiction arises under the concept of perjury, not treason.

However, the court is in an odd position here. If the defendant should take the witness stand, under oath or affirmation to tell the truth, and then truthfully state that he is not under oath of office and is not a federal officer or employee, that statement would contradict the signed statement on the tax form, already in evidence and made

under claim of oath. That contradiction would give rise to a technical perjury. Under federal statutes, courtroom perjury is committed when a person willfully makes two statements, both under oath, which contradict one another.

The perjury clause claims the witness to be a federal person. If he truthfully says the contrary from the witness stand, the judge is then duty bound to charge him with the commission of a perjury! At his ensuing perjury trial, the two contradictory statements "I am under penalties of perjury" and "I am not a federal official or employee" would be the sole evidence of the commission of the perjury. As federal employment is a matter of public record, the truth of the last statement would be evidenced. That would prove that the perjury clause was a FALSE statement. We cannot have that proof on the record, can we? About now you are thinking of some tax protester trials for "willful failure" where the defendant took the witness stand and testified, in full truth, that he was not a federal person.

This writer has studied a few such cases. Those of Irwin Schiff and F. Tupper Saussy come to mind. And you are right; they told the court that they were not federal persons. Unfortunately, they did not tell the court that while under oath.

A most curious phenomenon occurs at "willful failure" trials where the defendant has published the fact, in books or newsletters, that he is not a federal person. The judge becomes very absent-minded - at least that is surely what he would try to claim if the issue were ever raised. He forgets to swear-in the defendant before he takes the

witness stand. The defendant tells the truth from the witness stand, but does so without an oath. As he is not under oath, nothing he says can constitute a technical perjury as a contradiction to the "perjury clause" on the tax forms already in evidence. The court will almost always judge him guilty for his failure to file. Clever system. And it all begins when a person who is NOT a federal officer or employee signs his first income tax form, FALSELY claiming that he is under an oath which if perjured may bring him a duality of penalties. It is still a matter of jurisdiction (oath spoken). That has not changed in over 400 years. The only difference is that in this nation, we have no monarch able to command us to action. In the United States of America, you have to VOLUNTEER to establish jurisdiction.

Once you do, then you are subject to commands regarding the duties of your office. Hence the income tax is "voluntary", in the beginning, but "compulsory" once you volunteer. You volunteer when you sign your very first income tax form, probably a Form W-4 and probably at about age 15. You voluntarily sign a false statement, a false statement that claims that you are subject to jurisdiction. Gotcha!

Oh, and when the prosecutor enters your prior signed income tax forms into evidence at a willful failure to file trial, he will always tell the court that those forms evidence that you knew it was your DUTY to make and file proper returns.

DUTY?!

A free man owes no DUTY. A free man owes nothing to the federal government, as he receives nothing from it. But a federal official owes a duty. He receives something from that government - the benefits of office. In addition to a return of some of those benefits, Congress can also demand that he pay a tax on his other forms of income, now under the 16th Amendment, from whatever source they may be derived. If that were ever to be understood, the ranks of real, sworn federal officers would diminish greatly. And the ranks of the pretended federal officers (including you) would vanish to zero. It is still the same system as it was 400 years ago, with appropriate modifications, so you do not immediately realize it. Yes, it is a jurisdictional matter. An Oath-spoken matter. Quite likely you, as a student of the Constitution, have puzzled over the 14th Amendment. You have wondered who are persons "subject to the jurisdiction" of the United States and in the alternative, who are not. This is easily explained, again in the proper historical perspective.

The claimed purpose of the 14th was to vest civil rights to the former slaves. A method was needed to convert them from chattel to full civil beings. The Supreme Court had issued rulings that precluded that from occurring. Hence, an Amendment was necessary. But it took a little more than the amendment. The former slaves would need to perform an act, subjecting themselves to the "jurisdiction" of the United States. You should now realize that an oath is the way that was, and is accomplished now.

After the battles of the rebellion had ceased, the manumitted slaves were free, but had no rights as humans.

They held no electoral franchise - they could not vote. The governments of the Southern States were pretty peeved over what had occurred in the prior several years, and they were not about to extend electoral franchises to the former slaves. The Federal government found a way to force that.

It ordered that voters had to be "registered". And it ordered that to become a registered voter, one had to SWEAR an oath of allegiance to the Constitution. The white folks, by and large, were not about to do that. They were also peeved that the excuse for all the battles was an unwritten, alleged, Constitutional premise, that a "State had no right to secede".

The former slaves had no problem swearing allegiance to the Constitution. The vast majority of them did not have the slightest idea of what an oath was, nor did they even know what the Constitution was!

Great voter registration drives took place. In an odd historical twist, these were largely sponsored by the Quakers who volunteered their assistance. Thus, most of the oaths administered were administered by Quakers! Every former slave was sworn-in, taking what actually was an OATH OF OFFICE.

The electoral franchise then existed almost exclusively among the former slaves, with the white folks in the South unanimously refusing that oath and denied their right to vote. For a while many of the Southern State governments were comprised of no one other than the former slaves. The former slaves became de jure (by oath) federal

officials, "subject to the jurisdiction of the United States" by that oath. They were non-compensated officials, receiving no benefits of their office, save what was then extended under the 14th Amendment. There was some brief talk of providing compensation in the form of 40 acres and a mule, but that quickly faded.

Jurisdiction over a person exists only by oath. Always has, always will. For a court to have jurisdiction, someone has to bring a charge or petition under an oath. In a criminal matter, the charge is forwarded under the oaths of the grand jurors (indictment) or under the oath of office of a federal officer (information). Even before a warrant may be issued, someone has to swear there is probable cause. Should it later be discovered that there was NOT probable cause, that person should be charged with a perjury. It is all about oaths. And the one crime for which immunity, even "sovereign immunity", cannot be extended is ... perjury.

You must understand "jurisdiction". That term is only understandable when one understands the history behind it. Know what "jurisdiction" means. You did not WILLFULLY claim that you were "Under penalties of perjury" on those tax forms you signed. You may have done it voluntarily, but you surely did it ignorantly! You did not realize the import and implications of that clause. It was, quite frankly, a MISTAKE. A big one. A dumb one. Still it was only a mistake. Willfulness rests on intent. You had no intent to claim that you were under an oath of office, a perjury of which could bring you dual penalties. You just did not give those words any thought. What do you do

when you discover you have made a mistake? As an honest man, you tell those who may have been affected by your error, apologize to them, and usually you promise to be more careful in the future, that as a demonstration that you, like all of us, learn by your mistakes.

You really ought to drop the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a short letter, cc it to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Explain that you never realized that the fine print on the bottom of all income tax forms meant that you were claiming to be "under oath" a perjury of which might be "twice" penalized. Explain that you have never sworn such an oath and that for reasons of conscience, you never will. You made this mistake on every tax form you had ever signed. But now that you understand the words, you will most certainly not make that mistake again! That will be the end of any possibility that you will ever be charged with "willful failure to file". Too simple? No, it is only as simple as it is supposed to be. Jurisdiction (oath spoken) is a pretty simple matter. Either you are subject to jurisdiction by having really sworn an oath, or you are not. If you are not under oath and abolish all the pretenses, false pretenses you provided on which the government assumed that you were under oath, then the jurisdiction fails and you become a freeman. A freeman cannot be compelled to perform any act and threatened with a penalty, certainly not two penalties, should he fail to do so. That would constitute a treason charge by the part of the definition abolished here.

It is a matter of history. European history, American history and finally, the history of your life. The first two

may be hidden from you, making parts of them difficult to discover. But the last history you know. If you know that you have never sworn an oath of office, and now understand how that truth fits the other histories, then you are free. Truth does that. Funny how that works.

The Bible states: "But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne..." (*Matthew 5:34*). That was the method by which He set men free. Israel was a feudal society. It had a crown; it had landlords; they had tenant farmers bound by oath to them. Jesus scared them silly. Who would farm those lands in the next generation, when all of the people refused to swear oaths? Ring a bell? And what did the government do to Jesus? It tried to obtain jurisdiction on the false oath of a witness, charging Him with "sedition" for the out-of-context, allegorical statement that He would "tear down the temple" (a government building). At that trial, Jesus stood mute, refusing the administered oath. (*Matthew 27:14*). That was unheard of!

The judge became so frustrated that he posed a trick question and attempted to obtain jurisdiction from Jesus by accusing Him of sedition; Pilate said: "Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee?" (*Matthew 27:13*). Pilate failed to obtain a compelled oath / jurisdiction over Jesus Christ, as He responded thusly: "And he answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly." (*Matthew 27:14*)

He did not "take" the adjured oath. He left it with its speaker, the judge! That bound the judge to truth. Had the judge also falsely said that Jesus was the man (guilty of sedition)? No, not out loud, not yet. But in his heart he had said so. That is what this trial was all about. Jesus tossed that falsehood back where it belonged as well as the oath. In those few words, "And Pilate asked him, Art thou the King of the Jews? And he answering said unto him, Thou sayest it." (*Mark 15:2*). Jesus put the oath, and the PERJURY of it, back on the judge, where it belonged. The court could not get jurisdiction.

Israel was occupied by Rome at that time. The court then shipped Jesus off to the martial governor, Pontius Pilate, hoping that martial power might compel him to submit to jurisdiction. But Pilate had no quarrel with Jesus. He correctly saw the charge as a political matter, devoid of any real criminal act. Likely, Pilate offered Jesus the "protection of Rome". Roman law extended only to sworn subjects. All Jesus would need do is swear an oath to Caesar, then Pilate could protect him. Otherwise, Jesus was probably going to turn up dead at the hands of "person or persons unknown" which would really be at the hands of the civil government, under the false charge of sedition. Pilate administered that oath to Caesar. Jesus stood mute, again refusing jurisdiction. Pilate "..marveled greatly."

He had never before met a man who preferred to live free or die. Under Roman law the unsworn were considered to be unclean - the "great unwashed masses". The elite were sworn to Caesar. When an official errantly extended the law to an unsworn person that "failure of jurisdiction"

required that the official perform a symbolic act. To cleanse himself and the law, he would "wash his hands". Pilate did so. Under Roman law, the law to which he was sworn, he had to do so. The law, neither Roman law nor the law of Israel, could obtain jurisdiction over Jesus. The law could not kill Him, nor could it prevent that murder. Jesus was turned over to a mob, demanding His death. How was that for chaos? Jesus was put to death because He refused to be sworn. But the law could not do that. Only a mob could do so, setting free a true felon in the process. Thus, Jesus proved the one failing of the law - at least the law then and there - the law has no ability to touch a truly free man. A mob can, but the result of that is chaos, not order.

In every situation where a government attempts to compel an oath, or fails to protect a man of conscience who refuses it, the result is chaos. That government proves itself incapable of any claimed powers as the result, for the only purpose of any government should be to defend the people establishing it - all of those people - and not because they owe that government any duty or allegiance, but for the opposite reason, because the government owes the people its duty and allegiance under the law. This nation came close to that concept for quite a few decades. Then those in federal office realized that they could fool all of the people, some of the time. That "some of the time" regarded oaths and jurisdiction. Currently we are led by churchmen who still uphold the terms of that European treaty. They still profess that it is Christian to swear an oath, so long as it's a "lawful oath". We are deceived. As deceived as the tenant in 1300, but more so, for we now have the Words of the Bible to read for ourselves.

The Bible says: "But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne..." (*Matthew 5:34*), i.e. "swear no oaths", extending that even to oaths which do not name God. If His followers obeyed that command, the unscrupulous members of the society in that day would have quickly realized that they could file false lawsuits against Jesus' followers, suits that they couldn't answer (under oath). Thus, Jesus issued a secondary command, ordering His followers to sell all they had, making themselves what today we call "judgement proof". They owned only their shirt and a coat. If they were sued for their shirt, they were to offer to settle out-of-court (without oath) by giving the plaintiff their coat. That was not a metaphor. Jesus meant those words in the literal sense!

Are you ready to take action yet? You need to take the final step. You must swear no oaths. That is the penultimate step in self-preservation. It is all a matter of 'jurisdiction' (oath spoken), which a Sovereign cannot abide. Sovereigns must be freemen. Their duty and allegiance can go to no one on earth. We cannot serve two masters. No one can. As Sovereigns our allegiance rests not on an oath. Our allegiance arises naturally.

As to what sort of a society the Bible intended without oaths or even affirmations, I honestly cannot envision. Certainly it would have been anarchy (no crown). Would it have also been chaos? My initial instinct is to find that it would lead to chaos. Like the Quakers in 1786, I cannot envision a functional government without the use of oaths.

Yet, every time a government attempts to use oaths as a device to compel servitudes, the result is CHAOS. History proves that. The Dark Ages were dark, only because the society was feudal, failing to advance to enlightenment because they were sworn into servitudes, unwittingly violating Jesus' command. When the British crown attempted to compel oaths of allegiance, chaos certainly resulted. And Jesus' own death occurred only out of the chaos derived by His refusal to swear a compelled oath and an offered oath.

The current Internal Revenue Code is about as close to legislated chaos as could ever be envisioned. No two people beginning with identical premises will reach the same conclusion under the IRC. Is that not chaos? Thus, in every instance where the government attempts to use oaths to bind a people, the result has been chaos.

Hence, we are forced to the conclusion that the Bible is right. We ought to avoid oaths at all costs, save our own souls, and for precisely that reason. Yet, what system of societal interaction the Bible may have envisioned, without oaths, escapes me. How would we deal with murderers, thieves, rapists, etc. present in the society without someone bringing a complaint, sworn complaint, before a Jury (a panel of sworn men), to punish them for these criminal actions against the civil members of that society? As to where we go from there, well, given that there has never been a society, neither civil nor martial, which functioned without oaths, I guess we won't see how it will function until it arrives.

Meanwhile, the first step in the process is abolishing your prior FALSE claims of being under oath (of office) on those income tax forms. You claimed "jurisdiction". Only you can reverse that by stating the Truth. It worked 400 years ago. It will still work. It is the only thing that will work. History can repeat, but this time without the penalty of treason extended to you (or your daughters). You can cause it. Know and tell this Truth and it will set you free. HONESTLY. Tell the government, then explain it to everyone you know. Most of them will hate you for that bit of honesty. Be kind to them anyhow. Once they see that you are keeping what you earn, the market will force them to realize that you are not the extremist they originally thought!

If only 2% of the American people understand what is written here, income taxation will be abolished - that out of a fear that the knowledge will expand. The government will be scared silly. What if no one in the next generation would swear an oath? Then there would be no servants! No, the income tax will be abolished long before that could ever happen. That is only money. Power comes by having an ignorant people to rule. A government will always opt for power. That way, in two or three generations, the knowledge lost to the obscure "between the lines" of history, they can run the same money game. Pass this book on to your friends. But save a copy for yourself. Will it to your grandchildren. Someday, they too will probably need this knowledge. Teach your children well. Be honest; tell the truth. That will set you free - and it will scare the government silly.

Food for thought:

"The world runs on the initiative of about 5% of the people; the rest need orders.

The consensus of the other 95% on the subject of one's relationship with: government – banks – tax agencies – courts and corporations (all separate realms) is defective in that such inert abstractions have been accorded superiority over living beings.

Governments are transitory mental contrivances set up by the clever few for the purpose of living off the efforts of the trusting many – a generalization, yes, but also the truth."

Now that you know the history of the income tax, I will now provide the absolute truth about the fraudulence of the tax system in their own words and in law. A truth that our government prays you will never learn, or even become aware of.

Before we continue, I would like to mention some deceptive words that the IRS uses. It would be helpful to each of us to learn to Decipher the Internal Revenue Code and IRS Publications.

The Internal Revenue Code (IRC) is a masterpiece of deception designed to mislead Citizens into believing that

individuals are subject to federal income tax. The Code was written by attorneys for the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), and contains a series of directory statutes using the word "shall", with provisions that are requirements for corporations, but not for individuals. Even members of Congress are generally unaware of the deceptive legal meanings of certain terms that are consistently used in the IRC. These terms have legal definitions for use in the IRC that are very different from the general understanding of the meaning of the words.

Lack of knowledge of these legal definitions causes misunderstanding by uninformed Citizens who are confused as to the correct interpretation of both the IRC and the true meaning of the tricky wording in IRS instructional publications and news articles. However, when you understand the legal definitions of these terms, the deception is easily recognized and the limited application of the Code becomes clear. This understanding will help you to see that filing income tax forms and paying income taxes must be voluntary acts for most Americans because the United States Constitution forbids the federal government to impose any tax directly upon individuals.

'INCOME'

Most people mistakenly believe all moneys they receive, such as wages, salaries, and tips, are "income". However, for years, IRS publication #525, entitled "Taxable and Nontaxable Income", has acknowledged that wages and salaries are NOT "income". Publication #525 states: "Wages and salaries are the main SOURCE of income for

most people." In the court decision of *Graves vs People of the State of New York ex rel O'Keefe*, 59 S.Ct. 595 (1939), the United States Supreme Court ruled that a source of income is not income, and the source is not subject to income tax. In that decision, the Court stated: "A tax on income is not economically or legally a tax on its source." However, wages, salaries, commissions, and tips (sources) are considered to be "income" for an individual when he lists them as "income" on an IRS tax return form. When he signs the tax form under penalty of perjury, he has made a voluntary oath that his wages, salary, commissions, and tips listed on the return are "income" and that he is subject to the tax.

In the still standing decision of *Brushaber vs Union Pacific Railroad Company*, 240 U.S. 1, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the federal income tax is an excise tax under the Sixteenth Amendment (the income tax amendment). The Court explained that THE INCOME TAX CANNOT BE IMPOSED AS A DIRECT TAX (A TAX ON INDIVIDUALS OR ON PROPERTY) because the United States Constitution still requires that all direct taxes must be apportioned among the States. "Apportioned" means that a direct tax is laid upon the State governments in proportion to each State's population. The Court ruled that income tax can be constitutional only as an indirect (excise) tax -- that is, a tax on profits earned by corporations or privileges granted by government. In other words, said the Supreme Court, in order for there to be "income", there MUST be profits or gains received in the exercise of a privilege granted by government. As an example, a lawyer is

granted the government privilege of being an officer of the government court when he represents clients in litigation.

At law, labor is property. In fact, the Supreme Court has identified labor as man's most precious property. Therefore, the exchange of one's labor for wages or salary (which are also property) is considered by law to be an exchange of properties of equal value in which there is NO gain or profit. Such a property exchange of equal value cannot be taxed because there is no profit or gain. Also, one who works in an ordinary occupation is not a recipient of any privilege granted by government, because he is merely exercising his constitutionally guaranteed right to work and earn an living. Courts have repeatedly ruled that no tax may be placed upon the exercise of rights. Their reasoning was sensible. If the exercise of rights could be taxed, government could destroy them by excessive rates of taxation.

Items that the law includes in "income" are described in Code sections listed under the title of "Items Specifically Included in Gross Income", which covers Sections 71 through 86. Nowhere in these sections and nowhere else in the Code is there any mention of wages, salaries, commissions, or tips as being "income". For example, to deceive and intimidate waitresses into declaring their tips to be income is a double fraud. First, tips are gifts, not wages. According to the IRC, gifts are not subject to income tax. In fact, even if tips were considered to be wages, they would still not be "income" and would not be subject to an income (excise) tax unless one enters them as "income" on a tax return form.

'PERSON'

People generally consider the term "person" to mean an individual only. But, IRC Section 7701, entitled "Definitions", includes a corporation, a trust, an estate, a partnership, an association, or company as being a "person". All of these legal entities are "persons" at law, so it is legally correct but very misleading when the federal income (excise) tax on corporations is described by the deceptive title of "Personal Income Tax". This misleading description leads most people to believe that it means a tax on individuals.

The legal term "person" has an even more restricted definition when used in IRC Chapter 75, which contains all the criminal penalties in the Code. In Section 7343 of that Chapter, a "person" subject to criminal penalties is defined as:

... [A]n officer or employee of a corporation, or member or employee of a partnership, who, as such officer, employee or member, is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs.

An individual who is not in such a capacity is not defined as a "person" subject to criminal penalties. Unprivileged individuals, who do not impose the income (excise) tax upon themselves by filing returns, are not subject to the tax and they are not "persons" who can lawfully be subjected to criminal charges for not filing a return or not paying income tax.

Sections of the Code relating to the requirements for filing returns, keeping records, and disclosing information state that those sections apply to "every person liable" or "any person made liable". These descriptions mean "any person who is liable for the tax". They do not state or mean that all persons are liable. The only persons liable are those "persons" (legal entities such as corporations) who owe an income (excise) tax, and are therefore subject to the requirements of the IRC. If you substitute the word "corporation" for the term "person" (a corporation is a person at law) when reading the Code or other articles and publications relating to income tax, the true meaning of the Code becomes more apparent.

A TAX PAYER IS NOT A 'TAXPAYER'

The deceptive term "taxpayer" is a legal term created by combining the words "tax" and "payer". The general understanding of the term's meaning is different from its legal definition in the IRC. Section 7701(a)(14) gives the legal definition of the term "taxpayer" in relation to income tax. It states: "The term 'taxpayer' means any person subject to any internal revenue tax." (All internal revenue taxes are excise taxes.) Note that the section does not say that all persons are "taxpayers" subject to internal revenue tax. Corporations are "taxpayers", for they are "persons" subject to an internal revenue (excise) tax.

The term "taxpayer" is used extensively throughout the IRC, in IRS publications, news articles, and instructional literature as a verbal trap to make uninformed Citizens believe that all individuals are subject to federal income tax and to the requirements of the IRC. These materials state

that "taxpayers" are required to file returns, keep records, supply information, etc. Such statements are technically correct, because "taxpayers" are those legal "persons" previously described that are subject to an excise tax, but unprivileged individuals are not "taxpayers" within the meaning of the IRC.

The confusion about the meaning of the term leads most people to mistakenly assume that they are "taxpayers" because they pay other taxes such as sales taxes and real estate taxes. Those people are tax payers, not "taxpayers" as defined in the IRC. When they read articles and publications related to income tax, describing the legal requirements for "taxpayers", they erroneously believe that the term applies to them as individuals. It is very important to understand that the IRC requirements apply to IRC-defined "taxpayers" only, and not to unprivileged individuals. Corporations and other government-privileged legal entities are "taxpayers under the Internal Revenue Code"; unprivileged individuals are not, unless they voluntarily file income tax returns showing they owe taxes, thus legally placing themselves in the classification of "taxpayers". Because of its legal definition, the term "taxpayer" should never be used in relation to income tax, except to describe those legal entities subject to a federal excise tax.

'SHALL' MEANS 'MAY'

In general use, the word "shall" is a word of command with a mandatory meaning. In the IRC, "shall" is a directory word that has a mandatory meaning when applied to corporations. The IRC contains a series of directory

statutes using the word "shall" in describing the actions called for in those sections of the law. The provisions of these directory statutes are requirements for corporations, because corporations are created by government and, consequently, are subject to government direction and control. Since corporations are granted the privilege to exist and operate by government-issued charters, they do not have the constitutionally guaranteed rights of individuals. This government-granted privilege legally obligates corporations to make a "return" of profits and gains earned in the exercise of their privileged operations when directed to do so by law. This is why the tax form is called a "return".

However, directory words in the Code merely imply that individuals are required to perform certain acts, but directory words are not requirements for individuals when a mandatory interpretation of the directory words would conflict with the constitutionally guaranteed rights of individuals. Courts have repeatedly ruled that in statutes, when a mandatory meaning of the word "shall" would create a constitutional conflict, "shall" must be defined as meaning "may". The following are quotes from a few of these decisions. In the decision of *Cairo & Fulton R.R. Co. vs Hecht*, 95 U.S. 170, the U.S. Supreme Court stated:

As against the government the word "shall" when used in statutes, is to be construed as "may," unless a contrary intention is manifest.

In the decision of *George Williams College vs Village of Williams Bay*, 7 N.W.2d 891, the Supreme Court of Wisconsin stated:

"Shall" in a statute may be construed to mean "may" in order to avoid constitutional doubt.

In the decision of *Gow vs Consolidated Coppermines Corp.*, 165 Atlantic 136, the court stated:

If necessary to avoid unconstitutionality of a statute, "shall" will be deemed equivalent to "may"

Sections 6001 and 6011 of the IRC are cited in the Privacy Act notice in the IRS 1040 instruction booklet in order to lead individuals to believe they are required to perform services for tax collectors. Note the use of the word "shall" in the following sections of the Code:

Section 6001 states:

Every person liable for any tax imposed by this title, or for the collection thereof, shall keep such records, render such statements, make such returns, and comply with such rules and requirements as the secretary may from time to time prescribe.

Section 6011 states:

When required by regulations prescribed by the Secretary any person made liable for any tax imposed by this title, or for the collection thereof, shall make a return or statement according to the forms and regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Note that Sections 6001 and 6011 apply to "every person liable" and "any person made liable", but not to "individuals". However, THERE IS NO SECTION IN THE IRC THAT MAKES INDIVIDUALS LIABLE FOR PAYMENT OF INCOME TAX because any law imposing a federal tax on

individuals would be unconstitutional, for it would violate the taxing limitations in the U.S. Constitution which prohibit direct taxation of individuals by the federal government. People are often confused when reading the Code because, under Subtitle A, Chapter 1, which covers income taxes, Part 1 of Subchapter A has the misleading title of "Tax on Individuals". The title is misleading because Part 1 imposes the tax on "income", but contains no requirement for individuals to pay it. But an individual becomes a "person liable" for the tax when he files an income tax form, thereby swearing that he is liable for (owes) the tax.

The Privacy Act notice in the instruction booklet for IRS Form 1040 also shows that disclosure of information by individuals is not required. The notice states:

Our legal right to ask for information is Internal Revenue Code sections 6001 and 6011 and their regulations.

The IRS does not say that those sections require individuals to submit the information; those sections only give the IRS the authority to ask for it.

Section 6012 states:

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 which equals or exceeds the exemption amount"

Subsections (2) through (6) list corporations, estates, trusts, partnerships, and certain political organizations as also being subject to this section.

Any requirements compelling unprivileged individuals to keep records, make returns and statements, or to involuntarily perform any other services for tax collectors, would be violations of constitutionally guaranteed rights.

The Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution forbids compelling individuals to perform services involuntarily. The Amendment states:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crimes whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

The Fourth Amendment in the Bill of Rights of the United States Constitution states that the people's right to privacy of their papers shall not be violated by government. To compel individuals to disclose information taken from their papers would violate this right.

The Fifth Amendment in the Bill of Rights protects the right of individuals not to be required to be witnesses against themselves. To compel individuals to disclose information by submitting statements or information on a tax return form, all of which could be used against them in criminal prosecutions, would violate their Fifth Amendment right.

These examples show some constitutional conflicts that would result from defining the word "shall" as meaning "is required to". Thus, "shall" in the above mentioned statutes must be interpreted as meaning "may". Consequently, for

individuals, keeping records, making statements, and making returns are clearly voluntary actions that are not required by law.

'HAVING' INCOME

According to the wording of Section 6012 previously discussed, it is a directory statute which pertains to the filing of income tax returns, and applies only to those individuals "having income". Since the word "having" has no deceptive legal definition in the Code, its legal meaning is the same as its customary meaning in general use. Although dictionaries define the word "have" as meaning "possess" or "hold in one's possession", the IRS fraudulently misinterprets "having income" as meaning "receiving gross receipts" when applying Section 6012 to individuals.

To better understand the meaning of "having income", consider this example: If during one year a corporation receives ten million dollars (gross receipts) from the sales of its products, and has expense items of nine million dollars, the corporation has a profit (income) of one million dollars. When tax liabilities are determined at the end of the year, the corporation has (possesses) an increase in its assets (again) of one million dollars. But, if the corporation's expenses equaled its gross receipts, it would then have (possess) no profit or gain (income) and it would owe no income tax.

Now, consider another example: If during one year an individual receives fifteen thousand dollars in wages (gross receipts) from the sale of his labor, and has expenses of

fifteen thousand dollars to sustain himself and his family, he then has (possesses) no increase in assets. Although he has (possesses) nothing more than he had at the beginning of the year, IRS agents consider him as "having income" of fifteen thousand dollars. IRS agents ignore the fact that his wages were not income according to their own publications!

'MUST' means 'MAY'

Most people have never studied the IRC and their understanding of the law is generally based on hearsay, newspaper articles and IRS instructional materials. These instructions make frequent use of the deceptive word "must" in describing the things that the IRS wants you to do, because "must" is a forceful word that people mistakenly believe to mean "are required". Very few people realize that "must" is a directory word similar to "shall" and that, in IRS instructions to the public, it means "may", the same as the word "shall".

In the legal definition of the word "must" in Black's Law Dictionary, it states:

... [I]t is often used in a merely directory sense, and consequently is a synonym for the word "may" not only in the permissive sense of that word, but also in the mandatory sense which it sometimes has.

Because of the constitutional conflicts explained earlier in this article, the word "must", similar to the word "shall", cannot have a mandatory meaning for individuals. It therefore means "may" when used in IRS instruction publications.

The IRS instructions for Form 1040 state that you "must" file a return if you have certain amounts of income.

IRS withholding instructions state that employers "must" withhold money from paychecks for income tax, "must" withhold social security tax (an income tax also), and "must" send to the IRS any W-4 withholding statement claiming exemption from withholding, if the wages are expected to usually exceed \$200 per week. An understanding of the legal meaning of the word "must" exposes the deception by the IRS and makes it clear that the actions called for are voluntary actions for individuals that are not required by law. If these actions were required by law, the instructions would not use the word "must", but would say that the actions were "required".

FREE SOVEREIGN CITIZENS

Prior to the American Revolution, the American colonists were subjects of the English Kings and were subject to their orders and edicts. But, according to the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution, the Citizens of our country are free sovereign individuals. They are not subjects of government, nor are they subject to mandatory direction or control by the federal government. Except for duties such as military draft and jury duty, the federal government has no authority to require unprivileged individuals to perform services for government.

There is no section in the IRC requiring individuals to pay income tax or file income tax returns, because the federal government has no constitutional authority to impose any tax directly upon individuals or to require them involuntarily to keep records, make statements, make returns, or perform any acts for the convenience of federal

tax collectors. But, if an individual files a return, his voluntary action of signing the form, thereby swearing under penalty of perjury that he owes the tax, is an acknowledgement under oath that he is subject to the tax (a "taxpayer") and is therefore subject to the directory statutes of the IRC.

The reader should remember the legal definitions of the various terms and the information about the rights of Citizens presented in this article whenever he reads the IRC and other materials relating to income tax in order to better understand the correct meaning of whatever they read.

The truth is; United States citizens are not subject, under the letter of the law, to the payment of income taxes on domestic income, and are not required by law to file a Form 1040 for the purpose of reporting, or paying the income tax on, their own domestic income. The truth is the IRS has been a fraudulent and illegal operation for about 80 years. The truth is the IRS routinely violates the Law, the Regulations and the United States Constitution. The IRS is an operation that is more representative of the Gestapo than the American Constitution, routinely trampling the rights of innocent citizens. The IRS is the most un-American agency in the country today.

The truth is that America's tax system is based on voluntary compliance and self assessment, and that's right from the IRS itself, which we'll see later. But what does that actually mean, and why do they say that? "Voluntary

compliance and self assessment" Did you know that you "comply voluntarily" ?

You see in America, under the law, the citizens are free, and FREE means not taxed, except when done lawfully. If you *still* don't believe me, let's look and see what the tax laws actually say. Before we begin, I would just like to point out that I am not trying to tell anyone what they personally should do in the future. I'm simply going to show you what the law actually says about income taxes, how those laws are supposed to be applied, and then given what the law actually does say, what it is possible to legally do under those laws.

The Constitution of the united States of America, the Supreme Law of the Land, establishes a limited federal government in America, representative of WE THE PEOPLE. Wherein the Federal government is forever bound as the SERVANT of the PEOPLE, never to become their master. In this context, "Limited" means "bound by law"! The IRS has turned this relationship upside down, effectively enslaving the People to the existing political system and parties, denying the People their FREE CHOICE, and effectively creating a political system where it is virtually impossible to object to the activities of our supposedly representative government.

Most Americans fear the IRS out of ignorance of the law. This information has been assembled in an effort to help all American citizens overcome their own unfounded, hysterical fears of the IRS by making them knowledgeable

about the law imposing income taxes, and how those laws affect you.

THE CODE HAS BEEN BROKEN

The Paperwork Reduction Act Notice of 1980 is the key to exposing and understanding the truth about America's tax laws. The truth has been in print (the code) since 1916, and reaffirmed in print as recently as 1985, when the IRS complied with the mandates of the Paperwork Reduction Act by providing to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) the Table shown in 26 CFR 602.101. The IRS cannot ask you for more information than this Table shows is required, in association with any demand for information made under any given code section from Title 26 (the Internal Revenue Code). (In an effort to reduce paperwork and the administrative costs associated with its maintenance.)

The following chapters, all showing the actual legal code sections that the IRS itself cites, should serve as proof beyond any reasonable doubt what-so-ever that the income tax laws are being intentionally misapplied to all American citizens. To understand just how important the Paperwork Reduction Act is to the tax laws, keep in mind that since 1980 the IRS has been required by law to provide a notice of it (Notice 609) with every single piece of correspondence they issue to individuals. You can find a complete copy of this notice on Page 1 of any Form 1040 Tax Instruction Booklet, but the IRS won't tell you about the Table in the Code of Federal Regulations where you can

look up the information collection requirements of any given code section.

United States Code Annotated - General Index

The United States Code is voluminous and very complex. Let's start at the beginning. Here, in the General Index for the United States Code Annotated from 1994, under the major heading Citizenship, we try to find an entry for Income Tax. But we only find:

CITIZENSHIP, cont'd.

.....

Illegitimate Children 8 1409

Immigration, this index

Imprisonment,

Citizens by foreign governments 22 1732

*Detention of citizens prohibited except by
Act of Congress 18 4001*

Indians,

Generally 8 1401

.....

Where is income tax? There is nothing listed or shown for Income Tax in the General Index under 'Citizenship'. It would be there between 'Imprisonment' and 'Indians' if it existed. It's not listed. There are no income tax code statutes shown here in the General Index as being applicable under 'Citizenship' because, as you will see, the income tax does not apply to a citizen's domestic income earned by right, and the law accurately records that fact.

Here, in the General Index again, we see the entries for Citizens under the major heading Income tax.

INCOME TAX, Cont'd.

.....

Citizens,

About to depart from U.S., waiver of requirements
as to termination of taxable year 26 USC 6851
Living abroad, exclusion of earned income and
foreign housing costs from gross income 26 USC 911

Civic Leagues,

.....

How many code sections are shown here as being applicable to citizens under income tax? There are two sections, and they both have to do with what? They both have to do with FOREIGN countries. So, here in the General Index Annotated, we immediately get our first indication that the income tax laws may be substantially different than what we have been led to believe is true by our government. Furthermore, if one looks up "Income Tax" under the major heading of "Aliens" in the General Index Annotated , one will find nine pages of code sections listed as being applicable, eight of those pages relate to income tax sections relevant to nonresident aliens.

Income Duty of 1861

Most people in America believe that income taxes first started in America between 1913 and 1916. That is not correct. Income tax first appeared in the law at the beginning of the Civil War, in 1861. The text of the law read:

INCOME DUTY

SEC. 89. And be it further enacted, That for the purpose of modifying and reenacting, as hereinafter provided, so much of an act, entitled "An act to provide increased revenue from imports to pay interest on the public debt, and for other purposes," approved fifth of August, eighteen hundred and sixty-one, as

relates to income tax;...

The first income tax was an income DUTY, imposed as a duty on foreign IMPORTS, as a FOREIGN TAX. Duties are collected at the ports of entry to a nation, THEY ARE NOT IMPOSED ON DOMESTIC ACTIVITIES.

A Note From the Commissioner

If we look at what the IRS tells us about income taxes on the first page of the Form 1040 Tax Instruction Booklet from 1994 (long before our problem was as severe and the internet had not allowed information to have been distributed as of yet), we find a "Note From the Commissioner", which is usually one of the first things in the booklet. This one is from Margaret Richardson, a past Commissioner of the IRS. It states in part:

Dear Taxpayer,

Thank you for making this nation's tax system the most effective system of voluntary compliance in the world. The key to maintaining that system is ensuring that you are treated fairly and equitably, that your privacy is protected, and that our tax system is as simple and understandable as possible....

Margaret Milner Richardson

The first sentence here is:

"Thank you for making this nation's tax system the most effective system of voluntary compliance in the world."

There it is! Voluntary Compliance. Why do they say that? What does that mean? And how does it affect you, a sovereign American Man or Woman? We will come back to those questions in a bit, but I would point out here that this opening statement is not unusual. Nearly every instruction booklet from past years has opened with some variation of this statement from the Commissioner.

The next thing we're going to take a look at is the Privacy Act & Paperwork Reduction Act, Notice 609, which is required by law to be supplied to you by the IRS with any correspondence you receive from the IRS. It states in pertinent part:

Privacy Act and Paperwork Reduction Act

Notice 609

The Privacy Act of 1974 and Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 say that when we ask you for information, we must first tell you our legal right to ask for the information, why we are asking for it, and how it will be used. We must also tell you what could happen if we do not receive it and whether your response is voluntary, required to obtain a benefit, or mandatory under the law.

This notice applies to all papers you file with us,

including this tax return. It also applies to any questions we need to ask you so we can complete, correct, or process your return; figure your tax; and collect tax, interest, or penalties.

Our legal right to ask for information is Internal Revenue Code sections 6001, 6011, and 6012(a) and their regulations. They say that you must file a return or statement with us for any tax you are liable for. Your response is mandatory under these sections.....

We ask for tax return information to carry out the tax laws of the United States. We need it to figure and collect the right amount of tax.....

If you do not file a return , do not provide the information we ask for, or provide fraudulent information, the law says that you may be charged penalties and, in certain cases, you may be subject to criminal prosecution.....

Please keep this notice with your records. It may help you if we ask for other information. If you have questions about the rules for filing and giving

information, please call or visit any Internal Revenue Service office.

In the third paragraph it states:

"Our legal right to ask for information is Internal Revenue Code Sections 6001, 6011 & 6012(a) and their regulations. They say that you must file a return or statement with us for any tax you are liable for."

Now does that say you have to file a return for taxes that you are not liable for? No! Does it state who is liable? No! Does it even state what liability is? No! And that raises the legal questions, what is liability, and who is liable?

Now keep in mind that this does not actually say that this is their right to ask you (the citizen) for information. It doesn't actually say from whom information may be requested, it just establishes that a legal right to request information does exist. But from whom may information actually be requested under these laws? Well, they cite three code sections in this notice, what do they say ?

6001. Notice or regulations requiring records, statements, and special returns.

Every person liable for any tax imposed by this title or for the collection thereof, shall keep such records, render such statements, make such returns, and comply with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may from time to time prescribe. Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary it is necessary, he may require any person, by notice served upon such person or by regulations, to make such returns, render such statements or keep such records as the Secretary deems sufficient to show whether or not such person is liable for tax. The only records which an employer shall be required to keep under this section in connection with charged tips shall be charge receipts, records necessary to comply with section 6053(c), and copies of statements furnished by employees under section 6053(a).

Notice that the first three words in this code section are:

"Every person liable". Does this code section actually establish liability or, does it simply list the consequences of being liable, leaving the reader to "assume" that he or she is in fact made liable elsewhere in the Code. Indeed it does not establish liability, it merely lists the consequences of being liable. It is interesting to note, that the second sentence here says:

"Whenever in the judgment of the Secretary it is necessary, he may require any person, by notice served upon such person or by regulations, to make such returns, render such statements or keep such records as the Secretary deems sufficient to show whether or not such person is liable for tax."

Have you ever received notice from the Commissioner? Are you sure that you're required to make such returns, render such statements or keep such records? Which records, which statements, and which returns are required?

Do you see in the third sentence where it refers to "employers". Does this code section apply to employers? Are employers liable for tax? (see Section 3403 Liability for Tax)

Section 6011 was the next section cited in Notice 609 by the IRS as their right to request information, and it says:

6011. General requirement of return, statement, or list.

(a) 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 and regulations prescribed by the Secretary. Every person required to make a return or statement shall include therein the information required by such forms or regulations.....

The first sentence states in pertinent part:

"... any person made liable..."

Does this code section actually make anyone liable, or again, does it just list the consequences of being made liable, leaving the reader to assume or presume, again, that liability exists, or is actually established elsewhere in the code? Neither of these code sections, 6001 nor 6011, actually establish liability. They simply establish the consequences of being liable, or being made liable. So, we're going to look for Code sections that do state some person is liable, or made liable for the payment of the tax, that would trigger the filing requirements established by these sections.

The last section referenced by the IRS in Notice 609, as their right to ask for information, Section 6012, states in pertinent part:

6012. Persons required to make returns of income.

(a) 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, except that a return shall not be required of an individual -

(i) who is not married, is not a surviving spouse, is not a head of a household and for the taxable year has gross income of less than the sum of the exemption amount plus the basic standard deduction applicable to such an individual.

(ii) who is a household and for the taxable year has gross income of less than the sum of the exemption amount plus the basic standard deduction applicable to such an individual.

(iii) who is a surviving spouse and for the taxable year has gross income of less than the sum of the exemption amount plus the basic standard deduction applicable to such an individual.

(iv) who is entitled to make a joint return and whose gross income, when combined with the gross income of his spouse, is, for the taxable year, less than the sum of twice the exemption amount plus the basic standard deduction applicable to such a joint return, but only if such individual and his spouse, at the close of the taxable year, had the same household as their home.

Clause (iv) shall not apply if for the taxable year such spouse makes a separate return or any other taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for such spouse under section 151(c)....

This section states:

"Returns with respect to income taxes under Subtitle A shall be made by the following:"

and Subsection (1)(A) says,

"Every individual having for the taxable year..."

So, the filing requirement identified here is being established for "individuals". Now, where is the tax imposed on individuals that would correspond to this filing requirement, and what is the exact legal nature of the specific requirement that is established by this section, under that section (the imposing statute)? This Code

section would appear to be properly related to individuals and their corresponding filing requirement, but what are its legal limitations, as recorded in the law?

Structural Organization of Title

First, a short explanation regarding the organization of the Tax laws in the United States Code. The tax law of the United States of America is in Title 26 of the United States Code (Internal Revenue Code). Title 26 is broken into a number of Subtitles, each Subtitle being a distinct and separate section of the law as the table below shows:

<i>Tax or Topic</i>	<i>Subtitle</i>	<i>Chapters</i>	<i>Sections</i>
<i>Income Taxes</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>1 to 6</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Estate & Gift Taxes</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>2001</i>
<i>Employment Taxes</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>21 to 25</i>	<i>3101</i>
<i>Miscellaneous Excises</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>31 to 47</i>	<i>4041</i>
<i>Alcohol, Tobacco-Other Excises</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>51 to 54</i>	<i>5001</i>
<i>Procedure and Administration</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>61 to 80</i>	<i>6001</i>
<i>Joint Committee on Taxation</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>91 to 92</i>	<i>8001</i>
<i>Financing Presidential Campaigns</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>95 to 96</i>	<i>9001</i>
<i>Trust Fund Code</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>98</i>	<i>9500</i>

This examines the laws under Subtitle A Income taxes, Subtitle C Employment taxes, and Subtitle F Procedure and Administration, which applies and implements the other Subtitles under the law. The code sections we just looked at 6001, 6011 and 6012 are all from Subtitle F. Income taxes are in Subtitle A, consisting of chapters 1 - 6 of Title 26, Employment taxes are in Subtitle C, consisting of chapters 21 - 25.

It is important to understand that each Subtitle establishes a distinct and separate program, or "tax", with its own individual authority to administer within that Subtitle, over its code sections. These authorities do not automatically cross over into the other Subtitles and cannot be invoked as an authority in the other Subtitles unless it is shown as applicable within the law and its provisions (regulations).

Each Subtitle imposes its own tax, and establishes the groups of persons subject to that tax, within that specific subtitle. Just because one group of people is subject to one tax under one subtitle, does not necessarily imply that group is automatically also subject to the taxes imposed by other subtitles. To demonstrate this point one could ask "Do you pay Subtitle E taxes?". For most people, the answer is a resounding "NO". Why not, you may ask, isn't everyone subject to the law? The answer, of course, is that the group of persons subject to Subtitle E taxes are those people who engage in the manufacture and sale of alcohol and tobacco products.

As you will see, the group of people who are subject to the Subtitle C Employment Tax laws are those people who have voluntarily chosen to participate in the Social Security program. Who then, is the subject of the Subtitle A Income Tax laws, and what exactly is the true nature of this tax and its associated filing requirements? Well, Section 6012 said:

"... with respect to income taxes under Subtitle A ...",

and we are looking for the Code section where the income tax is imposed on individuals, so, we go to Title 26, Subtitle A, Chapter 1, Section 1, which states:

TITLE 26 INTERNAL REVENUE CODE (IRC)

SUBTITLE A INCOME TAXES

Chapter 1. NORMAL TAXES AND SURTAXES

Subchapter A. Determination of Tax Liability

PART 1. Tax On Individuals

1. Tax Imposed.

(a) Married individuals filing joint returns and surviving spouses. There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of

(1) every married individual (as defined in Section 7703) who makes a single return jointly with his spouse under Section 6013, and

(2) every surviving spouse (as defined in Section

2(a)), a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If taxable income is: The tax is:

Not over 32,450 - 15% of taxable income

Freedom From Government: How to reclaim your power

Over 32,450 but not over 78,400 - 4,867.50, plus 28% of the excess over 32,450.

Over 78,400 - 17,733.50, plus 31% of the excess over 78,400

(b) Heads of households. There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every head of a household (as defined in section 2(b)) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If taxable income is: Not over 26,050 - 15% of taxable income

Over 26,500 but not over 67,200 - 3,907.50, plus 28% of the excess over 26,500

Over 67,200 - 15,429.50, plus 31% of the excess over 67,200

(c) Unmarried individuals (other than surviving spouses and heads of households) There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual (other than a surviving spouse as defined in section 2(a) of the head of a household as defined in section 2(b)) who is not a married individual (as defined in section 7703) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If taxable income is: The tax is:

Not over 19,450 - 15% of taxable income

Over 19,450 but not over 47,050 - 2,917.50, plus 28% of the excess over 19,450

Over 47,050 - 10,645.50, plus 31% of the excess over 47,050

(d) Married individuals filing separate returns. There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every married individual (as defined in section 7703) who does not make a single return jointly with his spouse under section 6013, tax determined in accordance with the following table:

If taxable income is:

The tax is:

Not over 16,225

15% of taxable income

Over 16,225 but not over 39,200

2,433.75, plus 28% the excess over 16,225

Over 39,200

8,866.75, plus 31% of the excess over 39,200

(e) Estates and trusts. There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of -

(1) every estate, and

(2) every trust, taxable under this subsection a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

<i>If taxable income is:</i>	<i>The tax is:</i>
<i>Not over 3,300</i>	<i>15% of taxable income</i>
<i>Over 3,300 but not over 9,900</i>	<i>495 , plus 28% of the excess over 3,300</i>
<i>Over 9,900</i>	<i>2,343 plus 31% of the excess over 9,900</i>

(f) *Adjustments*

Does all of this look familiar? It should, this is the Income Tax you probably pay every April 15th of every year and it sure looks like everyone has to pay, doesn't it?

But wait, notice that the language in each of the paragraphs of this section reads in the form:

"...there is hereby imposed on the taxable income ... a tax ...". (emphasis mine)

Notice that in all of these paragraphs the tax is not actually imposed on the individual him or herself, it is imposed on the taxable income of the individual. So, that leads to the question, what is taxable income? What everybody in America apparently does: is assume that they have taxable income, and then assume that they have liability for tax, and then they assume that Form 1040 is the correct form to file to satisfy that liability for tax on taxable income that they have as individuals, So they fill out Form 1040 and send it in to the IRS to pay the tax. But, is that the correct and proper legal procedure to follow under the law? Certainly that is what the IRS tells us to do,

but what does the law actually say? What information is legally required from U.S. citizens to satisfy this liability for tax on taxable income established in Chapter 1, Section 1, by the (income) tax imposed?

For the answer to that question we must go back to the Paperwork Reduction Act. The Paperwork Reduction Act effectively says that the United States government cannot require, or collect, more information from citizens than is absolutely necessary to satisfy the requirements of the law. And under this Act, which was passed in 1980, the IRS was required to file with OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, a list of all the code sections that required information to be collected from individuals, together with the cross-referenced list of forms to be used to satisfy those legal information collection requirements for any given code section.

This table is incorporated into this law in the Code of Federal Regulations in 26 C.F.R. 602.101, whose introduction states that the purpose of this regulatory section is to comply with the legal requirements imposed on the government by the Paperwork Reduction Act. The IRS itself prepared and supplied this Table to OMB. It took the IRS five years to comply with the mandate of this Act to document the specific filing requirements associated with any given section, and after you see the table you will understand why the IRS did not want to release this information for over five years.

It states in pertinent parts:

PART 602 - OMB CONTROL NUMBERS UNDER THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

Section 602.101. OMB Control numbers.

(a) Purpose.. This part collects and displays the control numbers assigned to collections of information in Internal Revenue Service regulations by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980. The Internal Revenue Service intends that this part comply with the requirements of

.... (OMB regulations implementing the Paperwork Reduction Act), for the display of control numbers assigned by OMB to collections of information in Internal Revenue Service regulations....

26 CFR (4-1-94 Edition)

CFR part or section where Current identified and described OMB Control Number No.

<i>1.1-1</i>	<i>1545-0067</i>
<i>1.23-5</i>	<i>1545-0074</i>
<i>1.25-1T.....</i>	<i>1545-0922</i>
<i>1.25-2T.....</i>	<i>1545-0922</i>
<i>1.6012-0.....</i>	<i>1545-0067</i>
<i>1.6012-1.....</i>	<i>1545-0074</i>

In the portion of the table reproduced above, the left hand column shows the code section (where the income tax is imposed, Chapter 1 Section 1, designated here in the table as 1.1-1), and the right hand column shows the OMB

Document Control Number (DCN) assigned to the information collection request (the form), that is required by the code section to satisfy its legal requirements. Note that there is only one form shown here as being required by the law that imposes the income tax, and note that the form that is to be used to satisfy the requirements of this code section, where the income tax is imposed, carries OMB DCN 1545-0067. Also note that the same form is required by Regulation 1.6012-0, which corresponds to the individual's filing requirement established in Section 6012, which has already been reviewed.

It should be noted that 6012 (from Subtitle F - Procedure and Administration) is used to enforce all of the individual filing requirements established and imposed in the other Subtitles, but it does not expand or establish any new or additional requirements in association with any given section. So, while 1.6012-1 can be used to enforce (and require) the use of Form 1040 in association with those sections that actually do require it (1.23-5 etc.), IT DOES NOT AND CANNOT EXPAND THE REQUIREMENT OF SECTION 1, as shown in the table. It can enforce the requirement shown, but it cannot expand that requirement for section 1.

So, if Form 1040 is the proper form for United States citizens to file to satisfy their liability on taxable income, under the law, as listed by the IRS; that OMB Document Control Number, 1545-0067, will show up on the top of a Form 1040.

Form 1040-ES Department of the Treasury Internal Revenue Service	2012 Estimated Tax		Payment Voucher 1	OMB No. 1545-0074
				Calendar year—Due April 17, 2012
File only if you are making a payment of estimated tax by check or money order. Mail this voucher with your check or money order payable to "United States Treasury." Write your social security number and "2012 Form 1040-ES" on your check or money order. Do not send cash. Enclose, but do not staple or attach, your payment with this voucher.			Amount of estimated tax you are paying by check or money order.	
			Dollars	Cents
Print or type	Your first name and initial	Your last name	Your social security number	
	If joint payment, complete for spouse			
	Spouse's first name and initial	Spouse's last name	Spouse's social security number	
	Address (number, street, and apt. no.)			
	City, state, and ZIP code. (If a foreign address, enter city, province or state, postal code, and country.)			

For Privacy Act and Paperwork Reduction Act Notice, see instructions.
Form 1040-ES (2012) -11-

Here is the reproduced top portion of a Form 1040 from 2012, and there in the upper right hand corner, it says OMB No. 1545- 0074. Does that number match the number shown in the table as being required by the code section that imposes the tax? No! It's the wrong number! The Table in the Code of Federal Regulations shows that the law requires the form with OMB Document Control Number 1545-0067, not 1545-0074.

It's probably worth saying that 1545 is the prefix assigned by OMB to all IRS documents. But OMB Document Control Number 1545-0074 is assigned to Form 1040, and the form required by the law carries DCN 1545-0067. So what form does carry the OMB Document Control Number 1545-0067?

Form 2555 Foreign Earned Income |OMB No. 1545-0067

For Use by U.S. Citizens and Resident Aliens Only

Here, you see at the top of the form, in the upper right hand corner it says: OMB No. 1545-0067. Now that matches the entry in the CFR Table! And what is the title of this form? Form 2555 Foreign Earned Income! And what does it say underneath the title?

"For Use by U.S. Citizens and Resident Aliens Only"

Now does Form 1040, say anything about who is supposed to use it ? No, it doesn't! But Form 2555 Foreign Earned Income states who is supposed to use it, "U.S. citizens and resident aliens only". This is the form that's listed in the law as being required to satisfy the information reporting requirements associated with the individual's liability for income tax on "taxable income", imposed by Section 1 in Chapter 1, the income tax, and, it is the same form shown as being required under Section 6012, which was cited by the IRS itself in Notice 609.

I'll mention that here again, under the law, we find that the income tax, for citizens, appears to be related only to foreign income; the tax is imposed not upon the citizen but upon any foreign earned income of the citizen. Remember we started with the General Index for the United States Code Annotated and found that under Income Tax, under Citizens, it only referenced foreign countries, and here again, we find that the only form required under the law, only reports foreign income. The law is consistent so far, isn't it? It doesn't agree with what we are told to believe by the IRS, but it agrees with itself, without contradiction, doesn't it?

So what is the proper legal use of Form 1040? The next document will help explain things.

TREASURY DECISION 2313

Income Taxes

Treasury Department

Office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue

Washington, D.C., March 21, 1916

To collectors of internal revenue:

Under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railway Co., decided January 21, 1916, it is hereby held that income accruing to nonresident aliens in the form of interest from the bonds and dividends on the stock of domestic corporations is subject to the income tax imposed by the act of October 3, 1913.

Nonresident aliens are not entitled to the specific exemption designated in paragraph C of the income-tax law, but are liable for the normal and additional tax upon the entire net income "from all property owned, and of every business, trade, or profession carried on in the United States," computed upon the basis prescribed in the law.

The responsible heads, agents, or representatives of nonresident aliens, who are in charge of the property owned or business carried on within the United States, shall make a full and complete return of the income there from on Form 1040, revised, and shall pay any and all tax, normal and additional, assessed upon the income received by them in behalf of their nonresident alien principals.

The person, firm, company, copartnership, corporation, joint-stock company, or association, and insurance company in the United States, citizen or resident alien, in whatever capacity acting, having the control, receipt, disposal, or payment of

fixed or determinable annual or periodic gains, profits, and income of whatever kind, to a nonresident alien, under any contract or otherwise, which payment shall represent income of a nonresident alien from the exercise of any trade or profession within the United States, shall deduct and withhold from such annual or periodic gains, profits, and income, regardless of amount, and pay to the office of the United States Government authorized to receive the same such sum as will be sufficient to pay the normal tax of 1 per cent imposed by law, and shall make an annual return on Form 1042. (emphasis added)

This is the only place that I have ever been able to find the proper explanation, actually, any explanation whatsoever from the United States government, for the proper use of Form 1040. Treasury Decision 2313, handed down in 1916, instructs the collectors of the Internal Revenue on how to implement the income tax laws as imposed under the 16th Amendment. This Treasury Decision is the result of a Supreme Court ruling, referenced in the first paragraph as "Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railway Co.", which was decided January 21, 1916, and from which

"... it is hereby held that the income accruing to nonresident aliens in the form of interest from the bonds and dividends on the stock of domestic corporations is subject to the income tax imposed by the act of October 3, 1913."

The second paragraph states:

"Nonresident aliens are not entitled to the specific exemption designated in paragraph C of the income-tax law, but are liable for the normal and additional tax upon the entire net income from all property owned, and of every business, trade, or profession carried on in the United States," computed upon the basis prescribed in the law."

Now, the first paragraph says that nonresident aliens are subject to the tax. The second paragraph says that nonresident aliens are liable for the tax and that they are not allowed to claim the exemption designated as paragraph C. That implies that citizens are allowed to claim

the exemption in paragraph C, and that citizens are not liable for the tax, because they are not subject to the tax, because it was not specified in paragraph one that citizens are subject. Now let's read the third paragraph, and keep in mind that we are going to look for a Paragraph C in the United States Code that exempts citizens from income tax. The third paragraph states:

"The responsible heads, agents, or representatives of nonresident aliens, who are in charge of the property owned or business carried on within the United States, shall make a full and complete return of the income therefrom on Form 1040, revised, and shall pay any and all tax, normal and additional, assessed upon the income received by them in behalf of their nonresident alien principals."

Now there's the proper legal use of Form 1040. It is to be used by United States citizens to report the income of his or her foreign principals. It is not to be used to report the citizen's own personal domestic income. Again, this is the only place where I have ever seen a legal explanation from the government for the proper legal use of Form 1040, and now I think you know why. Form 1040 is to be used by withholding agents to report the income of foreign principals. It is not to be used by U.S. citizens to report their own income, and that's why voluntary self assessment and voluntary compliance are so important to the IRS. Because the current mythical system doesn't work unless the citizen voluntarily MISAPPLIES the law and uses the wrong form mistakenly, to voluntarily assess his own domestic income for income tax.

This Treasury Decision references the Supreme Court decision *Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co.*, so it is time to step back, and get a little background information.

The first thing we're going to do is look at what the Constitution says about taxation. The limitations in the Constitution restricting the direct taxation of individuals and their property are found in Article 1 in two different sections. Both sections specifically restrict the Federal government as to how it may lay direct taxes on the citizens. Article 1, Section 2, Clause 3 states:

"Representative and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included within this union, according to their respective numbers"

and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 4 states:

"No capitation or other direct tax shall be laid, unless in apportionment to the Census or enumeration herein before directed to be taken."

These basic sections of the Constitution have never been repealed or amended. The Constitution still forbids the direct taxation of individuals, their property, and their rights, unless the tax is apportioned to the State governments for collection.

In 1895, Congress tried to pass an Act that imposed income taxes on the interest and dividends of U.S. citizens on deposit in U.S. banks. This Act was immediately struck down in *Pollock vs Farmer's Loan and Trust Co.* (157 US 429), wherein the Supreme Court ruled that it is unconstitutional to impose an income tax on the interest and dividends of United States citizens on deposits in U.S.

banks. The court ruled that the tax was unconstitutional because it was a direct tax that was not apportioned as required by the Constitution. This decision has never been overturned.

Then, in 1913 Congress passed the 16th Amendment which says,

"Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on income, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration."

So that changed everything, right? Well no! That is not what the Supreme Court ruled. What the Supreme Court ruled, in *Brushaber vs. Union Pacific R.R. Co.* and in *Stanton vs. Baltic Mining Co.*, is that since the provisions of Article I, requiring that direct taxes be apportioned, were not repealed, they are still in full force and effect. And, that since the language of the 16th Amendment specifies that the income tax is to be a tax without apportionment, then it cannot be a direct tax, because otherwise the Constitution would inherently contradict itself, which cannot be allowed to happen. Article I cannot prohibit direct taxation unless apportioned, while the 16th Amendment grants the power to lay direct taxes without apportionment, because then the Constitution would inherently contradict itself and could no longer serve as a valid foundation for our Law. So, to specifically prevent the Constitution from contradicting itself, the Supreme Court ruled that since the 16th Amendment provides for an income tax without apportionment, then the income tax cannot be a direct tax.

But, there are only two major classes of taxation authorized in the Constitution; direct taxes and indirect taxes. So, if the income tax cannot be a direct tax, then it must be an indirect tax. Indirect taxes are classified into three minor categories in the Constitution: imposts, duties and excises. If you remember, the income tax started in 1861 as an Income Duty, imposed only on foreign imports, so obviously it was contained and allowed within the Constitutional category of duties. As a duty it was only imposed on the flow of foreign goods into America, NOT DOMESTIC GOODS, NOR DOMESTIC INCOME.

Obviously today, the income tax is not currently being enforced as a duty, so the questions are: "Did the 16th Amendment create a new congressional power to tax directly?", and; "How did the 16th Amendment change the income tax?".

The answer to the first question was supplied by the Supreme Court in *Stanton v. Baltic Mining Co.*, 240 US 112 (1916), stating:

"...by the previous ruling, it was settled that the provisions of the 16th Amendment conferred no new power of taxation but simply prohibited the previous complete and plenary power of income taxation possessed by Congress from the beginning from being TAKEN OUT of the category of indirect taxation to which it inherently belonged.." (emphasis added)

The Supreme Court clearly states that the 16th Amendment did not create a new power to tax the People in a direct fashion without apportionment, AS IS FRAUDULENTLY CLAIMED BY THE IRS. So, if it is NOT A DIRECT TAX then it is still an indirect tax, but, possibly, no

longer a duty. Then; "What kind of tax is the income tax now?"

In the "previous ruling" referenced above, *Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. Co.* 240 US 1 (1916), the court stated:

"...taxation on income was in its nature an excise ...",

and

"...taxes on such income had been sustained as excises in the past...".

The Court ruled that the 16th Amendment effectively transformed the income tax from an indirect duty to an indirect excise. It is not a direct tax without apportionment. And, if we examine the law closely, that is exactly what we find; that the income tax is imposed and applied under the law, as an indirect excise.

So, what is an excise tax ? Fortunately, the Supreme Court used to know what it was doing, and both of these decisions, *Brushaber* and *Stanton*, refer you to another case handed down five years earlier, *Flint vs Stone Tracy Co.* 220 U.S. 107 (1911), in which the Supreme Court ruled that excise taxes are:

"...taxes laid on the manufacture, sale or consumption of commodities within the country, upon licenses to pursue certain occupations and upon corporate privileges; the requirement to pay such taxes involves the exercise of the privilege and if business is not done in the manner described no tax is payable...it is the privilege which is the subject of the tax and not the mere buying, selling or handling of goods."

The Supreme Court effectively establishes with this ruling that excise taxes are manufacturing taxes, sales

taxes, and taxes on privileges. Privileges in the form of either licenses to pursue certain occupations, corporate privileges, and any other privileges granted to the individual by the government as well. One of these other privileges, is the privilege of being protected by the United States government in a foreign country under a tax treaty. The government normally would have no jurisdiction or ability to protect you or your business interests in a foreign country, but because of the existence of the tax treaty with that foreign government, your business is protected by the U.S. government outside their jurisdictional boundaries (the United States). In other words you would be receiving a benefit from the government wherein the government could legally expect reciprocity in the form of a legitimate tax. That benefit, namely protection, being afforded by the tax treaty, is construed to be a privilege granted to you by the government; and therefore, the income earned in that foreign country under the tax treaty, is privileged income and subject to the income tax.

And that is why the General Index shows that there are only two code sections that apply to citizens, both having to do with foreign countries. And that is why the form that is actually required by the law is Form 2555 -Foreign Earned Income. Because that is the privileged income that you have as "taxable income", upon which you have liability to satisfy. And that is the only filing requirement that you have as an individual American citizen under the law!!! If you have no foreign earned income under tax treaties and no foreign principals to whom money is paid, then you don't have to file anything under the letter of the

law because other income, domestic income, is earned by right, not privilege. It is a long and well established rule of law that the government cannot tax your rights, nor may it tax the proceeds derived from the simple exercise of those rights, and the law accurately reflects and captures that Constitutional truth. It is the IRS that ignores the truth, ignores the law, ignores the implementing regulations and tramples your citizen's rights into the mud, because, as you will see, their actions are certainly not supported by the law, or even properly, legally authorized under it.

There is no requirement to file a Form 1040 reporting your own domestic income because the form is only supposed to be used by non-resident aliens and those U.S. citizens who serve as "agents" to aliens, and have foreign principals to whom monies are being paid. As the "agents" for those foreign principals they are required to deduct and withhold and pay the income tax, not on their own income, but on the income of the foreign principals, who do not possess the same rights as a citizen.

Now, the reason why these facts are so little known in America, and in the legal community itself, is that if you just look up the *Brushaber vs Union Pacific R.R. Co.* decision and read it quickly it appears that the Supreme Court tells the U.S. citizen (Brushaber) that the tax is constitutional and he has to pay it. It reads as if the citizen is being told by the Court that he has to pay the income tax. But, the fact of the matter is Frank Brushaber was the U.S. agent for a group of foreigners who had stock in the Union Pacific Railroad. Under the 16th Amendment he (Brushaber) and the Union Pacific Railroad were both made

withholding agents and were both ordered by the government to deduct, withhold and pay over the income tax to the government, on the foreigners' income from the stock.

Now, Frank Brushaber filed this suit on behalf of his foreign principals, who had no standing as foreigners in the U.S. courts to file themselves, and that is why Brushaber's name is on the decision. The foreigners lost the suit. The foreigners were essentially told by the courts that it was a privilege to be allowed to have access to the United States marketplace and earn income there. That privilege is granted by the U.S. government, which is given, in the Constitution, full authority over foreigners in America and foreign affairs with other nations. The Court determined that it is the U.S. government that allows foreigners the privilege of earning money in America, therefore; any income that they earn under that extended privilege is taxable income, and the citizen who acts as the foreigner's agent has to withhold and pay the income tax to the federal Government. In this case the citizen essentially got told by the court that you have to pay the tax because you're the withholding agent for these foreigners upon whom the income tax is imposed.

But the decision simply isn't written up so that it's clear about the circumstances of the case. You have to research it thoroughly. If you just look it up, it looks like the U.S. citizen, Frank Brushaber, gets told by the government, "the tax is Constitutional, and you have to pay it", and the IRS has found it very easy to deceive the American people as to the true nature of this Supreme Court decision because of

the way this decision is written. In fact, if you call the IRS and ask them why the income tax is Constitutional, they will answer that the Supreme Court ruled it was Constitutional in *Brushaber v. Union Pacific Railroad Co.* But they won't tell you that this was a case about the taxation of foreigners, AND HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THE DIRECT TAXATION OF CITIZENS, as fraudulently claimed by the IRS for over 60 years.

Finally, from the Congressional Research Service in 1979:

SOME CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS REGARDING

THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX LAWS

By

Howard Zaritsky

Legislative Attorney

American Law Division

May 25, 1979

Report No. 79-131 A

*... In *Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. Co.* (1916), the Supreme Court held that the income tax, including a tax on dealings in property, was an indirect tax, rather than a direct tax, and that:*

*"the command of the amendment that all income taxes shall not be subject to the rule of apportionment by a consideration of the source from which the taxed income may be derived FORBIDS the application to such taxes of the rule applied in the *Pollock* case by which alone such taxes were removed from the great class of excises, duties, and imposts subject to the rule of uniformity and were placed under the other or direct class." 240 U.S. 1 18-19 (1916)*

This same view was reiterated by the Court in *Stanton v. Baltic Mining Co.* (1916) in which the court stated that the:

"Sixteenth Amendment conferred no new power of taxation but simply prohibited the previous complete and plenary power of income taxation possessed by Congress from the beginning from being taken out of the category of indirect taxation to which it inherently belonged." 240 U.S. 112 (1916)

Therefore, it is clear that the income tax is an "indirect" tax of the broad category of "Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises," subject to the rule of uniformity, rather than the rule of apportionment.....

Withholding Agent Defined

Remember that the third paragraph of Treasury Decision 2313 essentially says that (withholding) "agents", or "representatives", are going to withhold tax (from nonresident aliens). But, what is the legal definition of a "Withholding Agent", who appears to be the legal entity responsible for the withholding and payment of income taxes?

Chapter 79, from Subtitle F Procedure and Administration, contains many of the legal definitions for the terms used in Title 26.

7701 Definitions.

(a). When used in this Title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof--

(1). Person - The term "person" shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.

(16). Withholding Agent. - The term "Withholding Agent" means any person required to deduct and withhold any tax under the provisions of sections 1441, 1442, 1443, or 1461."

First note that the word "person" is not restricted to meaning just people. For purposes of the application of the tax laws, "person" means any entity subject to the tax laws. But, nevertheless, it appears as though a withholding agent can definitely withhold tax, can't he? Well, let us look at what is truly authorized by these Code Sections referenced here, in the definition. The first thing to point out is that all of the code sections that start with `14' are in Chapter 3 of Title 26. Chapter 3 is titled:

WITHHOLDING OF TAX ON NONRESIDENT ALIENS AND FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

These sections, 1441, 1442, 1443, and 1461, cited in the definition of a Withholding Agent, state:

1441. Withholding of Tax on Nonresident Aliens.

(a) General rule. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c) all persons, in whatever capacity acting having the control, receipt, custody, disposal or payment of any of the items of income specified in subsection (b)(to the extent that any of such items constitutes gross income from sources within the United States), of any nonresident alien individual, or of any foreign partnership shall deduct and withhold from such items a tax equal to 30 percent thereof, except that in the case of any items of income specified in the second sentence of subsection (b), the tax shall be equal to 14 percent of such item.

(b) Income items. ...

Section 1441 only authorizes withholding from nonresident aliens.

1442 . Withholding of tax on foreign corporations.

(a) General rule. In the case of foreign corporations subject to taxation under this subtitle, there shall be deducted and withheld at the source in the same manner

and on the same items of income as is provided in Section 1441 a tax equal to 30% thereof.

(b) Exemption. Subject to such terms and conditions as may be provided by regulations prescribed by the Secretary, subsection (a) shall not apply in the case of a foreign corporations engaged in trade of business in the United States if the Secretary determines that the requirements of subsection (a) impose an undue administrative burden and that the collection of the tax imposed by section 881 on such corporation will not be jeopardized by the exemption.

(c) Exception for certain possessions corporations.

For purposes of this section, the term "foreign corporation" does not include a corporation created or organized in Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Marianna Islands, or the Virgin Islands or under the law of any such possession if the requirements of subparagraphs (A),(B), and (C) of section 881(b)(1) are met with respect to such corporation.

Section 1442 only authorizes the withholding from foreign corporations.

1443 Foreign Tax Exempt Organizations

(a) Income subject to section 511. In the case of income of a foreign organization subject to the tax imposed by section 511, this chapter shall apply to income includible under section 512 in computing its unrelated business taxable income, but only to the extent and subject to such conditions as may be provided under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) Income subject to section 4948. In the case of income of a foreign organization subject to the tax imposed by section 4948(a), this chapter shall apply, except that the deduction and withholding shall be at the rate of 4 percent and shall be subject to such conditions as may be provided under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 1443 only authorizes the withholding from foreign tax exempt organizations.

The last section referenced in the definition of a Withholding Agent, 1461, states:

1461 Liability for withheld tax.

Every person required to deduct and withhold any tax under this chapter is hereby made liable for such tax and is hereby indemnified against the claims and demands of any person for the amount of any payments made in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

Section 1461 says withholding agents are made liable for the payment of taxes they withhold from individuals (foreigners). Well, what do you know? Here is a code section where someone is made liable for such tax. And who is made liable? The withholding agents are made liable for the tax, and that triggers the filing requirements of 6011. Remember 6011, we were looking for someone who was made liable for payment of the tax, and here it is. 6011 is the filing requirement for withholding agents, not citizens, or even individuals. Withholding agents are made liable in Section 1461 for the payment of taxes withheld, and that liability triggers the filing requirements associated with and under Section 6011. And who are Withholding agents authorized to withhold income taxes from? Foreigners, and foreigners only. And what else does 1461 also say, that they are :

"indemnified against the claims and demands of any person for the amount of any payment made in accordance with the provisions of this chapter".

And what Chapter is this from? Chapter 3 - Withholding from Foreigners. And that means that if they wrongfully withhold from someone other than a foreigner, like a citizen, they're not indemnified from claims against them for wrongful withholding. So, U.S. citizens who have income tax wrongfully withheld from them, can sue the withholding agent to have those moneys returned.

Who are the withholding agents? Well, your bank is a withholding agent, your stock broker is a withholding agent, your employer is NOT a withholding agent. Your employer is your employer and employers are defined for purposes of implementing the employment taxes imposed in Subtitle C, and they don't have anything to do with income taxes under Subtitle A, other than the fact that they are apparently authorized to withhold income taxes at the source which we are going to look at in a minute. It is clear that withholding agents can only withhold from foreigners, and that they are only indemnified for withholding under Chapter 3, which, as we have seen, is only from foreigners.

We have just examined the complete legal authority of a "Withholding Agent" to withhold income taxes and, as you can see for yourself, there is no authority anywhere in the law for a withholding agent to withhold income tax from a U.S. citizen. WHY? Because the tax is not imposed on the domestic income of citizens earned by right!

Remember the mysterious paragraph C, that nonresident aliens cannot claim, referenced in the third paragraph of Treasury Decision 2313. Here is Section 6654 - Failure by individual to pay estimated income tax. Take careful note of paragraph (e)(2)(C).

6654. Failure by individual to pay estimated income tax.

(a) Addition to the tax. In the case of any underpayment of estimated tax by an individual, except as provided in subsection (d), there shall be added to the tax under chapter 1 and the tax under chapter 2 for the taxable year an amount determined at an annual rate established under section 6621 upon the amount of

the underpayment (determined under subsection(b)) for the period of the underpayment (determined under subsection (c)).

.....

(e) Exceptions.

(1) Where tax is small amount

(2) Where no tax liability for preceding taxable year.

No addition to tax shall be imposed under subsection (a) for any taxable year if -

A) the preceding taxable year was a taxable year of 12 months,

B) the individual did not have any liability for tax the preceding taxable year, and

C) the individual was a citizen or resident of the United States throughout the preceding taxable year.

(3) Waiver in certain cases ...

When you file a Form 1040, what you are actually doing is paying estimated income tax. And this Section, 6654, addresses the failure by an individual to pay estimated income tax. Subsection (e) addresses the exceptions for that failure. Within subsection (e), Subsection (2) provides that where there is "no tax liability for preceding taxable year" then "No addition to tax shall be imposed under subsection (a) for any taxable year if" the conditions in subparagraph (A),(B)and (C) are met.

Remember that citizens don't have any liability for tax on domestic income, according to the Paperwork Reduction Act tables in the Code of Federal Regulations relating to the tax imposed and the liability established under Chapter 1 Section 1 - Tax Imposed. It is nonresident aliens who are liable according to Treasury Decisions 2313.

Now let's look at conditions (A) and (B) as well. (A) says, "the preceding taxable year was a taxable year of 12 months". Well, just about everyone satisfies that condition, and (B) says: "the individual did not have any liability for tax for the preceding taxable year". We've seen that all citizens who do not have foreign earned income or foreign principals satisfy this condition, and then we have, again, (C) "the individual was a citizen or resident..." . Citizens and residents aliens are excepted from the failure to pay. Here is the mysterious paragraph C referenced in Treasury Decision 2313, excepting citizens from the failure to file and pay estimated income tax.

If you still are skeptical and don't believe me, here's Section 1.1441-5 from The Code of Federal Regulations.

26 C.F.R. 1.1441-5 Claiming to be a person not subject to withholding.

(a) Individuals. For purposes of chapter 3 of the code an individual's written statement that he or she is a citizen of the United States may be relied upon by the payer of the income as proof that such individual is a citizen or resident of the United States. This statement shall be furnished to the withholding agent in duplicate. An alien may claim residence in the United States by filing form 1078 with the withholding agent in duplicate in lieu of the above statement.

(b) Partnerships and Corporations.

This corresponds to Section 1441 of the United States Code which we reviewed earlier. It clearly states:

"For purposes of chapter 3 of the Code an individual's written statement that he or she is a citizen or resident of the United States may be relied upon by the payer of the income as proof that such individual is a citizen or resident of the United States."

And therefore, is not subject to the withholding of income taxes. This is confirmed in Publication 515, the instruction booklet from the IRS, to the employer, on how to implement the withholding regulations. In the section of this booklet titled "WITHHOLDING EXEMPTIONS AND REDUCTIONS" it states,

WITHHOLDING EXEMPTIONS AND REDUCTIONS

You should withhold any required tax if facts indicate that the individual, or the fiduciary, to whom you are to pay the income is a nonresident alien. However, the alien may be allowed an exemption from withholding or a reduced rate of withholding as explained here.

Evidence of Residence. If an individual gives you a written statement stating that he or she is a citizen or resident of the United States, and you do not know otherwise, you do not have to withhold tax. An alien may claim U.S. residence by filing with you, Form 1078, Certificate of Alien Claiming Residence in the United States...

Why? Because as we have seen, under the law, the tax is not imposed on the domestic income of citizens, or resident aliens as it turns out, and therefore there is no need to withhold from those persons, as the instructions accurately point out.

That brings us to Section 3402 Income Tax Collected at Source. This is where most employers believe they're authorized to withhold income tax from citizens.

3402. Income tax collected at source

(a) Requirement of withholding.

(1) In general. Except as otherwise provided in this section, every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages a tax determined in accordance with tables or computational procedures prescribed by the Secretary....

(n) Employees incurring no income tax liability Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section an employer shall not be required to deduct and withhold any tax under this chapter upon a payment of wages to an employee if there is in effect with respect to such payment a withholding exemption certificate furnished to the employer by the employee certifying that the employee -

(1) incurred no liability for income tax imposed under subtitle A for his preceding taxable year, and

(2) anticipates that he will incur no liability for income tax imposed under subtitle A for his current taxable year....

(p) Voluntary withholding agreements. The Secretary is authorized by regulations to provide for withholding -

(1) from remuneration for services performed by an employee for his employer which does not constitute wages, and

(2) from any other type of payment with respect to which the Secretary finds that withholding would be appropriate under the provisions of this chapter, if the employer and the employee, or in the case of any other type of payment the person making and the person receiving the payment, agree to such withholding. Such agreement shall be made in such form and manner as the Secretary may by regulations provide.

For purposes of this chapter (and so much of subtitle F as relates to this chapter) remuneration or other payments with respect to which such agreement is made shall be treated as if they were wages paid by an employer to an employee to the extent such remuneration is paid or other payments are made during the period for which the agreement is in effect ...

As you can see in Subsection (a) it says: "every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages a tax...". If one does not read this whole section carefully, it appears that employers are authorized to withhold income taxes from your wages. But after reading subsections (n) and (p) carefully it is clear that if you tell your employer that you have no liability, with a Statement of Citizenship as referenced in 26 CFR 1.1441-5, and that you will not volunteer to agree to such

withholding, then the employer is not required to withhold tax, and in fact has no legal authority left in the law, under which withholding could be legally authorized.

Now, what's really happening in the work place? "Voluntary withholding agreements" under subsection (p), that's what's really happening. When you file a W-4 with your employer, and specify the number of deductions you are claiming on it, you are voluntarily authorizing your employer to withhold income taxes from you. Naturally, he honors your voluntary request. But, if you gave him a statement of citizenship instead of a W-4, he would not have any legal authorization at all, anywhere in the law, to withhold any taxes from you. And the employer is instructed not to withhold income taxes under such circumstances in Publication 515.

To see that Section 3402 - Income tax collected at source isn't really a legal authority to withhold income tax (rather, it is an authority to withhold employment tax) on "wages" (Even Section 61 doesn't include "wages"), one need only look as far as Section 7806.

Section 7806 - Construction of Title.

(a) Cross references. The cross references in this title to other provisions of law, where the word "see" is used, are made only for convenience, and shall be given no legal effect.

(b) Arrangement and classification. No inference, implication, or presumption of legislative construction shall be drawn or made by reason of the location or grouping of any particular section or provision or portion of this title, nor shall any table of contents, table of cross references, or similar outline, analysis, or descriptive matter relating to the contents of this title be given any legal effect. The preceding sentence also applies to the side notes and ancillary tables contained in the various prints of this Act, before its enactment into law.

As you can see the descriptive title of Sec. 3402. Income Tax Collected at Source, HAS NO LEGAL EFFECT! The actual legal authorities established by the law are the limited authorities established by the actual wording of the code section paragraphs. (That is why I'm showing you the actual code sections here. Can your accountant do this with his claims? How about your lawyer? I would like to meet anyone in the country who can rebut this presentation of law, which is why you need to know about this.) Section 3402 authorizes the collection of employment taxes on WAGES, not the collection of income taxes on INCOME.

A W-4 is the "voluntary agreement" referenced in subsection (p) of 3402. Through its execution, you voluntarily create "taxable income" in your name for Social Security purposes, and further request the withholding of income tax from your wages when you specify a number of deductions to be taken.

A Statement of Citizenship may serve as the "withholding exemption certificate" referenced in subsection (n) of 3403.

Wages

20 CFR 404.1041 Wages.

(a) the term "wages" means remuneration paid to you as an employee for employment unless specifically excluded....

(b) if you are paid wages it is not important what they are called. Salaries, fees, bonuses and commissions on sales or on insurance premiums are wages if they are paid for employment....

20 CFR 404.1003 Employment.

Employment means, generally any service covered by social security performed by an employee for his or her employer...

20 CFR 404.1004 What work is covered as employment.

(a) General requirements of employment. Unless otherwise excluded..., the work you perform as an employee for your employer is covered as employment under social security if one of the following situations applies:

(1) You perform the work within the United States...

(2) You perform the work outside the United States and you are a citizen or resident...

OK. Is that all clear? Maybe this will help:

20 CFR 404.1001 Introduction

(a)(1) In general, your social security benefits are based on your earnings that are on our records... you receive credit only for earnings that are covered for social security purposes. The earnings are covered only if your work is covered. If you are an employee.....Some work is covered by Social Security and some work is not. Also, some earnings are covered by social security and some are not. It is important that you are aware of what kinds of work and earnings are covered so that you will know whether your earnings should be on our records.

(2) If you are an employee, your covered work is called "employment."...

(3) If your work is "employment" your covered earnings are called "wages".

I'm sorry, ISN'T THIS WHERE WE STARTED with WAGES. Don't you just love circular legal definitions that define themselves with references to variations of themselves? I mean, I hope you don't just think I'm making this up on my own. I couldn't dream this stuff up, ever.

Discussion on Wages

The term "wages" is also redefined in Title 26 (in Section 3101 for purposes of use in Chapter 21 and in Section 3401 for purposes of use in Chapter 24) where it does not relate to anything but Employment taxes, for Social Security purposes, under Subtitle C. WAGES HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH INCOME TAXES UNDER SUBTITLE A. Legally, "Wages" are "covered earnings". "Covered earnings" are earnings that are taxed, at your request, for the purpose of accumulating "credits" to be used in calculating future Social Security benefit payments.

If you have given a Social Security number to your "employer" on a W-4 you have "wages", and you are an "employee" and your work is called "employment". If you do not participate in Social Security or choose to NOT provide your social security number, then you are NOT "legally" an "employee", and you just have earnings, NOT "wages", and you just have a job not "employment", and you have a boss, not an "employer". Your employer became an "employer", when he voluntarily applied for an EIN (employment identification number) to participate in the Social Security system as a WITHHOLDER OF EMPLOYMENT TAXES (employer) under subtitle C. These definitions (descriptive paragraphs) are in Title 20 - Education, because just like public schooling, Social Security is VOLUNTARY, not mandatory (one can choose a private school, and one can choose a private retirement program, if he wishes).

As a final point it should be noted that 404.1001(a)(5)(b) also states:

"...We generally do not include rules that are seldom used..."

LIKE CITIZENS THAT DON'T PARTICIPATE IN SOCIAL SECURITY !

3406. Backup Withholding.

(a) Requirement to deduct and withhold.

(1) In general. In the case of any reportable payment, if -

(A) the payee fails to furnish his TIN to the payor in the manner required,

(B) the Secretary notifies the payor that the TIN furnished by payee is incorrect,

(C) there has been a notified payee under-reporting described in subsection (c), or

(D) there has been a payee certification failure described in subsection (d), then the payor shall deduct and withhold from such payment a tax equal to 31 percent of such payment.

(2) Subparagraphs (c) and (d) of paragraph (1) apply only to interest and dividend payments. Subparagraphs (C) and (D) of paragraph (1) shall apply only to reportable interest or dividend payments

and,

3451. Income Tax Collected at Source on Interest, Dividends and Patronage Dividends.

(a) Requirement of withholding. Except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, the payor of any interest, dividend or patronage dividend shall withhold a tax equal to 10 percent of the amount of the payment.

(b) Special Rules.

(1) Time of Withholding. Except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, for the purposes of this subchapter-

(A) any payment of interest, dividend, or patronage dividend shall be treated as made, and

(B) the tax imposed by this section shall be withheld, at the time of such interest, dividend, or patronage dividend is paid or credited.

So if anyone tries to backup withhold from your SALARY OR WAGES, you ask him where that's authorized in the law, because these sections ONLY APPLY TO INTEREST AND DIVIDENDS.

There is NO authority, anywhere in the law, to backup withhold income tax from the wages or earnings of a United States citizen, only foreigners. If you have given a statement of citizenship to an broker (agent), that agent cannot even backup withhold from your interest and dividends legally because the Statement of Citizenship relieves the agent from the duty of withholding income tax from that person !

The following Code section, 6041, is where the reporting of income on a Form 1099 originates. It states, in pertinent parts:

6041. Information at source.

(a) Payments of \$600 or more. All persons engaged in a trade or business and making payment in the course of such trade to another person, of rent, salaries, wages, premiums, annuities, compensations, remunerations, emoluments, or other fixed or determinable gains, profits and income (other than payments to which section 6042(a)(1), 6044(a)(1), 6047(e), 6049(a), or 6050(N)(a) applies, and other than payments with respect to which a statement is required under the authority of section 6042(a)(2), 6044(a)(2), or 6045), of \$600 or more in any taxable year, or, in the case of such payments made by the United States, the officers or employees of the United States having information as to such payments and required to make returns in regard thereto by the regulations,

hereinafter provided for, shall render a true and accurate return to the Secretary, under such regulations and in such form and manner and to such extent as may be prescribed by the Secretary, setting forth the amount of such gains, profits and income, and the name and address of the recipient of such payment

.....

(c) Recipient to furnish name and address. When necessary to make effective the provisions of this section, the name and address of the recipient of income shall be furnished upon demand of the person paying the income. (emphasis added)

Now, do you see any requirement to provide an SSN, or any other number, to a payor who will be reporting your earnings on a Form 1099, INSTEAD of on a Form W-2 ? No, its not there.

As stated, this is the code section where the use of the Form 1099 originates (reporting payments to individuals NOT "covered" by Social Security). Carefully note that this reporting requirement DOES NOT REQUIRE a Social Security number, a TIN, or any other number from the individual. This section ONLY requires the NAME and ADDRESS of the recipient. So give your clients (and/or your employer) your name and address on a Statement of Citizenship (as specified in C.F.R. 1.1441-5 Claiming to be a Person Not Subject to Withholding), refuse to supply a social security number on a W-4 (because it is voluntary), and tell them to report your earnings on a Form 1099 instead of on a Form W-2 using your name and address as specified in the United States Code. Does that really sound so tough? Without a SSN on the Form 1099, the IRS computers will not recognize that income as "taxable income", and consequently, will never try to collect tax on it. In fact there is some question as to whether these

reports, without SSNs, ever even get entered into the IRS computer systems because without an SSN, or some other number, the record will never "link" to any "person" for reporting or auditing purposes by the IRS, and therefore is useless information that can never be utilized by the "system". Why bother enter it?

If your employer (or his lawyer) is worried about IRS penalties, show them:

Sec. 6724. Waiver; definitions and special rules.

(a) Reasonable cause waiver. No penalty shall be imposed under this part with respect to any failure if it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not to willful neglect.

This shows that your employer and clients cannot be penalized by the IRS if you have provided the correct documentation when making your requests (see C.F.R. 1.1441-5 Claiming to be a Person Not Subject to Withholding). Certainly, being relieved of the duty of withholding tax (Publication 515) under the presentation of Statement of Citizenship is "reasonable cause".

It is interesting to note that section 3403 - Liability for Tax, states:

3403. Liability for tax.

The employer shall be liable for the payment of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under this chapter, and shall not be liable to any person for the amount of any such payment. (emphasis added)

There you go, the employer is liable! The employers are liable, and that triggers the filing requirements of Section

6001 , remember, where "Every person liable...". It's the employers who are liable, and the withholding agents who are made liable, and both of those sections, 6001 and 6011, establishing the associated filing requirements, are there so that the government can prosecute anyone who withholds income taxes and doesn't pay them over to the Federal Treasury. Remember that Section 6001 referenced "employers" in its third sentence? This is why, according to Section 3403 "THE EMPLOYER SHALL BE LIABLE", not the individuals. And, of course, Section 6001 relates to those "persons" who are liable - the employers.

These are the only code sections in existence that establish liability for the payment of income tax, other than the limited liability for foreign earned income imposed and established by Chapter 1, Section 1 - Tax imposed (the income tax), which we have already examined. There are no other Code Sections anywhere in the United States Code that establish liability for payment of the income tax. And as you have seen, what the U.S. citizens are liable for is the payment of income tax on privileged (under tax treaties) foreign earned income, not domestic income earned by right. It is Voluntary.

"You are among the millions of Americans who comply with the tax law voluntarily." - (Form 1040 Tax Instruction Booklet)

"Two aspects of the Federal Income Tax system, voluntary compliance with the law and self-assessment of tax, make it important for you to understand your rights and responsibilities as a taxpayer. Voluntary compliance places on the taxpayer the responsibility for filing an income tax return. You must decide whether the law requires you to file a return. If it does, you must file your return by the date it is due." - (IRS Publication 21)

"The IRS's goal is to increase the rate at which taxpayers voluntarily pay their taxes from the current 82.3% to 90% by 2001." (The Washington Post front page Dec. 2, 1993 - "IRS Hopes Change")

"Each year American taxpayers voluntarily file their tax returns and make a special effort to pay the taxes they owe." (Johnnie M. Walters IRS Commissioner, 1971 Form 1040 Booklet)

"Our tax system is based on individual self-assessment and voluntary compliance." (Mortimer Caplin, IRS Commissioner, 1975 IRS IR Audit Manual)

"The mission of the service is to encourage and achieve the highest possible degree of voluntary compliance." (Donald C. Alexander, IRS Commissioner, Federal Register, March 1974)

"The IRS's primary task is to collect taxes under a voluntary compliance system. (Jerome Kurtz IRS Commissioner, 1980 IR Annual Report)

"We have a voluntary compliance system." (Fred Goldberg, IRS Commissioner, Nightline with Ted Koppel, Apr.13, 1990)

and finally, from the Supreme Court of the United States of America, the highest authority in the land:

"Our system of taxation is based on voluntary assessment and payment, not upon distraint (force)." (United States v. Flora, 362 US 145 (1958))

This is a whole page full of statements that the IRS has made, in public, to the media and the People, regarding the "true nature of our tax situation". The sources are quoted. In these, the IRS repeatedly states over and over again that citizens comply with the tax laws voluntarily, and that our tax system is based on voluntary compliance and self assessment, and now you know why. Because if the citizen does not voluntarily comply, and through his own ignorance of the law, misapply the code and use the wrong form, the whole system fails. And that's why they say it's voluntary, because under the law, it is. And, if you do

comply voluntarily, then they can use against you the information that you provided on the Form, because the courts have ruled that when you perform a voluntary self assessment (file a Form 1040), you establish the liability for payment of the tax necessary for the IRS to collect and enforce the amount assessed.

But there is no statutory liability imposed on citizens for the payment of income tax on domestic income, only foreign income under tax treaties. You, the citizen, create your own liability for the income tax that grants the IRS the jurisdictional authority to enforce and collect the numbers you show on your return when you voluntarily perform that self assessment using the wrong form. And, it doesn't matter that you misapplied the law or used the wrong form; you establish the liability voluntarily with the assessment, and it is then legal, and you owe it. You have to pay it, and they can enforce it if you don't. And if they find anything incorrect or fraudulent on the return, they can assess penalties and interest because the assessment was incorrect or not done properly.

I don't know if anybody noticed, but if you look back to the table in 26 CFR 602.101, where we saw the OMB Document Control Numbers required by Section 1.1-1, on the next line 1.23-5 appears, which does require the form numbered 1545-0074, Form 1040. Some of you may have noticed this and thought I was trying to slip one by you. So, here's 1.23-5.

26 CFR 1.23-5 Certification Procedures.

(a) Certification that an item meets the definition of an energy-conserving component or renewable energy source property. Upon request of a manufacturer of an item....the Assistant Commissioner shall certify ...

that :

(1) the item meets the definition of insulation (see

.....

This is from the Code of Federal Regulations, and it starts:

"Certification procedures. (a) Certification that an item meets the definition of an energy-conserving component or renewable energy source property..."

Section 1.23-5 is the renewable energy resource credit. If you want to claim this deduction, or that credit, you have to file Form 1040, because it's the proper legal vehicle or mechanism through which that deduction is claimed. And there are a lot of other deductions and credits and legal reasons why Form 1040 would be required. If you want to claim a refund, you have to file Form 1040, because that's the established legal mechanism through which a citizen claims a refund. If you want to claim certain credits, or take certain deductions, you have to file Form 1040 because that is the legal mechanism through which those credits and deductions are claimed. But, if all you want to do is satisfy the liability for tax on taxable income that you as a citizen have, without claiming any deductions, or taking any credits, then the only form that you are required to file is Form 2555, not Form 1040. Because Form 2555 is the only form required by law, the proper vehicle for you to use to satisfy the liability you have for income tax as an individual citizen, according to the law. So, how does the

IRS get away with doing what they have been doing for so long?

Remember that if you want to claim a refund, you MUST file a Form 1040 because it is the legal mechanism through which a refund is claimed!! This is why they deceptively withhold from you when you are young and start working at your first job. You are young and naive, and know nothing about the tax law and they take advantage of your ignorance and withhold more than is necessary. You are gradually conditioned, or programmed, to file a return TO GET A REFUND, NOT to pay the tax. Then when you get older, you've been filing the Form 1040 all your life, so you continue doing what you did all along, ignorantly; because you are no longer filing to get a refund, NOW YOU'RE FILING TO PAY A TAX THAT YOU ARE NOT LIABLE BY LAW TO PAY !

IF ALL YOU WANT TO DO IS SATISFY YOUR LIABILITY, YOU DO NOT USE FORM 1040.

CITIZENS USE FORM 2555 to satisfy liability! At least that's what the law says! That's because, as far as individuals are concerned,

THE INCOME TAX IS STILL JUST A FOREIGN TAX !

I know old habits are hard to break, and that all of this information doesn't agree with what you have been told to believe all of your life, and in fact, doesn't seem possible, but keep reading because the truth is far stranger than fiction and the law records the truth.

Remember earlier, the question was raised: "What is taxable income? Section 63 is the code section that the IRS claims establishes what "taxable income" is. It states:

63. Taxable income defined

(a) In general. Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), for purposes of this subtitle, the term "taxable income" means gross income minus the deductions allowed by this chapter (other than the standard deduction).

(b) Individuals who do not itemize their deductions

.....

The IRS claims that since the definition of "taxable income" references "gross income" (defined in Section 61), then everything that anybody makes that is listed in Section 61 is taxable income and must be reported. That is the complete and total argument that the IRS makes in its demand for income taxes.

Section 61 states:

61. Gross income defined.

(a) General definition. Except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, gross income means all income from whatever source derived, including (but not limited to) the following items:

(1) Compensation for services, including fees, commissions, fringe benefits and similar items;

(2) Gross income derived from business;

(3) Gains derived from dealings in property;

(4) Interest;

- (5) Rents;
 - (6) Royalties;
 - (7) Dividends;
 - (8) Alimony and separate maintenance payments;
 - (9) Annuities;
 - (10) Income from life insurance and endowment contracts;
 - (11) Pensions;
 - (12) Income from discharge of indebtedness;
 - (13) Distributive share of partnership gross income;
 - (14) Income in respect of a decedent; and
 - (15) Income from an interest in an estate or trust.
- (b) Cross references.

*For items specifically included in gross income, see part II (Sec. 71 and following).
For items specifically excluded from gross income, see part III (Sec. 101 and following).*

So, "gross income" is defined as:

"compensation for services, gross income derived from business, gains derived from dealings in property, interest, rents, royalties, dividends, alimony, annuities, income from life insurance, pensions, income from discharge of indebtedness, distributive share of partnership..."

You can see that the definition of gross income has all of these things listed. But, I would like you to remember that in 1895 the Supreme Court ruled in *Pollock v Farmers Loan & Trust Co.* that it is unconstitutional to impose an income tax on the interest and dividends of U.S. citizens on deposit in U.S. banks. Both of those items are listed here in section 61. Interest is number (4) and Dividends is number (7). And the Supreme Court further ruled in *Stanton v Baltic*

Mining Co. in 1916, that no new power of taxation was conferred by the 16th Amendment.

So, if it was unconstitutional before the 16th Amendment, and no new power was conferred by it; How can Section 61 be constitutional when it states that interest and dividends are part of gross income and will be taxed? Well, we have to look at what the law shows for how Section 61 is supposed to be implemented and applied.

This version of Section 61 that is shown above is from the CURRENT 1986 version of the Code. The PREVIOUS version of the Code is from 1954. This Section, 61, is nearly identical in both versions, except for the following footnote shown in the 1954 version:

"Source: Sec. 22(a), 1939 Code, substantially unchanged"

For some reason the footnote was dropped when the law was recodified in 1986. It is not known why the footnote was dropped in 1986, but it is very important because, as you can see, the footnote identifies the source of Section 61 as being Section 22(a) in the 1939 code, the last codified version previous to the 1954 version. Being able to research the source of a law is very important to determining how that law is supposed to be properly applied under the law. Without a review of the source materials it is very difficult to accurately determine how a law was ORIGINALLY intended to be applied, and the courts, of course, only have authority over the law, under, and to the extent of, its original intent. So we go to Section 22(a) in the 1939 code, and we see that the format has

changed, but indeed, the substance is pretty much the same as in 1986.

SEC. 22. GROSS INCOME.

(a) General Definition.-"Gross Income" includes gains, profits, and income derived from salaries, wages, or compensation for personal service ... of whatever kind and in whatever form paid, or from professions, vocations, trades, businesses commerce or sales, or dealings in property, whether real or personal, growing out of the ownership or use of or interest in such property; also from interest, rent, dividends, securities, or the transaction of any business carried on for gain or profit, or gains or profits and income derived from any source whatever....

But it's very important to understand how Section 22 was implemented and applied in 1939 in order to understand how Section 61 is supposed to be applied today. The two sections are inextricably linked in such relevant fashion, and the answer to our question of how Section 61 can be Constitutional, given the Pollock decision, can only be found by a thorough examination of this relationship.

As you can see here, from the Code of Federal Regulations, Index of Parallel Tables - 1991 enabling regulations for the 1939 code sections, it clearly shows that Section 22, under the 1939 code, was implemented under Title 26, Part 519.

CFR INDEX PARALLEL TABLE

1991 Enabling sections

26 U.S.C. (1939 I.R.C.)

<i>22</i>	<i>26 Part 519</i>
<i>40</i>	<i>26 Part 1</i>
<i>62</i>	<i>26 Parts 509,513,514,520, 521</i>
<i>143-144</i>	<i>26 Part 521</i>
<i>....</i>	

The next table reveals what Part 519 is:

CHAPTER 1 - INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

(Parts 500 to 529)

SUBCHAPTER G - Regulations Under Tax Conventions

Part

500 [Reserved]

501 Australia

502 Greece(x)

503 Germany(x)

504 Belgium

505 Netherlands

506 Japan

507 United Kingdom

509 *Switzerland*(x)
510 *Norway*
511 *Finland*
512 *Italy*
513 *Ireland*.....(x)
514 *France*(x)
515 *Honduras*
516 *Austria*(x)
517 *Pakistan*(x)
518 *New Zealand*
519 *Canada*
520 *Sweden*(x)
521 *Denmark*.....(x)

Part 519 is the Canadian Tax Treaty. What Section 61 actually defines, under the letter of the law; are the sources of taxable income under the foreign tax treaty with Canada. It does not define the domestic sources of taxable income. It defines the Canadian sources, under the Canadian Tax Treaty.

The countries shown in the table with an '...(x)' (ed.'s addition) are the countries with whom America has current tax treaties, in effect today (1996). However, since the Canadian Tax Treaty expired in 1993, Part 519 is now shown as reserved for future use in this Table, and Section 61 no longer has any legitimate application within Title 26 (IR Code) for the purpose of defining what gross income is (except, perhaps, under other tax treaties).

But, most citizens are ignorant of the law, they're ignorant of the application of the law, they're ignorant of the history of the law and these Court rulings, and the IRS relies on and takes advantage of that ignorance. The IRS relies on your ignorance, and your wrongfully self assessing the tax by using the wrong form. And legitimately, under the law, that's not the way the law is actually applied, nor was it ever intended to be applied in such fashion.

The IRS claims that Section 6201 grants them the authority to assess income taxes. It states:

6201. Assessment authority.

(a) Authority of Secretary. The Secretary is authorized and required to make the inquiries, determinations, and assessments of all taxes imposed by this title, or accruing under any former internal revenue law, which have not been duly paid by stamp at the time and in the manner provided by law. Such authority shall extend to and include the following:

(1) Taxes shown on return. The Secretary shall assess all taxes determined by the taxpayer or by the secretary as to which returns or lists are made under this title.

(2) Unpaid taxes payable by stamp.

(A) Omitted stamps. ...

(B) Check or Money Order not duly paid. ...

(3) Erroneous income tax prepayment credits.

.....

(b) Amount Not To Be Assessed.

(1) Estimated income tax. No unpaid amount of estimated income tax required to be paid under section 6654 or 6655 shall be assessed.....

Are income taxes paid by stamp? No! Now, are you beginning to understand why the IRS wants you to voluntarily file a return? Because subparagraph (a)(1) here gives them the authority to assess taxes shown on returns. But, let's suppose you don't file a return; what authority is left? Well, Subsections 2 and 3 are left. "(2) Unpaid Taxes Payable By Stamp." Again, are income taxes payable by stamp? No, they're not. And (3): "Erroneous Income Tax Prepayment Credits". That's it. That's the true extent of the authority to assess taxes under the law 1- Taxes shown on returns (done voluntarily), 2 - unpaid taxes payable by prepayment credits (withheld taxes). So where is the legal authority to assess income taxes not shown on a return? (for individuals who do not file).

Now, it's interesting to note, down at the bottom of 6201, it also states "(b) Amount Not To Be Assessed. (1) Estimated income tax. No unpaid amount of estimated income tax required to be paid under section 6654 or 6655 shall be assessed". Remember, 6654 (e)(2)(C), your exception to the failure to file? Right here under 6201 their claimed authority, it states that if 6654 applies, no unpaid amount of estimated income tax is required to be paid. If there is no return, the IRS has no legal authority to assess income taxes, and surprisingly enough, they admit that, so they claim Section 6020 applies. The IRS claims that Section 6020 allows them to prepare and file a Form 1040 return for those individuals who refuse to do so voluntarily. It states:

6020. Returns prepared for or executed by Secretary.

(a) Preparation of return by Secretary. If any person shall fail to make a return required by this title or by regulation prescribed thereunder, but shall consent to disclose all information necessary for the preparation thereof, then, and in that case, the Secretary may prepare such return, which being signed by such person, may be received by the Secretary as the return of such person.

(b) Execution of return by Secretary.

(1) Authority of Secretary to execute return. If any person fails to make any return required by any internal revenue law or regulation made thereunder at the time prescribed therefor, or makes, willfully or otherwise, a false or fraudulent return, the Secretary shall make such return from his own knowledge and from such information as he can obtain through testimony or otherwise.

(2) Status of returns. Any return so made and subscribed by the Secretary shall be prima facie good and sufficient for all legal purposes. (emphasis added)

As you can see Subsection (a) says:

"If any person shall fail to make a return required by this title or by regulations prescribed there under, but shall consent to disclose all information necessary in that case, the Secretary may prepare such return...".

Subsection (a) requires consent from the citizen. So the IRS claims that Subsection (b) is what applies. Subsection (b) says:

"if a person fails to make any return required by any internal revenue law or regulation made thereunder at the time prescribed therefor, or makes, willfully or otherwise, a false or fraudulent return, the Secretary shall make such return from his own knowledge and from such information as he can obtain through testimony or otherwise."

Here, the Secretary is authorized, in fact required, to file forms for individuals if they fail to do so. So, if the Secretary was required; why do they charge citizens with the failure to file? The only requirement that can be found in the law is for the Secretary. It's the secretary that fails

the requirement to file the assessment forms, not the citizen. Also note that the Secretary must sign (subscribe) the return for it to be valid (prima facie).

So, the IRS claims that 6020(b) authorizes them to file a Form 1040 for a citizen who refuses to do so voluntarily. However, the Internal Revenue Manual, in Chapter 5200, addresses the proper legal use and invocation of 6020(b). It states:

5290. Refusal to file - IRC 6020(b) Assessment Procedure.

5291. Scope

(1) This procedure applies to employment, excise and partnership returns the following returns will be involved:

(a) Form 940 - Employer's Annual Federal Unemployment Tax Return

(b) Form 941 - Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return

(c) Form 942 - Employer's Quarterly Tax Return for Household Employees

(d) Form 943 - Employer's Annual Tax Return for Agricultural Employees

(e) Form 11-B - Special Tax Return - Gaming Devices

(f) Form 720 - Quarterly Federal Excise Tax Return

(g) Form 2290 - Federal Use Tax Return on Highway Motor Vehicles

(h) Form CT-1 - Employer's Annual Railroad Retirement Tax Return

(i) Form 1065 - U.S. Partnership Return of Income

It clearly states that:

"This procedure applies to employment, excise and partnership tax returns".

Does that say that 6020(b) applies to individual return? No, it doesn't. It applies to employment excise and partnership tax returns. And look at what forms it states they are authorized to file under 6020(b):

" Form 940 ... 941 ... 942 ... 943 ... 11-B ... 720 ... 2290 ... CT-1 ... and ... 1065"

End of list. Is Form 1040 listed here? No, it is not! Form 1040 is not one of the forms that the IRS is actually authorized to file under Section 6020(b), according to the Internal Revenue Manual itself! 6020(b) is authorized only for employment, excise & partnership tax returns.

Why? Because, the tax is not imposed in a direct fashion on the domestic income of U.S. citizens. And, again in the Internal Revenue Manual (IRM), at 5293.1 it states:

Returns Prepared Under IRC 6020(b)

5293.1

General.

(1) If the taxpayer fails to file employment, excise and partnership tax returns by the specified date, the return should be prepared under the authority of IRC 6020(b).....

Does that say individual returns? No! Again it emphasizes employment, excise and partnership returns only, not individual returns.

Finally at IRM 5293.1(7) it states:

(7) In unable to locate situations when the

proprietors, partners or responsible officers and assets cannot be located and:

(a) when their SSNs can be determined process the returns and follow the guidelines in IRM 5263 for returns without full payment; or

(b) when their SSNs cannot be determined, close the delinquency using TC (transaction code) 593 with the proper closing code. (see the guidelines in IRM 5235(2)(c)).

Now, what do Social Security numbers have to do with delinquencies under Subtitle A? Why would they close a delinquency simply because there is no Social Security number for the individual? Why is a Social Security number necessary to have an income tax delinquency ? Social security numbers, under the law, have nothing at all to do with income taxes! They are only to be used for the administration of the Subtitle C - Employment Tax laws contained in chapters 21 through 25. The improper use of 6020(b) can be further exposed by a review of Sections 6061 and 6065.

6061. Signing of returns and other documents. Except as otherwise provided by sections 6062 (Signing of corporation returns) and 6063 (Signing of partnership returns) , any return, statement, or other document required to be made under any provision of the internal revenue laws or regulations shall be signed in accordance with forms or regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

6065. Verification of returns. Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, any return, declaration, statement, or other document required to be made under any provision of the internal revenue laws or regulations shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury.

Section 6061 states:

"Any returns, statements or other documents required to be made under any provision of the internal revenue laws or regulations shall be signed in accordance with forms or regulations".

And Section 6065 states:

"any return declaration, statement, or other document required to be made under any provision of the internal revenue laws or regulation shall contain or be verified by a written declaration that it is made under the penalties of perjury".

Furthermore, Section 6020 subsection (b)(2) stated:

"Any return so made and subscribed by the Secretary shall be prima facie good and sufficient for all legal purposes."

I have never seen a substitute Form 1040, prepared by the IRS, that was either signed, or sworn to. Obviously that would be a violation of these laws. The IRS is required by law to sign these documents, but they refuse to do so, because they know they're acting outside the authority authorized under the law and actually contained within the Revenue Manual. They know that if they sign the documents, they will assume the liability for the wrongful claims made on them. They do not want to do that, so they refuse to sign. They fill it all out and send it to you, for you to sign. They refuse to validate their own work with a signature as required under the law, but they demand that you, the citizen, honor this fraudulent work with payment, without anyone from the government ever validating it for you or swearing that it's true. It is a violation of the law, but the citizens generally accede to the demands, and out of ignorance, they comply. But the fact of the matter is: the law supports you, the citizen, and does not support the United States government.

Finally the Delegation Orders actually filed at the District offices, delegating the Authority to prepare and execute returns under 6020(b) read:

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

SOUTHWEST REGION

Order No.

DD-OKC-150, Rev. 5

OKLAHOMA CITY DISTRICT

CR: SD-61

DELEGATION ORDER

Date of issue: Nov 27 1987

Effective Date: Nov 27 1987

Subject:

AUTHORITY TO EXECUTE RETURNS

Authority is redelegated to Revenue Officers, GS-9 and above to prepare and execute the following returns on behalf of the District Director under Section 6020(b) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Form 940, Employer's Annual Federal Unemployment Tax Return;

Form 941, Employer's Quarterly Federal Tax Return;

Form 942, Employer's Quarterly Tax Return for Household Employees;

Form 943, Employer's Annual Tax Return for Agricultural Employees;

Form 11-B, Special Tax Return - Gaming Services;

Form 720, Quarterly Federal Excise Tax Return;

Form 2290, Federal Use Tax Return on Highway Motor Vehicles;

Form CT-1, Employer's Annual Railroad Retirement Tax Return; and

Form 1065, U.S. Partnership Return of Income

This authority may not be redelegated.

This order supersedes Delegation Order DD-OKC-150 (Rev. 4) dated December 13, 1984

Reference: Treasury Regulations 301.6020-1(b)

Commissioner Delegation Order No. 182 (rev. 1)

IRM 5292

K. J. Sawyer

District Director

This list agrees completely with the Forms shown as authorized under 6020(b) in the Internal Revenue Manual itself. The IRS cannot produce a delegation order for any district in the country authorizing the preparation or execution of a Form 1040. Although this Delegation Order is for Oklahoma City, the Orders for the other District Offices are exactly the same.

So, how does the IRS get away with the fraud that they have been perpetrating on the American People. WE ARE IGNORANT. Amazingly enough, the IRS computer systems have been properly programmed and will not trigger or initiate a collection action against a citizen of the United States of America, UNLESS THEY ARE FED FRAUDULENT INFORMATION by an IRS employee.

This is, of course, exactly what the IRS does! If you have ever received a letter from the IRS you can look and see, usually in the upper right hand corner area, what the CP number of the letter is. CP stands for Computer Paragraph.

All of the IRS's collection correspondence is generated by computers and under the Paperwork Reduction Act all of it must be documented and properly authorized. The Internal Revenue Manual contains an explanation relating the proper legal use of each of these CP codes and corresponding letters. The Manual clearly shows that the letters generated by the computers that relate to individuals carry a TWO DIGIT CP CODE. The Manual further shows that all BUSINESS accounts are addressed with letters that use a THREE DIGIT CP CODE. All of the three digit CP Code Letters ARE RESERVED FOR USE WITH BUSINESSES. It is those Business letters that individuals wrongfully receive that threaten enforced collection of the income tax. If you have one, see what the CP Code on your letter is. If it carries three digits: you are the victim of IRS FRAUD and EXTORTION.

What the IRS illegally does is post a code on your Individual Master File (IMF) in the computer, that deceives the computer into believing that YOU ARE A BUSINESS instead of an individual. That fraudulent entry is used by the computer systems to wrongfully trigger a collection action against a citizen, which action is, in reality, reserved for use ONLY against businesses, because the computer knows that citizens are not actually liable.

THE IRS MUST DEFRAUD ITS OWN COMPUTER SYSTEM TO INITIATE A COLLECTION ACTION AGAINST A CITIZEN. ONCE THAT FRAUDULENT BUSINESS CODE IS ILLEGALLY POSTED ON YOUR IMF, THAT IMF, THE IRS'S OWN DOCUMENT, CAN BE USED AS PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE IN

COURT AGAINST THEM TO EXPOSE THE FRAUDULENT AND ILLEGAL NATURE OF THEIR ACTIVITIES AND ACTIONS.

If you are ignorant, and unaware of the fraud that they have committed you will not be able to stop their illegal theft of your property, perpetrated under this fraudulent deception of their own computer systems.

After the IRS illegally makes up a return that they illegally refuse to sign, and fraudulently deceive the computers into initiating the correspondence related to a collection action, they illegally create a deficiency within that return.

6211. Definition of a deficiency.

(a) In general. For purposes of this Title in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes imposed by subtitles A and B and excise taxes imposed by chapters 41, 42, 43, and 44, the term "deficiency" means the amount by which the tax imposed by subtitle A or B, or chapter 41, 42, 43, or 44, exceeds the excess of -

(1) the sum of

(A) the amount shown as the tax by the taxpayer upon his return, if a return was made by the taxpayer and an amount was shown as the tax by the taxpayer thereon, plus

(B) the amounts previously assessed (or collected without assessment) as a deficiency, over -

(2) the amount of rebates, as defined in subsection (b)(2), made...

This section clearly states:

"... in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes imposed by Subtitles A & B ... "

Deficiencies are clearly based on Subtitle A and Subtitle B taxes (and the excise taxes in Chapters 41, 42, 43 & 44 - Subtitle D). So why is the IRS using the record of earnings collected under Subtitle C Employment Taxes when calculating deficiencies?? The IRS is wrongfully and illegally using the record of earnings created under the Subtitle C Employment Tax laws, for Social Security purposes and foreigners, to demand that you, the citizen, pay income tax on those domestic earnings. And that record of earnings comes not from any income tax withholding requirement under Subtitles A or B, it comes from the employment taxes imposed in Subtitle C. The record of earnings belonging to the citizen is coming from their voluntary participation in the social security program; whereby a social security number is provided to an employer on a W-4, who then withholds the taxes on wages for social security purposes under Subtitle C authorizations. We've already seen that income tax can only be withheld from foreigners, not from citizens, unless it is requested on a Form W-4 (where you specify deductions)!

Then the IRS takes that Subtitle C information and wrongfully and illegally uses it to demand Subtitle A Income taxes on those Subtitle C records of earnings. But this code section, 6211 states that a deficiency can only be based on Subtitle A and Subtitle B requirements, not Subtitle C. So the IRS is in violation of the law to claim that there is a deficiency based on that record of earnings. But that's what they do and they will continue to do it as long as you allow a record of earnings to accumulate under your name and social security number. As long as payers have your social security number and make reports to the IRS

using that social security number the IRS is going to wrongfully and illegally use the information created under those subtitle C regulations to demand that you pay income taxes imposed under Subtitle A on foreigners. After fraudulently creating a deficiency the IRS wrongfully claims a lien on property.

6321. Lien for taxes.

If any person liable to pay any tax neglects or refuses to pay the same, after demand, the amount (including any interest, additional amount, addition to tax, or assessable penalty, together with any costs that may accrue in addition thereto) shall be a lien in favor of the United States upon all property and rights to property, whether real or personal, belonging to such person. (emphasis added)

The IRS refuses to say how, or under what code section, they have determined that individual citizens are **LIABLE** for tax on **DOMESTIC** income, **THEY JUST PRETEND** you are, and hope you don't know any better! The next thing the IRS tries to do is levy property held by third parties. The Authority they claim for this is Section 6331.

6331 Levy and distraint.

(a) Authority of Secretary. If any person liable to pay any tax neglects or refuses to pay the same within ten days after notice and demand, it shall be lawful for the Secretary to collect such tax (and such further sum as shall be sufficient to cover the expenses of the levy) by levy upon all property and rights to property (except such property as is exempt under section 6334) belonging to such person or on which there is a lien provided in this chapter for the payment of such tax. Levy may be made upon the accrued salary or wages of any officer, employee, or elected official, of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of the United States or the District of Columbia by serving a notice of levy on the employer (as defined in section 3401 (d)) of such officer, employee or elected official.

This clearly states:

"Levy made be made upon the accrued salary or wages of any officer, employee, or elected official of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of the United States or the District of Columbia."

Subsection (a) establishes the authority of the Secretary that limits the authority of all the other Subsections b, c, d, e, and f in this Code section. Who does Subsection (a) say levy may be made on? "Officers, employees or elected officials of the United States government".

Does this section apply to citizens or individuals? No, it does not. It explicitly states who it does apply to and citizens are not included. It only grants an authorization to levy federal employees. And this subsection is being wrongfully invoked all over the country to seize property from US citizens who don't really owe income tax on domestic income. And if you don't believe me, that 6331 only grants an authority to levy the salary of federal employees, we can go to the United States Code Annotated for 6331 and read Note 5 where the authors of the law stated the purpose and original intent of this law. It states:

"Note 5. Purpose. This section was enacted to subject salaries of federal employees to the same collection procedures as are available against all other taxpayers, including employees of a state."

This section was specifically enacted to subject just federal employees to levy. Now it references the "same collection procedures as are available against all other taxpayers" but, the IRS refuses to site them or establish

what they may be. Apparently they feel that Section 6331 is the only code section in Title 26 that they can rely on for levy, and clearly, it does not apply to U.S. citizens, only federal employees. And, as it turns out, it only applies to federal employees who are living and working in federal territories or federal states, like the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Marianna Islands etc.; so that the IRS can collect income tax from federal employees who are enjoying the privilege of working and being protected in those foreign territories.

The Criminal Investigative Division

It states in the Internal Revenue Manual (IRM), in Chapter 1100, at Section 1132.75: 1132.75

Criminal Investigative Division

The Criminal Investigative Division enforces the criminal statutes applicable to income, estate, gift, employment, and excise tax laws involving United States citizens residing in foreign countries and nonresident aliens subject to Federal income tax filing requirements.

Now you show me the corresponding section, anywhere in the law or the IRM, that would cover citizens NOT "RESIDING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES", but living and working in the United States!

This, of course, supports and agrees completely with the claim that the income tax is STILL JUST A FOREIGN TAX, as it is accurately recorded in the law. It also supports the charge that the IRS is exceeding the LIMITED authorities established for it under the law and operating unlawfully.

There has never been a LEGAL criminal investigation of any U.S. citizen living and working in the United States of America in the history of the IRS. CID HAS NO LEGAL AUTHORITY OVER THE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS AND ACTIVITIES OF CITIZENS, at least that is what the law records. Everything the IRS does to citizens in America is illegal, occurring within a complete vacuum of law.

That brings us to CHAPTER 75. - CRIMES, OTHER OFFENSES AND FORFEITURES, and Section 7203, which is typically the statutory charge in a court of law against a citizen. It is titled; "Willful failure to file return, supply information, or pay tax". It states:

7203. Willful failure to file return, supply information, or pay tax.

Any person required under this title to pay any estimated tax or tax, or required by this title or by regulations made under authority thereof to make a return, keep any records, or supply any information, who willfully fails to pay such estimated tax or tax, make such return, keep such records, or supply such information, at the time or times required by law or regulations, shall, in addition to other penalties provided by law, be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than \$25,000 (\$100,000 in the case of a corporation) or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both, together with the costs of prosecution. In the case of any person with respect to whom there is failure to pay any estimated tax, this section shall not apply to such person with respect to such failure if there is no addition to tax under section 6654 or 6655 with respect to such failure. In the case of a willful violation of any provision of section 60501, the first sentence of this section shall be applied by substituting "felony" for "misdemeanor", and "5 years" for "1 year".

Now, it's worth pointing out that Section 7203 is a penalty statute, and that the government tries to skip right over the part of a trial where they identify an actual violation of law and charge you with it. They try to skip right over the requirement to explain what actual statutory

violation has occurred, and leap right to the penalty phase. When accused, one has the right to demand to know what the underlying statutory infraction is that has caused and justified the invocation of this penalty statute. One should demand to know what statutory violations the IRS has based the penalty charge on, and guess what? The IRS cannot site a statutory violation upon which the penalty is based, given the facts herein.

I'd further like to point out that Section 7203 specifically says,

"Any person required under this title..."

and this next section, also from Chapter 75, redefines the term "person" for use in Chapter 75.

7343. Definition of the term person.

The term "person" as used in this chapter includes an officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs.

Now does this say that the term 'person' includes individuals? No! The term "person" is redefined for purposes of use within Chapter 75 to mean only corporate officers. But it is not redefined right up there in Section 7203 where it says, "any person"; you have to read through the whole chapter to get to the redefinition of the term "person" in order to recognize that Section 7203 was never intended to be applied against any citizen, who didn't

or wasn't acting in the capacity of a corporate or partnership officer with responsibility?

Section 7203 is here to file against the corporate officers who fail to honor their legal responsibilities to report and pay the tax on the privileged income the corporation is making. It is not a statutory section that authorizes criminal penalties against the common citizen, or even individuals.

Furthermore, this Section clearly states:

"... this section shall not apply to such person with respect to such failure if there is no addition to tax under section 6654 ..."

Do you remember 6654 (e)(2)(C), the citizen's exception to the failure to pay, where no addition to tax shall be imposed if there is no liability and the individual was a citizen or resident? The same paragraph C referenced in Treasury Decision 2313? How can Section 7203 possibly be used against individual citizens, given this specific language within the statute itself? Do you really need a lawyer to read these English sentences to understand what they mean ?

Therefore, consider the following:

1) Our Founding Fathers created a constitutional REPUBLIC as our form of government. The Constitution gives the federal/national government LIMITED powers. All powers not delegated to the United States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the People. The Union was

created to be the servant of the People! The United States Constitution is the Supreme Law of the land. (Article VI, Clause 2)

2) The Constitution gives the Congress the power to lay and collect taxes to pay the debts of the government, provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, subject to the following rules, pertaining to the only two classifications of taxes permitted by the Constitution: Direct Taxes, which are subject to the rule of apportionment (to the states for collection), and Indirect Taxes - imposts, duties and excises, subject to the rule of uniformity.

3) The government is NOT ALLOWED, by either one of the two classifications, TO TAX DIRECTLY citizens or permanent resident aliens of the United States, in the United States. The intent of the founders was to keep the government the servant of the People, and to prevent it from becoming the master. (Article I, Section 2, Clause 3)

4) The census is taken every ten years to determine the number of representatives to be allotted to each state and the amount of a direct tax that may be apportioned to each state determined by the percentage its number of representatives bears to the total membership in the House of Representatives. (Article I, Section 2, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 9, Clause 4)

5) It was established in the Constitutional convention of 1787 that the Supreme Court of the United States would have the power of "judicial review", i.e., the power to

declare laws passed by the United States Congress to be null and void if such a law or laws were in violation of the Constitution, to be determined from the original intent as found in Madison's Notes recorded during the Convention, the Federalist Papers, and the ratifying conventions found in Elliott's Debates.

6) Due to the characteristics of the second classification of taxation authorized in the Constitution, the Supreme Court called it an Indirect Tax, and it is divided into three distinct categories of taxes: IMPOSTS, DUTIES and EXCISES. These taxes were intended to provide for the operating expense of the government of the United States.

7) Duties and Imposts are taxes laid by the government on things imported into the country from abroad, and are paid at the ports of entry.

8) The Supreme Court says that "EXCISES are:... taxes laid upon the manufacture, sale and consumption of commodities within the country, upon licenses to pursue certain occupations and upon corporate privileges" (See *Flint v. Stone Tracy Co.* 220 US 107 (1911))

9) In 1862, Congress passed an Act (law) to create an "Income Duty" to help pay for the war between the states. A duty is an indirect tax which the federal government cannot impose on citizens or residents of a state having sources of income within a State of the Union.

10) Congress passed an Act in 1894 to impose a tax on the incomes of citizens and resident aliens of the United

States. The constitutionality of the Act was challenged in 1895 and the Supreme Court said the law was UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT WAS A DIRECT TAX THAT WAS NOT APPORTIONED as the Constitution required. (See Pollock v. Farmer's Loan & Trust Co., 157 US 429 (1895))

11) In 1909 Congress passed the 16th Amendment to the Constitution that was allegedly ratified by three-fourths (3/4) of the states; it is known as the "Income Tax Amendment".

12) Some officials within the IRS, along with professors, politicians, teachers and some judges have said, and are saying, that the 16th Amendment changed the Constitution to allow a direct tax without apportionment.

13) The above persons are NOT EMPOWERED to interpret the meaning of the United States Constitution! As stated above (Fact 5), this power is granted by the Constitution to the Supreme Court, but is limited to original intent. The supreme Court is NOT EMPOWERED to function as a "social engineer", to amend or alter the Constitution as they have been doing. A change or "amendment" can only be lawfully done according to the provisions of Article V of that document.

14) The U.S. Supreme Court said in 1916 that the 16th Amendment DID NOT change the Constitution because of the fact that Article I, Section 2, Clause 3, and Article I, Section 9, Clause 4, were not repealed or altered; the U.S. Constitution cannot conflict with itself. The Court also said

that the 16th Amendment MERELY PREVENTED THE INCOME DUTY FROM BEING TAKEN OUT OF THE CATEGORY OF INDIRECT TAXATION. (Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. CO. 240 US 1 (pg. 16) (1916))

15) After the Supreme Court decision, the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue issued Treasury Decision 2313, ([Order] dated March 21, 1916; Vol. 18 January-December, 1916, page 53). It states in part: "...it is hereby held that income accruing to nonresident aliens in the form of interest from the bonds and dividends on the stock of domestic corporations is subject to the income tax imposed by the Act of October 3, 1913."

16) In another Supreme Court decision in 1916, the Court, in CLEAR LANGUAGE, settled the application of the 16th amendment: by the previous ruling (Brushaber) it was settled that the provisions of the 16th Amendment CONFERRED NO NEW POWER OF TAXATION but simply prohibited the previous complete and plenary (full) power of income taxation possessed by Congress from the beginning from being taken out of the category of indirect taxation to which it inherently belonged.... (Stanton v. Baltic Mining Co., 249 US 112 (1916))

17) The United States Constitution gives the national government the exclusive authority to handle foreign affairs. Congress has the power to pass laws concerning the direct or indirect taxation of foreigners doing business in the United States of America. It has possessed this power from the beginning, needing no amendment

(change) to the U.S. Constitution to authorize the exercise of it.

18) The DIRECT classification of taxation was intended for use when unforeseen expenses or emergencies arise. Congress, needing funds to meet the emergency, can borrow money on the credit of the United States (Article I, Section 8 Clause 2). The founding fathers intended that the budget of the United States be balanced and a deficit be paid off quickly and in an orderly fashion, through a DIRECT tax. The tax bill is given to the Senate of the Union. The bill is "apportioned" by the number of representatives of each State in Congress; therefore, each State is billed its apportioned share of the Direct tax equal to the number of votes its Representatives could employ to pass the tax. How the states raise the money to pay the bill is not a federal concern. (Article I, Section 2, Clause 3)

19) In the Brushaber and Stanton cases, the Supreme Court said the 16th Amendment did not change income taxes to another classification. So, if the income tax is an indirect excise, then how is it applied and collected? According to the Supreme Court: "Excises are taxes laid upon the manufacture, sale and consumption of commodities within the country, upon licenses to pursue certain occupations and upon corporate privileges; the requirement to pay such tax involves the exercise of the privilege and if business is not done in the manner described, the tax and not the mere buying, selling or handling of goods."

QUESTION: If all RIGHTS come from God (citizens of the States retained all RIGHTS except those surrendered as enumerated in the Constitution) and PRIVILEGES are granted by government AFTER APPLICATION FOR PRIVILEGE IS MADE BY THE CITIZEN, then WHAT IS THE PRIVILEGE THAT THE INCOME TAX IS APPLIED AGAINST?

ANSWER: As established in the Constitution, the federal government cannot directly tax a citizen living within the States of the Union. Citizens possess RIGHTS; these RIGHTS cannot be converted to privileges by the government. The only individuals who would not have these rights and be liable to regulation by government are NONRESIDENT ALIENS doing business and working within the United States or receiving domestic source profits from investment instruments in America, and United States citizens working in a foreign country and taxable under TREATIES between the two governments.

20) WITHHOLDING AGENTS withhold income taxes. The only section in the Internal Revenue Code that defines this authority is section 7701(a)(16).

21) Withholding of money for income tax purposes, according to section 7701(a)(16), is only authorized under sections 1441 - Nonresident aliens, 1442 - Foreign Corporations, 1443 - Foreign Tax Exempt Organizations, and 1461- Withholding Agents' Liability for Withheld Tax.

22) Internal Revenue Manual Chapter 1100, Organization and Staffing, section 1132.75 states: "The Criminal Investigative Division enforces the criminal

statutes applicable to income, estate, gift, employment, and excise tax laws involving United States citizens RESIDING IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES and nonresident aliens subject to Federal income tax filing requirements..."(emphasis added)

23) The implementation of IRS Treasury Regulation 26 CFR 1.1441-5 is explained in Publication 515 on page 2: "If an individual gives you a written statement, in duplicate, stating that he or she is a citizen or resident of the United States, and you do not know otherwise, you may accept this statement and are RELIEVED OF THE DUTY OF WITHHOLDING TAX."

24) The ONLY way a U.S. citizen or permanent resident alien , living and working in a State of the Union can have taxes deducted from their pay, is by voluntarily making an application (Form SS-5) to obtain a social security number, and then entering that number on an IRS Form W-4 - Employee's Withholding Allowance Certificate, and signing it to permit withholding of "Employment Taxes". That is why the IRS pressures children to apply for social security numbers at an early age, and why citizens are pressured to "get used" to using the number, and employers are pressured to obtain the voluntary execution of a Form W-4 immediately from all those being hired. However, no federal law or regulation REQUIRES workers to have a social security number, or to sign a W-4 to qualify for, obtain, or retain a job.

25) Karl Marx wrote in his Communist Manifesto, ten planks needed to create a communist state. The second

plank is:" A HEAVY PROGRESSIVE OR GRADUATED INCOME TAX"

26) The attorney who successfully challenged the Income Tax Act of 1894, Joseph H. Choate, recognized the communist hand in the shadows. He told the United States Supreme Court: "The Act of Congress which we are impugning (challenging as false) before you is communistic in its purposes and tendencies, and is defended here upon principles as communistic, socialistic - what shall I call them - populistic as ever have been addressed to any political assembly in the world."

27) The Supreme Court agreed; and Justice Field wrote the Court's opinion, concluding with these prophetic words: "Here I close my opinion. I could not say less in view of questions of such gravity that go down to the very foundations of the government. If the provisions of the Constitution can be set aside by an Act of Congress, where is the course of usurpation to end? The present assault upon capital is but the beginning. It will be but the stepping-stone to others, larger and more sweeping, till our political contests will become a war of the poor against the rich; a war growing in intensity and bitterness."

28) Internal Revenue Code Section 6654(e)(2)(C) states:no liability....if the individual was a citizen or resident alien of the United States throughout the preceding taxable year.

The IRS contends the success of the self-assessment system depends upon VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE -- EVIDENTLY SO!

As you can see, the laws regarding Income taxes under Subtitle A and Employment taxes under Subtitle C, their corresponding authorities and powers, are being illegally mixed and wrongfully invoked in a fraudulent and improper fashion against all U.S. citizens. That means that you, as a citizen can disable and prevent that wrongful use of the information simply by handling your financial affairs in a particular fashion.

The law specifically states that you do not have to give your social security number to anyone except the Social Security Administration. You must also show it on the forms that you file with the IRS. But, as we've seen, you don't have to legally file any forms with the IRS, UNLESS you have foreign earned income under a tax treaty or foreign principals with domestic income. And if you refuse to supply your social security number to your employer on a W-4, or if you revoke your application for a Social Security number and rescind your participation in the Social Security program; then you have no legal requirement to supply a social security number to anyone at all; and there will never be any record of any earnings that is created under Subtitle C employment tax laws that the IRS can wrongfully and illegally use to demand that you pay income tax on.

But, the most important thing to understand, and the secret to living and working in the United States of America

tax free, without repercussions or harassment from the IRS, is understanding that Social Security is a voluntary program and that people who do not use a social security number NEVER RECEIVE CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE IRS regarding the collection of tax because that correspondence is never issued!

There is no law that requires you to participate in social security, and if you wish, you can opt out of the program, or conversely, you can just exercise your rights under the law and refuse to disclose your social security number to your employer, or anyone, for that matter, except the Social Security Administration. Thereby totally disabling, in a completely legal fashion, the information collection mechanism that the IRS relies upon to wrongfully demand income tax payments from citizens. If the IRS insists on illegally misusing the information collected under Social Security, we, the People, are left with no other option but to legally prevent its collection in the first place, in order to prevent its misuse against us. As irrefutable proof that Social Security is indeed a voluntary program, I offer the following:

In Texas, the Justice Department argued for the EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) against an employer who had, under IRS advice, refused to hire an individual who would not provide a social security number. The complaint was styled as a DISCRIMINATION action. The discrimination involves both religious convictions and national origins (Americans are not required).

The IRS refused to appear in court to defend its advice to the employer, who immediately folded when confronted in court with a team of Justice Department lawyers suing him for discrimination. (Who wants to be in court against the Justice Department without any legal facts to stand on and no witness to call?) The IRS typically passes out incorrect or misleading information to the employer, and then refuses to appear in the court room to defend the advice that the Employers are acting on.

The case proves beyond the shadow of any doubt whatsoever that it is NOT necessary to use a social security number in association with your personal finances and earnings, IF YOU CHOOSE NOT TO!

EXCERPTS FROM

EEOC v. Information Systems Consulting

CA3-92-0169-T

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

DALLAS DIVISION

1. From the EEOC's Letter of Determination, Dated May 2, 1990

(p.2)

The evidence supports the charge that there is a violation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as amended,... Section 706(b) of Title VII requires that if the commission determines there is a reasonable cause to believe that the charge is true, is shall endeavor to eliminate the alleged unlawful employment practice by informal methods, of conference, conciliation, and persuasion, having determined there is reasonable cause to believe the charge is true, the Commission now

invites the parties to join with it in a collective effort toward a just resolution of this matter.

2. From the Affidavit of Tim Fitzpatrick, September 29, 1989

(p.3):

After discussions with the IRS, the company discovered that if Mr. Hanson did not provide the company with a Social Security number, the company would be in violation of the Internal Revenue Regulations and subject to various penalties.

3. From the Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, April 1, 1992 (p.8-9)

"...the Internal Revenue Code and the Regulations promulgated pursuant to the code do not contain an absolute requirement that an employer provide an employee social security number to the IRS. Internal Revenue Code Section 6109(a)(3) states:

Any person required under the authority of this title to make a return, statement or other document with respect to another person, shall request from such person, and include in any such return, statement or document, such identifying number as may be prescribed for securing proper identification of such person.

26 U.S.C. 6109(a)(3) (Supp. 1992)"

The IRS regulation interpreting section 6109 provides:

"If he does not know the taxpayer identifying number of the other person, he shall request such number of the other person. The request should state that the identifying number is required to be furnished under the law. When the person filing the return, statement, or other document does not know the number of the other person, and has complied with the request provision of this paragraph, he shall sign an affidavit on the transmittal document forwarding such returns, statements, or other documents to the Internal Revenue Service so stating.

Treas. Reg. 301.6109-1(c) (1991)"

"The applicable IRS statute and regulation place a duty on the employer to request a taxpayer identifying number from the employee. If document must be filed and the employer has been unable to obtain the number but has made the request then the employer need only include an affidavit stating that the request was made."

The Government also avers that:

"In 1989, Internal Revenue Code Section 6676, 26 U.S.C. and 6676 (1989), set forth the penalties for failing to supply the IRS with identifying numbers as required by the code....a \$50.00 penalty will be imposed for failure of an employer to provide an identifying number on any document filed with the IRS unless it is shown that the failure was due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect.

The Treasury Regulation interpreting the statute states:

Under Section 301.609-1(c) a payor is required to request the identifying number of the payee. If after such a request has been made, the payee does not furnish the payor with his identifying number, the penalty will not be assessed against the payor.

Treas. Reg. 3106676-1 (1989)"

"Public Law 101-239, Title VII, Section 7711(b)(1), Dec. 19, 1989, 103 Stat. 2393, repealed Section 6676 of the Internal Revenue Code, 26 USC 6723 (Supp. 1992) has governed the failure to comply with information reporting requirement. However, Internal Revenue Code Section 6724, 26 USC 6724 (Supp. 1992), provides for a waiver of any penalties assessed under the code upon a showing of reasonable cause. Section 6724(a) provides:

No penalty shall be imposed under this part with respect to any failure if it is shown that such failure is due to reasonable cause and not willful neglect.

26 USC 6724(a) (Supp. 1992)"

4.) From the Consent Decree, dated November 4, 1992 (p.4)

The defendant ... shall be permanently enjoined from terminating an employee or refusing to hire an individual for failure to provide a social security number.... If an employee or applicant for employment advises the defendant that he does not have a social security number....., the defendant shall request, pursuant to Section

6724 of the Internal Revenue Service Code {sic}, 26 USC 6724, a waiver of any penalties that may be imposed for failing to include an employee social security number on forms and documents submitted to the IRS.

OBVIOUSLY, SOCIAL SECURITY IS VOLUNTARY - NOT MANDATORY !

Social Security is a fraudulent, PONZI PYRAMID con game. There is no money in any "social security" account, anywhere in the country. NOT ONE security is held anywhere in the world by the social security system. If Congress does not make an annual appropriation for Social Security payments EVERY YEAR, the program ends, JUST LIKE THAT. "What happened to all the money in my account", you may wonder? THERE IS NO MONEY IN YOUR ACCOUNT, THERE NEVER WAS. IT WAS ALL SPENT THE DAY IT ARRIVED AT THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION.

Carlos dePonzi was a Count in the early 1900s who "operated" the first fraudulent "pyramid" investment cons; wherein money from later investors is directly and immediately used to "pay off" earlier investors, WITHOUT EVER INVESTING IN ANY REAL THING. Each "level" of "investors" is successively promised higher and higher rates of return, with the testimony of earlier "investors", "documenting" how well the program worked for them, as part of the sales pitch, until there are no more "investors" (read fools, or pigeons) left to enroll in the "pyramid". Of course, at that point in the con the "operators", and all the money "invested", disappear forever, never to be seen again! Congress of course made these fraudulent cons

illegal for anyone to operate, EXCEPT THE GOVERNMENT, who has been doing it ever since under the name "Social Security". They just got rid of the private competition!

In summary, if you allow earnings to be reported under your Social Security number to the IRS, the IRS will illegally use that social security information to demand that you pay income tax on those earnings. This demand is NOT supported by the law.

If you are less than 40 years of age, and you believe that you will ever see, even a dime, from Social Security, perhaps you had better go back and read again the preceding paragraphs! Or, maybe, you really deserve your "social security", and the "benefits" you receive from it.

THE BEST KEPT SECRET IN AMERICA is that the IRS NEVER contacts or issues tax collection correspondence regarding income tax to citizens who don't have, or don't use, a social security number in connection with their financial affairs and earnings!

This correspondence is never received because it is never issued by the IRS computers. It is never issued because the IRS computers have no earnings records upon which a fraudulent entry may be made by an IRS employee to cause the initiation of any collection action.

KNOWLEDGE OF THE FEDERAL TAX LAWS IN FEDERAL COURTS

Former Federal District Judge Harry Claiborne admitted that, while he was a federal judge he knew nothing of federal tax law, yet decided tax cases.

In *Bursten v. US*, 395 f 2d 976, 981 (5th. Cir., 1968), the court acknowledged:

"We must note here, as matter of judicial knowledge, that most lawyers have only scant knowledge of the tax laws."

In *Lord v. Kelly*, 240 FSupp 167, 169 (D. Mass., 1965), it states the judges are under IRS scrutiny.

Even though the judges and lawyers admittedly do not know the tax laws, they sit in judgment and prosecute and/or defend the average citizen. Even though this is the case, the citizen being charged with a tax crime is supposed to have more knowledge than the law professionals and is held accountable by these professionals.

Under the criminal law, a criminal defendant has a right to rely upon decisions of the courts and this is a separate defense; see the *Albertini* case from the 9th Circuit. But further, if these decisions concerning a specific point of law are themselves conflicting, there is the additional defense of uncertainty of the law.

The nature of the income tax is itself conflicting. At the state level, most of the state courts hold that the tax is an excise, while a minority line of authority holds that it is a direct property tax. The reverse is true at the federal level, with most appellate courts holding that it is a direct tax and a minority holding that it is an excise; see the attached list. Since there is no doubt that this conflict is present within the cases, this demonstrates a very serious due process problem of uncertainty in the law.

To violate a clearly known legal duty, one must plainly know the law. But when the law itself is unclear, there correspondingly cannot be a clearly known legal duty.

The Relevant Chronological History

1. 1861 - Income tax first appears in American law as an income DUTY (see The Income Duty of 1861). I am sure you are aware that duties are imposed on foreign imports, not domestic productivity, and as such, this tax did not affect U.S. citizens domestic income or productivity.

2. 1898 - In Pollock v. Farmers Loan & Trust Co. (1898) the Supreme Court strikes down an Act of Congress that attempted to expand the application of the income tax and impose it on the interest and dividends from funds on deposit at U.S. banks, ruling that the tax was UNCONSTITUTIONAL because it was a direct tax without apportionment, as required by Article 1 for all direct (see Referenced Sections of the Constitution).

3. 1913 - The 16th Amendment is passed and allegedly ratified by 3/4ths of the States, although to this day, the

Federal government still will not produce or release for examination the ratification documents supposedly received from the states.

4. 1916 - The Brushaber v. Union Pacific R.R. Co. (1916) decision rules that the 16th amendment IS constitutional because it is NOT a direct tax, but rather, is an INDIRECT EXCISE tax, which does not have to be apportioned. The Court refers the reader to Flint v. Stone Tracy Co. (1911) for the definition of what an excise tax is. This ruling means that the 16th Amendment has no legal effect except to move the income tax from the indirect category of duty to the INDIRECT category of EXCISE. In Flint vs. Stone Tracy the Court ruled that excise taxes are:

"taxes on the manufacture, consumption and sale of commodities within the country, on licenses to pursue certain occupations and on corporate privileges."

Given this fact, how would income tax be applied to income NOT derived from these three defined taxable excise activities ?

Treasury Decision 2313 was issued by the commissioner of the IRS as a result of this Supreme Court decision. It clearly states that non-resident aliens are liable for the tax, and that the income of those nonresident aliens is to be reported on Form 1040. It does NOT say "citizens" or "all persons" because it was properly understood that citizens are not subject to the tax unless they are engaging in PRIVILEGED activities. Citizens have a RIGHT TO WORK, and our rights cannot be taxed. In fact, this Treasury Decision explicitly references an exemption (for citizens, at

Sec. 6654. Failure to Pay Estimated Tax, Exceptions), as paragraph C, that nonresident aliens cannot claim.

5. 1916 - In *Stanton v. Baltic Mining Co.* (1916) the Court rules that the 16th Amendment:

"CONFERS NO NEW POWERS OF TAXATION"

upon Congress. It does not create a new authority to tax citizens directly without apportionment (because it is an indirect tax), according to the Supreme Court itself. So if it was unconstitutional to tax the interest and dividends (of citizens) before the 16th (according to *Pollock*), and no new powers to tax are created by the 16th, how can the income tax be constitutionally imposed today on those sources when *Pollock* has never been overturned or reversed ?

6. 1918 - The 75 year Canadian Tax treaty is signed and Section 22(a) (now Section 61) is added to the USC, defining the sources of taxable income from Canadian sources, subject to the income tax under the foreign tax treaty with Canada (see *The Proper Application*). Income earned in a foreign country under a tax treaty is privileged income, and therefore, is subject to the income tax under the *Brushaber* decision.

7. 1918 - 1935 The income tax is properly collected, not from all U.S. citizens, but only from those who enjoy income from privileged or licensed activities, as determined by the Supreme Court in *Brushaber*. The income tax is also properly collected from foreigners earning money in the

U.S., from any source, per the instructions issued in Treasury Decision 2313.

1935 - Social Security begins (Subtitle C - Employment taxes) and those who voluntarily take a number and provide it to an employer voluntarily subject their wages to tax. This begins the withholding of tax from U.S. citizens, but not for income tax purposes (under Subtitle A), just for Social Security (Subtitle C). The W-4 (or its predecessor) provides a legal authority for the withholding of employment tax from the citizen by the EMPLOYER. The use of W-4s originates under Sec. 3402. Income Tax Collected at Source , subsection (p) - Voluntary Withholding Agreements. This Form becomes the legal basis and ONLY legal authority in the U.S. Code under which the withholding of tax from U.S. citizens is authorized. Social security taxes are now withheld from wages.

1939 - 1944. World War II and lots of new money for the government (and debt for the People) is provided by the bankers, who just 2 years earlier supposedly did not have a penny to loan to farmers and businesses, but suddenly had unlimited billions for a war the America people did not even want to be in.

1942 (approximately) The Victory tax is imposed and it is withheld from citizens wages along with the Social Security taxes. (This tax was probably unconstitutionally direct, but no one objected, so the point is moot.)

1944- Present. The victory tax expires, but the withholding of tax continues after Form W-4 is modified to include a voluntary request to "claim a number of deductions". This of course relates to income tax, NOT Social Security (or employment taxes under Subtitle C). The W-4 is now a voluntary withholding agreement that covers BOTH Employment taxes AND Income taxes, which are withheld at the voluntary request (on the W-4) made by the employee.

It should be carefully noted that Employers are authorized BY STATUTE to withhold EMPLOYMENT taxes under Subtitle C (26 USC 3402), and authorized BY REQUEST (on the W-4 under 26 USC 3402(p)) to withhold INCOME tax (imposed in Subtitle A) from citizens. The STATUTORY authority to withhold INCOME tax is granted to WITHHOLDING AGENTS under Subtitle A, NOT EMPLOYERS. The definition of a "withholding agent" is provided in Sec. 7701(a)(16) - Withholding Agent Defined, where the agent is authorized to deduct and withhold from foreigners, and only foreigners, exactly as the tax was authorized and collected for the first 16 years (1916-1932) of its existence as an excise tax (under the 16th).

The last paragraph accurately reflects the legal reality of today's situation. While you are correct that the tax laws are imposed as "liabilities" NOT filing requirements, the only code sections that exist in the U.S.C. that actually specify or establish liability for tax are Sec. 1461. Liability for Withheld Tax and Sec. 3403. Liability for Tax. If you believe that there is another code section that establishes liability for the income tax, PLEASE CITE IT NOW.

If you believe that Sec. 1. Tax Imposed establishes LIABILITY, you need to read it more closely. It imposes a tax on "taxable income", but does not mention liability. If Section 1 creates liability, who is liable? Where does it say that? The truth is that 26 CFR 602.101 - The Form Required reveals the true extent of any liability that may be imposed under Section 1 as being limited to a liability for "taxable income", earned in foreign countries under foreign tax treaties, which is a PRIVILEGED source of income and, therefore, subject to the indirect excise income tax.

I am sure that you are aware that taxes are not withheld from 1099 earnings, unless they relate to a foreigner. The statutory authority to withhold income tax is limited to withholding agents (over foreigners, as shown by 7701(a)(16)), and employers (from employees, i.e. "covered workers"); what statutory authority would your payors invoke to withhold tax from you? Please provide a cite of the specific code section you believe establishes this authority. I would remind you that the ONLY authorities to backup withhold income tax are established in Sec. 3406 - Backup Withholding and Sec. 3451 - Income Tax Collected at Source on.... Both of these sections only provide an authority to backup withhold against interest and dividends (and patronage dividends). Before anyone can take your money THEY BETTER HAVE A STATUTORY AUTHORITY TO DO SO or they will suffer the legal consequences of attempting to perpetrate theft through fraud. If you believe that there is another code section that authorizes the Backup Withholding of income tax, PLEASE CITE IT NOW.

Furthermore, the Code provides that where a failure to withhold tax is due to "reasonable cause" rather than negligence on the part of the payor, no penalties are imposed (see - Sec. 6724. Waiver; Definitions and Special Rules and 26 CFR 301.6676-1(a)) on the payor. You can be provided with a Statement of Citizenship as provided for in C.F.R. 1.1441-5 Claiming to be a Person Not Subject to Withholding, relieving the withholding agent of the duty of withholding income accepts these statements as "reasonable cause" for failure to withhold, which is why payors are never penalized or asked to pay "back" taxes, or withhold taxes on my earnings. Publication 515 - Employer's Instructions (IRS instructions to employers on how to implement the income tax withholding regulations) also clearly states that if someone gives you (as an employer) a Statement of Citizenship you are relieved of the duty of withholding (income) tax from that individual. Since you do not participate in Social Security and are not an employee with "covered earnings", there is no requirement under Subtitle C to withhold employment tax. No statutory authority to withhold means no tax can legally be withheld. No privileged "taxable income" (and 26 CFR 602.101) means no legal requirement to file a return because no statutory liability exists! NO withholding, NO liability, NO return, NO penalties,

NO enforcement actions, NO TAX == FREEDOM. (free MEANS "not taxed". Citizens are FREE, RIGHT!)

Try to ask attorneys 3 questions to prove to them that they have been misled by the IRS concerning these income tax laws. The first two are easy, the third has never been

answered, BY ANYONE (including the IRS and the Justice Dept.)

QUESTION:

Where are the laws regarding income tax contained in the U.S. Code ?

ANSWER:

Title 26, Subtitle A. (Subtitle C is Employment taxes NOT Income taxes.)

QUESTION:

How many Chapters are there in that Subtitle ?

ANSWER:

6 (Chapters 1 - 6)

QUESTION:

Where in those 6 chapters do you find the withholding of income tax from American citizens ?

Please respond with a cite of the specific code section that you claim establishes this authority. If you cannot provide a cite of a law from Subtitle A authorizing this, I would expect an admission from them that the law doesn't really say what they thought it did, and that these issues should be investigated and addressed by our government.

(PS. Don't waste too much of your time trying to find this, IT DOESN'T EXIST)

This is NOT a Tax Protest

Although the IRS will try to claim that all of this information (from the law itself) is "tax protest", THAT IS A LIE. This is TAX LAW, in fact, IT IS THE IRS THAT PROTESTS THE TAX LAW, by protesting its VERY LIMITED APPLICATION as proscribed in the law, as shown on these pages. The fact of the matter is the phrase "Illegal Tax Protester Schemes" is defined in the law in the Internal Revenue Manual in Section 5431.4. It states:

Illegal Tax Protester Scheme Definitions

1. Constitutional Basis---Refusal to include tax return

information on Form 1040/1040A because of violation of Constitutional rights. In lieu of information required on Form 1040/1040A, the illegal tax protester either shows "--0--", "none", "Object", or a Fifth Amendment annotation in all of the blanks or will include a broad general statement regarding his/her constitutional rights (including 4th Amendment and 16th Amendment). This is commonly referred to as a Porth/Daly type return.

2. Fair Market Value---Reducing gross income because of declining value of dollar. The gross income is listed on the face of the return and there is a large adjustment to income which makes adjusted gross income small enough for standard deduction to

eliminate taxable income. The adjustment to gross income is on Schedule D, Schedule of Capital Gains and Losses, or Form 2106, Employee Business Expenses, for Form 1040.

3. Gold/Silver Standard---Any return with a statement that only gold or silver backed currency can be taxed.

4. Blank Form 1040/1040A---These generally fall into two categories. In one category the individual files a return with only a name and address, and possibly signature and Form(s) W-2 is attached. This scheme is usually verified upon correspondence with the taxpayer. In the second category the individual files a return similar to the Porth type return, i.e. the lines contain "object", "Fifth Amendment", etc., with the exception that Form(s) W-2 is attached. In both instances, the return could or could not list marital status and/or exemptions.

5. Non-Payment Protest---Non-Payment or underpayment of tax based upon some type of protest statement written or attached to the return.

6. Protest Adjust---This is similar to Non-Payment Protest, in that the return contains specific unallowable items (e.g., deductions, exclusions, etc.) identified to some type of protest.

7. Mail Order Ministries---Individual receives income from non-religious sources and declares that it is non-taxable because of "vow of poverty". This scheme also involves returns where the individual includes all or substantially all of gross income as a contribution deduction on Schedule A of Form 1040. Some individuals will complete Form 1040 and then take an unusually large contribution deduction on Schedule A of Form 1040, normally 50% or more of the adjusted gross income.

8. Protester Letters and Cards---The receipt of letters and cards (without tax return) protesting the use of taxes for war, defense and/or other government spending policies, and indicating that this will affect their reporting and payment of taxes.

9. Family Estate Trust---The trusts are filed on Forms 1041. Terms such as "family", "equity pure", "prime", or "constitutional" are used in the title of the trust. Income is from "wages" or "Contract" sources and deductions are for personal living expenses, such as housing, medical, auto, child care, interest or taxes. Generally, an individual will establish a trust, give his/her wages or other income to the trust, and the trust pays for the expenses of the individual. The expenses claimed as administrative expenses of the trust,

resulting in the individual paying no tax and the trust paying little or no taxes.

10. W4---Excessive Overstatement of Allowances---This scheme is usually employed in conjunction with one of the other schemes mentioned above. The claiming of excessive allowances is usually directed towards eliminating withholding of Federal taxes from wages.

11. Forms 843 and Amended Returns--- Some individuals are filing Form 843 Claims and/or Amended Form 1040 (1040X) returns to obtain a total refund on all taxes paid in prior years, even though returns have not been filed for the prior years.

Now, you tell me which of these defined categories of "Tax Protest Schemes" that "applying the law properly" as specified in this chapter, would fall into.

CHAPTER 7 -PRESUMPTIONS OF LAW

A nonresident alien who has filed one or more Forms 1040 in the past is presumed by the IRS to be an individual who was required to file those forms. The filed forms entitle the IRS to presume that this individual either was required to file, or elected to be treated as one who is required to file. Such a requirement would be triggered by changing to resident status, changing to citizen status, and/or opting to derive income from a source inside the federal zone (like federal employment). Accordingly, the IRS is entitled to presume that this nonresident alien has "volunteered" to become a "taxpayer", that is, a person who is subject to an internal revenue tax. Quite apart from the day-to-day assumptions we all make about life in general, the term "presumption" has a very special meaning in law. A presumption in law is a logical inference which is made in favor of a particular fact. The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) defines "presumption" and "presumed" as follows:

"Presumption" or "presumed" means that the trier of fact must find the existence of the fact presumed unless and until evidence is introduced which would support a finding of its nonexistence. - [UCC 1-201 (31)]

Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, defines "presumption" as follows:

A presumption is a rule of law, statutory or judicial, by which finding of a basic fact gives rise to existence of presumed fact, until presumption is rebutted. ... A legal device which operates in the absence of other proof to require that certain inferences be drawn from the available evidence.

There are, in law, two different and directly opposite kinds of presumptions: a conclusive presumption and a rebuttable presumption. A conclusive presumption is one for which proof is available to render some fact so "conclusive", it cannot be rebutted. To "rebut" a fact is to expose it as false, to disprove it. Thus, a "rebuttable fact" is one which can be disproven and exposed as false. In other words, a rebuttable fact is a lawyer's way of describing a fact that is not a fact. (1984 was a long time ago; the book is even older than that.) The opposite kind of presumption is a rebuttable presumption. A rebuttable presumption is a one that can be overturned or disproven by showing sufficient proof. We are interested primarily in this second type of presumptions -- rebuttable presumptions -- because the Code of Federal Regulations makes explicit certain presumptions about nonresident aliens. The regulations have this to say about the proof of alien residence:

Proof of residence of aliens.

*(a) Rules of evidence. The following rules of evidence shall govern in determining whether or not an alien within the United States** has acquired residence therein for purposes of the income tax.*

(b) Nonresidence presumed. An alien by reason of his alienage, is presumed to be a nonresident alien. - [26 CFR 1.871-4] [emphasis added]

The regulations are very clear about a key presumption which the IRS does make about aliens. Because of their "alienage", that is, because of their status as aliens in the first place, all aliens are presumed by Treasury regulations to be nonresident aliens. This presumption is built into the law, because the Code of Federal Regulations is considered to have the force of law. (The CFR is judicially noticed, and courts have ruled that the CFR is a supplement to the published Federal Register, which puts the general public on actual notice too.) This presumption is not a conclusive presumption, however; it is a rebuttable presumption. The regulations establish the rules by which this presumption can be rebutted or disproven, as follows:

Other aliens.

In the case of other [not departing] aliens, the presumption as to the alien's nonresidence may be overcome by proof--

*(i) That the alien has filed a declaration of his intention to become a citizen of the United States** under the naturalization laws; or*

(ii) That the alien has filed Form 1078 or its equivalent;

or

*(iii) Of acts and statements of the alien showing a definite intention to acquire residence in the United States** or showing that his stay in the United*

*States** has been of such an extended nature as to constitute him a resident. - [26 CFR 1.871-4]*

Filing a declaration of intent to become a U.S.** citizen will "rebut the presumption". Acts or statements by aliens showing a definite intent to acquire residence will also "rebut the presumption". Form 1078 is a Certificate of Alien Claiming Residence in the United States**. The IRS Printed Product Catalog, Document 7130, describes this form as follows:

1078 171951 (Each)

Certificate of Alien Claiming Residence in the United States

*Who May File. A resident alien may file the original and one copy of this certificate with the withholding agent to claim the benefit of U.S.** residence for income tax purposes. (A withholding agent is responsible for withholding tax from your income.) D:RF:F Tax Form or Instruction. - [page 10, emphasis added]*

Notice, in particular, the explicit reference to "the benefit of U.S.** residence for income tax purposes". What are the benefits of U.S.** residence for income tax purposes? Recall, from the previous chapter, the "benefits" of being under the protection of Congress and thereby subject to its exclusive jurisdiction. The actual scope of Social Security, for example, is limited to the federal zone, except for those outside the zone who wish to partake of its "benefits" voluntarily. Under the law of presumption, your use of a social security number can be seen by the federal government as proof that you have opted to obtain benefits from the federal zone. Form 1078 is likewise ready-made for those who begin as nonresident aliens, but later opt to declare themselves "resident" in the United

States** in order to claim the benefit of that "residence". Simply stated, Form 1078 declares a nonresident alien to be a "resident" for income tax purposes. It moves nonresident aliens out of the square at row 2/column 2 in The Matrix, and into the square at row 1/column 2.

There are other ways by which the presumed nonresidence of aliens can be rebutted, or disproven, thereby moving their four- square checkers into a square that is within the federal zone. The regulations make reference to Form 1078 or its equivalent. (Try to find a definition of the term "equivalent" in the statute or its regulations.) If nonresident aliens sign a Form W-4, for example, they are presumed to be government employees with income from a source inside the federal zone. Employers are to treat all employees as "residents" and to withhold pay as if the employers have not been instructed otherwise.

Notice how the presumption has shifted. Contrary to the regulations at 26 CFR 1.871-4 (quoted above), employers are told by the IRS to make the opposite "presumption" about the residence of their employees, even if they are not true "employees" as that term is defined in the IRC. If individuals have W-4 and W-2 forms, the presumption is that they were either required to sign these forms, or they have made elections to be treated as residents. Recall that the instructions for Form 1040NR describe the "election to be taxed as a resident alien". This is accomplished by filing an income tax return on Form 1040 or 1040A, and attaching a statement confirming the "election".

An extremely subtle indicator of one's status is the perjury oath which is found on IRS forms. Under Title 28 of the U.S.** Codes, Section 1746, there are two different perjury oaths to which penalties attach: one within the United States**, and one without the United States** (see Appendix R for the precise wording of 28 USC 1746). If an oath is executed without the United States**, it reads, "I declare ... under the laws of the United States of America." If an oath is executed within the United States**, it reads, "I declare ... that the foregoing is true and correct." Thus, your signature under the latter oath can be presumed to mean that you are already subject to the jurisdiction of the United States**. This latter oath is the one found on IRS Form 1040.

It should be clear by now that the IRS may well be making presumptions about your status which are, in fact, not correct. If an original presumption of nonresidence has been rebutted, for example, because a nonresident alien filed one or more 1040 forms in the past, the filed forms do not cast the situation into concrete. The IRS is entitled to formulate a presumption from these filed forms, but this presumption is also rebuttable. If you filed under the mistaken belief that you were required to file, that mistaken belief, in and of itself, does not suddenly turn you into a person who is required to file. Tax liability is not a matter of belief; it is a matter that arises from status and jurisdiction.

The best approach is to "clean the slate". In other words, clear the administrative record of any written

documents which may have been filed in error, or in the mistaken belief that the filer was required. In Appendix F of this book, there is an Affidavit of Rescission which can be used to clean the slate. This affidavit is not meant to be a document with universal application, because everyone's situation is different. For example, the affidavit makes certain statements about the laws and regulations which have been studied by the individual who signs it. Not everyone has read these same laws and regulations. The affidavit does, however, cover a wide range of factual matters which will serve to educate the reader about the constructive fraud which Congress and other federal officials have perpetrated on the American people. Various qualified organizations are now available to assist individuals with the procedure for executing this affidavit, filing it with a County Recorder, and serving it on the appropriate government officials. The National Commodity and Barter Association is one such organization. Their address is in the list of organizations found in Appendix M of this book.

Now, let's have a little fun with this law of presumption, as it is called. The law works both ways. This means that you can use it to your advantage as well as anyone else can. One of the most surprising and fascinating discoveries made by the freedom movement in America concerns the bank signature card. If you have a checking or savings account at a bank, you may remember being asked by the bank officer to sign your name on several documents when you opened that account. One of these documents was the bank signature card. You may have been told that the bank needed your signature in

order to compare it with the signatures that would be found on the checks you write, to detect forgeries. That explanation sounded reasonable, so you signed your name on the card.

What the bank officer probably did not tell you was that you signed your name on a contract whereby you agreed to abide by all rules and regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury. You see, bank signature cards typically contain such a clause in the fine print. These rules and regulations include, but are not limited to the IRC (all 2,000 pages of it) and the Code of Federal Regulations for the IRC (all 6,000 pages of it). These rules may also include every last word of the Federal Reserve Act, another gigantic statute. Now, did the bank have all 8,000 pages of the IRC and its regulations on exhibit for you to examine upon request, before you signed the card? Your bank should be willing, at the very least, to identify clearly what rules and regulations adhere to your signature.

You are presumed to be a person who knows how to read, and who knows how to read a contract before signing your name to it. Once your signature is on the contract, the federal government is entitled to presume that you knew what you were doing when you signed this contract. Their presumption is that you entered into this contract knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally. Why? Because your signature is on the contract. That's why. Is this presumption rebuttable? You bet it is. Here's why:

Instead of telling you that the bank needed your signature to catch forgeries, imagine that the bank officer described the signature card as follows:

Your signature on this card will create a contract relationship between you and the Secretary of the Treasury. This Secretary is not the U.S. Secretary of the Treasury, because the U.S. Treasury Department was bankrupted in the year 1933. The Treasury Department referred to on this card is a private corporation which has been set up to enforce private rules and regulations. These rules and regulations have been established to discharge the bankruptcy of the federal government. Your signature on this card will be understood to mean that you are volunteering to subject yourself to a foreign jurisdiction, a municipal corporation known as the District of Columbia and its private offspring, the Federal Reserve system. You accept the benefits of limited liability offered to you by this corporation for using their commercial paper, Federal Reserve Notes, to discharge your own debts without the need for gold or silver.

By accepting these benefits, you are admitting to the waiver of all rights guaranteed to you by the Constitution for the United States of America, because that Constitution cannot

impair any obligations in the contract you will enter by signing this card. Your waiver of these rights will be presumed to be voluntary and as a result of knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and likely consequences, as explained by the Supreme Court in the case of Brady vs U.S. With your signature on this card, the Internal Revenue Service, a collection agency for the Federal Reserve system, will be authorized to attach levies against any and all of your account balances in order to satisfy any unpaid liabilities which the IRS determines to exist. You will waive all rights against self-incrimination. You will not be entitled to due process in federal administrative tribunals, where the U.S. Constitution cannot be invoked to protect you. Your home, papers and effects will not be secured against search and seizure. Now, please sign this card.

How does the law of presumption help you in this situation? First of all, you presumed that your signature was required, to compare it with the signatures on checks you planned to write. This was a reasonable presumption, because that's what the bank officer told you, but it is also a rebuttable presumption, because of what the fine print says. That fine print can be used to rebut, or disprove, your presumption when push comes to shove in a court of law. The federal government is entitled to presume that you

knew what you were doing when you signed this contract. Well, did you? Did the bank officer explain all the terms and conditions attached thereto, as explained above? Did you read all 8,000 pages of law and regulations before deciding to sign this contract? Did you even know they existed? Was your signature on this contract a voluntary, intentional and knowingly intelligent act done with sufficient awareness of all its relevant consequences and likely circumstances? The Supreme Court has stated clearly that:

Waivers of Constitutional Rights not only must be voluntary, but must be knowingly intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and likely consequences.

[Brady vs United States, 397 U.S. 742, 748 (1970)]

Fortunately, the federal government's presumption about you is also rebuttable. Why? Because the feds are guilty of fraud, among other reasons, by not disclosing the nature of the bankruptcy which they are using to envelope the American people, like an octopus with a suction tentacle in everybody's wallet, adults and children alike. The banks became unwitting parties to this fraud because the Congress has obtained a controlling interest in the banks through the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and their traffic in Federal Reserve Notes and other commercial paper issued by the Federal Reserve banks,

with the help of their agent, the private Treasury Department.

Because this fraud can attach to bank accounts without your knowledge or consent, it is generally a good idea to notify your bank(s), in writing, that the IRS cannot inspect any of your bank records unless you have specifically authorized such inspections by executing IRS Form 6014. The IRS Printed Products Catalog describes this form as follows:

6014 42996R (Each)

Authorization -- Access to Third Party Records for Internal Revenue Service Employees

Authorization from Taxpayer to third party for IRS employees to examine records. Re-numbered as a 4-digit form from Letter 995(DO) (7/77). Changes suggested per IRM Section 4082.1 to help secure the correct information from the third party. EX:E:D Tax Related Public Use

[IRS Printed Product Catalog]

[Document 7130, Rev. 6-89, p. 49]

Make explicit reference to this Form in a routine letter to your bank(s). Inform the appropriate bank officers that they must have a completed Form 6014 on file, with your

authorized signature, before they can legally allow any IRS employees to examine your records. Then state, discretely, that you hereby reserve your fundamental right to withhold your authorized signature from Form 6014, because it might otherwise constitute a waiver of your 4th Amendment Rights, and no agency of government can compel you to waive any of your fundamental Rights such as those explicitly guaranteed by the 4th Amendment in the Constitution for the United States of America. (Banks are chartered by the States in which they do business, and as such they are "agencies" of State government.) For good measure, you might also cite pertinent sections in your State Constitution, particularly if it mandates that the U.S. Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land, as it does in the California Constitution of 1879. Finally, you may wish to state that Form 6014 is not applicable to you anyway, because you are not a "Taxpayer" as that term is defined by Section 7701(a)(14) of the Internal Revenue Code. Therefore, the bank is simply not authorized to release information about you to IRS employees, period!

Social Security is another example of a fraudulent contract with a built-in presumption. Your signature on the original application for Social Security, the SS-5 Form, is presumed by the federal government to mean that you knew what you were getting into, namely, that you knew it was voluntary, that you knew it wasn't a true insurance program, that you knew it was a tax, that you knew Congress reserved to itself the authority to change the rules at any time, and that you knew it would render you a subject of the Congress because you knowingly, intentionally and voluntarily chose to accept the "benefits"

of this government program. Now ask yourself the 64,000 dollar questions: How could you have known any of these things, if nobody told you? How could you have known, if the real truth was systematically kept from you? How could you have known, if all applicable terms and conditions were not disclosed to you before you joined the program? And how could you have made a capable, adult decision in this matter when you signed the form as a minor, or your parents signed it for you? The answers to these questions are all the same: there is just no way.

For the record, Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, defines "fraud" as follows:

An intentional perversion of truth for the purpose of inducing another in reliance upon it to part with some valuable thing belonging to him or to surrender a legal right. A false representation of a matter of fact, whether by words or by conduct, by false or misleading allegations, or by concealment of that which should have been disclosed, which deceives and is intended to deceive another so that he shall act upon it to his legal injury.

[emphasis added]

The law with respect to fraud is crystal clear. "Constructive fraud as well as actual fraud may be the basis of cancellation of an instrument." *El Paso Natural Gas Co. vs Kysar Insurance Co.*, 605 Pacific 2d. 240 (1979).

How do you reverse these ominous presumptions which the federal government is entitled to make about the "contract" you signed at your friendly local bank, or the "contract" you signed to apply for Social Security? Study the "Affadavit of Rescission" available in the documents section of the website for this book at <http://freedomfromgovernment.us>.

This Affidavit is normally served on the Secretary of the Treasury. The situation is a serious one, but knowledge can help to set you free. It is better to light a candle than to curse the darkness. And light always drives out darkness; darkness never drives out light.

CHAPTER 8 - REMOVING PRESUMPTIONS

The courts and government agents use presumptions liberally in their dealings with the public. The thing that makes these presumptions so bad is the fact that they "stand" until "rebutted". As was mentioned in the chapter immediately preceding this one, the fraud that is being perpetrated means that we have recourse to remove these presumptions and demand that the government offer full disclosure if they want us to contract with them anymore.

There is an old English term that is used to make a legal definition of physical property, but it is a good analogy to use to describe what we need to remove these legal presumptions once and for all. We need to set out our "meets and bounds" and historically this meant a

surveyor's description of a parcel of real property, using carefully measured distances, angles, and directions, which results in what is called a "legal description" of the land, as distinguished from merely a street address or parcel number. Such a metes and bounds description is required to be recorded in official county record on a subdivision map and in the deeds when the boundaries of a parcel or lot are first drawn. We need to define our own "meets and bounds" for interaction with public servants so that they know exactly what they are getting involved in when they decide to violate our God given human rights.

The used car lot of your person

If a public servant is demanding that you perform an action, you need to make sure that they know what they are getting into right from the get go.

Let's say you are pulled over on the side of the road, and you have done no harm to anyone. Yet there is a police officer demanding that you exit your automobile. You could tell the officer that you only contract on your terms and that if he is demanding that you perform a function of government, you need to get the "details" out of the way.

Specifically, your compensation for the service you are about to perform, you see, if you work for someone, you need to be compensated, and this is defined in a fee schedule that is part of your claim of right (we will get to the claim itself soon enough). A reasonable amount to charge for exiting an automobile (in my opinion) would cost the agency around \$50,000.

Think of your rights as a used car lot that you own. Your lot is fenced in and every car in the lot has a price on it. If someone wants to buy a car from you on your lot, you can charge whatever you like. Each car is clearly marked with the purchase price and there is no question about what it is going to cost if someone wants to drive one of your cars off the lot. Sure, some might say that your prices are too high, and that your lot is full of junkers, but to this you could reply "If you don't like my prices or my cars, DO NOT BUY CARS FROM ME!", "SHOP SOMEWHERE ELSE!"

The used car lot is symbolic of your body, and each of the cars are your rights. If an agent of government wants to buy a car (violate your rights), you are the one that determines the price. And personally, I would charge them enough to make them not want to shop at my lot anymore.

In other words, "This body you keep throwing in jail... well, it's MINE and I won't allow it anymore!" As a sovereign, we are our own king or queen, and we do not have to use their rules. We make our own rules. I know that if you have read this book so far, I don't need to tell you again that as a creation of God (whoever or whatever God is to you), we have dominion over the earth, and all men under God are equal.

So, now we know that a "presumption of law" is what makes the "person" (a legal fiction, meaning that it only exists on paper), possible. We must remove any presumptions about our person, and only contract with consideration, acceptance, and most importantly; our consent.

Don't be afraid to clarify any term that you do not understand (meaning comprehend, not consent). Ask them what definition they are using. I would even inquire about any "unstated presumptions" and intent as well. We need to stop fearing them, and if you are to the point where you are contemplating going down this path, you need to fully understand that you are now finally starting to also know that you need to accept total responsibility for everything that you do. The only way that this will work is by removing the presumption that we are incompetent and need our lives to be run by the state. We must realize that when we assume full commercial liability, we are giving ourselves full unlimited ability to do anything we choose as freemen.

Our statement of claim

Part of accepting full responsibility of our actions is affirming our ownership over our persona, body, and soul with a "claim of right" also called a "statement of claim" or "notice of understanding and intent and claim of right". Whatever term you choose to use, it is always the substance that matters and not grammar. As long as you make your claim clear, concise, to the point, and complete; you will have the upper-hand when it comes to law.

Remember that while our claim is absolutely one of the most important things that you can do for yourself, it is also as important as remaining in honor by following through with what you say, and not making false claims by not following through. What I mean by this is that you will not have solved all of your problems simply by going and

getting a claim, having it notarized, and then mailing it (certified so you know it was delivered) to every entity you want to inform of your sovereignty. You have to back up your claims by remaining responsible, liable, and always following through when you contract. We are removing the ignorance, and joining the elite or illuminated, and as such we need to remain honorable at all times.

We always need to keep negotiations open, always offer full disclosure, and be willing to collapse all fraudulent relationships and contracts from now on. If we see fraud, we need to let the other party know that we cannot be a party to it.

Back to the "Statement of Claim"; this is a legal contract that you make with the government to take back what is rightfully yours. In it, you need to have a few things; you need to demand that the government provide proof of claim for something that you cannot do (this is much better than the older methodology of listing everything out that you want to have rights to do, and not necessary; because we turn it around and take away their power by claiming ALL of it), you need to include a "fee schedule" (mentioned earlier), and a "default clause" as well. The "default clause" allows the government 21 days (or whatever you deem necessary 10, 14, 30, 60 days...), to respond and let you know if they have something from you that you have knowingly agreed to with full disclosure. This is something that will never happen; because even if they did have something from you that you agreed to, a person in government would not dare risk liability by claiming that you do not have the right to do something. It just won't

happen. Let me know if you get a response? I never did, and I sent mine via certified mail to the Washington County Sheriff of Oregon, the Senior District Attorney, The Hillsboro police chief, the Governor for the State of Oregon, the US Secretary of State, and any other elected government officials you like (I sent it to a few judges as well just for fun). Remember to keep it simple; the less you say, the less they have to use against you in escaping the contract.

It all comes back to your birth registration, and your birth certificate. Make sure that you do plenty of research on this first, and do even ask to see the original birth contract as well, remember this is about YOUR LIFE, it is very important to learn about it.

The government currently does legally own the name on your birth certificate. This name is the intellectual property of the Government of whatever state you were born in. It is not YOUR intellectual property, since at this point you were a new born baby, and have no memories of the day you were born. Your parents didn't have the choice to fill in a statement of birth. They filled in papers with information and signed certifying this info is true and correct.

A government agent, took this information and registered the event of your birth, and then issued your birth certificate.

If you want to be a free, you have to first tell them that you didn't know that the name that you have been identified with all your life was actually their property, that

you are sorry you have been using their property, and you no longer will use it to identify your SELF. The registered name will still exist, and they cannot ask you to send your birth certificate back; so you will still own the papers with the information. This means you can still use it, but not to identify yourself as a flesh and blood human being.

This is where you have to decide what you want to stand for... You can use this name as a company name (person... corporation) to set up bills, etc... But if you want to be a Sovereign, it means you do not want to be part of that society this name is registered under; so you shouldn't ask them to pay for you!

Now the problem is that the government decided to own the land you live on too. Every bit of free land is owned by the state and you are not allowed to build a permanent dwelling on it (and you have the right to security and a dwelling, as a human being, whether you are part of the Governed society or not). You will not be eligible for a loan or a mortgage on a land if you are not identified with a registered name and identification papers. By using a Social Security number you agree to be identified with this name; so most likely you will not be able to find employment without and therefore make enough money to buy a land or a dwelling with cash. This makes learning a trade VITAL.

I think that you can ask them to pay for the things that you are entitled for because people have done so before, and because you cannot live without them. But you cannot

call yourself a Sovereign if you ask the government to do so...

This is why you have to personally craft your statement of claim for your rights. You have to research and understand any of the disclosure you include in it.

It is possible to not be part of the governed society of The United States and still live on its land, because you are a creature of GOD (or nature, whatever you choose to believe in) just like a tree, a fish and a wolf. But, because the government made you and everything else that lives on its territory it's property, you have to know and understand every aspect of your rights and think about your personal needs before you give anything away.

On the following pages you will find my original "Statement of Claim" from October, 2010 (Do not use this one, it is not the best setup and layout - it is simply the one I filed before I knew as much as I know now).

WARNING! - Please do not send off any of these notices unless you know what you are doing! You can find samples of this document at <http://freedomfromgovernment.us> in the documents section.

Notice of Understanding and Intent And Claim of Right

Whereas it is my understanding the United States of America is a common law jurisdiction, and,
Whereas it is my understanding equality before the law is paramount and mandatory, and,
Whereas it is my understanding a statute is defined as a legislated rule of society which has been given the force of law, and,
Whereas it is my understanding a society is defined as a number of people joined by mutual consent to deliberate, determine and act for a common goal, and,
Whereas it is my understanding the only form of government recognized as lawful in the United States of America is a representative one, and,
Whereas it is my understanding representation requires mutual consent, and,
Whereas it is my understanding that in the absence of mutual consent neither representation nor governance can exist, and,
Whereas it is my understanding all Acts are statutes restricted in scope and applicability by the Constitution and/or Bill of Rights and,
Whereas it is my understanding that said scope and applicability is limited to members and employees of government, and,
Whereas it is my understanding those who have a SIN (Social Insurance Number) are in fact employees of the federal government and thus are bound by the statutes created by the federal government, and,
Whereas it is my understanding that it is lawful to abandon one's SIN, and,
Whereas it is my understanding people in the United States of America have a right to revoke or deny consent to be represented and thus governed, and,
Whereas it is my understanding if anyone does revoke or deny consent they exist free of government control and statutory restraints, and,
Whereas a Freeman-on-the-Land has lawfully revoked consent and does exist free of statutory restrictions, obligations, and limitations, and,
Whereas I, Trent of-the-family Goodbaudy, am a Freeman-on-the-Land, and,
Whereas it is my understanding that acting peacefully within community standards does not breach the peace, and,
Whereas it is my understanding that any action for which one can apply for and receive a license must itself be a fundamentally lawful action, and,
Whereas as I am a Freeman-on-the-Land who operates with full responsibility and not a child, I do not see the need to ask permission to engage in lawful and peaceful activities, especially from those who claim limited liability, and,
Whereas it is my understanding a by-law is defined as a rule of a corporation, and,
Whereas it is my understanding corporations are legal fictions and require contracts in order to claim authority or control over other parties, and,
Whereas it is my understanding legal fictions lack a soul and cannot exert any control over those who are thus blessed and operate with respect to that knowledge as only a fool would allow soulless fictions to dictate ones actions, and,
Whereas it is my understanding that I have a right to use my property without having to pay for the use or enjoyment of it, and,

Freedom From Government: How to reclaim your power

Whereas I claim the right to collect a pension if I have paid into it and claim that said right is not affected if I abandon my Social Insurance Number, and,

Whereas it is my understanding that a summons is merely an invitation to attend and that they create no obligation or dishonor if ignored, and,

Whereas it is my understanding peace officers have a duty to distinguish between statutes and law and those who attempt to enforce statutes against a Freeman-on-the-Land are in fact breaking the law, and,

Whereas I have the power to refuse intercourse or interaction with peace officers who have not observed me breach the peace, and,

Whereas permanent estoppel by acquiescence barring any peace officer or prosecutor from bringing charges against a Freeman-on-the-Land under any Act is created if this claim is not responded to in the stated fashion and time,

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

Furthermore, I claim that these actions are not outside my communities' standards and will in fact support said community in our desire for truth and maximum freedom.

Furthermore, I claim the right to engage in these actions and further claim that all property held by me is held under a claim of right.

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

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

Furthermore I claim the right to lawfully:

1. Exercise my "common law right to travel", unhindered, unencumbered at my discretion in my private conveyance of the day, to wit, my private, unregistered, unlicensed automobile.
2. Exercise my God given right to travel.
3. Exercise my "common law right" to refuse to obtain by submission; any application for any government issued license, permit or seek permission to perform any fundamentally lawful action or, enter into any government contract under duress, threat and/or intimidation which would involve committing an act of fraud and/or theft, or any other crime, by way of deception by "I" and/or any involved government principal, employee or agent, (in compliance with my Common Law Rights, etc.).
4. Exercise my right to possess, cultivate or use medicinally any plant of the genus **Cannabis** and also, I claim the right to the maximum state of health that I can achieve and maintain and the right to cultivate, process, store, use or consume any naturally occurring substance or derivations thereof to that purpose,

including, but not exclusively limited to, vitamins, minerals, enzymes, probiotics, phyto-nutrients, herbs and homeopathic remedies, the right to uncontaminated air, uncontaminated water, uncontaminated nutrition, and the right to use the resources of any form of healer or therapist for the purpose of achieving and maintaining my health and in so doing do indemnify them against any form of statutory limitation.

5. Exercise my right to possess unregistered, unlicensed firearms and ammunition and to use the same for target practice at a range or hunting for food and further swear under oath never to open fire on another human being unless as a last resort to protect human life.

I claim that pursuant to any action by any government and/or any principal, member, employee, agent, servant, person thereof in Right of the United States of America, a province, or municipality:

"I reserve my right not to be compelled to perform under any contract or commercial agreement that I did not enter knowingly, voluntarily and intentionally and I do not accept the liability of the compelled benefit of any contract or commercial agreement not revealed to myself, which are my rights pursuant to Common Law".

Furthermore, I claim the right to engage in these actions and further claim that all property held by me under common law being; any and all intellectual property, real estate, trade tools, private automobile(s) and contents, firearms and ammunition, potted plants; contents at my private dwelling are held under claim of right.

Furthermore, I claim that the intentional blurring of the lines with smoke and mirrors, deception, outright lies and too numerous to mention false claims as to the well settled division, between the Crown created legal entity known as the "PERSON" and the flesh and blood creation of the Creator known as a "man", is nothing short of theft, fraud, breach of trust and forced slavery, a heinous criminal activity of the most odious form.

Furthermore, I claim that "all persons, acting as, governments, principals, employees, agents and justice system participants claiming, "retained legal counsel" have, by virtue of their own and/or their principals actions, claimed "total incompetence", in handling any of their own affairs in law and have become an instant ward of the court, hence, they are imprisoned by their own actions in hand or lack thereof.

Furthermore, I claim that due to the self evident facts in truth at hand, that all persons, the Crown, governments, principals, employees, agents and justice system participants claiming limited liability or immunity are doing so under the pretense of being in fact deemed totally incompetent and under law made instant wards of the Crown and/or court and therefore, cannot claim good faith or color of right over anyone who is thus blessed as being a competent heir.

Furthermore, I claim that, "Ignorance of the Law" is not a lawful or legal claim when used by the Crown, government principals, employees, agents and justice system participants at any and all levels to my harm or detriment, especially by those claiming limited liability.

Freedom From Government: How to reclaim your power

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

Furthermore, I claim my FEE SCHEDULE for any transgressions by peace officers, government principals or agents or justice system participants is TWO HUNDRED DOLLARS PER HOUR or portion thereof if being questioned, interrogated or in any way detained, harassed or otherwise regulated and TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS PER HOUR or portion thereof if I am handcuffed, transported, incarcerated or subjected to any adjudication process without my express written and Notarized consent.

Furthermore, I claim the right to use a Notary Public to secure payment of the aforementioned FEE SCHEDULE against any transgressors who by their actions or omissions harm me or my interests, directly or by proxy in any way.

Furthermore, I claim the right to convene a proper court de jure in order to address any potentially criminal actions of any peace officers, government principals or agents or justice system participants who having been served notice of this claim fail to dispute or discuss or make lawful counterclaim and then interfere by act or omission with the lawful exercise of properly claimed and established rights and freedoms.

Furthermore, I claim the law of agent and principal applies and that service upon one is service upon both.

Furthermore, I claim the right to deal with any counterclaims or disputes publicly and in an open forum using discussion and negotiation and to capture on video tape said discussion and negotiation for whatever lawful purpose as I see fit.

Affected parties wishing to dispute the claims made herein or make their own counterclaims must respond appropriately within FOURTEEN (14) days of service of notice of this action. Responses must be under Oath or attestation, upon full commercial liability and penalty of perjury and registered in the Notary Office herein provided no later than fourteen days from the date of original service as attested to by way of certificate of service.

Failure to register a dispute against the claims made herein will result in an automatic default judgment and permanent and irrevocable estoppels by acquiescence barring the bringing of charges under any statute or Act against My Self Freeman-on-the-Land Trent of-the-family Goodbaudy

Place of claim of right: The United States of America

Dated: 10-4-2010

State of Oregon
County of Washington
Signed to before me by
Trent Goodbaudy on
the 4th Day of October, 2010

Claimant: My signature in blue ink

Notary Public: Sara M Ramos



Use of a Notary is for attestation and verification purposes only and does not constitute a change in status or entrance or acceptance of foreign jurisdiction.

CHAPTER 9 - TRUST LAW, AND THE ROLES WE PLAY

The court operates in trust law, we have had an introduction to what a trust is in chapter 3, and in this chapter we will cover trust law and the roles we play on a daily basis.

To begin, we can examine the Wikipedia definition of "Trust Law":

In common law legal systems, a trust is a relationship whereby property (real or personal, tangible or intangible) is held by one party for the benefit of another. A trust conventionally arises when property is transferred by one party to be held by another party for the benefit of a third party, although it is also possible for a legal owner to create a trust of property without transferring it to anyone else, simply by declaring that the property will henceforth be held for the benefit of the beneficiary. A trust is created by a settlor (archaically known, in the context of trusts of land, as the feoffor to uses), who transfers some or all of

his property to a trustee (archaically known, in the context of land, as the feoffee to uses), who holds that trust property (or trust corpus) for the benefit of the beneficiaries (archaically known as the cestui que use, or cestui que trust). In the case of the self-declared trust, the settlor and trustee are the same person. The trustee has legal title to the trust property, but the beneficiaries have equitable title to the trust property (separation of control and ownership). The trustee owes a fiduciary duty to the beneficiaries, who are the "beneficial" owners of the trust property. (Note: A trustee may be either a natural person, or an artificial person (such as a company or a public body), and there may be a single trustee or multiple co-trustees. There may be a single beneficiary or multiple beneficiaries. The settlor may himself be a beneficiary.)

The trust is governed by the terms under which it was created. The terms of the trust are usually written down in a trust instrument or deed but, in England, it is not necessary for them to be written down to be legally binding, except in the case of land. The terms of the trust must specify what property is to be transferred into the trust (certainty of subject-matter), and who the beneficiaries will be of that trust (certainty of objects). It may also set out the detailed powers and duties of the trustees (such as powers of investment, powers to vary the interests of the beneficiaries, and powers to appoint new trustees). The trust is also governed by local law. The trustee is obliged to administer the trust in accordance with both the terms of the trust and the governing law.

In the United States, the settlor is also called the trustor, grantor, donor or creator. In some other jurisdictions, the settlor may also be known as the founder.

When we look at this definition, we see that there is a lot of titles thrown around such as, beneficiary, trustee, settlor or grantor, a trust also needs an administrator, and at least one authorized representative.

So when we realize that there is no magic combination of words, and the all the court is using is Trust law we have a severe advantage. We then need to ask ourselves, exactly what role or title/s do I have in this structure. Who is master, and who is the servant? We need to realize that we are a spiritual being, and we definitely are NOT one of "those" persons that are subject to the statutes that are only for the public servants. Remember the car lot analogy from the last chapter? As the "owner" of that car lot, you rule everything that happens in the car lot, so that makes you the "executor" of your "estate" (we ALL have an estate, and we don't need to die to have an executor for it), and also the beneficiary (we keep the profits of sales on our lot). And according to trust law, you can be the executor and beneficiary at the same time, but you cannot be the trustee while being either the beneficiary or executor.

Let me put this in more simple terms for those of you that might be lost right now. Let us start by saying that we are stuck with this name, and that it actually represents a legal fiction (a person). Despite the fact that it has been the thing that government has been using to control us all

these years, we know that equity or ownership is king, and once we assume liability and the ability to manage our own affairs we can look at this "person" that we have in a new way.

If we use our person the way it was intended, as a component in a corporate structure, and we look at a court proceeding as a corporate tribunal. We will notice that because of our person and its relationship to the company, we have a vested interest in the proceeding. When we enter the tribunal we need to clarify any presumptions that may be made about our status, title, and role in the proceeding immediately.

Understanding the corporate power structure

When we view a court proceeding as an internal corporate tribunal, we realize that we must play a part in the corporation. The difficult part is figuring out exactly what role we fill, and what title we use.

Let's look at some typical corporate titles and what their function is so we can get a sense for what is happening when we go to court. First of all there is the President or Director, and they make the major decisions about how the company is run, and they also set company policy. Then we have the employees, and the company would not run without them, but they always follow policy and decisions set by the president. They are also entrusted with taking care of corporate assets, so they are also the trustees. Then we have the shareholders, and they receive a dividend on their investment in the company which makes them the beneficiary. The shareholders also can choose to

appoint a new president or director if they are making bad decisions for the company or setting bad policy so they actually have the power to remove and appoint new directors for the benefit of their investments.

Now that we know the three main roles or titles involved in the corporate power structure, we can determine what role we play in the corporate tribunal. Which would you choose to be? A shareholder, president, or employee? If you are an employee, you could be president someday, but chances are that you never will. If you are the president, you will never be an employee, but that's ok because all of the employees have to do what you say. And if you are a shareholder, you get to collect a benefit and help determine if the director is doing a good enough job.

I will first tell you what you may have already guessed. We really don't want to be the employee, we want to be the president and/or shareholder (at least I do... I don't know about you). What if I told you that you already are the president? Would you believe me? Who is the one who sets policy in your life? Who makes major decisions in your life? YOU DO of course! Guess what else, you are also the SOLE beneficiary of your legal fiction. And as the sole beneficiary (aka only shareholder), you appoint your own director! So when you go to court, if you set your own company policy; everyone else in that courtroom is a trustee or employee, also known as a public servant or agent of the government. When a person is acting as a public servant, they actually have less rights than you do as a Man created by God with inherent rights. And they can be held liable if they violate these rights.

Keep in mind that if you are performing a function of government, you are then a trustee or employee which we do not want, ever. Unless you think that is benefitting you, which I will tell you right now... it isn't benefitting you, and you are not even being paid as an employee of government. It is time to stop working for them for free, and I would say that it is time to stop working for them period.

So now you will know your title, your position, who you are acting as. Please do not be the trustee. Ever notice how they call inmates trustees? But only the ones that have earned the trust to perform a function of government, even if it is mopping the floor, they are working for government, and I bet they don't get paid very well either.

All of this is hidden in plain sight, can you see it yet? The court is just a moderation service, a last resort for parties who could not come up with a solution on their own. It really all boils down to being responsible, honorable and being able to handle matters that have to do with your estate without moderation.

We really know nothing about what the court is up to, all we can really do is give our own position. It is all about removing presumptions, and taking responsibility. But to exercise your rights you really have to do your homework! You have to take charge! You are the sole shareholder, YOU appoint the director (never appoint the judge as the director, btw). The judge is typically the administrator of the dispute and is just another public servant or employee

with no special powers unless you are determined to also be an employee/trustee, which makes them your superior (not good). I could spend another 500 pages on trust law alone, so I am going to get into the fun stuff like going to court and interacting with law enforcement. Someone to check out that has made amazing strides in the area of trust law is a Canadian named Dean Clifford, check him out, he has all kinds of good stuff on YouTube.

CHAPTER 10 - GOING TO COURT

I have said this before and I will say it again, court is not for you. You are better off to settle all your issues out of court, but if you absolutely *have* to go, make sure you win before you appear. "How do I do that?", you may be asking.

Have you ever thought of using the resources already available to you? Personally, what I would do is file some documents and get some sworn statements and evidence on the record. Don't get discouraged, this is easy! There are three things that any filing (usually a motion or affidavit - a *motion* compels the court to take action, and an *affidavit* is a sworn allegation) must have; a statement of facts, damages, and remedy. And remember to keep it simple, use short concise sentences, and make it to the point.

On the following pages are examples of sworn affidavits, and motions, which are just documents that direct the court. The following examples are PERFECT because they were actually drafted by government.

FILED
OREGON JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT
WASHINGTON COUNTY
2005 OCT 27 PM 2:08

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF OREGON ex rel)	
████████████████████)	AFFIDAVIT, MOTION AND ORDER
)	TO ISSUE BENCH WARRANT
Plaintiff,)	(PROBATION VIOLATION)
)	
vs.)	
████████████████████, ████████████████████)	No. C9 ██████████ I
)	DA No. 2 ██████████
Defendant.)	CSP: 0 ██████████ 1

AFFIDAVIT AND MOTION

STATE OF OREGON)
County of Washington) ss.

I, Rebecca P. Mehringer, being first duly sworn, depose and say;

1. I am a duly appointed Deputy District Attorney for Washington County, Oregon.
2. On 12/01/██, Defendant was found to be in Contempt of Court for failure to pay child support and placed on probation for a period of two (2) years.
On 06/02/05, Defendant was found in violation of probation. Probation was extended two (2) years.

- AFFIDAVIT, MOTION & ORDER TO ISSUE A BENCH WARRANT
NS78W

3. The conditions of defendant's probation include requirements that he pay his current child support of \$[REDACTED].00 per month plus \$[REDACTED].00 per month toward support arrearages.

As indicated by the attached certified support history printout, defendant has failed to fully make payments as directed by the court. Defendant paid [REDACTED] from 07/01 [REDACTED] through 09/30/[REDACTED].

4. Also included in the conditions of probation were the requirements that defendant keep the District Attorney advised of employment and address changes in writing within 10 days of the change. According to the District Attorney's records, defendant has not fully complied with the terms of probation.

5. I make this affidavit in support of a motion requesting the Court for an order to the Clerk of the Court to issue a bench warrant for the apprehension of the above-named defendant to be brought before the Court to show cause why probation should not be revoked.

Rebecca P. Mehringer
Rebecca P. Mehringer - OSB 04543
Deputy District Attorney

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this date: 10-18-[REDACTED]

Oscar Estrada
Notary Public for Oregon; Washington County



ORDER

Based upon the motion and affidavit of the Washington County Deputy District Attorney, it is hereby ORDERED that the Clerk of

- AFFIDAVIT, MOTION & ORDER TO ISSUE A BENCH WARRANT
NEW

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

the Circuit Court is directed to issue a bench warrant for the apprehension of the above-named defendant to be brought before the Court to show cause, if any, why probation should not be revoked. Said warrant shall be a no bail warrant.

DATED: 10/26 [REDACTED]



Circuit Court Judge

John B. Lewis

- AFFIDAVIT, MOTION & ORDER TO ISSUE A BENCH WARRANT
NS78W

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

COPY

STATE OF OREGON ex rel,

██████████
Plaintiff,

vs.

██████████
Defendant.

BENCH WARRANT
(Probation Violation)

No. C ██████████
DA No. 2 ██████████
CSP: 0 ██████████ 41

TO ANY PEACE OFFICER IN THE STATE OF OREGON, GREETINGS:

The above-named defendant, on 12/01/██████████, was convicted and placed on probation for Contempt of Court (failure to comply with a child support order) and having been accused of violating said probation, you are commanded to arrest the above-named defendant forthwith and bring defendant before such Court to show cause why said probation should not be revoked, and for judgment; or if the Court has adjourned for the term, deliver the defendant into the custody of the jailor of this county. By order of the Court.

No bail or security release is allowed before arraignment except upon order of the Court.

Witness my hand and seal of the said Circuit Court, at Hillsboro, in said county and state, this 18 day of Nov 20

By *E. V. Vaker*
Trial Court Clerk



DOB: ██████████
Address: ██████████
Issue: *per Judge Lewis*

- AFFIDAVIT, MOTION & ORDER TO ISSUE A BENCH WARRANT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON
FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHINGTON

STATE OF OREGON,)
Plaintiff,) Case No. D [REDACTED] M

vs.)
[REDACTED])
Defendant.)

COPY

**AFFIDAVIT, MOTION AND ORDER
AUTHORIZING CLERK TO:**
 Issue Bench Warrant and
Schedule Show Cause Hearing
 Schedule Show Cause Hearing

AFFIDAVIT AND MOTION

I, the undersigned, being first duly sworn, say as follows:
I am an Accounting Clerk in Washington County Circuit Court, being duly sworn, do depose and say that the following named defendant was ordered by the court, on the date set forth, to pay a monetary obligation as set forth, said obligation to be paid by a date certain and said obligation remains unpaid.



 Court Clerk

ORDER to ISSUE BENCH WARRANT

Based on the Motion and Affidavit of the above, it is hereby ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court be, and hereby is, directed to issue a Bench Warrant for the apprehension of the above-named defendant to be brought before the Court to show cause, if any, why probation should not be revoked. Bail Amt.: 9000

DATED: 5-21-05 _____
Circuit Court Judge

ORDER FOR SHOW CAUSE. MICHAEL J. MCELLIGOTT

Based on the Motion and Affidavit of the above, it is hereby ORDERED that the defendant be and is hereby required to appear on _____
at _____ so that a Show Cause Hearing may be set.

DATED: _____
Circuit Court Judge

DOB: _____ ADDRESS: _____
RACE: _____, SEX _____ HT: _____ WT: _____ HAIR: _____ EYES _____

Page 1 - AFFIDAVIT, MOTION AND ORDER AUTHORIZING CLERK.
AFORSC:LS:10/99

Pretty simple stuff. Notice how these documents are all "sworn"? Well, you were never "sworn" (with full disclosure anyway) and therefore these orders and motions are

fraudulent and should NOT affect anyone except someone performing a function of government.

To get good at writing a good motion or affidavit it just takes practice. Unfortunately, I do not have room in this book to teach this skill, but I will build a treasure trove of filings at <http://freedomfromgovernment.us> for you.

An awesome resource that you may not have thought of is the court itself. I know that they always say that they cannot offer legal advice, but procedural information is NOT legal advice. Just say that you need information about the process, and not advice. If you check your county courts website there is usually lots of information there as well, and even blank forms and form templates too. People just don't think that they can win so they never try. People need to stop using ignorance as an excuse if they don't like the service being provided.

Making an appearance

The most important thing for you to understand when you go to court is; your position on this planet and where your true power actually comes from. You can argue law all you want but if you understand what your real position of power is, they will not be able to trick you or lie to you anymore. Most people don't know what to say in court. They are unsure of themselves and they don't know how to stay in honor without compromising their sovereignty.

As a sovereign, we are fully liable for ourselves, we always operate with honor and integrity. Those trustees and government agents want you to argue law with them,

they have years of experience, and if they can get you to slip up, they have a chance at catching you in a word game and winning. The courtroom is a warzone, you are supposed to have settled your dispute before court. The court is not your forum. Some say that you need to notify the court that you are making a "special appearance" versus a "general appearance" and to this I say sure, go ahead and notify them that you will be making a "special appearance". All you have to do is let them know that you are appearing in your "Propria persona", a legal term that means that you are appearing in your proper person. Just make sure that when you get there you KNOW YOUR STUFF! That is the most important thing I can get across to anyone, you do not go to war unarmed, so for your own sake please arm yourself with the information you need to be clear with them.

When making an appearance in court the most important thing that you can remember is that you are a common law man of inherent jurisdiction, and that you need the prosecution to produce any facts or evidence to the contrary, which they will never be able to do if you present yourself correctly.

We have "inherent", or God given rights and as such, unless they can prove that we were acting in the capacity of government or as an agent of government their statutes do not apply to us. An easy way to know that this is true is the fact that you do not receive a paycheck from them, if you worked for them, they would be paying you. If you do work as an agent of government or in a government capacity, I am sorry to inform you that the oath you have

sworn means that you ARE subject to all statute and legislation. I don't know why anyone would want to work for them.

We need to remember that our first and only relationship with them is that of a trust. We remove presumptions by providing evidence of a trust, which is the highest form of law and supersedes all statute and legislation. If they were doing what they were supposed to be doing and acting honorably we would not require any court other than civil court. Really what they are doing is a very serious abuse of executive power, denying us of our due process. The good news is, they have to prove that we work for them. And if they screw up, we will have some awesome lawsuits to file.

Remember, we don't use their rules. Use your birthright to show that you are not in their jurisdiction. What gives you authority? As a sovereign, only you do!

They are running a business. They would be a bad business, and they would never make any money if they told us that we really don't want to be a part of this. If they told us; "You would have to be insane to sign this!" Would you sign it?

So, when we are in court it all boils down to what you can prove. We have all the power because we can swear our own statements as evidence, court officials cannot.

The best way to go to court is if you have already won. I mentioned this before, but to do this you need to make sure that your paperwork is filed and that it is in front of

the judge and prosecution before you even get there and you want them to have had a chance to review your motion and affidavit.

So, your motion is filed a week in advance, and it contains your evidence and pleadings. You want to put it in writing so that there is no question about what you mean, and there can be no question about what is happening.

So, in court this is what should be done if you have your paperwork filed beforehand (we will talk about if you don't have your paperwork filed in advance, in a bit).

When your case is called, say; *"Yes, I am here for that matter"* (if you have your paperwork filed beforehand, it says who you are... you don't have to play the name game... spelling and other nonsense are not applicable). Or even, *"Yes, I'm him."*

Make sure that you have identified yourself properly in your pleadings. So it's in writing, and the judge already has it.

It should be as easy as:

Me: *"Did you get my paperwork? Did you read my affidavit judge?"*

Judge: *"Yes, I read your affidavit."*

Me: *"Good."*

If you did your filing right, you have established everything in the paperwork already. There is nothing to argue about, now that they have it. You should actually not even discuss it with them.

Do not open the document up to discussion or interpretation. If you do, the judge will try to decide that they don't like things that are in there.

WE DON'T CARE about their laws, make sure that the prosecution is served with a copy of it as well. If they have it, there is no dispute. They therefore have the duty to dismiss and or preferably discharge.

Your paperwork clarifies jurisdiction. It should have a title of "Motion to discharge, with prejudice". Then start with point number one; "I am known as -your name-, I am a common law man with inherent jurisdiction as evidenced by: Exhibit "A" the particulars of live birth on file with the state.", then point-by-point describe events that happened that have to do with the case, but only from a sovereign viewpoint. You don't have to get caught up in ANY statute or legislation. You will want to describe and identify yourself properly and positively. You will also want to include the fact that you contacted the prosecution and asked them for proof you were performing a function of government or agent of government, and if so could they please provide payroll records, they never replied... blah, blah, blah. List it all out!

Make sure you include that if I am not acting as an agent of government, then you have no jurisdiction over

me. Make sure that you also request to dismiss or discharge this matter.

You can't counterclaim in statutory court, but you may want to let them know, actually you will be giving them an opportunity; let them know that *"I am willing to drop my civil claim against you if you withdraw immediately."* Put that in your affidavit, and also make them an offer again in live court, and if they don't reply now, they are now again in dishonor before the court. Double dishonor is not good, not only are they not replying to you, but they are also refusing to settle. At all. how much more dishonorable could they get (make sure this is in the pleading as well).

So then you could ask *"Is the prosecution rebutting anything?"*

"Do they have any facts or evidence to rebut anything I have provided?"

"Dismiss! I am not even discussing this with you."

"It is not open to discussion, this is between me and the prosecution. You (judge) are the net in the middle."

"Motion to discharge, with prejudice."

If you have your motion in, then your affidavit is before the court, and they are aware of it, this is your first avenue and best course of action.

If you fail to put in a motion beforehand there are still some things you can do. Keep reading.

You could go in there and start waving your Certificate Of Live Birth around... the judge won't want to SEE it, because if he sees it he will know that you are not in proper jurisdiction and he will be bound to act that way, and now he has a duty to act honorably. He will try to not look.

His duty is to protect you once you establish common law jurisdiction. The judge is OBLIGATED to protect you.

Countless people have done this.

If you are not prepared prior to court, and you show up for your court date, ask for "full disclosure", ON THE RECORD.

State in NO UNCERTAIN TERMS; *"So, the prosecution is telling me, that this is full disclosure and they have no other documents to support any of their claims against me?"*

Of course they will say; *"yes, yes, yes"*.

And you say; *"excellent"*.

Then you could say that there is *"Not one shred of evidence that I was performing a function of government, acting as an agent, I am not being paid, there is no contract, not even an injury, nothing."*

Now they have admitted that what they have given you is everything they have on you, and they haven't demonstrated anything that would pull you into their jurisdiction, this is perfect.

About crossing the bar, some people have a problem with this as they do not want to give up their inherent rights, so what you could do is say *"I'm -your name-; I am a common law man with inherent jurisdiction, do you recognize that? And will my rights be protected if I cross this bar?"*

If they say no; are you going to cross the bar?

You could tell them; *"Well then I'm not crossing the bar!", "Are you crazy? Why would I want to go anywhere where my rights are not protected? Do you think I'm stupid?"*

Say; *"Have a good day."*, and leave, and also *"Clearly I am in the wrong court, because I have inherent common law rights. If I have no rights beyond that bar, that is not somewhere I should be."* And GET IT ON THE RECORD, while you are talking to them. Get the transcripts, and that will be an exhibit in your future lawsuit if they continue to proceed against you.

You can also remedy the controversy at any time, halfway through a trial, or whenever you want. The following is the procedure to deal with the duality in court AT ANY TIME.

It is important to just use the most plain language you can with them, like *"Oh, I just became aware that there is this real big, mistake. An error going on. I just became aware of it. Thought I better mention it to the court because it turns out that it is fraudulent in nature, and I don't want to be a party to fraud."*

"It turns out that I didn't know that they were coming after me trying to say I was an agent of the government, I just found this all out today. I do not perform a function of government, I am only in inherent jurisdiction. You don't have the authority to prosecute me."

Fraud nullifies the contract. Voids ANY contract even ones with consent.

So if you think that they have you in a contractual obligation because you have been playing ball so far. You can ALWAYS say; *"WOAH, I just became aware that this is all a total and complete fraud. I cannot be a party to fraud. I'm sorry."*

"I did not know that I was willingly participating in fraud, forgive me."

"Now that I do know, I have a duty to correct the situation, as do you." Simply be honest with them. You really can't be more honest than that.

Everyone thinks that there are magic words. There is no secret code, but really it is just all your perception. Don't send the judge a decoded message, JUST TELL THEM! In as PLAIN a language as you possibly can.

In Propria persona (proper person) means you are making a special appearance. A general appearance binds you to statutes and legislation. Make sure you declare that you are appearing in "Properia Persona".

Your lawyer cannot challenge a jurisdictional claim, they are bound by and created by statute. It is not even possible, this has even been ruled by the supreme court. Only you can challenge jurisdiction, by making a special appearance.

The problem is, you are not an agent of government. You are "Common Law" man of "inherent jurisdiction", always. No fancy new statement. They are always testing you though.

"I know you by your actions." Do you actually know who you are? You HAVE TO if you are going to try this in court.

What about when they ask if you understand? Do you know that they are really asking you if you "assume liability". Always say that you don't understand what's going on (in other words you do not assume liability). Or

define understanding as simply comprehending, and you do not consent to anything. Remember also that questions have more power than statements.

"You have my affidavit, you have my paperwork, do you understand what my rights are?"

Do not admit that you are the "accused" either. That is making an assumption that you do not need to make.

Do they have a "Cause of action", "injury", anything?

If you are not sure about something, ask if your rights will be protected, it's common sense; "If I consent to a trial will my common law rights be protected?"

And one of the best questions you can ask them is; *"Why would I come to a trial in your jurisdiction when we should be in civil court? If you really had a claim against me that is where we would be. An actual injured party can take me to court, but we are not over there, that tells me that there is no cause of action."*

"No cause of action. I'm not putting up with any more of your BS, Everything you say and do here I am going to be swearing out an affidavit of it, and add you to a civil claim in civil court for attacking me in statutes."

Direct to the Judge: *"Are you participating in what they are doing?"*

To judge; *"Are you helping them to attack me? You're supposed to be protecting me!"*

Always assume liability if it is valid (it never will be though), but if you have done harm or have a victim, you should accept liability.

And if you need "representation", I may be taking on a limited number of local cases in the future (for compensation of course, we should know by now that I do not contract without being compensated). And we need to be clear, I am not an attorney (I would never want to be one of those), but I can be duly authorized as a representative for you via power of attorney. Also please know that with the amount of corruption in court today, you run the risk of being railroaded anyway - so make sure you make objections and make it known to the judge that you will be appealing. This helps keep everything on the up-and-up, and further informs the judge that you are not playing games.

I want to re-iterate that this is NOT LEGAL ADVICE! It is legal information. Once you read it, it is up to you to process it and make your own decisions. As a sovereign I cannot accept responsibility for anyone else's actions save for my own.

Everything said by the public servants in court is an OFFER. Remember this, it is very important. And with any offer there is four doors (or ways to respond) we can go through with each offer. We can respond by either; remaining silent, argument, acceptance, or conditional

acceptance. With everything being an offer, I would have to say that the only proper way to honorably respond would be with a "conditional acceptance". The conditional acceptance offers acceptance of an offer, but only upon demonstration that they can meet your "condition". A great example of this is a line I used in 2009 in court, and I made the judge very angry. The funny thing is, I didn't even really know what I was saying at the time, but if you have read this whole book so far you will know the impact of the following statement. When the judge asked my name, I responded; "I shall give you my name, upon proof of claim that you have established jurisdiction over the matter pending". This makes the judge have to prove that he has jurisdiction (oath spoken) over me. And it does not deny his original request.

The court operates on "facts", but a fact in the eyes of the court is not what a fact means to you or me. In court a "fact" simply consists of something that has been agreed upon by both parties. You can enter (preferably in your affidavit beforehand) some really good facts about the fraud occurring, along with being able to actually attest as a spiritual being to these "facts". This is a power that is higher than the court, you see, they can only swear as a public servant with limited liability. When *you* swear that something is true, it is as if a king made a proclamation, and this holds more force than any affidavit they can ever swear, because they are all limited liability. We bear the responsibility of full commercial liability for all of our actions.

You may even find that the court does not make everything that they do a matter of PUBLIC record. It may be recorded, but only as "a record" not "a public record" (there is a BIG difference). You may want to ask if the proceedings are a matter of court record or are they public record? And then no matter what they say, simply add "I am convening a court of record" because as a sovereign, we can convene a court any time we like and everything that happened in our court will later be sworn into an affidavit as part of a lawsuit against any persons that perpetrated in the fraud. Let them know this as well. Civil court is where we get our remedy.

Just remember; we are not public servants, we perform no function of government, we compose our own government. We set our own policy. As a power that is greater than theirs, we have to disallow them. We only deal with head honchos, this corporate tribunal is not where we belong. We only belong there if we work for them, and if we work for them we better be getting paid. Consent to nothing (except a dismissal).

As you go to court, remember these important "facts" (that not even the prosecution will be able to disagree with you on), you are an original man of this land, you are your own king and you rule everything in your dominion, you have a title of authority, and you do NOT perform a function of government.

It will help if you go by your title (be sure to make it sound like a position of authority, like president, director, or CEO).

Then you wait to be called... I would wait outside of the courtroom, because when they say "all rise" that is a trick to show you have given jurisdiction. Come in after the "all rise", just so that there is no consent. I usually just sit in the courtroom, and remain seated when they say "all rise", but you may not want to make such a display yourself.

Remember to always stay in honor. Did you promise to perform? Because if you swore to do something, do it. And if not, don't do harm and you are good to go.

Be ready for them to call in the sheriffs at any point, and they are also public servants as well, they work for you! So address the sheriffs', *"Sheriffs', don't touch me! Back away from me, you do not have my consent. For the record, the public servant on the bench has asked the sheriffs' to physically attack me."*

You must disallow them, and it is likely going to get pretty intense. This is why you need to KNOW YOUR STUFF! No little script I write here is going to be how it actually goes because every experience will be different. If you KNOW the concepts and terminology well enough, they will not be able to trick you any longer. You must NEVER threaten them with anything you cannot carry out though. Make every threat valid, and then actually follow through with what you say, because after all, all we have is our honor and integrity.

Here is another example of how it could go. When your name is called, say *"I am the director for that*

corporation/legal fiction, and I am here to speak on that matter". No doubt they will ask you for your name again, and then you would say, "My name is MAN". I would also offer that "My business is not government business, as I am not a public servant or agent of government".

Then perhaps you could say to the Judge: *"I am the General Executor of this account. By whose authority do you use that name as personal identification? I'm going to appoint you Trustee, and you dissolve this case. Goodbye."*

And then get out of there. It really helps to say you do not consent to their jurisdiction and that you are the single beneficiary and shareholder of your corporation. This should do the trick, but you have to be prepared for whatever happens, even spending the night in jail.

You must never compromise your honor, your integrity, your title. You must carry the confidence that your title inspires and actually requires. If you don't act like a president, why would they believe that you are one? You need to have a spine, you have to be willing to take a stand for yourself, or you might as well not even try.

Remember, there is no magic combination of words! It is all just trust law! If you want to be successful, you have to do your homework! We hold all the equity, we hold all the commercial energy, we are the fuel, and that is why we have the power that we have.

Some more things that I would like you to know about court.

Pose questions instead of statements. The carry more weight.

Do not rely on case law. Case law is not a responsible substitute for real law. Case law is also irrelevant! Think about it, EVERY case is different. I don't know the circumstances surrounding the incident, I don't know what definitions that they were using, don't know what the intent of the lawsuit was.

You are not a public servant, and you do NOT perform a function of government, unless you choose to.

Unless we have a business arrangement (contract) leave me alone!

You are not incompetent, you are not their property.

Always demand the original charges! This is so important, because they need to produce your signature that you used on the original charge. Odds are that this does not exist, and if it does it was done via fraud.

Nothing can compel you to testify against yourself, never do it!

Set your "meets and bounds" (see chapter 8 "Removing Presumptions").

You are claiming that you own yourself, act like it!

Establish jurisdiction (oath spoken), to thine own self be true.

You are the "Duly authorized administrator", both publicly and privately.

The state is meddling in your estate, they are not authorized to administer your estate.

It is all about substance, not grammar.

You don't have to use their rules, YOU set policy for your own corporation!

Remove any presumptions. Find out who is paying for dinner BEFORE the check comes.

Positively ID yourself per contract.

STOP FEARING THEM! Who is compelling you to act? What binds you to the name they are using? They are presuming you are performing a function of government.

The lowest form of law is statutory law, which only applies to public servants.

Everyone in the courtroom is an "agent" of the name of the person that is called, including you. Do not admit to being an "agent" of the matter at hand.

Be sure to refer to the judge as a "public trustee" and or "public servant". Say, "Are you not a public servant?", "I am administering here!" The government is ALL trustees.

If they threaten to issue a warrant for the person and they say that they will just arrest you when you leave, you say, "Thank you for making the judicial determination that I am not the accused.", and get the heck out of there.

The Sheriff's job is to hold the TRUSTEE (which is NOT you) accountable, and this is why they have the most power in government.

All the judges know the truth, you are ignorant to think that they don't. To be a judge you have to be a sick, power hungry maniac. The way they look at it is, it isn't fraud if you don't know your rights.

If sheriffs are called in, say something like this, "Excuse me, are these gentlemen public servants? They do not have consent to touch me, nor do they have consent to intimidate me. Please have them back away from me."

We do not know what the court is up to, all we can do is give our own position, title, and who we are acting as. "Are you challenging my claim? So, you don't think I am in charge of this legal person? Pretty sure I am."

What tells me I have all this power? God does and the Bible does.

God put US here, so we are the ones with the true power. We have to figure out what a real claim is.

Have FUN! If you aren't having fun, you aren't doing it right!

CHAPTER 11 - DEALING WITH POLICE ENCOUNTERS

A policeman has only the power of arrest granted them by their charter. The FBI, IRS, ATF, license bureaus, income tax, and police power are all heads from the same monster, and only differ contractually. If the contract they presume to exist is "dishonored" for your failure to do, or not to do a thing; even the freeman will be summoned to Tribunal if he does not reserve his rights.

The very first thing I need to tell you about police is not to talk to them! When I say this I mean absolutely do not try to explain your way out of it thinking that they will go easy on you. This is where they get their evidence, directly from you! Do not give it to them! Anyone that tells me I have the right to remain silent and then I start talking trying to explain my way out of it I am an *idiot*. The most important rules for talking to the police are; keep quiet, shut-up, say nothing, and SHUT-UP!

If we are sovereign, we do not have the luxury of not talking to them at all. We have to stay in honor and defend ourselves whenever it is required. We can do this without admitting jurisdiction. I must add caution and say that you take these actions at your own risk. This is not advice, it is information and it is your choice to act. Never try the following unless you are willing and able to take full responsibility for yourself and your actions.

Now that we have that out of the way, we can go over the topic of driving with no insurance, license, or license plate. If we are truly going to claim our own sovereignty, we will shed these things as we become ready internally and it manifests in our external lives. We must know also that when we use the public roads, we automatically assume risk by using them. Everyone has to assume risks, that's life.

To get ready to do this we need to make some preparations. First, and foremost we will need to be willing and able to make arguments for ourselves. This means we need to spend time studying the material. We operate on the honor system, and because of this we must prepare for those that have no honor on the public servant side. If you are going to drive without a license and license plate, start out with a cheap car. One that won't hurt so bad when it gets towed, plus you want to pay cash for it. Make your own license plate with the following message on it, or at least have this message prominently displayed on your automobile:

NOT FOR HIRE PRIVATE PROPERTY

When you get pulled over, let them know that you are driving in private, and not as a public servant. You can only be charged under an act on the highways that has to do with commerce, and only while performing as an agent of the government. He who does not deny; admits.

The roads are public roads, we extend the privilege for the public servants to be on them, not the other way around. Who's permission do we need? Absolutely no one's other than our own. My business is not government business. You are only performing a function of government if you have applied for it. After you apply, and are licensed, government assumes responsibility for you so you can be told what to do. We are responsible for ourselves, no one else is. We make the rules! We made the government!

A W-4, summons, or license is presumed to be voluntary, knowingly, willingly and intentionally signed by the Citizen. A negotiable instrument is Constitutional, no matter what rights the Citizen is restricted from uttering, for some are waved and therefore frivolous. "Obligation of Contract" applies to all parties, and claiming that

something is "unconstitutional" will not serve remedy to an "unconditional" and voluntarily signed contract. The court is not in the business of advising its "clients" how to protect their Bill of Rights upon any negotiable contract.

Face the fact; you *will* get pulled over if you do this. Better mentally prepare for it now. Some things you might want to say to the officer (choose what you say wisely):

"Did you observe me breach the peace?"

"Am a common law man of inherent jurisdiction, statutes and legislation do not apply."

"I do not consent to any searches."

"Are you claiming that I am a public servant?"

"I am not an agent of government."

"Am I under arrest? Am I free to go?"

"Don't touch me! Stand down!"

"Nothing can compel me to testify against myself."

Hand them a copy of your fee schedule and say; *"You are damaging me, here is what the damages are."*

"Do you have a charge? Do you have a warrant?"

Any requests, demands, or attempts to contract; *"I don't work for free. That's going to be \$xx,xxx. And if you want me in the back of your car it's gonna cost you a million bucks."*

You are only obligated to adhere to court orders (legitimate ones).

Use conditional acceptance; *"I will give you what you want, when you can prove such-and-such."*

"You can't force me to do anything for free."

"How much is your bond worth?"

Give them no name, no charge to answer to.

"I am not a government agent, and as a matter of fact, I don't even know who you are! Are you a public servant?"

"My human rights have been violated."

"I claim you have no authority."

We do not "apply" for things, as a sovereign, we make declarations.

We created it! We own it!

Always stay in honor, and never show emotion. If you aren't ready to go to jail for a few days, don't even bother. Remember that NO ONE can assume liability for your

actions. If you don't want to be responsible for your actions, you will end up in a cage.

FREEDOM = RESPONSIBILITY

If the police are asking you questions while you are walking down the street, you have the legal right to not talk to them. Turn around and walk the other way. You do not have to give them ID either, but be warned if they find ID on you after you state you have none that is a crime that they will probably charge you with. Your best bet is to not carry any state or federal issued ID.

What do you do when the police are pounding on your door? Well, with the terrorism laws from the 2011 National Defense Authorization Act in place, consider yourself lucky that they didn't just bust in the door and kidnap you already. At least if they are pounding on your door they typically do not have enough evidence to charge you quite yet, or they are looking for information or for someone .

The best way to communicate with the police at your door is through the door. Do not open it. If you do open it, step outside to talk to them after locking the door and closing it so that they cannot enter. Simply opening a door allows the public servant to block it from closing again, and at that point it is easy to gain entry. So, I would just stick to talking to them through the door.

There are two fundamental ways that you can handle a traffic stop. Either assert your rights as a citizen, or as a sovereign. Asserting rights as a citizen in no way affords

you as much freedom as a sovereign. You cannot be a sovereign and a citizen at the same time. Being a citizen makes the presumption that you have sworn an oath, while a sovereign takes no oaths other than to himself.

"I don't consent to searches!"; The first time I told this to an officer, his whole demeanor and attitude changed and he started treating me with more respect. They are the public servant, always remember that they are there to serve *us*. If they do not respect you not allowing them to search you, let them know by saying *"You are trespassing on my private property as soon as you touch it."*

Police however, are trained to get you to consent, and they are good at it. And in reality a cop has to initiate 9 searches on the average before he finds someone with something illegal. This means that they put 9 people through the humiliation of a search before they find one with something illegal. And if you asked an officer why they performed so many searches, they would just tell you that people like to cooperate. Why would they subject so many to this invasive procedure if their first interest was not to try and charge you. It all boils down to convictions and revenue, they need them.

Your next best line is; *"Am I being detained or am I free to go?"* Police are legally allowed to lie to you. If the cop says that they are looking for bombs, and you say that you don't have any bombs, and allow them to search, if they find a pot pipe the presumption is that you have already consented to the search. In other words prepare to receive

a citation if not worse. Avoid playing any word games and arguments with them, it will not help you, trust me.

Their best line is *"You don't mind if I take a look?"*, and even if you don't have anything to hide, you NEVER know what they might find that someone else left in the car. Who knows, the cops might even find something illegal from the previous owner. The best practice for us, being sovereign, is that of honor, integrity, and responsibility. We must never consent to searches, and if we are going to be performing a function of government, you better have your fee schedule in place so that you have remedy in civil court. Let them know that if there are any rights violations you will be swearing out affidavits to that effect in a civil suit against him.

For example, if an officer wants me to step out of the vehicle; I would say, *"It sounds like you are asking me to perform a service. I do not work for free, and as a matter of fact my lawfully binding fee schedule states that I charge \$50,000 an hour to exit the automobile, enforceable against your person in civil court. Are you sure you want to accept full commercial liability for your actions and are you sure that you still want to contract with me?"*

The contract makes the law. If you are not a party to a contract, then it does not apply to you. If you have not received full disclosure the contract was made under fraudulent pretenses and is void.

The \$50,000 an hour is only to exit the vehicle, if he wants to put handcuffs on me that is another \$100,000 an

hour for detention and questioning, and \$250,000 an hour for imprisonment. It also helps to have a death clause in there for at least \$1,000,000 (a million dollars is not unreasonable; what is your life worth? mine is far more than a million, but that figure should get their attention). Why not give them an "invoice" too? You know that they would give you a ticket if they had a chance.

So to summarize, remain silent as far as any accusations of statute infractions go, and you really don't want to get mouthy with them at all, but be calm, sensible, honest, and honorable. Never consent to searches, even if you are under pressure! Don't let them trick you! Are you detaining me, or am I free to go? This question establishes that the stop is not voluntary. Don't expose yourself. The stop and frisk is very frequent and usually illegal.

CONSENT = ARREST

You always have the right to refuse searches. They also have to provide "probable cause", or clear facts that you are involved in illegal activity. And last but not least, police can legally lie to you!

Freedom From Government: How to reclaim your power

CHAPTER 12 - CONCLUSION

Now you have an idea of what it really means to live in the "land of the free". Hopefully you use this newfound knowledge to make this world the best for mankind in history. It is up to us, just imagine how beautiful the world would be if everyone accepted total responsibility for themselves. Imagine the love we would have for each other.

There is no "government" that passes "laws" that need to be "escaped" or "broken". In terms of valid concepts, the associations between the individuals so employed and paid with your tax money and their offices are so loose as to be a granfalloon, rather than a logically valid conceptual entity.

What actually exists are individuals, going about making noises with their mouths, making scribbles with their pens and typing characters on a computer screen. They then

make noises to the media broadcasters who in turn look at scribbles and make noises to each other and to viewers who interpret these noises according to their ongoing fantasy and hallucinations.

Having shared noise-meaning conventional neural configurations, individuals then go about modifying their behaviors, making more noises - some happy and some not so happy.

Do you really want to directly challenge people living in a fantasy world and having access to all the guns, fists and other weapons of war they could ever need? There's no need to. The first goal is to become conscious of the game, or the matrix. Until then, I recommend "*rendering unto Caesar what is Caesar's*" so you may live long enough to be useful to your network and fulfill whatever your true potential may be. Or, as otherwise directed by who you wish to serve.

The Work is esoteric to begin with. According to Gurdjieff, when you fuse a singular I, or fuse to a certain point, consciously chosen sacrifice can stop. At that point and with your own will, you will know what your options are, you will be the master of the option and you simply do whatever you choose to do.

We are not lost at sea, we are not incompetent. The government is there to serve us, it is time we took advantage of this fact. Claim dominion over yourself and shed the bonds of slavery. We have been free this whole time, we just need to lay our claim to our inheritance.

Learn how to draft and file a lawsuit, civil court is our remedy. We can sue them so bad they will really think twice before doing the same thing to someone else.

Study your law! Now that you know what you know, keep studying. Get really familiar with the techniques. Watch Dean Clifford videos on YouTube, this guy is good! Many of the concepts in this book came from him. He is an example of true sovereignty.

Replace your fear with love for all mankind. We have no reason to fear government once we are enlightened. They are there to serve us, not the other way around.

Make sure you surf on over to <http://freedomfromgovernment.us> for all kinds of good stuff. I am going to keep a blog with updates on tactics, a huge document repository, videos and more all about how to reclaim your freedom from government.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Trent Goodbaudy lives in Hillsboro, Oregon and is also a professional copywriter and ghostwriter. He also writes for several blogs and guest articles around the web. Trent's main website is Trentslist.org where he likes to speak his mind and the truth, and has a solid following of 10,000 active registered users.

Trent has spent many years dealing with cops, courtrooms, and lawyers, after trying virtually everything and finding out what works and what doesn't, he now brings this tried and tested methodology to everyone. There is no reason for the fraud that they are perpetrating to continue. There is a better way, let us start today.