The United States is a Corporation

Yes, you read the title correctly. We are not living in a country with a government of the people, by the people, for the people, but we are part of a giant Corporation, The United States Corporation, and the President of America is the CEO. We are only the employees. This Corporation, in its turn, is owned by another Corporation, The British Crown.

"Hey, wait a minute! First of all, America is not owned by Great Britain," you may way. "That´s what the War of Independence was all about; to free ourselves from British tyranny. We are free from Britain and we have our own Constitution. Our Founding Fathers helped out with that!"

If this is what you think, it is incorrect, and I will tell you why. We have never been free from Britain; the power only changed from overt power to covert power. They gave us an illusion of freedom, and they have succeeded well to keep their little secret. Thus, the Founding Fathers, who most of them were Freemasons, had no intention to give us any freedom. They worked hand in glove with the British Crown all the time, but the only way to establish a "New World" in America was to fool the people and tell them that they were fighting for freedom. This is the plain truth in a nutshell, but now it´s time to back up and explain the above a little deeper...

Corporation of the People, by the People, for the People

(The following section is an excerpt from David Icke´s book, The David Icke Guide to the Global Conspiracy [and how to end it] pp. 231-233. I strongly recommend this book, because it gives you a brilliant overview of how this conspiracy works.
You can order the book at www.davidicke.com *

The United States ´government´ is actually the United States Corporation. It was created behind the screen of a ´Federal Government´ when, after the manufactured ´victory´ in the American War on ´Independence´, the British colonies exchanged overt dictatorship from London for the far more effective covert dictatorship that has been in place ever since.

In effect, the Virginia Company, the corporation headed by the British Crown that controlled the ´former´ colonies, simply changed its name to the United States of America and other related pseudonyms. These include the US, USA, United States of America, Washington DC, District of Columbia (Samurais) and the President of the Corporation is known as the President of the United States. This is an accurate title

given that one is the names for the Corporation is the ´United States´. He or she is not the President of the people or the country as they are led to believe - that´s just the smokescreen.

This means that Bush launched a ´war on terrorism´ on behalf of a private Corporation to further the goals of that Corporation. It had nothing to do with ´America ´ or ´Americans´, because these are very different legal entities. It is the United States Corporation, not the ´government´, which owns the United States military and everything else that comes under the term ´federal´. The privately-owned Corporation called the United States is the holding company, if you like, and the fifty states are its subsidiaries.

You may have noticed that the national flag of the United States always has a god fringe when displayed in court or federal buildings, and you see this also in federally-funded schools and on the uniforms of US troops. Under the International Law of the Flags, a gold fringe indicates the jurisdiction of commercial law, also known as British Maritime Law, and, in the US, as the Uniform Commercial Code, or UCC. The gold fringe is not part of the American flag known as the Stars and Stripes, but it is a legal symbol indicating that the court, government building, school or soldier is operating under British Maritime Law and the Uniform Commercial Code; military and merchant law.

For example, if you appear in a court with a gold-fringed flag your constitutional rights are suspended, and you are being tried under British Maritime (military/merchant) Law. If it seems strange that a court or building on dry land could be administered under Maritime or Admiralty Law, look at US Code, Title 18 B 7. It says that Admiralty Jurisdiction is applicable in the following locations:
1) the high seas
2) any American ship
3) any lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States, and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction thereof, or any place purchased or otherwise acquired by the United States by consent of the legislature of the state. In other words, mainland America.

All this is founded on Roman law, which goes back to Babylon and Sumerian law; because the Illuminati have been playing this same game throughout the centuries wherever they have gone. The major politicians know that this is how things are and so do the top government administrators, judges, lawyers and insider ´journalists´.

Americans think that their government and legal system is pegged in some way to the Constitution, but it is not. The United States, like Britain and elsewhere, is ruled by commercial law to overcome the checks and balances of common law. It´s another monumental fraud. The US court system does not operate under the American Constitution, but under corporate law. It is the law of contracts and you have to make a contract with the Corporation for that law to legally apply to you.

The scam has been set up so that when you register with the ´Federal Government´ in any way, by accepting a Social Security Number, driver´s license, or any of the other official federal documents, you are, unknowingly, contracting to become an asset-employee of the United States Corporation...Every word, or use of lower/upper case, is making a legal statement. Have you noticed that when you receive correspondence relating to government, law and anything to do with finance, including taxation, your name is always spelt in all upper case, as in BILL JONES?

But your upper case name is not you. It is a corporation/trust set up by the ´government´ Corporation through the treasury department at your birth. Every time a child is born a corporation/trust is created using his or her name in all upper case. So BILL JONES is what they call a ´straw man´, a corporate, not human, entity. They do it this way because governments are corporations and they operate under commercial law, the law of contracts. The laws passed by governments only apply to corporations and not to living, breathing, flesh and blood, sovereign, free men and women spelt in upper and lower case, or all lower case, as with Bill Jones, or bill jones. The living, breathing sovereign man and woman is subject to common law, not eh commercial law introduced by governments through legislation.

Using commercial law makes it much easier to install an ´elected´ dictatorship. Unlike common law, you are not subject to precedents built up over centuries. You simply have to get a majority to vote for a bill in Parliament of Congress, or have the US President sign a document, and the law is imposed. What you also have to do - clearly not difficult - is to keep from the people the knowledge that their name in all upper case is not them. They will then pay you taxes and be subject to your jurisdiction and control in all areas of their lives, by unknowingly standing surety for the corporation - ´BILL JONES´ - that they don´t even know exists.

All court documents have the person´s name in all upper case because under the law of contracts the living, breathing being cannot be tried under corporate law, only a corporate entity can. It is so crazy that Americans pay personal income tax to the government (corporation) via the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) when the law to introduce personal income tax was never passed. Ask anyone from the US government or IRS to produce the law that says Americans must pay income tax on their wages and they will not be able to do it. Many have tried and the law has never been revealed because it doesn´t exist...A $50,000 reward was offered by the We The People organization to anyone who could produce the law and IRS agent, Sherry Jackson, thought it would be easy money. She then found out that there was no law and resigned to become a campaigner against this fantastic hoax...

...Yet, when people don´t pay taxes, which they do not legally have to pay, the IRS takes their property, puts them in jail, and ever more often sends in the armed goons in the black masks. It´s fascism, nothing less...If anyone thinks that without personal income tax there would be no education and other public services - it´s not true. They are paid for by state and property taxes, business taxes, sales taxes, fuel tax, booze tax and all the other endless taxation that we pay besides income tax. In fact, personal income tax in the US is roughly the same as the money paid by government to the banks in interest on loans.

Resources:

- The United States Isn´t a Country — It´s a Corporation!
- An etymology of the word "corporation."Corporation
- THE VATICAN LONDON CORPORATION/
- and *see* HERE

28 U.S. Code § 3002 - Definitions

(15) "United States" means—
(A) a Federal corporation;
(B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or
(C) an instrumentality of the United States.

With no constitutional authority to do so, Congress creates a separate form of government for the District of Columbia, a ten mile square parcel of land (*see*, Acts of the Forty-first Congress," Section 34, Session III, chapters 61 and 62). Act 1871 allows the "Corp US" to control the country in the place of the natural Government HERE and HERE

Delegated Authority

WARNING!

This research may be hazardous to bad laws. Courts, bureaucrats and socialists may not welcome or approve of these truths, nor are they to be construed as legal advice. Therefore, to act on these facts is to do so at your own risk or opportunity. – Doyel Shamley

Necessity for delegated authority.

It is essential for a federal employee to possess delegated authority to perform any particular act; the absence of delegated authority means that the act in question was beyond the scope of the employee´s duties, and therefore unlawful.

The necessity for a public employee to possess delegated authority is shown by a wealth of cases. For example, in United States v. Spain, 825 F.2d 1426 (10th Cir. 1987), at issue was the authority of the Drug Enforcement Administration to place certain substances upon the federal controlled substances list and thus make possession thereof a crime. Under former provisions of this law, the Attorney General possessed this power to schedule controlled substances, and he had previously delegated that authority to the DEA. But, in 1984, Congress amended the law and provided a new statutory procedure by which such substances could be placed upon the list through a "bypass" procedure. Without delegated authority to schedule drugs under the amendment, the DEA did so and commenced prosecution of parties possessing the newly scheduled drugs. However, Spain´s conviction was reversed when the Court held that the DEA´s acts were void due to the lack of delegated authority to schedule the drugs pursuant to the new statutory procedure. Other courts have reached the identical conclusion; *see* United States v. Pees, 645 F. Supp. 697 (D. Col. 1986); United States v. Hovey, 674 F. Supp. 161 (D. Del. 1987); United States v. Emerson, 846 F. 2d 541 (9th Cir. 1988); United States v. McLaughlin, 851 F. 2d 283 (9th Cir. 1988); and United States v. Widdowson, 916 F.2d 587, 589 (10th Cir. 1990).

In United States v. Giordano, 416 U.S. 505, 94 S.Ct. 1820 (1974), at issue was the validity of a wire-tap application, which under existing law could be approved only by the Attorney General and a specially designated assistant. In this case, a wire-tap was needed and application was submitted to the Attorney General, who was absent from his office as was the designated assistant. Instead, an executive assistant lacking authority to approve the application authorized it on the supposition that the Attorney General would approve. The Court held the executive assistant´s act void, declared the wire-tap illegal, and as a consequence evidence was suppressed. *See*

also, Department of Ins. of Indiana v. Church Members Relief Ass´n., 217 Ind. 58, 26 N.E.2d 51, 52 (1940)("When the right to do a thing depends upon legislative authority, and the Legislature has failed to authorize it, or has forbidden it, no amount of acquiescence, or consent, or approval of the doing of it by a ministerial officer, can create a right to do the thing which is unauthorized or forbidden").

In United States v. Mott, 37 F.2d 860, 862 (10th Cir. 1930), an incompetent Indian leased some land and received large amounts as royalties, which were held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior. An agreement made to disburse those funds was held to be without authority:

"Where an executive officer, under his misconstruction of the law, has acted without or beyond the powers given him, the courts have jurisdiction to restore the status quo ante insofar as that may be done (cites omitted)."

See also, Continental Casualty Co. v. United States, 113 F.2d 284, 286 (5th Cir. 1940) ("Public officers are merely the agents of the public, whose powers and authority are defined and limited by law. Any act without the scope of the authority so defined does not bind the principal, and all persons dealing with such agents are charged with knowledge of the extent of their authority").

In United States v. Gemmill, 535 F.2d 1145, 1152 (9th Cir. 1976), some Indians were engaged in a demonstration within a federal park. As a result of the presence and protest of the Indians, park officials closed the park and thereafter arrested the Indians, who were convicted of trespass. The decision vacating these convictions was premised upon the lack of delegated authority for the officials who closed the park:

"Absent an explicit delegation from the Secretary, the boundaries of the Forest Supervisors´ authority should not be extended into areas the regulations have clearly reserved for higher officials. "By immediately closing the entire area, the Supervisor went beyond the limits of his authority and exercised a power that had not been granted to him. The closure orders were invalid and the trespass convictions cannot stand."

In reaching this conclusion, the Court referenced the applicable delegation orders published in the CFR. *See also*, Sittler v. Board of Control of Michigan College of Mining and Technology, 333 Mich. 681, 53 N.W.2d 681, 684 (1952)("The extent of the authority of the people´s public agents is measured by the statute from which they derive their authority, not by their own acts and assumption of authority"); Phillips v. Fidalgo Island Packing Co., 238 F.2d 234 (9th Cir. 1956); Flavell v. Dept. of Welfare, City and County of Denver, 355 P.2d 941, 943 (Colo. 1960); Tulsa Exposition and Fair Corp. v. Board of County Commissioners, 468 P.2d 501, 507 (Ok. 1970)("Public officers possess only such authority as is conferred upon them by law and such authority must be exercised in the manner provided by law"); In re Benny, 29 B.R. 754, 762 (N.D. Cal. 1983) ("an unlawful or unauthorized exercise of power does not become legitimated or authorized by reason of habitude"); Ramirez de Arellano v. Weinberger, 745 F.2d 1500, 1523 (D.C. Cir. 1984) ("when an officer acts wholly outside the scope of the powers granted to him by statute or constitutional provision, the official´s actions have been considered to be unauthorized"); Outboard Marine Corp. v. Thomas, 610 F.Supp. 1234, 1242 (N.D. Ill. 1985)("Acting without statutory power at all, or misapplying one´s statutory power, will result in a finding that such action was ultra vires").

In Lopez-Telles v. I.N.S., 564 F.2d 1302, 1303 (9th Cir. 1977), a deportee alleged that an administrative law judge could refuse to deport him for humanitarian reasons, a reason not permitted by statute. In rejecting this argument, it was stated:

"Immigration judges, or special inquiry officers, are creatures of statute, receiving some of their powers and duties directly from Congress... and some of them by subdelegation from the Attorney General... These statutes and the regulations implementing them... contain a detailed and elaborate description of the authority of immigration judges. Nowhere is there any mention of the power of an immigration judge to award the type of discretionary relief that was sought here."

These rules regarding the necessity for a government employee to have delegated authority to act apply with equal force in the field of tax law. For example, in Botany Worsted Mills v. United States, 278 U.S. 282, 288, 289, 49 S.Ct. 129, 131, 132 (1929), the mills and a subordinate revenue agent entered into an informal compromise agreement regarding the tax liability of the mills. That agreement was held invalid on the ground that the agent lacked delegated authority to make the agreement:

"We think that Congress intended by the statute to prescribe the exclusive method by which tax cases could be compromised, requiring therefor the concurrence of the Commissioner and the Secretary, and prescribing the formality with which, as a matter of public concern, it should be attested in the files of the Commissioner´s office; and did not intend to intrust the final settlement of such matters to the informal action of subordinate officials of the Bureau. When a statute limits a thing to be done in a particular mode, it includes the negative of any other mode.

"It is plain that no compromise is authorized by this statute which is not assented to by the Secretary of the Treasury... For this reason, if for no other, the informal agreement made in this case did not constitute a settlement which in itself was binding upon the Government or the Mills."

See also, Brubaker v. United States, 342 F.2d 655 (7th Cir. 1965); and Royal Indemnity Co. v. United States, 313 U.S. 289, 61 S.Ct. 995 (1941).

In Country Gas Service, Inc. v. United States, 405 F.2d 147, 149, 150 (1st Cir. 1969), the taxpayer entered into a compromise with a revenue agent to settle a tax liability in a beneficial manner, but the agent had no delegated authority to do so. To decide this case, the Court noted the absence of any delegated authority for the agent and concluded the agreement was void:

"The narrow issue presented by this case is whether the revenue agent had authority to make a binding agreement ... The exclusive procedure for compromising tax liabilities is set forth in Int. Rev. Code of 1954 § 7122. This section explicitly reposes such authority in ´the Secretary or his delegate´, and such delegation stops at the district level. Since the exclusive means of compromise established by §7122 was not utilized in this case, any arrangement taxpayer made with agent McInnis had no legal standing."

And in Brooks v. United States, 833 F.2d 1136, 1146 (4th Cir. 1987), there was a dispute concerning competing claims to and liens upon some property and one party claimed that such a compromise agreement concerning taxes should be accepted as

valid in the case. The court rejected the validity of the agreement because it would have been consummated by agents lacking delegated authority:

"[T]he authority to settle disputes involving unpaid liability over $100,000 is granted only to IRS Regional Commissioners and Regional Counsel. Delegation Order 11 (Rev. 13), 1982-1 Cum. Bull. 333. Thus, even if the District Director had signed the letter and intended to accept Frank´s offer of compromise, the acceptance would have been ineffective."

See also, Boulez v. C.I.R., 810 F.2d 209, 217, 218 (D.C. Cir. 1987) ("Acting in contravention of a regulation governing execution of compromise agreements, the Director was as much without authority to join in the oral agreement with Boulez´s counsel as he would have been had power to compromise never been delegated to him"); and Thornton v. United States, 73-1 U.S.T.C. ¶ 9232 (E.D.Pa. 1973), holding that a jeopardy assessment approved by a group chief rather than the district director was void.

The necessity for a federal employee to have delegated authority to act not only is shown in the above cases, it also manifests itself in cases under the Federal Torts Claims Act (herein "FTCA"), 28 U.S.C. §1346(b). Under this law, the United States is liable for torts committed by its employees if so committed within the scope of their employment. If the act in question was not committed in the scope of employment, the employee is liable and the United States is not.

A variety of cases deciding FTCA claims show instances where the United States is held not liable for its employees torts. In Paly v. United States, 125 F.Supp. 798 (D.Md. 1954), a soldier detailed as a military funeral escort was driving his own car to a funeral and was involved in an accident. Since the soldier lacked express orders to do so, his tort was held to be outside the scope of his employment and the United States was not liable. In Jones v. F.B.I., 139 F.Supp. 38, 42 (D.Md. 1956), it was alleged that certain FBI agents had stolen or converted property belonging to the plaintiff. The court held that if such were true, the agents "were not ´acting within the scope of [their] office or employment´, " and the United States could not be liable in tort. In James v. United States, 467 F.2d 832 (4th Cir. 1972), a reservist was involved in a car accident on his return from an annual field training exercise; since this travel was not within the scope of his employment, the government was held not liable for damages. In another accident case involving an Army truck, White v. Hardy, 678 F.2d 485, 487 (4th Cir. 1982), the driver was found to have no authority to drive the truck when the accident happened, thus his acts were beyond the scope of his employment and the United States was not liable ("There was substantial evidence that Sergeant Hardy was not given the requisite express authority to use the government vehicle involved in the collision"). In Hughes v. United States, 662 F.2d 219 (4th Cir. 1981), the United States was held not liable for child molestation committed by one of its employees, a postal worker. In Trerice v. Summons, 755 F.2d 1081 (4th Cir. 1985), the United States was held not liable for the wrongful death of one serviceman committed by another. And in Thigpen v. United States, 800 F.2d 393 (4th Cir. 1986), the court held the government not liable under the FTCA for the sexual assault of some girls by one of its employees.

Cases from other jurisdictions also demonstrate that for an act to be within the government employee´s scope of employment, it must have been authorized by a regulation or some other written document. For example, in Mider v. United States, 322 F.2d 193 (6th Cir. 1963), a FTCA claim was being asserted against the United

States for damages arising from an accident involving a drunken Air Force serviceman. To define the serviceman´s authority, written regulations were consulted to determine whether the act of driving the government´s car was authorized. Finding that the regulations did not permit use of the vehicle on this occasion, the serviceman was found not to be acting within the scope of his employment. In Bettis v. United States, 635 F.2d 1144 (5th Cir. 1981), a soldier drove a truck off a military base without authority and was involved in an accident; his act was held to be beyond his authority and thus the United States was not liable in tort. In Turner v. United States, 595 F.Supp. 708 (W.D.La. 1984), a recruiter conducted an unclothed physical examination of some potential females enlistees, which caused them to sue under the FTCA. In finding that there were no regulations either permitting or requiring such examinations, the United States was found not liable. *See also*, Doggett v. United States, 858 F.2d 555 (9th Cir. 1988), and Lutz v. United States, 685 F.2d 1178 (9th Cir. 1982).

Thus the above cases adequately demonstrate that a government employee must have some specific delegated authority, based upon statutes, regulations or delegation orders, in order to be authorized to act in the premises. The absence of such authority, when challenged, therefore requires a holding that the employee´s acts were unauthorized and thus beyond the scope of his employment.

Immunity depends upon delegated authority.

When a citizen challenges the acts of a federal or state official as being illegal, that official cannot just simply avoid liability based upon the fact that he is a public official. In United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220, 221, 1 S.Ct. 240, 261 (1882), the United States claimed title to Arlington, Lee´s estate, via a tax sale some years earlier, held to be void by the Court. In so voiding the title of the United States, the Court declared:

"No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives.

"Shall it be said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the citizen has been deprived of his property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government without any lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the protection of personal rights."

See also, Pierce v. United States ("The Floyd Acceptances"), 7 Wall. (74 U.S.) 666, 677 (1869)("We have no officers in this government from the President down to the most subordinate agent, who does not hold office under the law, with prescribed duties and limited authority"); Cunningham v. Macon, 109 U.S. 446, 452, 456, 3 S.Ct. 292, 297 (1883)("In these cases he is not sued as, or because he is, the officer of the government, but as an individual, and the court is not ousted of jurisdiction because he asserts authority as such officer. To make out his defense he must show that his authority was sufficient in law to protect him... It is no answer for the

defendant to say I am an officer of the government and acted under its authority unless he shows the sufficiency of that authority"); and Poindexter v. Greenhow, 114 U.S. 270, 287, 5 S.Ct. 903, 912 (1885).

In Reagan v. Farmers Loan & Trust Co., 154 U.S. 362, 390, 14 S.Ct. 1047, 1051, 1052 (1894), the Court declared:

"A tax law, as it leaves the legislative hands, may not be obnoxious to any challenge; and yet the officers charged with the administration of that valid tax law may so act under it, in the matter of assessment or collection, as to work an illegal trespass upon the property rights of the individual. They may go beyond the powers thereby conferred, and when they do so the fact that they are assuming to act under a valid law will not oust the courts of jurisdiction to restrain their excessive and illegal acts."

In Cooper v. O'Connor, 99 F.2d 135, 137, 138 (D.C. Cir. 1938), a banker was indicted, acquitted and then brought suit for malicious prosecution against the agents who caused his indictment. Regarding the rule that agents acting outside the scope of their authority are personally liable for their torts, the court stated:

"There is also a general rule that if any officer- ministerial of otherwise- acts outside the scope of his jurisdiction and without authorization of law, he is liable in an action for damages for injuries suffered by a citizen as a result thereof."

See also, Estrada v. Hills, 401 F.Supp. 429, 434 (N.D.Ill. 1975).

This rule that agents are personally liable for their acts outside the scope of their authority has not been modified or changed in any way over the years. In Barr v. Matteo, 360 U.S. 564, 572, 79 S.Ct. 1335, 1340 (1959), the Court stated that the immunity rules have always been subject to the "limitation upon that immunity that the official´s act must have been within the scope of his powers." In Doe v. McMillan, 412 U.S. 306, 320, 93 S.Ct. 2018, 2028 (1973), it was held that the "scope of immunity has always been tied to the scope of... authority."

Simply put, for a government agent to have some type of absolute or qualified immunity from suit for conduct arising from the performance of his duties, he must first have the valid authority to perform the acts in question; if he lacks such delegated authority, his immunity vanishes. In Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478, 98 S.Ct. 2894 (1978), this rule was clearly acknowledged by the Court:

"As these cases demonstrate, a federal official was protected for action tortious under state law only if his acts were authorized by controlling federal law," 438 U.S., at 490.

"Beyond that, however, neither case purported to abolish the liability of federal officers for actions manifestly beyond their line of duty; and if they are accountable when they stray beyond the plain limits of their statutory authority, it would be incongruous to hold that they may nevertheless willfully or knowingly violate constitutional rights without fear of liability," 438 U.S., at 495.

See also, Westfall v. Erwin, 484 U.S. 292, 297, 298, 108 S.Ct. 580, 584 (1988)(" As Doe´s analysis makes clear, absolute immunity from state law tort actions should be available only when the conduct of federal officials is within the scope of their official

duties and the conduct is discretionary in nature"); Benford v. American Broadcasting Co., Inc., 554 F.Supp. 145, 148 (D.Md. 1982); and Pleasant v. Lovell, 876 F.2d 787 (10th Cir. 1989). *See also*, Rutherford v. United States, 702 F.2d 580 (5th Cir. 1983).

It was established long ago that whenever any officer exceeds his authority and wrongfully seizes or levies upon property, he is personally liable in tort for that act. For example, in Buck v. Colbath, 70 U.S. 334, 344 (1866), a marshall levied upon property of one party to satisfy a judgment entered against another. In holding that the Marshall was liable for this wrongful levy, the Court declared:

"In all these particulars he is bound to exercise his own judgment, and is legally responsible to any person for the consequences of an error or mistake in its exercise to his prejudice. He is so liable to plaintiff, to defendant, or to any third person whom his erroneous action in the premises may injure."

The lack of statutory authority for a government employee or agent to levy or seize the property of another party was the subject of Bates v. Clark, 95 U.S. 204, 209 (1877). Here, an Army captain had statutory authority to seize whiskey within "Indian country," and pursuant to this authority, he seized such from a merchant not within Indian country. The Court held this to be an illegal seizure which subjected the officer to personal liability:

"But the objection fatal to all this class of defenses is that in that locality they were utterly without any authority in the premises; and their honest belief that they had is no defense in their case more than in any other, where a party mistaking his rights commits a trespass by forcibly seizing and taking away another man´s property."

This is an extremely old rule. In Gaillard v. Cantini, 76 F. 699 (4th Cir. 1896), a state constable executed a search warrant of a business premises and home looking for illegal alcoholic beverages. But, state law required such warrants to be executed by the county sheriff, and the constable had no authority under the statute to execute the warrant. He was sued and suffered judgment. This court affirmed that judgment by noting that the constable lacked authority to search under state law and he was liable as a consequence. At the opposite end of the country, this rule is also followed as shown by McKnight v. United States, 130 F. 659 (9th Cir. 1904). Here, a state sheriff was executing a warrant to levy upon property of a husband, but instead levied upon cattle belonging to his Indian wife, a ward of the government. Noting that the sheriff possessed only authority to levy upon the cattle of the husband and not the wife, the court held the sheriff personally liable for conversion.

This rule obtains in Maryland. An illegal levy was the subject of State, to use of German v. Timmons, 90 Md. 10, 44 A. 1003 (1899), which involved a constable making a levy via a null and void warrant. In holding that the proper remedy here was a suit personally against the constable, the Court held:

"There can be no doubt that a constable acting under a void warrant is a trespasser, and is not protected by reason of such a warrant being issued to him, if he enforces it; for, although the law does not hold an officer responsible, as a trespasser, for acting under a warrant that is merely defective or irregular, yet, when it is void on its face, it is as if no warrant had been issued to him."

At the other end of this country in California, if a public official such as a sheriff wrongfully levies upon property he is personally liable in tort for conversion. For example, in Irwin v. McDowell, 91 Cal. 119, 27 P. 601, 602 (1891), an officer seized some mortgaged grain contrary to state law which required him to pay any prior claims. Since the levy was wrongful, he was held personally liable; *See also*, Black v. Clasby, 97 Cal. 482, 32 P. 564 (1893); and Curtner v. Lyndon, 128 Cal. 35, 60 P. 462 (1900). In Brinkley-Douglas Fruit Co. v. Silman, 33 Cal.App. 643, 166 P. 371 (1917), the sheriff seized some potatoes owned by a third party, who sued him for illegal levy; it was determined that the sheriff was personally liable for this wrongful act. *See also*, Phillips v. Byers, 189 Cal. 665, 209 P. 557, 560 (1922).

This rule applies in other states between Maryland and California. An illegal levy was the subject of Duff & Repp Furn. Co. v. Read, 74 Kan. 730, 88 P. 263, 264 (1907), where it was declared that, "where levy is made by an officer under a process which is irregular, unauthorized, or void, the party suing out the process is a trespasser, and in such case the former becomes the agent of the latter." *See also*, Adamson v. Noble, 137 Ala. 668, 35 So. 139 (1903); Stowers Furn. Co. v. Brake, 158 Ala. 639, 48 So. 89, 93 (1908); and Tregre & Shexnayder v. Carter, 132 La. 293, 61 So. 379 (1913). In Texas Liquor Control Board v. Whitefield, 127 S.W.2d 339, 340 (Tex.Civ.App. 1939), this rule was stated as follows:

"Nowhere is it alleged or proved that the seizure was made by virtue of a lawfully issued search warrant or under circumstances rendering such a warrant unnecessary. It is alleged by appellee that the seizure was unlawfully made. If the seizure were made without lawful authority, the act was not that of the Board or the Administrator, as such, the officers making the seizure were trespassers and the suit was against them as individuals."

See also, Bishop v. Vandercook, 228 Mich 299, 200 N.W. 278 (1924); Kelly v. Baird, 64 N.D. 346, 252 N.W. 70, 76 (1934); Bowler v. Vannoy, 215 P.2d 248, 258 (Nev. 1950); Reese v. Bice, 87 Ga.App. 519, 74 S.E.2d 476 (1953); Mica Industries, Inc. v. Penland, 249 N.C. 602, 107 S.E.2d 120 (1959); Bowman v. Waldt, 9 Wash.App. 562, 513 P.2d 559, 564 (1973); and Kemp´s Wrecker Service v. Grassland Sod Co., Inc., 404 So.2d 348 (Ala.App. 1981).

END OF BRIEF

An interesting issue:

Back in the early 80s, research was conducted on ways to raise legal issues to challenge the Federal Reserve and one of the arguments developed asserted that Congress had unlawfully delegated its legislative authority to issue obligations of the United States to the Fed, a complicated issue. While doing this research, cataloging was done concerning some of the state cases regarding this point, and these cases hold that a state legislature cannot connect state laws to another jurisdiction because to do so constitutes an unlawful delegation of legislative authority to that other jurisdiction. Some of the cases on this point appear below:

Alabama: Clark & Murrell v. Port of Mobile, 67 Ala. 217 (1880); State v. Firemen´s Fund Ins. Co., 223 Ala. 153, 134 So. 858 (1931); State v. Proetorians, 226 Ala. 259, 146 So. 411 (1933).

Arkansas: Crowley v. Thornbrough, 226 Ark. 768, 294 S.W.2d 62 (1956); Cheney v. St. Louis Southwestern Ry. Co., 394 S.W.2d 731 (Ark. 1965). The opposite was held in Curry v. State, 279 Ark. 153, 649 S.W.2d 833 (1983)(can connect with existing federal laws).

Florida: Hutchins v. Mayo, 143 Fla. 707, 197 So. 495 (1940).

Idaho: Idaho Sav. & Loan Assoc. v. Roden, 82 Idaho 128, 350 P.2d 225 (1960). But compare State v. Kellogg, 98 Idaho 514, 568 P.2d 514 (1977).

Kentucky: Western & Southern Life Ins. Co. v. Commonwealth, 133 Ky. 292, 117 S.W. 376 (1909); Young v. Willis, 305 Ky. 200, 203 SW 2d 5, 7-8 (1947); Dawson v. Hamilton, 314 S.W. 2d 532, 535-36 (Ky.App. 1958); Legislative Research Comm. V. Brown, 664 S.W.2d 907 (Ky. 1984).

Louisiana: State v. Rodriguez, 379 So.2d 1084, 1087 (La. 1980)("The Louisiana legislature is not authorized to delegate its legislative power to a federal agency, nor to Congress)".

Maine: State v. Intoxicating Liquors, 121 Me. 438, 117 A. 588 (1922).

Massachusetts: Opinion of Justices, 239 Mass. 606, 133 N.E. 453 (1921).

Minnesota: Wallace v. Comm. of Taxation, 184 N.W.2d 588 (Minn. 1971).

Nebraska: Smithberger v. Banning, 129 Neb. 651, 262 N.W. 492 (1935).

New York: Darweger v. Staats, 267 N.Y. 290, 196 N.E. 61 (1935).

Ohio: State v. Emery, 55 Ohio St. 364, 45 N.E. 319 (1896); State v. Perrico, 66 Ohio Misc. 7, 419 N.E.2d 895 (1980).

Pennsylvania: Holgate Bros. Co. v. Bashore, 331 Pa. 255, 200 A. 672 (1938).

Utah: Utah League of Insured Savings Assoc´s. v. State of Utah, 555 F.Supp. 664, 673-74 (D.Utah 1983): court indicated that Utah courts would follow this rule.

See also, the interesting ALR annotation at 133 ALR 401. This is not an exhaustive list.

PATRIATION

By: A WITAN

"and now for a completely different point of view." --Monty Python

ALL EMPHASIS ARE ADDED

Contained are observations, by myself but mostly from learned men, which I hope will make sense and spur the reader to further studies to make order from the abyss we are in.

By virtue of Executive Order 12616ii of Oct. 26., 1987, appearing at 52 FR 41685, § 2(d) to wit: "The people of the States are free, subject only to the restrictions in the Constitution itself or in the constitutionally authorized Acts of Congress, to define the moral, political, and legal character of their lives." Remember, the Constitution is a compact between the States, and operates only on them. Always ask WHY? Why a 14th amendment? "If a State has conformed to the new Order, there is no need for Congress to intervene. And if a white Citizen has not obtained the standing of a former slave by petitioning Congress for admittance to venue and jurisdiction of the Fourteenth Amendment, then Congress has no power over that individual under this clause (Amend. 14, Sec. 5)." [9 Fed. Stat. Anno. 6331. The definition in Black´s Sixth Edition, pg.657, tells it all: "The Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, ratified in 1868, creates or at least recognizes for the first time a citizen of the United States, as distinct from that of the states.". Notice it didn´t do away with citizenship of a state, it only adds this citizen of the United States.

"U.S.C.A. Const. Amend. 14 defined citizenship which citizen keeps unless he voluntarily relinquishes."/Affroyim V Rush, 1967, 87 SCt 1660, 387 US 253, 18 L.Ed 2d 757. [8 U.S.C.A. § 1481. (Note 21)1. They lie by not telling the complete story, in this statement, by a judge, wouldn´t you think that the only citizenship available to a man who makes his home within one of the states of the Union is 14th Amendment Citizenship? "The 14th Amendment creates and defines citizenship of the United States. It had long been contended, and had been held by many learned authorities, and had never been judicially decided to the contrary, that there is no such thing as a citizen of the United States, except by first becoming a citizen of some state." [United States v. Anthony (1874), 24 Fed. Cas. 829 (No. 14,459), 830]iii. . . there is no such thing as a citizen of the United States . . . " [Ex Parte Frank Knowles, (1855), 5 Cal 300, pg. 302], this is still good law, it is mentioned in 8 U.S.C.A.§ 1421, (note 44), in shepardizing this case, it has never been overturned. This was the understanding before the 14th Amendment.

"2. Clause Reverses Previous Rule of Citizenship. Prior to the adoption of this amendment, strictly speaking, there were no citizens of the United States, but only of some one of them. Congress had the power ´to establish an uniform rule of naturalization,´ but not the power to make a naturalized alien a citizen of a state. But the states generally provided that such persons might, on sufficient residence therein, become citizens thereof, and then the courts held *ab convenienti*, rather than otherwise, that they became ipso facto citizens of the United States. But the amendment declares the law positively on the subject, and reverses this order of procedure, by making citizenship of a state consequent on citizenship of the United States; for, having declared what persons are citizens of the United States, it does not stop there, and leave it in the power of the state to exclude any such person who may reside therein from its citizenship, but adds, ´and such persons shall also be citizens of the state where in they reside.´"[Federal Statutes Annotated, Vol. 9, pg. 387].

In 1857 Judge Taney in the Dred Scott case, 60 US 393, using Common Law practice, decided that Dred Scott was unable to attain United States citizenship, people of African nativity were subjects of their respective kingdoms, what he failed to state was that Scott could have become a state citizen by the laws of nature (equity), also he (Scott) was a resident of a state not of the United States, so of course he couldn´t become a citizen of the United States. Although a slave, he was still a subject of his African Kingdom by common law. When you read this case remember that the justices knew the true jurisdiction of the United States, that being other than a state.iv

"This Amendment which I have offered [14th] is simply declaratory of what I regard as the law of the land already, that every person born within the limits of the United States, and subject to their jurisdiction, is . . . a citizen of the United States." [Congressional Globe, 39th Cong. 1st sess. 1866, pg.2890] . "The phrase "subject to its jurisdiction" was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign states born within the United States." [Slaughter House Cases, 83 US. 73. [US.C.A. 14th Amend. §1, Note 5.]. "It recognizes and establishes a distinction between citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a state." "Not only may a man be a citizen of the United States without being a citizen of a state, but an important element is necessary to convert the former into the latter. He must reside within the state to make him a citizen of it, but it is only necessary that he should be born or naturalized in the United States to be a citizen of the Union. It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the United States, and a citizenship of a state, which are distinct from each other, and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual.. . .; but he cannot be a citizen of a state until he becomes a bona fide resident of that state." [Cory et al. V. Carter, 48 Ind. 327 (1874)] So, how do you become a "bona fide" state citizen?

"By the common law, allegiance to the government of the country of one´s birth could not be discharged by naturalization in a foreign country." [Ainslie v Martin, 1813, 9 Mass. 454. [8 U.S.C.A. § 1481(note 3)] . By the common law a subject could not expatriate, he was bonded to his sovereign for life, as were his children. One reason for the War of 1812 was the impressing of former Englishmen off American ships into the English Navy, their duty as English subjects.v

But, "in Equity" (the laws of nature) a man was able to cast off the bonds that bound him, and Congress expressed that to wit: "Whereas the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and whereas in the recognition of this principle this government has freely received emigrants from all nations, and invested them with the rights of citizenship; and whereas it is claimed that such American citizens, with their descendants, are subjects of foreign states, owing allegiance to the governments thereof; and whereas it is necessary to the maintenance of public peace that this claim of foreign allegiance should be promptly and finally disavowed: Therefore any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officer of the United States which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation, is declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of the Republic.vi [15 United States Statues at Large, Chapter 249, pg. 223, 27 July, 1868; REVISED STATUES of THE UNITED STATES passed at the FIRST SESSION OF THE FORTY-THIRD CONGRESS, 1873- ´74, CITIZENSHIP-Title XXV, § 1999; 8 U.S.C.A. § 15, moved to 1482 and 1483 Historical Note, *see* Historical Note under section 1481 of this code, *see* 8 U.S.C.A. prec. §1481, (note 1), 8 U.S.C.A.§ 800. "Right of Expatriation, Codification. Section, R.S. 1999, is set out as a note under section 1481 of this title. ´7 do you think they are trying to hide this. So, this poses the question, why did they wait till 1866 to pass this law when the problem existed since at least from 1800? If this statue was for foreign countries, then why is it directed at officers of the United States? This Act talks of natural rights (not legal or lawful), of people (not persons), of emigration (not immigration), note definition at 8 U.S.C.A. 1101 (14), (21), (22),and (23). Understand that Title 8 is for immigrants and R.S. 1999 is for emigrantsvii. This Statue was the remedy for the 14th Amendment. This Act is titled "An Act concerning the Rights of American Citizens in foreign States." The 14th wasn´t passed yet, so where did this American Citizenship come from? State Citizenship? "Foreign state" [8

U.S.C.A..§ 1101(14)] "The term "foreign state" . . . self-governing dominions . . . shall be regarded as separate foreign states." Remember: Dominion = sovereignty. Sovereignty = ownership.

State, Foreign state. " . . . The several United States are considered foreign to each other . . ." [Black´s Sixth Edition, pg 1407]. Foreign states. "Nations which are outside the United States. Term may also refer to another state; i.e. a sister state. . . ."[Black´s Sixth Edition, Pg 6481 Remember federal jurisdiction! [Title 8 U.S.C.A. § 1101 (22)] "The term "national of the United States" means (A) a citizen of the United States, or (B) a person who, though not a citizen of the United States, owes permanent allegiance to the United States. "[It does not include an alien.]viii National, " . . .The term "national" as used in the phrase "national of the United States" is broader than the term "citizen". [Brassert v. Biddle, D.C.Conn., 59 F.Supp. 457, 462. Black´s Sixth Edition, pg. 10241 Well, how do you think that it´s broader? Could the term "national" include the citizen of a state? Remember they lie by omission. So it appears that you can be a citizen of a state and also a national of the United States at the same time. But if you are a United States citizen, are you considered to be a resident of the state? [Constitution of California (1879), Article II, § 2], "A United States citizen 18 years of age and resident in this State may vote." IT DOESN´T SAY CITIZEN OF THIS STATE!!!! "Residence and citizenship are wholly different things within the meaning of the Constitution...." [U.S.C.A., Amend. 14, §1, Note 25, Steigleder v. McQuesten, Wash.1905, 25 S.Ct. 616, 198 US. 143, 49 L.Ed. 986].

CITIZEN, "For convenience it has been found necessary to give a name to this membership. The object is to designate a title the person and the relation he bears to a nation. For this purpose the words "subject," "inhabitant," and "citizen" have been used, and the choice between them has been sometimes made to depend upon the form of the government. Citizen is now more commonly employed, however, and as it has been considered better suited to the description of one living under a republican government, it was adopted by nearly all of the states after their separation from Great Britain, and was afterward adopted in the Articles of Confederation and in the Constitution of the United States. When used in this sense it is understood as conveying the idea of membership of a nation and nothing more." [MINOR v. HAPPERSETT, (1874) 21 Wall. 162, 22 Led 627. Cases on Constitutional Law (1928) by Dudley 0 McGovney, Professor of Law in the University of California] . "Both before and after the Fourteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution, it has not been necessary for a person to be a citizen of the United States in order to be a citizen of his state." [US. v. Cruikshank (1875) 92 US. 542] , and "The term resident and citizen of the United States is distinguished from a Citizen of one of the several states, in that the former is a special class of citizen created by congress." [US. V Anthony, 24 Fed. 829 (1873)] .ix

"Residents, as distinguished from citizens, are aliens who are permitted to take up a permanent abode in the country. Being bound to the society by reason of their dwelling in it, they are subject to its laws so long as they remain there, and, being protected by it, they must defend it, although they do not enjoy all the rights as citizens. They have only certain privileges which the law, or custom, gives them. Permanent residents are those who have been given the right of perpetual residence. They are a sort of citizen of a less privileged character, and are subject to the society without enjoying all its advantages. Their children succeed to their status; for the right of perpetual residence given them by the State passes to their children." [THE LAW OF NATIONS OR THE PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL LAW, by E. De Vattel, Translation

of the Edition of 1758, by Charles Fenwick, Published by the Carnegie Institution, Washington, 1916] . Looks like a United States Citizen is a foreigner in one of the several states and is classified as such, an alien/resident. What we have in America is a whole lot of United States Citizens owing their allegiance to that 10 square miles on the Potomac, which are foreigners living in the several states of the Union.

So now we know that there are two distinct citizenship´s and two forms of law that could govern how the courts look at their implementation, Common law or Equity(natural law) and one of the several states or United States citizenship.

Of course there is this thing called dual citizenship. Dual Citizenship. [Black´s Sixth Edition, pg. 498] :". . . Status of citizens of the United States who reside within a state; i.e., persons who are born or naturalized in the U.S. are citizens of the U.S. and the state wherein they reside." Reside. [Black´s Sixth Edition, pg. 1308] : ". . . ; specifically, to be in residence, . . ." the first line of [STATE OF [CALIFORNIA, TEXAS, etc.] VOTER REGISTRATION FORM] "ARE YOU A U.S. CITIZEN? YES NO
If no, don´t fill out this form." So, if you´re a state citizen, you can´t vote for those 14th Amendment U.S. Officers. What is the status of a citizen of a state that is part of the Union of the united States of America?
WHAT IS YOUR STATUS AND HOW DO YOU PROVE IT?

But, back to the 14th amendment, it was proposed June 13, 1866, ratified July 9, 1868 and certified July 28, 1868, on the day before it became law, July 27, 1868, the natural law was set out in the statue, An Act Concerning the Rights of American Citizens in foreign States (*see above*). Do you think that it was just a coincidence? Remember, this is 56 years after the War of 1812. "On three occasions, in 1794, 1797, and 1818, Congress considered and rejected proposals to enact laws which would describe certain conduct as resulting in expatriation." [Afroyim v. Rusk (1967), 387 US 253, 18 L. ed 2d 757] . This case is full of this history.

"nationality is a term denoting a relationship between an individual and a nation involving a duty of obedience or allegiance by the subject and protection by the state." [Cabebe v Acheson, C.A.1950, 183 F2d 795, 8 U.S.C.A. § 1101 (note 39)]. Here we have a duty or allegiance, duty being a 14th amendment citizen/subject and allegiance a state citizen or United States national.

Subject.[Black´s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pg. 1425], "Constitutional Law. . . . Men in free governments are subjects as well as citizens; as citizens they enjoy rights and franchises; and as subjects they are bound to obey the laws. The term [subject] is little used, in this sense, in countries enjoying a republican form of government. Swiss Nat. Ins. Co. v Miller, 267 US. 42."

Allegiance. "Obligations of fidelity and obedience to government in consideration for protection that government gives. US. v Kuhn, D.C.N. Y, 49 F.Supp. 407, 414." [Black´s Sixth Edition, pg. 74]. "[A]llegiance imports an obligation on the citizen or subject, the correlative right to which resides in the sovereign power: allegiance in this country is not due to Congress, but to the people, with whom the sovereign power is found; it is, therefore, by the people only that any alteration can be made of the existing institutions with respect to allegiance." [31 Annals of Congress, (1818) Pg.1045 as quoted in Afroyim v. Rusk 387 US 253, 18 L ed 2d 757].

"He [citizen] owes its allegiance and is entitled to its protection. Allegiance and protection are, in this connection, reciprocal obligations. The one is a compensation for the other; allegiance for protection and protection for allegiance." [MINOR v. HAPPERSETT. (1874) 21 Wall. 162] . So there is a quid pro quo between the government and the citizen. Have you received your protection today?

Nation. [Black´s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pg.1024] , "A people, or aggregation of men, . . .In American constitutional law the word "state" is applied to the several members of the American Union, while the word "nation" is applied to the whole body of the people embraced within the jurisdiction of the federal government." "There cannot be a nation without a people." [MINOR v. HAPPERSETT, (1874) 21 Wall. 162] . Looks like you have to have people to have a government /nation/country/state. By encapsulating a people into United States citizens the 14th amendment created or at least recognized for the first time a NEW NATION, by creation of these new subjects within the states, this gave the federal government the excuse to enter the states to control their new creations. *See* definition of the 14th Amendment above. This is when the overlay of the Federal Corporate States happened. ". . . From the moment of their association, the United States necessarily became a body corporate; . . ." *See*; [Respublica v. Cornelius Sweers, Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, April Term 1779], and the same applies to these new states. Over the years the U.S. citizens within the states have increased to the point now that the federal government thinks that the invasions are complete. In order to return the Union to it's original status the states have to be repopulated with state citizens. In which Country do you want to live or be a member?

The 14th Amendment § 2 governs the way the elected officials are elected for the new or expanded United States.(*see*: definition of the 14th above)

The 14th Amendment § 3 tells who may be an elected official: "No person shall be a Senator or.... [elected official]...., who, having previously taken an oath, as.... [elected official]...., to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in.... [treason] . . ." If you had taken an oath to the de jure United States you couldn't be elected to the 14th Amendment United States Government. This tells you what effects allegiance, an oath of fidelity. (*See* Allegiance above) Notice there is no differentiation between the north and the south. I don't know this for a fact but I am sure that every one in the Confederacy swore an oath to the same renouncing all other allegiances. Every one that goes into the military or government service takes an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, before 1962 the oath was to the United States of America. *See*; 10 U.S.C.A. § 502, 1962 Amendments, Pub.L. 87-751. Also, under the same section, Note 3. Induction without oath, there are several cases listed that basically say the same thing, that being, you don't have to take an oath to be subject to the code of military justice when drafted. Now, where do you think they get that reasoning from? Common Law? These inductees were assumed to be 14th Amendment citizens/subjects, doesn't this sound like impressment (*see above*: War of 1812). Are you getting the picture? Back to the rest of the new United States and the real reason for the 14th Amendment.

14th Amendment § 4 and this is a goody: "The validity of the public debt of the United States, . . . , shall not be questioned . . . . ,or any claim for loss or emancipation of any slave; but all such debts, obligations and claims shall be held illegal and void.", first of all this is a taking without compensation, Constitutional Amendment 5 "...nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." This is natural

law. Now for "shall not question the debt". Everything we use in tender of payment is a debt instrument, a Dollar bill (a Debt owed), the ability to pay a debt was discharged by HJR 192, June 5, 1933, 73rd Congress, 1st Session, *see*: Bank Holiday of 1933, Black´s Sixth Edition, pg. 146. So a United States Citizen can't question the money (debt) or the taking of his property with out compensation. You see, the creation has to answer to his creator, no questions asked, (the creation being the 14th Amendment United States Citizen *see*: definition above). So when you end up before the Judge with your traffic ticket the government agent has perfected a commercial lien which through your ignorance, you are now the underwriter/surety. You can't question the debt /taking, that's why they call you a lunatic.

"Although § 4 "was undoubtedly inspired by the desire to put beyond question the obligations of the Government issued during the Civil War, its language indicates a broader connotation . . . . "[T]he validity of the public debt' . . . [embraces] whatever concerns the integrity of the public obligations," and applies to government bonds issued after as well as before adoption of the Amendment.7" [The Constitution of the United States of America, Analysis and Interpretation, 1972, Pg. 1530, quoting Perry v. United States, 249 US. 330, 354, (1935)] .

So what governs citizenship? Citizenship is acquired through birth, by the situs (place) or through your parents and their situs of birth. If you were born in California of Californian parents you are also a Californian. (*See above*, THE LAW OF NATIONS, by E. De Mattel). But if you were born in California to U.S. citizen parents you are a citizen of the United States. Now comes the question, how do we change this status as a creation of the United States?

"The term "naturalization" means the conferring of nationality of a state upon a person after birth, by any means whatsoever." [8 U.S.C.A. §1101 (23)] . Read my lips "nationality of a state," "by any means whatsoever." Naturalization, this is accomplished by the taking an oath to the country/state of your free choice, which renounces all previous allegiances. The Constitution gives Congress the authority to set the rule for naturalization, Article I, § 8, " . . . to establish an uniform rule of naturalization, . . ." and these rules are found (supposedly) in Title 8 of the United States Code at 01435-1459 and loss of nationality is covered by 01481-1489. If the congress couldn't naturalize anyone, then the 14th Amendment would be unconstitutional but the U.S. through Statues and Acts since 1802 had rules for making U.S. Citizens, *see*, [2 United States Statues at Large, Chapter 28, Pg. 153,155, 14 April 1802, REVISED STATUES of THE UNITED STATES passed at the FIRST SESSION OF THE FORTY-THIRD CONGRESS, 1873- '74, TITLE XXX- Naturalization, R.S. 2165 to §2174].x A good explanation of the Constitutional powers of Congress regarding naturalization can be found at §1098 of Joseph Story on the Constitution. xi Section 1099, of the same treatise is revealing, the Constitution does not give the power of naturalization ". . .though there was a momentary hesitation, when the constitution first went into operation, whether the power might still be exercised by the states, subject only to the control of congress, . . .yet the power is now firmly established to be exclusive.(6) . . ." Note (6): "See The Federalist, No. 32, 42; [case sites] "A question is often discussed under this head, how far a person has a right to throw off his national allegiance, and to become time subject of another country, without the consent of his native country. This usually denominated the right of expatriation. It is beside the purpose of these Commentaries to enter into any consideration of this subject, as it does not properly belong to any constitutional inquiry. It may be stated, however, that there is no authority, which has affirmatively

maintained the right,(unless provided for in the laws of the particular country), and there is a very strong current of reasoning on the other side, independent of the known practice and claims of the nations of modern Europe. [sites]". It is not a proper constitutional inquiry because the Constitution does not give that power of Naturalization. "Known practice" is that of the "Common Law" and the other side would be that of Equity, the Natural Law.

"If we examine the language closely, and according to the rules of rigid construction always applicable to delegated powers, we will find the power to naturalize, in fact was not given to Congress, but simply the power to establish an uniform rule . . . ., It follows conclusively that there is no mode by which a foreigner can be made expressly a citizen of a State, for I have already shown there is no such thing, technically as a citizen of the United States. Consequently, one who is created a citizen of the United States is certainly not made a citizen of any particular State. It follows, that as it is only the citizens of the State who are entitled to all the privilege and immunities of citizens of the several States, if the process is left alone to the action of Congress through her federal tribunals, and in the form that they have adopted, then a distinction both in name and privileges is made to exist between citizens of the United States ex vi termini, and citizens of the respective States. To the former no privilege and immunities are granted; and it will hardly be contended, that political status can be derived by implication against express legal enactments. I cannot concede that such a result was ever contemplated, and yet it would be inevitable upon any other hypothesis, than that the "uniform rule," declared by the Constitution, was intended to be prescribe for the action of the States, and that by this rule they were left to exercise, or not, their original power of naturalization." [Ex Parte-Frank Knowles, (1855) 5 Cal 300] . Well, isn't this a fine kettle of fish, the United States Government has been doing something unconstitutional from almost its beginning. But that doesn't mean that they don't have the power to do what they do this authority comes from the "civil war amendments" (another story) read United States Constitution the Fourteenth Amendment Fact or Fiction by Gordon W. Epperly. *See* end note 3.

I've quoted MINOR V. HAPPERSETT [MINOR v. HAPPERSETT, (1874) 21 Wall. 162, 22 Led 627. Cases on Constitutional Law (1928) by Dudley 0 McGovney, Professor of Law in the University of California] several times, this is a very interesting case, Mrs. Minor was denied suffrage (vote) by Mr. Happersett (registrar), and she sued for the right and it was appealed to the supreme court, when the Missouri supreme court denied her, relying on its constitution which gave the privilege only to men, the case went to the Supreme Court of the United States. The court decision was in 1874, the case doesn't say, but Mrs. Minor was probably born before the civil war to parents that were citizens of Missouri, making her a citizen of Missouri, ". . . The Fourteenth Amendment did not affect the citizenship of women any more than it did of men. In this particular, therefore, the rights of Mrs. Minor do not depend upon the Amendment. She has always been a citizen from her birth,[which citizenship?] and entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizenship. The Amendment prohibited the state, of which she is a citizen, from abridging any of her privileges and immunities as a citizen of the United States; but it did not confer citizenship on her. That she had before its adoption. . . ." The U.S. court found against her because suffrage for a women was not one of the privileges and immunities that were in effect at the time of the adoption of the United States Constitution. But, boy is this revealing: you can be a state citizen and still be protected by the federal government, state citizenship also makes you a U.S. citizen but the 14th didn´t create that citizenship.xii. In Prentiss v. Brennan, No.

11,385, 19 Fed Cas. 1278, Mr. Justice Nelson says: "A person may be a citizen of the United States, and not a citizen of any particular state. This is the condition of citizens residing in the District of Columbia, and in the territories of the United States, or who have taken up a residence abroad, and others that might be mentioned . . ." [Hammerstein v. Lyne, 1912, 200 Fed 165] . I wonder what the others are?

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

"I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by law; that I will perform non-combatant service in the Arm Forces of the United States when required by law; that I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by law; and that I take this obligation freely without mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God."

From: How to become a U S citizen by Sally Schreudin 5th Ed. (For what should be in an oath, read 8 U.S.C.A. §1448.) This is the oath that people take to become US citizens, the underlined clause is interesting, sounds like voluntary servitude. This gives a guide as to what has to be in an oath, the rejection of former allegiances with the pledge of fidelity to the nation of choice.

What have we learned:

1. The 14th created or at least expanded U.S. citizenship without an oath.
2. It takes people to make a nation.
3. Citizenship is governed by two different forms of Law: Equity and the Common Law.
4. Ones Citizenship comes from the nationality of your parents.
5. Citizenship is changed by renouncing allegiance and then taking an oath to another country.
6. United States citizens owe their allegiance to the 10 square miles of Washington D.C. through the 14th Amendment.
7. There is a difference between a citizen and a resident.
8. A resident is a title for an alien.
9. Citizens of one of the several states do not need the 14th Amendment for protection from government.
10. The original United States government/Congress never had the powers of naturalization.

This Federal Government is full of enigmas, I have searched and have not yet found any uniform rules on naturalization for state citizenship, and they seem to have left it up to the states. But, they continue to pass laws: [14 July, (1870), Chapter 245, Section 7, Volume 16, Page 256; REVISED STATUES of THE UNITED STATES passed at the FIRST SESSION OF THE FORTY-THIRD CONGRESS, 1873- '74, Title JOCK NATURALIZATION, Sec. 2169, as Amended page 1435, R.S. 382]: "The provisions of this Title shall apply to aliens being free white persons, and to aliens of African nativity and to persons of African descent."(*See* § 2165; how an alien is admitted to be a citizen of the United States).

Also, the reader should be aware of Title LXXI., pg.1082, of the Revised Statue´s of the United States, of 1873-74,§§5551 to 5569, Acts of 1818, 1794, and 1800, the first seizures that the U.S. executed were from these acts, the U.S. seized ships that were dealing in slaves. Art. I, § 9, of the United States Constitution: the states had till 1808 to import and populate their states at will with emigrants or slaves, this was the compromise placed in the Constitution between the slave and non-slave states. Read the notes in Calero-Toledo v. Pearson Yacht Leasing, 40 L Ed 2d 452. So, slavery was illegal within the jurisdiction of the United States. Then why the 13th Amendment? The 13th says ". . .within the United States. . .subject to their jurisdiction." not within the several states. If the slavery issue, in the 13th Amendment is mute, what´s left? Involuntary servitude? Except as a punishment for crime? The 13th Amendment was the start of this new Nation. *See*: The Reconstruction Acts. xiii

My words are only marks on paper, not to be taken as gospel, there are more questions than answers, and everyone needs to do their own research, thereby arriving at your own conclusion. How else can you defend your position? This Union of states can only be returned one people at a time. The Law of Nations says that the military government must recognize the civil government when it acts. And as the Sovereignty is in the people we must act individually in our civil capacity in order to resume our power. This is all food for thought, everyone who lives in a state of the Union and is a true state citizen will have dual nationality, first that of his adopted state and that of a United States Citizen/National when he is not within his state, for protection.

See R.S. 2000 and 2001 codified at title 22 U.S.C. § 1731 and 1732, this comes from that same act of Congress of the 27th of July of 1868. Also, see the definition of the United States in Black´s Sixth Edition, pg. 1533 "This term has several meanings. It may be the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in family of nations [the 10 square miles of Washington D.C.], it may designate territory over which sovereignty of the United States extends [the overlay of the states and other trust territories], or it may be collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution [the true Union]. Hooven & Allison Co. v. Evatt, U.S. Ohio, 324 US. 652. . . .". I have just touched on this matter. All aspects of law seem to be encompassed by this subject: the Law of Nations, History, Equity, Common Law, Trusts, Military Law, etc. all need to be studied and understood. Here are two cases for the more advanced researcher:

"When a change of government takes place, from a monarchial to a republican government, the old form is dissolved. Those who lived under it, and did not choose to become members of the new, had a right to refuse allegiance to it, and to retire elsewhere. By being a part of the society subject to the old government, they had not entered into any engagement to become subject to any new form the majority might think proper to adopt. That the majority shall prevail is a rule posterior to the formation of government, and results from it. It is not a rule binding upon mankind in their natural state. There, every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellow men without his consent." [Cruden v. Neale, 2 N C. 338 (1796) 2 S.E. 70.]xiv

"Participation in a system of charitable uses under the Law of Charitable Uses and Status of Wills, among others, is voluntary. Once participation is discontinued for various reasons such as `breach of trust,' and 'lack of confidence' the non participant,

so separated from use, may assert rights to be restored to his prior status and condition." [Williams v. Williams, (1853) 8 NY.-4 Selden 525. McCartee v. Orphan Asylum Soc., 9 Cowen 511, 18 am. Dec. 516, quoting Blackstone´s Comm. 104].xv

And in conclusion from a 1993 case Jones v. Temmer, 829 F. Supp. 1226: "The privileges and immunities clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protects few rights because it neither incorporates any of the Bill of Rights nor protects all rights of individual citizens. *See* Slaughter-House Cases, 83 U.S.(16 Wall.) 36, 21 L.Ed. 394 (1873). Instead, this provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the federal government; it does not protect those rights that relate to state citizen,

Rather the provision protects only those rights peculiar to being a citizen of the United States; it does not protect those rights which relate to state citizenship."

If you have an I.R.S. problem, be forewarned, Title 26 U.S.C. 877. *See* HERE

Manumittere idem est quod extra manum vel postestatem ponere. To manumit is the same as to place beyond power. Pg 965, Black´s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition. Manumit, to free from slavery or bondage. American Heritage dictionary.

Read "Our Enemy the State" by Albert S. Nock (1935) xvi

Note this is about Patriation not Expatriation, when done properly the one encompasses the other.
Look it up. Black´s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, or any good dictionary.

ii HERE

iii HERE

iv *See*: JURISDICTION OVER FEDERAL AREAS WITHIN THE STATES, June 1957, HERE

v HERE 1

vi HERE

vii An immigrant is one who retains his allegiance to the country he came from and plans to return there, whereas an emigrant does not plan on returning to his former country and has announced his intentions to pledge his allegiance to his new country.

viii This small but important sentence is in the nationality Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 1137, Title 1, Section 1, Chapter 1, Definitions, Sec. 101, but has been conveniently omitted from the code.

ix HERE

x *See*: NATURALIZATION

xi www.constitution.org/js/js316.txt

xii This case was also sited in U S v Cruikshank, 92 US. 542 (1875). Also see Van Valkenburg v Brown, 43 Cal. 43 (1872), this case arrived at the same conclusion.

xiii HERE

xiv HERE

xv HERE

xvi HERE

The Official State Office Known as "Person"

This is the single most important lesson that you MUST learn. If you spend an hour to learn this material you will be rewarded for the rest of your life.

The word "person" in legal terminology is perceived as a general word which normally includes in its scope a variety of entities other than human beings. *See* e.g. 1 U.S.C. sec 1. Church of Scientology v. U.S. Dept. of Justice (1979) 612F.2d 417, 425.

One of the very first of your state statutes will have a section listed entitled "Definitions. "Carefully study this section of the statutes and you will find a portion that reads similar to this excerpt:

In construing these statutes and each and every word, phrase, or part hereof, where the context will permit:

(1) The singular includes the plural and vice versa.

(2) Gender-specific language includes the other gender and neuter.

(3) The word "person" includes individuals, children, firms, associations, joint adventures, partnerships, estates, trusts, business trusts, syndicates, fiduciaries, corporations, and all other groups or combinations.

NOTE HOWEVER, THE DEFINITIONS STATUTE DOES NOT LIST MAN OR WOMAN -- THEREFORE THEY ARE EXCLUDED FROM ALL THE STATUTES !!!

Under the rule of construction "expressio unius est exclusio alterius," where a statute or Constitution enumerates the things on which it is to operate or forbids certain things, it is ordinarily to be construed as excluding from its operation all those not expressly mentioned. Generally words in a statute should be given their plain and ordinary meaning. When a statute does not specifically define words, such words should be construed in their common or ordinary sense to the effect that the rules used in construing statutes are also applicable in the construction of the Constitution. It is a fundamental rule of statutory construction that words of common usage when used in a statute should be construed in their plain and ordinary sense. If you carefully read the statute laws enacted by your state legislature you will also notice that they are all written with phrases similar to these five examples :

1. A person commits the offense of failure to carry a license if the person . . .
2. A person commits the offense of failure to register a vehicle if the person . . .
3. A person commits the offense of driving uninsured if the person . . .
4. A person commits the offense of fishing if the person . . .
5. A person commits the offense of breathing if the person . . .

Notice that only "persons" can commit these state legislature created crimes. A crime is by definition an offense committed against the "state." If you commit an offense against a human, it is called a tort. Examples of torts would be any personal injury, slander, or defamation of character.

So how does someone become a "person" and subject to regulation by state statutes and laws ?

There is only one way. You must ask the state for permission to volunteer to become a state person. You must volunteer because the U.S. Constitution forbids the state from compelling you into slavery. This is found in the 13th and 14th Amendments.

13th Amendment Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.14th Amendment Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. You become a state created statutory "person" by taking up residency with the state and stepping into the office of "person." You must hold an "office" within the state government in order for that state government to regulate and control you. First comes the legislativel created office, then comes their control. If you do not have an office in state government, thelegislature's control over you would also be prohibited by the Declaration of Rights section, usually found to be either Section I or II, of the State Constitution.

The most common office held in a state is therefore the office known as "person." Your state legislature created this office as a way to control people. It is an office most people occupy without even knowing that they are doing so. The legislature cannot lawfully control you because you are a flesh and blood human being.

God alone created you and by Right of creation, He alone can control you. It is the nature of law, that what one creates, one controls. This natural law is the force that binds a creature to its creator. God created us and we are, therefore, subject to His laws, whether or not we acknowledge Him as our Creator.

The way the state gets around God´s law and thereby controls the people is by creating only an office, and not a real human. This office is titled as "person" and then the legislature claims that you are filling that office. Legislators erroneously now think that they can make laws that also control men. They create entire bodies of laws - motor vehicle code, building code, compulsory education laws, and so on ad nauseum. They still cannot control men or women, but they can now control the office they created. And look who is sitting in that office -- YOU.

Then they create government departments to administer regulations to these offices. With in these administrative departments of state government are hundreds of other state created offices. There is everything from the office of janitor to the office of governor. But these administrative departments cannot function properly unless they have subjects to regulate. The legislature obtains these subjects by creating an office that nobody even realizes to be an official state office.

They have created the office of "person." The state creates many other offices such as police officer, prosecutor, judge etc. and everyone understands this concept. However, what most people fail to recognize and understand is the most common state office of all, the office of "person." Anyone filling one of these state offices is subject to regulation by their creator, the state legislature. Through the state created office of "person," the state gains its authority to regulate, control and judge you, the real human. What they have done is apply the natural law principle, "what one creates, one controls. "A look in Webster's dictionary reveals the origin of the word "person." It literally means "the mask an actor wears."

The legislature creates the office of "person" which is a mask. They cannot create real people, only God can do that. But they can create the "office" of "person," which is merely a mask, and then they persuade a flesh and blood human being to put on that mask by offering a fictitious privilege, such as a driver license. Now the legislature has gained complete control over both the mask and the actor behind the mask. A resident is another state office holder.

All state residents hold an office in the state government. But not everyone who is a resident also holds the office of "person."

Some residents hold the office of judge and they are not persons.

Some residents hold the office of prosecutors and they are not persons.

Some residents hold the office of police office(rs) and they are not persons.

Some residents hold the office of legislators and they are not persons.

Some residents are administrators and bureaucrats and they also are not persons.

Some residents are attorneys and they also are not persons.

An attorney is a state officer of the court and is firmly part of the judicial branch. The attorneys will all tell you that they are "licensed" to practice law by the state Supreme Court. Therefore, it is unawful for any attorney to hold any position or office outside of the judicial branch. There can be no attorney legislators - no attorney mayors - no attorneys as police – no attorneys as governor. Yes, I know it happens all the time, however, this practice of multiple office holding by attorneys is prohibited by the constitution and is a felony in most states. If you read farther into your state constitution you will find a clause stating this, the Separation of Powers, which will essentially read as follows:

Branches of government -- The powers of the state government shall be divided into legislative, executive and judicial branches. No person belonging to one branch shall exercise any powers appertaining to either of the other branches unless expressly provided herein. Therefore, a police officer cannot arrest a prosecutor, a prosecutor cannot prosecute a sitting judge, a judge cannot order the legislature to perform and so on.

Because these "offices" are not persons, the state will not, and cannot prosecute them, therefore they enjoy almost complete protection by the state in the performance of their daily duties. This is why it is impossible to sue or file charges against most government employees. If their crimes should rise to the level where they "shock the

community" and cause alarm in the people, then they will be terminated from state employment and lose their absolute protection. If you carefully pay attention to the news, you will notice that these government employees are always terminated from their office or state employment and then are they arrested, now as a common person, and charged for their crimes. Simply put, the state will not eat its own.

The reason all state residents hold an office is so the state can control everything. It wants to create every single office so that all areas of your life are under the complete control of the state. Each office has prescribed duties and responsibilities and all these offices are regulated and governed by the state. If you read the fine print when you apply for a state license or privilege you will see that you must sign a declaration that you are in fact a "resident" of that state.

"Person" is a subset of resident. Judge is a subset of resident. Legislator and police officer are subsets of resident. If you hold any office in the state, you are a resident and subject to all legislative decrees in the form of statutes.

They will always say that we are free men. But they will never tell you that the legislatively created offices that you are occupying are not free. They will say, "All men are free," because that is a true statement.

What they do not say is, that holding any state office binds free men into slavery for the state. They are ever ready to trick you into accepting the state office of "person," and once you are filling that office, you cease to be free men. You become regulated creatures, called persons, totally created by the legislature. You will hear "free men" mentioned all the time, but you will never hear about "free persons."

If you build your life in an office created by the legislature, it will be built on shifting sands. The office can be changed and manipulated at any time to conform to the whims of the legislature. When you hold the office of "person" created by the legislature, your office isn't fixed. Your duties and responsibilities are ever changing. Each legislative session binds a "person" to ever more burdens and requirements in the form of more rules, laws and statutes. Most state constitutions have a section that declares the fundamental power of the people:

Political power -- All political power is inherent in the people. The enunciation herein of certain Rights shall not be construed to deny or impair others retained by the people.

Notice that this says "people" it does not say persons. This statement declares beyond any doubt that the people are Sovereign over their created government. This is natural law and the natural flow of delegated power.

A Sovereign is a private, non-resident, non-domestic, non-person, non-individual, NOT SUBJECT to any real or imaginary statutory regulations or quasi laws enacted by any state legislature which was created by the people.

When you are pulled over by the police, roll down your window and say, "You are speaking to a Sovereign political power holder. I do not consent to you detaining me. Why are you detaining me against my will ?"

Now the state office of policeman knows that "IT" is talking to a flesh and blood Sovereign. The police officer cannot cite a Sovereign because the state legislature can only regulate what they create. And the state does not create Sovereign political power holders. It is very important to lay the proper foundation, Right from the beginning. Let the police officer know that you are a Sovereign. Remain in your proper office of Sovereign political power holder. Do not leave it. Do not be persuaded by police pressure or tricks to put on the mask of a state "person."

Why aren't Sovereigns subject to the state's charges? Because of the concept of office. The state is attempting to prosecute only a particular office known as "person." If you are not in that state created office of "person," the state statutes simply do not apply to you. This is common sense, for example, if you are not in the state of Texas, then Texas laws do not apply to you. For the state to control someone, they have to first create the office. Then they must coerce a warm-blooded creature to come fill that office. They want you to fill that office.

Here is the often expressed understanding from the United States Supreme Court, that "in common usage, the term "person" does not include the Sovereign, statutes employing the person are ordinarily construed to exclude the Sovereign." Wilson v. Omaha Tribe, 442 U.S. 653, 667 (1979) (quoting United States v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600, 604 (1941)). *See also*, United States v. Mine Workers, 330 U.S. 258, 275 (1947).

The idea that the word "person" ordinarily excludes the Sovereign can also be traced to the "familiar principle that the King is not bound by any act of Parliament unless he be named therein by special and particular words." Dollar Savings Bank v. United States, 19 Wall. 227, 239 (1874). As this passage suggests, however, this interpretive principle applies only to "the enacting Sovereign." United States v. California, 297 U.S. 175, 186 (1936). *See also*, Jefferson County Pharmaceutical Assn., Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories, 460 U.S. 150, 161, n. 21 (1983). Furthermore, as explained in United States v. Herron, 20 Wall. 251, 255 (1874), even the principle as applied to the enacting Sovereign is not without limitations: "Where an act of Parliament is made for the public good, as for the advancement of religion and justice or to prevent injury and wrong, the king is bound by such act, though not particularly named therein; but where a statute is general, and thereby any prerogative, Right, title, or interest is divested or taken from the king, in such case the king is not bound, unless the statute is made to extend to him by express words." U.S. Supreme Court Justice Holmes explained:

"A Sovereign is exempt from suit, not because of any formal conception or obsolete theory, but on the logical and practical ground that there can be no legal Right as against the authority that makes the law on which the Right depends." Kawananakoa v. Polyblank, 205 U.S. 349, 353, 27 S. Ct. 526, 527, 51 L. Ed. 834 (1907).

The majority of American states fully embrace the Sovereign immunity theory as well as the federal government. *See* Restatement (Second) of Torts 895B, comment at 400 (1979). The following U.S. Supreme Court case makes clear all these principals. I shall have occasion incidentally to evince, how true it is, that states and governments were made for man; and at the same time how true it is, that his creatures and servants have first deceived, next vilified, and at last oppressed their master and maker.

A state, useful and valuable as the contrivance is, is the inferior contrivance of man; and from his native dignity derives all its acquired importance. ... Let a state be considered as subordinate to the people: But let everything else be subordinate to the state. The latter part of this position is equally necessary with the former. For in the practice, and even at length, in the science of politics there has very frequently been a strong current against the natural order of things, and an inconsiderate or an interested disposition to sacrifice the end to the means. As the state has claimed precedence of the people; so, in the same inverted course of things, the government has often claimed precedence of the state; and to this perversion in the second degree, many of the volumes of confusion concerning Sovereignty owe their existence. The ministers, dignified very properly by the appellation of the magistrates, have wished, and have succeeded in their wish, to be considered as the Sovereigns of the state. This second degree of perversion is confined to the old world, and begins to diminish even there: but the first degree is still too prevalent even in the several states, of which our union is composed. By a state I mean, a complete body of free persons united together for their common benefit, to enjoy peaceably what is their own, and to do justice to others. It is an artificial person. It has its affairs and its interests: It has its rules: It has its Rights: and it has its obligations. It may acquire property distinct from that of its members. It may incur debts to be discharged out of the public stock, not out of the private fortunes of individuals. It may be bound by contracts; and for damages arising from the breach of those contracts. In all our contemplations, however, concerning this feigned and artificial person, we should never forget, that, in truth and nature, those who think and speak and act, are men. Is the foregoing description of a state a true description? It will not be questioned, but it is. ...

It will be sufficient to observe briefly, that the Sovereignties in Europe, and particularly in England, exist on feudal principles. That system considers the prince as the Sovereign, and the people as his subjects; it regards his person as the object of allegiance, and excludes the idea of his being on an equal footing with a subject, either in a court of justice or elsewhere. That system contemplates him as being the fountain of honor and authority; and from his grace and grant derives all franchise, immunities and privileges; it is easy to perceive that such a Sovereign could not be amenable to a court of justice, or subjected to judicial control and actual constraint. It was of necessity, therefore, that suability, became incompatible with such Sovereignty. Besides, the prince having all the executive powers, the judgment of the courts would, in fact, be only monitory, not mandatory to him, and a capacity to be advised, is a distinct thing from a capacity to be sued. The same feudal ideas run through all their jurisprudence, and constantly remind us of the distinction between the prince and the subject. No such ideas obtain here(speaking of America): at the revolution, the Sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the Sovereigns of the country, but they are Sovereigns without subjects (unless the African slaves among us may be so called) and have none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the Sovereignty. (February Term, 1793) Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 U.S. 419, 2 Dall. 419, 1 L.Ed 440.

There are many ways you can give up your Sovereign power and accept the role of "person." One is by receiving state benefits. Another is by asking permission in the form of a license or permit from the state.

One of the subtlest ways of accepting the role of "person," is to answer the questions of bureaucrats. When a state bureaucrat knocks on your door and wants to know why your children aren't registered in school, or a police officer pulls you over and starts asking questions, you immediately fill the office of "person" if you start answering their questions. It is for this reason that you should ignore or refuse to "answer" their questions and instead act like a true Sovereign, a King or Queen, and ask only your own questions of them. You are not a "person" subject to their laws.

If they persist and haul you into their court unlawfully, your response to the judge is simple and direct, you the Sovereign, must tell him :

> I have no need to answer you in this matter.
>
> It is none of your business whether I understand my Rights or whether I understand your fictitious charges.
>
> It is none of your business whether I want counsel.
>
> The reason it is none of your business is because I am not a ‘person’ regulated by the state. I do not hold any position or office where I am subject to the legislature. The state legislature does not dictate what I do.
>
> I am a free autonomous (Sovereign) "Man" (or woman) and I am a political power holder as lawfully decreed in the _____ State Constitution at article I (or II) and that constitution is controlling over you.
>
> Do you understand me?

You must NEVER retain or hire an attorney, a state officer of the court, to speak or file written documents for you. Use an attorney (if you must) only for counsel and advice about their "legal" system. If you retain an attorney to represent you and speak in your place, you become "NON COMPOS MENTIS", not mentally competent, and you are then considered a ward of the court. You LOSE all your Rights, and you will not be permitted to do anything herein.

The judge knows that as long as he remains in his office, he is backed by the awesome power of the state, its lawyers, police and prisons. The judge will try to force you to abandon your Sovereign sanctuary by threatening you with jail. No matter what happens, if you remain faithful to your Sovereignty, The judge and the state may not lawfully move against you. The state did not create the office of Sovereign political power holder. Therefore, they do not regulate and control those in the office of Sovereign. They cannot ascribe penalties for breach of that particular office. The reason they have no authority over the office of the Sovereign is because they did not create it and the Sovereign people did not delegate to them any such power.

When challenged, simply remind them that they do not regulate any office of the Sovereign and that their statutes only apply to those state employees in legislative created offices. This Sovereign individual paradigm is explained by the following U.S. Supreme Court case:

"The individual may stand upon his constitutional Rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no such duty [to submit his books and papers for an examination] to the State,

since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property. His Rights are such as existed by the law of the land [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the State, and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution. Among his Rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law. He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their Rights." Hale v. Henkel, 201 U.S. 43 at 47 (1905).

Let us analyze this case. It says, "The individual may stand upon his constitutional Rights." It does not say, "Sit on his Rights." There is a principle here: "If you don't use 'em you lose 'em." You have to assert your Rights, demand them, "stand upon" them.

Next it says, "He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way." It says "private business" - you have a Right to operate a private business. Then it says "in his own way." It doesn't say "in the government´s way."

Then it says, "His power to contract is unlimited." As a Sovereign individual, your power to contract is unlimited. In common law there are certain criteria that determine the validity of contracts. They are not important here, except that any contract that would harm others or violate their Rights would be invalid. For example, a "contract" to kill someone is not a valid contract. Apart from this obvious qualification, your power to contract is unlimited.

Next it says, "He owes no such duty [to submit his books and papers for an examination] to the State, since he receives nothing therefrom, beyond the protection of his life and property." The court case contrasted the duty of the corporation (an entity created by government permission - feudal paradigm) to the duty of the Sovereign individual. The Sovereign individual doesn't need and didn't receive permission from the government, hence has no duty to the government.

Then it says, "His Rights are such as existed by the law of the land [Common Law] long antecedent to the organization of the State." This is very important. The Supreme Court recognized that humans have inherent Rights. The U.S. Constitution (including the Bill of Rights) does not grant us Rights. We have fundamental Rights, irrespective of what the Constitution says. The Constitution acknowledges some of our Rights. And Amendment IX states, "The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain Rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people." The important point is that our Rights antecede (come before, are senior to) the organization of the state.

Next the Supreme Court says, "And [his Rights] can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution." Does it say the government can take away your Rights? No! Your Rights can only be taken away "by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution." "Due process of law" involves procedures and safeguards such as trial by jury. "Trial by jury" means, inter alia, the jury judges both law and fact.

Then the case says, "Among his Rights are a refusal to incriminate himself, and the immunity of himself and his property from arrest or seizure except under a warrant of the law." These are some of the Rights of a Sovereign individual. Sovereign individuals need not report anything about themselves or their businesses to anyone.

Finally, the Supreme Court says, "He owes nothing to the public so long as he does not trespass upon their Rights." The Sovereign individual does not have to pay taxes. If you should discuss Hale v. Henkel with a run-of-the-mill attorney, he or she will tell you that the case is "old" and that it has been "overturned." If you ask that attorney for a citation of the case or cases that overturned Hale v. Henkel, there will not be a meaningful response. The OUTLAWS have researched Hale v. Henkel and here is what we found :

"We know that Hale v. Henkel was decided in 1905 in the U.S. Supreme Court. Since it was the Supreme Court, the case is binding on all courts of the land, until another Supreme Court case says it isn't. Has another Supreme Court case overturned Hale v. Henkel? The answer is NO. As a matter of fact, since 1905, the Supreme Court has cited Hale v. Henkel a total of 144 times. A fact more astounding is that since 1905, Hale v. Henkel has been cited by all of the federal and state appellate court systems a total of over 1600 times. None of the various issues of this case has ever been overruled.

So if the state through the office of the judge continues to threaten or does imprison you, they are trying to force you into the state created office of "person." As long as you continue to claim your Rightful office of Sovereign, the state lacks all jurisdiction over you. The state needs someone filling the office of "person" in order to continue prosecuting a case in their courts.

A few weeks in jail puts intense pressure upon most "persons." Jail means the loss of job opportunities, separation from loved ones, and the piling up of debts. Judges will apply this pressure when they attempt to arraign you. When brought in chains before a crowded courtroom the issue of counsel will quickly come up and you can tell the court you are in propria persona or simply "PRO PER", as your own counsel and you need no other. Do not sign their papers or cooperate with them because most things about your life are private and are not the state's business to evaluate. Here is the Sovereign peoples command in the constitution that the state respect their privacy: Right of privacy -- Every man or woman has the Right to be let alone and free from governmental intrusion into their private life except as otherwise provided herein. This section shall not be construed to limit the public's Right of access to public records and meetings as provided by law.

If the judge is stupid enough to actually follow through with his threats and send you to jail, you will soon be released without even being arraigned and all charges will be dropped. You will then have documented prima facie grounds for false arrest and false imprisonment charges against him personally.

Now that you know the hidden evil in the word "person", Try to stop using it in everyday conversation. Simply use the correct term, MAN or WOMAN. Train yourself, your family and your friends to never use the derogatory word "person" ever again.

[Alledged] Statement by the Texan Edward Mandell House (1858-1938) who made secret missions to Europe and helped President Woodrow Wilson get elected:

> "[Very] soon, every American will be required to register their biological property in a national system designed to keep track of the people and that will operate under the ancient system of **pledging**. By such methodology, we can compel people to submit to our agenda, which will affect our security as a charge back for our fiat paper currency. Every American will be forced to register or suffer being able to work and earn a living. They will be our chattel, and we will hold the security interest over them forever, by operation of the law merchant under the scheme of secured transactions. Americans, by unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of lading to us will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent, forever to remain economic slaves through taxation, secured by their pledges. They will be stripped of their rights and given a commercial value designed to make us a profit and they will be none the wiser, for not one man in a million could ever figure our plans and, if by accident one or two should figure it out, we have in our arsenal plausible deniability. After all, this is the only logical way to fund government, by floating liens and debt to the registrants in the form of benefits and privileges. This will inevitably reap to us huge profits and beyond our wildest expectations and leave every American a contributor to this fraud, which we will call "Social Insurance." Without realizing it, every American will insure us for any loss we may incur and in this manner; every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly. The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and, we will employ the high office of the President of our dummy corporation to foment this plot against America."

LEGAL DEFINITIONS
(as found in Black´s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition)

PLEDGE
In common law pleading, those persons who became sureties for the prosecution of the suit.

ALLEGIANCE
- Obligation of fidelity and obedience to government in consideration for protection that government gives.

...very interesting considering The Pledge of Allegiance

Watch Video At: https://youtu.be/j711tNiET1M

Policy Document: Who´s Who in the Freedom Movement, Form #08.009, Section 3.16

The corporation

What is the Strawman?

Your Strawman is an Artificial Person

Notes on PERSON

Commentary On Why The Ucc Filing

A Quick Study Of Commercial Law

The UCC Filing

Commercial Law And The Uniform Commercial Code

Mastering The UCC

Judaica Redemption Quote 1972

Addressing The Strawman Matter

UCC Connection

Best-selling author **Naomi Wolf**, "***I hope we wake up quickly because history shows it´s a small window in which people can fight back before it is too dangerous to fight back.***
"—**Naomi Wolf** on Fox News Channel´s **Tucker Carlson Tonight**
A New York Times Bestseller! -- The End of America: Letter of Warning to a Young Patriot *
Important update, March 19, 2022 - The End of America?
Naomi Wolf, The End of America and Bill Gates

Robert Higgs, Mises.org

The Song That Is Irresistible: How the State Leads People to Their Own Destruction

Naomi Wolf, from 2007 - Fascist America, in 10 easy steps

NOTICE: Presented entities are not affiliated with Freedom School.
Views presented, expressed and/or curated here, in the Public´s interest, do not necessarily reflect those of Freedom School or its staff.
Please be aware that articles and relating links presented were valid at the time of posting. We are not responsible for deletions and/or censorship by others.
***** Please notice: Books are suggested as public service, Freedom-School.com is not an Amazon Affiliate nor do we derive any profit from any sales.
Do you have something for inclusion - please feel encouraged to submit it to us.

If anything in this presentation is found to be in error a good faith effort will be made to correct it in timely fashion upon notification.

(This page was last modified on: 04/25/2022 20:05:09) **Specialty Areas**

All the powers in the universe seem to favor the person who has confidence.

More & Other Information - Resource Pages:

AntiShyster Magazine	Attention Signing the Constitution Away
Aware	Belligerent Claimant
Bonds	Citizenship / nationality related items
Education	Graphics
health related	Howard Griswold
Jerry Kirk	Jurisdiction
Law related items	Lee Brobst
Lewis Mohr	Luis Ewing
Money	Reading Material
Reading Room	Stuff
Tax matters	Travel related
	Video

NOTICE: The information on this page was brought to you by people who paid this website forward so that someone such as you might also profit by having access to it. If you care to do so also please feel encouraged to KEEP THIS SITE GOING by making a donation today. Thank you.

Freedom-School is not affiliated with the links on this page - unless otherwise stated.
This enterprise collectively is known and generally presented as "Freedom-School.com" - "we," "us" or "our" are other expressions of Freedom-School.com used throughout. "You" is in reference to the user / visitor.

This is the fine print that so important. Freedom School and other information served is so for educational purposes only, no liability expressed or assumed for use.
The information you obtain at this site is not, nor is it intended to be, legal advice.
Freedom School does not consent to or condone unlawful action.
Freedom School advocates and encourages one and all to adhere to, support and

defend all Law which is particularly applicable.
BE AWARE - This page and its contents are subject to change without notice, and is VOID where prohibited by Law.
Information is intended for [those] men and women who are not "US CITIZENS" or "TAXPAYERS" - continued use, reference or citing indicates voluntary and informed compliance. Support is not offered.

Freedom School is a free speech site, non-commercial enterprise and operation as there is no charge for things presented.
Freedom-School.com site relies on this memorandum and others in support of this philosophy and operation.

The noteworthy failure of [the] government or any alleged agency thereof to at any time rebut anything appearing on this website constitutes a legal admission of the fidelity and accuracy of the materials presented, which are offered in good faith and prepared as such by Freedom School and any and all [third] parties affiliated or otherwise. THIS IS AN ELECTRONIC AGREEMENT AND IS A LEGALLY BINDING CONTRACT, EQUIVALENT TO A SIGNED, WRITTEN CONTRACT BETWEEN PARTIES - If the government, or anyone else, wants to assert that any of the religious and/or political statements appearing on this website are not factual or otherwise in error, then they as the moving party have the burden of proof, and they must responsively meet that burden of proof under the Administrative Procedures Act 5 U.S.C. § 556(d) and under the due process clauses found in the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Amendments to the national Constitution BEFORE there will be response to any summons, questions, or unsubstantiated and slanderous accusations. Attempts at calling presented claims "frivolous" without specifically rebutting the particular claim, or claims, deemed "frivolous" will be in deed be "frivolous" and prima facie evidence that shall be used accordingly. Hey guys, if anything on this site is found to be in error a good faith effort will be made to correct it in timely fashion upon notification.

Freedom-School.com is not responsible for content of any linked website or material.
In addition, users **may not** use Freedom-School.com to engage in, facilitate or further unlawful conduct;
use the service in any way, or manner, that harms us or anyone connected with us or whose work is presented;
damage, disable, overburden, or impair the service (or the network(s) connected to the site)
or interfere with anyone´s use and enjoyment of the website.

All claims to be settled on the land - Austin, Travis county Texas, united States of America, using Texas Common Law.
All parts of this contract apply to the maximum extent permitted by law. A court may hold that we cannot enforce a part of this contract as written. If this happens, then you and we will replace that part with terms that most closely match the intent of the part that we cannot enforce. The rest of this contract will not change. This is the entire contract between you and us regarding your use of the service. It supersedes any prior contract or statements regarding your use of the Freedom-School.com site. If there exists some manner of thing missing we do not forfeit our right to that thing as
we reserve all rights.

We may assign, or modify, alter, change this contract, in whole or in part, at any time with or without notice to you. You may not assign this contract, or any part of it, to any other person. Any attempt by you to do so is void. You may not transfer to anyone else, either temporarily or permanently, any rights to use the Freedom-School.com site or material contained within.

GOOGLE ANALYTICS: While we do not automatically collect personally identifiable information about you when you visit the Freedom-School.com site, we do collect non-identifying and aggregate information that we use to improve our Web site design and our online presence.
Visitors to this site who have Javascript enabled are tracked using Google Analytics. The type of information that Google Analytics collects about you includes data like: the type of Web browser you are using; the type of operating system you are using; your screen resolution; the version of Flash you may be using; your network location and IP address (this can include geographic data like the country, city and state you are in); your Internet connection speed; the time of your visit to the Freedom-School.com site; the pages you visit on the Freedom-School.com site; the amount of time you spend on each page of the Freedom-School.com site and referring site information. In addition to the reports we receive using Google Analytics data, the data is shared with Google. For more information on Google´s privacy policies, visit:
www.google.com/privacy_ads.html
Here is Google´s description of how Google Analytics works and how you can disable it: "Google Analytics collects information anonymously, and much like examining footprints in sand, it reports website trends without identifying individual visitors. Analytics uses its own cookie to track visitor interactions. The cookie is used to store information, such as what time the current visit occurred, whether the visitor has been to the site before, and what site referred the visitor to the web page. Google Analytics customers can view a variety of reports about how visitors interact with their website so they can improve their website and how people find it. A different cookie is used for each website, and visitors are not tracked across multiple sites. Analytics requires that all websites that use it must update their privacy policy to include a notice that fully discloses the use of Analytics. To disable this type of cookie, some browsers will indicate when a cookie is being sent and allow you to decline cookies on a case-by-case basis."

Freedom-School.com site, the DVD issue, microSDHC card issue, or work computers´ DMCA Policy

The Freedom-School.com site, the DVD issue, microSDHC card issue, and/or work computers, make effort to be in compliance with 17 U.S.C. § 512 and the Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA"). It is our policy to respond to any infringement notices and take appropriate actions under the Digital Millennium Copyright Act ("DMCA") and other applicable intellectual property laws.

If your copyrighted material has been posted on the Freedom-School.com site, the DVD issue, microSDHC card issue, or work computers, in other than fair use capacity or if links to your copyrighted material are returned through our search engine and you want the material removed, you must provide a written communication that details the information listed in the following section. Please be aware that you will be liable for damages (including costs and attorneys´ fees) if you

misrepresent information listed on the site that is allegedly infringing on your alleged copyrights. We suggest that you may want to first contact competent legal assistance on this matter.

The following elements must be included in your copyright infringement claim:

* Provide evidence of the authorized person to act on behalf of the fully disclosed alleged owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly infringed. Please notice that we generally do not deal with third parties.
* Provide sufficient contact information so that we may contact you. You must also include a valid email address.
* You must identify in sufficient detail the copyrighted work claimed to have been infringed and including at least one search term under which the material appears in Freedom-School.com search results.
* A statement that the complaining party has a good faith belief that use of the material in the manner complained of is not authorized by the copyright owner, its agent, or the law.
* A statement that the information in the notification is accurate, and under penalty of perjury, that the complaining party is authorized to act on behalf of the owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly infringed.
* Must be signed by the authorized person to act on behalf of the owner of an exclusive right that is allegedly being infringed. (Proper ratification of commencement.)

Send the infringement notice via email to the postmaster at Freedom-School.com

Please allow 1~5 business days for an email response. Note that emailing your complaint to, or otherwise contacting, any other parties such as our Internet Service Provider (ISP) or server host(s) will not expedite your request and may (most likely) result in a delayed response due the complaint not being properly filed.

NOTICE: The information presented on this page, and throughout the site, is subject to change at any time without notice, and is VOID where prohibited by Law.

H O M E