

TREATISE –
Introduction to Corporate Political Societies

This is a free publication offered to those who seek the truth by
goingtopeace.com

Introduction to Corporate Political Societies

Copyrighted © 2007 by goingtopeace.com. All rights are reserved, except the contents of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, and transcribed in any form or by any means without express permission, but may not be sold.

The author of this book does not give legal advice. Remedies are available if you know where to look for them. The purpose of this book is to reveal and compile the sources of some of these remedies that can be found in millions of pages of case law, statutes, codes, laws, rules, and regulations. This book is intended to decrease the time it takes to discover the components of your remedies and their application. It is the responsibility of the readers to understand their remedies, to seek assistance if necessary, and to apply proper and complete concepts to reach a successful conclusion to a dispute. This book does not exhaust the information that might be needed to successfully settle a dispute.

Other writings from goingtopeace.com on related topics that can be found at: www.lulu.com.

Search for writings by this author by entering **Byron Beers** in the search box at the top right of Lulu's site and choosing "**Books**" in the product box.

Click on **Byron Beers** under any title to enter his Lulu Marketplace.

Books

America – National or Federal?

Each state, in ratifying the Constitution, is considered a sovereign body, independent of all others, and only to be bound by its own voluntary act. In this relation, the new Constitution will, if established, be a federal and not a national Constitution. The Federalist, No. 39, James Madison

In Search of Liberty

Liberty, sir, is the primary object, ...the battles of the Revolution were fought, not to make 'a great and mighty empire', but 'for liberty'. Patrick Henry

What Does Accepted for Value Mean?

Agree with thine adversary quickly, while thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.

Matthew 5:25-26

Booklets

1 *When There is No Money* FREE

For thus saith the Lord, Ye have sold yourselves for nothing, and ye shall be redeemed without money. Isaiah 52:3

2 *Liberty* FREE

Now the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is Liberty. II Corinthians 3:17

Introduction to Corporate Political Societies

3 *The Natural Order of Thing* FREE

Owe no one anything, except to love one another; for he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law. Romans 13:8

4 *Sovereignty* FREE

Even in almost every nation, which has been denominated free, the state has assumed a supercilious pre-eminence above the people who have formed it. Hence, the haughty notions of state independence, state sovereignty, and state supremacy. Justice Wilson, *Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 Dal. (U.S.) 419, 458 (1792)

5 *The Legal System for Sovereign Rulers* FREE

The Lord shall judge the people with equity. Psalms 98:9

6 *The Negative Side of Positive Law* FREE

Therefore, one must be wise and attentive, since there are those among us who make kings and set up princes outside His law. Hosea 8:4

7 *Resident/Minister* FREE

You may also buy some of the temporary residents living among you and members of their clans born in your country, and they will become your property.

Leviticus 25:45

8 *Introduction to Law Merchant* FREE

Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty with which Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. Galatians 5:1

9 *Society of Slaves and Freedmen* FREE

If men, through fear, fraud, or mistake should in terms renounce or give up any natural right, the eternal law of reason and the grand end of society would absolutely vacate such renunciation. The right to freedom being a gift of ALMIGHTY GOD, it is not in the power of man to alienate this gift and voluntarily become a slave. Samuel Adams 1772

10 *Introduction to Corporate Political Societies* FREE

Finally, be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we are not contending against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this present darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places. Ephesians 6:10-12

11 *Superior Law, Higher Law, My Law* FREE

You have rights antecedent to all earthly governments' rights that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws; rights derived from the Great Legislator of the Universe. John Adams

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Illusion of Freedom for Slaves	2
Independent Political Society for Slaves.	9
Who Goes to Prison.	15
The Trust State	22
Change in the Works	28
How to Implement a Body Politic and Corporate System.	31
The Elements of a Body Politic and Corporate	38
Global Merchants and the Body Politic	42
Summary	44

**Emphasis is added throughout this writing by underlining.
Quoted passages are bolded.**

Finally, be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we are not contending against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this present darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in heavenly places.

Ephesians 6:10-12

TREATISE –
Introduction to Corporate Political Societies

INTRODUCTION

Those who are not ignorant of the founding principles of law and government in America realize that the way the current system operates is dramatically different that it was originally established. I have written on topics in the past that will need to be summarized here for one to understand the significance of modern political societies.

There are numerous issues one may consider that demonstrate the uniqueness of the present system of government, law, and courts. Why are so many prisoners in correctional facilities? Why are there practically uncountable rules and regulations we generally called laws, and to whom do these laws apply? What are administrative laws, agencies, procedures, and tribunals that do away with the separation of authority regarding executive, legislative, and judicial? Why are there so many taxes?

There short answer to these and many other perplexing questions is that you may appear to be a slave, or are the party responsible for a slave character that operates as a U.S. citizen in the modern system. I know that sounds preposterous, even impossible, until you see the facts and understand there are two types of slaves. There are slaves who appear to be free, go to school, work where they want, receive consideration for their labor or industry, get married and have children, live in a house, and so on. All of this does not mean he or she is not perceived as a slave, since one may still be subject to the will of another, and be compelled to show obedience and gratitude to a master or superior authority.

The type of state and government the people of the American states established for themselves and for future generations was designed for people who are free with liberty. Have those institutions been replaced with quite different versions designed for a society of slaves? This is the main issue of this writing. We will begin with information that will lead us in that direction.

ILLUSION OF FREEDOM FOR SLAVES

People would rather be free than slaves. The history of planet Earth tells us time and time again, in all its areas, that man has struggled against being subject to the will or command of another. If you believe the Word of God as expressed in the Holy Bible, you know

there are many references directing His people to be free, be at liberty, and not be slaves or servants of men. If you search inside yourself, you know you desire to be free.

The Roman Empire with its Roman civil law was built upon the foundation of a society of slaves. Much of Europe had its law based upon a servile or slave population. The same is true of England according to scholastic writings. The current system in use under the name of United States or United States of America, borrowed from those foreign sources just listed, is based upon slavery. For this to occur, you need a political system composed of superiors and inferiors, or masters and slaves. The political system of the United States attempts to mimic some of the aspects of the true American system based upon people who are free, but there is no hiding the fact the modern system relies upon a society of slaves.

I previously wrote *TREATISE – A Society of Slaves and Freedmen* that provides more details than the brief overview found in this section. This issue is fundamental to our understanding of how such extreme changes can be employed while escaping the awareness of most people. First, there are two types of slaves.

[T]he general principles of international law are broad enough to cover this case. Slaves are looked upon in all codes in two lights, as persons, and as property. Story's Conflict of Laws, 64. *Commonwealth v Thomas Aves*, 36 Mass. (18 Pick.) 193, 195 (1836)

[T]he status of slavery embraces every condition from that in which the slave is known to the law simply as a chattel, with no civil rights, to that in which he is recognised as a person for all purposes, save the compulsory power of directing and receiving the fruits of his labor. Which of these conditions shall attend the status of slavery must depend on the municipal law which creates and upholds it. *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. 393, 624-5 (1856)

In expounding this law, we must not lose sight of the twofold character which belongs to the slave. He is a person, and also property. As property, the rights of the owner are entitled to the protection of the law. As a person, he is bound to obey the law, and may, like any other person, be punished if he offends against it; and he may be embraced in the provisions of the law, either by the description of property or as a person, according to the subject-matter upon which congress or a state is legislating.

Taney, Circuit Justice, *U.S. v. Amy*, 24 Fed. Cas. 792, 810 #14,445 (1859)

We saw that slaves have two characters; as chattel property or as persons. As property, the slave has commercial value, can be bought and sold, can be hypothecated thereby serving as backing or collateral for credit to the master or those having a financial interest or security interest in the slave, and are mostly dependent upon a master for the basic necessities of life for which they are expected to produce more revenue or value to the master than that which the master provides to the slave. The master or his agents also provide necessities, in the

4

nature of welfare, for the children of his slaves who are usually considered as the property of the master or owner, who also aids an injured slave, according to general laws or municipal laws on the subject of master and slave relationship. A master or owner is to provide reasonable comfort, including medical care, when a slave must retire from the rigors of his life and he is no longer commercially productive.

The slave in the character of a person refers to a slave not confined to a particular place like a manor or plantation, nor looking to a master for his necessities of life. A slave as a person is not within the masters' immediate care or control, nor does he owe service to a particular master. The slave person is often subject to a sovereign political authority following a conquest and emancipation, or by way of a treaty, giving the slave a legal personality in a special kind of State, a political corporation often referred to as a political society or body politic. This is where we are heading in this writing.

If the slave person is not obedient to the rules of the sovereign authority of the corporate political society including its agents, is ungrateful for his granted rights and liberty by not sharing in the fruits of his industry, or if he has a habit of doing wrong to others with whom he meets or associates, he will likely be returned to his original condition as property and placed in confinement like a box or cell. In these cases the limited (civil or personal) rights and conditional (personal) liberty that were granted to the slave can be withdrawn,

and he can be placed in a correctional facility so he might reflect on the error of his ways and understand he is to be in subjection to his sovereign's will.

CORRECTION. **Discipline; chastisement administered by a master or other person in authority to one who has committed an offense, for the purpose of curing his faults or bringing him into proper subjection.** *Black's Law Dictionary*, 1st ed. (1891)

A slave, as a person, can appear to be free to everyone else, but he is still a slave to a master or a sovereign political authority. This is the character that can fool most people into believing they are free, when in fact they are, in a corporate political society, yet slaves. In the Roman civil law the term *freedman* is most often used to describe a slave of this character. In the English law, the two most prevalent terms used to identify this slave character were *villein* and *vassal*.

VILLEIN, Engl. law. A species of slave during the feudal times.' ... for no person was, in the eye of the law, a villein, except as to his master; in relation to all other persons he was a freeman.

A Dictionary of Law, Bouvier (1856)

villein. A person entirely subject to a lord or attached to a manor, but free in relation to all others; a serf. At the time of the Domesday Inquest (shortly after the Norman Conquest), about 40% of households were marked as belonging to villeins: they

were the most numerous element in the English population. Cf. FREEMAN. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 7th ed. (1999)

The slaves who were liberated by a generous master immediately entered into the middle class of libertini or freedmen; but they could never be enfranchised from the duties of obedience and gratitude; whatever were the fruits of their industry, their patron and his family inherited the third part, or even the whole of their fortune, if they died without children and without a testament.

Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393, 479 (1856)

We see how the character of slave, villein, or freedman, which is to say the slave in the character of a person, could easily be mistaken as one being actually free, when in fact he is yet subject to the will of another to whom he is to be obedient and show gratitude. The authority over a freedman, villein, or slave person need not be a man but is more likely to be a political corporation such as a nation. I should insert here that the meaning of the term *nation* is very different than that presumed by most people. In the definition of *villein* in Black's Law Dictionary, 7th edition, quoted above, we find a person is "attached to a manor". The English manor is very similar to a municipal corporation, which is actually a body politic and corporate. I know this may seem rather technical, but none of these terms refer to a state of free people, but rather to a society of slaves. Do you care to know how you became a slave?

Freedman. **An emancipated slave.** *Black's Law Dictionary*, 7th

MANUMISSION, **contracts.** **The agreement by which the owner or master of a slave sets him free and at liberty; the written instrument which contains this agreement is also called a manumission.** 2. **In the civil law it was different from emancipation, which, properly speaking, was applied to the liberation of children from paternal power.**

Bouvier, *A Dictionary of Law* (1856)

Libertinum ingratum leges civiles in pristinam servitutem redignant; sed leges Angliae semel manumissum semper liberum judicant. **The civil laws reduce an ungrateful freedman to his original slavery; but the laws of England regard a person once manumitted as ever after free.** *Black's Law Dictionary*, Legal Maxims, 7th ed.

We have already discussed the *freedman*, being liberated from a master but yet owing obedience and gratitude. Manumission is a term more in line with actual freedom and liberty, while emancipation is more like a transfer or sale so that a slave is freed from his master but is now under the control or care of another, or is removed from being property to having granted and conditional rights and liberty as a person. If you look at emancipation, and take the root word “manci”, you find it refers to **the transfer or purchase of things including slaves**. Emancipation also refers a parent being released from the legal obligations of support for a child.

INDEPENDENT POLITICAL SOCIETY FOR SLAVES

The Roman concept of the patriarchal family views children as slaves of the head of the family, and the family operates like a corporation. The patriarch is equated to a sovereign authority as lawgiver, enforcer and judge, but also as the trustee for the family. The patriarch represents the family in matters exterior to the family, plus the patriarch has a higher right to all the possessions of family members. This is where the idea for a corporate political society or civil state originates, as distinguished from state following the natural order where everyone is born free and equal, and is not perceived as a slave to a higher human authority. The corporate political society or civil state has its sovereign head ruling over numerous individuals similar to a patriarchal family.

Familia, in classical Latinity, means always a man's slaves." ... the place of grantee [in a will or sale regarding slaves] was taken by a person known technically as the *familiae emptor*, the Purchaser of the Family. *Ancient Law*, by Sir Henry Sumner Maine, p. 173

Did you know *familia* or family referred to a group of slaves? A group of slaves may be related by blood, but such relationship is not necessary to be a familia or family. It is not so obvious if you say a family or familia means a group of *persons*, and as we have seen person is one of the characters of a slave along with chattel property. Slaves in the political society are often required to ask permission of

the master or sovereign before doing many acts that would be considered natural or common for men who are truly free including marriage, moving oneself from place to place, or performing one's trade or service to others.

What became of the emancipated slaves of the civil war era of the 1860's?

The creation of a civil or legal person out of a thing, the investiture of a chattel with *toga civillis*, may be an achievement of the imperial power, but it is beyond the compass of an American congress. Congress must first emancipate the slave, before it can endow him with the rights of a citizen under the constitution, or impose upon him the responsibilities of a legal person, or compel him to pay money, or part with liberty.

United States v. Amy, 24 Fed.Cas.792, 794 #14,445 (1859)

There are many important terms and concepts involved in the quote above that were discussed in my TREATISE – *Society of Slaves and Freedmen*. We can easily see the continuation of the slave character as a person who owes obedience and gratitude for the conditional rights and liberty granted that can result in compelling the slave person to pay money and part with liberty, none of which he supposedly would have obtained except for congress endowing him with rights of a citizen (not one of the original citizens) under the constitution. Notice that it does say under the constitution, and not

one of the people of the several states who are the superior authority over the constitution.

[T]he courts were designed to be an intermediate body between the people and the legislature, in order, among other things, to keep the latter within the limits assigned to their authority.' (Federalist, No. 77, by Hamilton.) 'Nor does the conclusion by any means suppose a superiority of the judicial to the legislative power. It only supposes that the power of the people is superior to both,' ... There are several other questions, also, which may arise under our form of government that are not properly of judicial cognizance. They originate in political matters, extend to political objects ... These questions are decided sometimes by legislatures, or heads of departments, or by public political bodies, and sometimes by officers, executive or military, so as not to be revisable here. (See *Decatur v. Paulding*, 14 Peters, 497.)

Luther v. Borden, 48 U.S. 1, 53, 54 (1849)

The *Luther* quote is a good illustration of the two diverse states. The one I refer to as the true state, properly written with a small “s” state since it is under the people who are under their Creator, and it follows the natural order of things. The other State, properly written with a capital “S” since it consists of persons, state and government all rolled into one corporation ruled by a governmental sovereign authority as if it were a god. This corporation is often labeled an independent political society or community, or a body politic and

corporate. The constitutional judicial power is for men who are free and for things of substance, but not for the artificial or corporate political society ruled by a sovereign power and persons subject to its authority. Can the judicial power overrule the commands of a master to his voluntary slaves? Slavery and involuntary servitude are contrary to law; therefore, persons in the political society State must presumably be there voluntarily. The political society obviously has its own special courts and due process that are geared toward ruling for the sovereign, or the creditors as security interest holders of the corporate bonds, and against the character of a slave or subject that may also be viewed as property securing the corporate society debt.

In the earlier *Amy* case, we saw reference to congress creating civil and legal persons. Did Congress create a living breathing man with a soul and spirit from his Creator? No, congress is creating corporate characters with granted rights and correlating obligations, and a corporate personality and name for those who wish to function in that artificial and corporate dimension.

A plea that an abbot or prior was an alien was never good, for the reason that he was civiliter mortuus, as a monk professed in his natural capacity, and in his corporate character he was a subject of the crown of which his land was held.

Louisville, C. & C. R. v. Letson, 43 U.S. 497, 523 (1844)

The quote above concerns the political society or body politic in England. I just wanted to point out the corporate character was a subject of the sovereign crown. That which pertains to a subject and the sovereign to whom he or it owes allegiance is a political matter, not judicial. Evidently, the evidence did not support the subject's assertion that he was alien to that political system. It should also be noted that subjects in England equate very closely with the 14th Amendment citizen of the United States.

Person. **...Scope and delineation of term is necessary for determining those to whom Fourteenth Amendment of Constitution affords protection since this Amendment expressly applies to 'persons'.** *Black's Law Dictionary*, 6th Edition, "Person"

The creation of a new kind of citizen, a national citizen, for a national political society was the result of the civil war. Anyone, not just emancipated slaves, could join in the fun where all are equally subject to a superior political sovereign in this national system.

The evident meaning of these...words (subject to the jurisdiction thereof in 14th Amendment) is, not merely subject in some respects or degree to the jurisdiction of the United States, but completely subject to their political jurisdiction, and owing them direct and immediate allegiance.

Elk v. Wilkens, 112 U.S. 94, 102 (1884)

United States citizen. **The antithesis of alien. A person born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof. One who by birth, naturalization, or other means is a member of the independent political society of the United States of America.** *Ballentine's 3rd*

We see a United States citizen is a member of the independent political society of the United States of America. The word “of” meaning *from* or *origin*, we find something called United States of America created something described as the independent political society. This whole process we are looking at is remarkably similar to the plan followed by the Roman Empire.

We have made all freed men in general become citizens of Rome... by the exertion of despotic will to establish, under a false and misapplied denomination, one equal and universal slavery, and to effect this result required the exertions of absolute power -- of a power both in theory and practice, being in its most plenary acceptance the SOVEREIGNTY, THE STATE ITSELF -- it could not be produced by a less or inferior authority, much less by the will or the act of one who, with reference to civil and political rights, was himself a slave.

Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393, 480 (1856)

WHO GOES TO PRISON?

We have seen a few reasons why one might choose not be to a member of a corporate political society or accept the designation of person and United States citizen as that expression is now defined. Prisons are for slaves residing in a political society.

imprisonment for debt ... was unknown to the common law. It was even against Magna Charta. The nature of the population of England in feudal times, develops the cause. The different counties of England were held by great lords; the greater part of the population were their villeins... The statute of Acton Burnel, 11 Edw. I., gave the first remedy to foreign merchants, by imprisonment, in 1283.

Sturges v. Crowninshield, 17 U.S. 122, 140-1 (1819)

What was the cause for the imprisonment of debtors in England? First, it was a population of villeins who are persons appearing to be free to everyone, except they have a slave relationship with some political unit or corporate political matrix ruled by a sovereign power. Secondly, imprisonment was provided by an act of the sovereign power of the political society at the request of foreign merchants who had security interests resulting from pledges made by villeins to the foreign merchants who desired the remedy of imprisonment for their apparent debtors. Most, if not all, acts of the corporate political society involve commercial issues and the custom of merchants

known as law merchant. The next quote is in regard to the charter and laws of the District of Columbia, a municipal corporation meaning it is a *body politic and corporate*. It is but another phrase that means a corporate political society.

...to restrain and prohibit the nightly and other disorderly meetings of slaves, free negroes and mulattoes, and to punish such slaves by whipping, not exceeding forty stripes, or by imprisonment not exceeding six calendar months, for any one offence; and to punish such free negroes and mulattoes for such offences, by fixed penalties, not exceeding twenty dollars for any one offence; and in case of inability of any such free negro or mulatto to pay and satisfy such penalty and costs thereon, to cause such free negro or mulatto to be confined to labour for such reasonable time, not exceeding six calendar months, for any one offence, as may be deemed equivalent to such penalty and costs; ... to provide for registering of births, deaths and marriages; ... to authorize night watches and patrols, and the taking up and confining by them, in the night time, of all suspected persons; to punish by law corporally any servant or slave guilty of a breach of any of their by-laws or ordinances, unless the owner or holder of such servant or slave, shall pay the fine annexed to the offence... *Cohens v. Com of Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 285 (1821)

The penalties and prisons were for slaves or persons, either as property having an owner or holder, or as persons with limited rights

and conditional liberty. Slaves, as property or as persons, are always deemed to be a source of revenue for the corporate political society. Slaves, or freedmen who might be returned to their original condition as property, are commercial things or characters that exist only because of legislative acts passed for the corporate political society. The true state would not be able to provide for slavery, since slavery is contrary to the laws of nature, and of nature's God which upholds the principle that all men are born free and equal.

To improve our understanding of the previous quotation from *Cohens*, Chief Justice Taney in *Dred Scott* refers to a different case concerning Darnall who was of the African race in the character of a slave person having some rights and liberty, possibly in the nature of an emancipated slave. Taney explains that if Darnall's father had manumitted him, and Darnall had sojourned to a State that recognized him as a citizen (pre civil war), which might equate to a public record, then Darnall could have returned to Maryland "**and the State officers and tribunals would be compelled ... to receive him and treat him as one of its citizens, exempt from the laws and police of the State in relation to a person of that description, and allow him to enjoy all the rights and privileges of citizenship, without respect to the laws of Maryland, although such laws were deemed by it absolutely essential to is own safety.**

Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393, 425 (1856)

It is not about skin color; it is about status. It is about not being in either of the two categories for slaves. On a more confusing note, the *Dred Scott* case makes reference to English persons, or French persons who may now be citizens and referred to as persons here, but they are not persons applicable to those statutes and police regulations addressed to persons which, it is said, is but common knowledge. In my opinion, subjects coming from England came from a national political society as did the French, and so they might continue to be called persons. But if no one has a claim against them and they are not within the classifications of a slave, then, in my opinion, penal statutes compelling a payment of money or imprisonment would not apply to them. They might be able to volunteer to come under penal statutes, but it does not appear they automatically are subject to them. The quote below is in reference to Roman law where again the distinction is made between a slave and one who is not.

The Manifest Thief was he who was caught within the house in which he had been pilfering, or who was taken while making off to a place of safety with the stolen goods; the Twelve Tables condemned him to be put to death if he were already a slave, and, if he was a freeman, they made him the bondsman of the owner of the property.

Ancient Law, Sir Henry Sumner Maine,
with introduction by C.K. Allen,
Warden of Rhodes House, Oxford,
pages 140, 141, first published in 1861

Liberum corpus aestimationem non recipit. **The body of a freeman does not admit of valuation.** *Bouvier* 1856, Maxims of Law

In Roman civil law, a freeman was required to make restitution to the one he wronged, to work off his debt, we might say. But if he were a slave, he could be put to death. It makes you wonder what public records are in existence today that might connect you, or that corporate character name, to a slave classification. From what we have seen, it is possible only slaves are in prison.

The penitentiary inmate was considered "the slave of the State." See *Ruffin v. Commonwealth*, 62 Va. 790, 796 (1871).

Meachum v. Fano, 427 U.S. 215, 231 (1976)

The *Meachum* case of 1976 is referencing a Virginia case of 1871. This is just after the civil war era and the introduction of the new class of citizens being freedmen owing allegiance to the national political society. I do not think it is proper to say the inmate is a slave because he is in prison, but rather he is in prison because he was first a slave in the eyes of the national political system, and secondly because he was accused of disobedience or being ungrateful according to a statute or wrongdoing to others. Due process of law for slave persons within the corporate political society or body politic and corporate leaves much to be desired.

The Court indicates that a "liberty interest" may have either of two sources. According to the Court, a liberty interest may

"originate in the Constitution," ante, at 226, or it may have "its roots in state law." Ibid. Apart from those two possible origins, the Court is unable to find that a person has a constitutionally protected interest in liberty.

If man were a creature of the State, the analysis would be correct. But neither the Bill of Rights nor the laws of sovereign States create the liberty which the Due Process Clause protects. ... I had thought it self-evident that all men were endowed by their Creator with liberty as one of the cardinal unalienable rights.

Mr. Justice Stevens, *Meachum v. Fano*, 427 U.S. 215, 230 (1976)

Thank you Mr. Justice Stevens. Are you simply trying to get a message to the people to aid their understanding of what is happening in America, or do you truly not understand the nature and history of the term person? I believe it is the former. The concept of person, in the civil law or body politic, is a creature of the State. The term *person* is a creature of civil law developed for the society of slaves in the Roman Empire, which consisted of a matrix of corporate political societies. We saw earlier that civil persons and legal persons can be created by a legislative body.

LIBERTY. Freedom from restraint. The power of acting as one thinks fit, without any restraint or control, except from the laws of nature. *Bouvier* 1856

Homo vocabulum est naturae; persona juris civilis. **Man (homo) is a term of nature; person (persona), of civil law.**

Bouvier's Law Dictionary, (1914), Maxim of Law, p. 2136

As the *Meachum* case states, as well as other sources, liberty is quite different for a person as compared to a man whose liberty comes from his Creator. The emancipated slave is supposed to believe his liberty came from the national government as victor of the war. As a side note, there is reason to believe slavery was dramatically decreasing in the South before the civil war, and some States were already working to eliminate its political statutes supporting owners of slaves. The 13th Amendment was addressing emancipated slaves, not manumitted slaves.

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.

Amendment XIII, Constitution for the United States of America

Libertinum ingratum leges civiles in pristinam servitatem redignant; sed leges Angliae semel manumissum semper liberum judicant. **The civil laws reduce an ungrateful freedman to his original slavery; but the laws of England regard a person once manumitted as ever after free.** Black's Law Dictionary, Legal Maxims, 7th ed.

The 13th Amendment reminds me of that legal maxim, so I put them together above. In a recent book about Abraham Lincoln, it was stated that congress passed an act making it against their law to manumit a slave. The liberty of a person is not viewed as coming from God, the Creator, because he was in a position of no liberty before the transfer to the national government under the war and emancipation process.

THE TRUE STATE

It is difficult to recognize something as being counterfeit or someone as an imposter if you are not familiar with the original or that which is genuine. Could an art expert discover a forgery if he were not familiar with the original work of the artist? What we are looking at in this writing are those things in modern society that are counterfeit and imposters, but pretending to be the real thing.

Most people know or believe there is a God, a Supreme Being, or a Higher Intelligence involved in our experience on planet Earth. Most would agree if we properly understand His Creation we are experiencing, we are more likely to live in freedom, and in peace and harmony with all other creatures and all of creation. For those who know or accept that man is a divine being of the Creator, then what man creates should be in aid of or beneficial to his fellow man and His creation.

At one time in history, people stayed in a particular area and did not venture far. The family was the social order from birth to death. This is not what we call the immediate family but the very extended family. The idea of a state came about when people began journeying away from their families; therefore, people from different families began to settle in the same area at places around the globe. It is here we find the invention of this thing called a state.

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.

James Wilson, *Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 Dall. (U.S.) 419 (1792)

Wilson continues saying, **“When I speak of a state as an inferior contrivances, I mean that it is a contrivance inferior only to that which is divine.”** What is the meaning of divine? The Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 1967, defines divine as **“Of, or pertaining to a god, esp. the Supreme Being. 2. addressed, appropriated, or devoted to God or a god.”**

We should understand that in this era and earlier, many countries were ruled by a monarchy or aristocracy, where it was said they rule over citizens or subjects by divine rights. The American people did not want a king, queen, or government saying they rule by divine right from God. The people chose to have a common law based upon

knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, without having a superior political authority deciding for us. We have divine right to rule ourselves according to the common law of a free people, subject only to the restraints of the laws of nature. There was to be no sovereignty in government.

Wilson does as good of job as anyone of describing the relationships for the natural order of things in the following remarks.

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 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 concept of a *state* is for earthly purposes, so the people living in a particular area can do certain things in unison for the benefit of all or most of them. To limit governments, constitutions were written to expressly define what activity may be conducted by those serving in government, which is under a constitution, which is under a state,

which is under the people, who are divinely created by their Creator. Looking at a corporate political society, also known as a body politic and corporate, a government operates with sovereign powers and can do all things unless it is prohibited by a constitution. This is quite the reverse of the true meaning given to republican forms of government for a free people.

We have seen in this writing the importance of people being free, with liberty, and not subject to a master, owner, superior political authority, and also not being a slave to the will of a majority of the population composing a political society known a democracy.

History tells us that governments tend to usurp their limited purpose which is attested to by many scholars of history including James Wilson quoted above and George Washington quoted below. In George Washington's Farewell Address, he warns the American people of many situations that may arise by design to overthrow a proper government. In one such instance, he describes "**a small but artful and enterprising minority**" that may organize "**an artificial and extraordinary force**". He continues this point as follows:

"...combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious and unprincipled men will be enabled to subvert the Power of the People, and to usurp for themselves the Reins of

Government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.”

After years of research, I can say that George Washington is correct in that statement. The main issue of this writing is to describe in some detail how such subversion of the power of the people and usurpation of true republican forms of government occurs.

Usurpation follows a consistent plan. An alternate kind of State needs to be inserted into the de jure state which is described by various terms, such as independent political society or body politic and corporate. These terms describe a corporation, corporate-character members, and a national corporate matrix. Looking at the words of Washington above where he said “artificial and extraordinary force”, artificial is a word describing a corporation, which is extraordinary, meaning not ordinary and not found in nature. Also, a small minority can control a vast military and civil force if they are men of influence and wealth, particularly if they become the major bond holders of a national government and are able to control or issue a national paper currency. Once a matrix of corporate political societies is established, the usurpers need such corporations to issue bonds to raise money for fighting a war, combating a major health problem, or facilitating large construction projects, as well as a host of other corporate society (public) purposes. The small and enterprising group of usurpers will be the predominate purchasers of those bonds thereby obtaining the position of security interest holders

over the corporate political society. The corporations, falsely appearing to be a proper government under a constitution, become trustees concerning all the collateral or sureties of the corporation which serve as security for the bonds it issued. Therefore, the governments of a corporate society are serving the bondholders who are usually foreign to that society.

The following quote from the early supreme court of the United States is in regard to different types of states.

It may also be said to be a society by which a multitude of people unite together under the dependence of a superior power for protection. 2 Burlamaqui, 21. And sometimes it means a multitude of people united by a communion of interest and by common laws. This is the definition given by Cicero.

Hepburn and Dundas v. Ellzey, 2 Cranch (U.S.) 445 (1804)

It appears those two sources referenced above are describing the two basic types of states. It appears Burlamaqui is addressing the corporate political society where the members volunteer to be under a superior authority for protection. This superior political authority is given the title of sovereign, a god-like designation for a ruler over a nation of persons. Protection from a sovereign power is a constant theme for the corporate political societies; therefore, the claim to power is fear-based. To keep the political inferiors, the persons, believing in this system there must be a need for protection. It is

desirable for the members of the society to be afraid. There need to be bad guys out there, criminals everywhere, evil nations hating Americans, terrorists, etc.

In the other example from Cicero, the people come together because they have common interests and are agreeable to common laws. There is no desire to submit to a superior human authority. This was the desire of the American people in the establishment of the American system. Governments, as agents and servants, were established to aid the people.

The general condition was well stated by Mr. Madison in the Federalist, thus: 'The federal and state governments are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people, constituted with different powers, and designated for different purposes.'

Mr. Chief Justice Fuller, *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.*, 157 U.S. 429, 560 (1895)

CHANGE IS IN THE WORKS

The concept of *sovereignty* is key for the accomplishment of the goal of the cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled usurpers. As James Wilson rightfully explained in an earlier quote we read, the natural order becomes perverted due to this thing called sovereignty. The following definitions come from *American Dictionary of the English Language*, Webster, 1828.

SOVEREIGN, a [adjective]. **1. Supreme in power; possessing supreme dominion; as a sovereign prince. God is the sovereign ruler of the universe. 2. Supreme; superior to all others, chief. God is the sovereign good of all who love and obey him. 3. Supremely efficacious; superior to all others; predominant; effectual; as a sovereign remedy. 4. Supreme; pertaining to the first magistrate of a nation; as sovereign authority.**

SOVEREIGN, n [noun]. **A supreme lord or ruler; one who possesses the highest authority without control. Some earthly princes, kings and emperors are sovereigns in their dominions.**

SOVEREIGNTY, n [noun]. **Supreme power; supremacy; the possession of the highest power, or of uncontrollable power. Absolute sovereignty belongs to God only.**

It seems that someone attached the designation of *sovereign* to God, to legitimize the term and apply it to earthly rulers who desire to be a god over their corporate creations and, perhaps most important, to have God's people of substance pledge their allegiance to an artificial corporate society under the direction of a sovereign authority that creates corporate entities or persons, creates corporate laws and remedies, creates rules of conduct for its creatures. The sovereign authority, like a god, is the lawgiver, enforcer, interpreter, and judge for that which is within its corporate world.

[M]odern states, being held together by allegiance to a king or political superior, absorb considerable bodies of immigrant settlers with a quickness unknown to the ancient world, where the original citizens of a commonwealth always believed themselves to be united by kinship in blood, and resented a claim to equality of privilege as a usurpation of their birthright.

Ancient Law, by Sir Henry Sumner Maine, p. 39

In the introduction of *Ancient Law*, it is said the concepts of law by English scholars like Hobbes, Austin, and Bentham could be described as “**the imperative theory of law and sovereignty**” which can be described as “**the irresistible command of a legally illimitable sovereign, or political superior, issued to a subject or political inferior, who, being assumed to possess the habit of obedience, was absolutely bound by the obligation of submission.**”

The corporate political societies that are dominating the world today under the name of *nations* rely on allegiance from the political inferiors. Anyone can join. Common interest and common laws are no longer important. Just pledge allegiance and fidelity to the political superiors who will establish your laws, create your rights, provide your remedies, take your money, use your commercial energy and productively to back their paper money system. Then an association of cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men can siphon of the wealth of the people and leave the people living in the illusion of mounting debt regardless of how industrious they may be.

As sophisticated as the system is, it is impossible to believe it occurred naturally or by chance. It has all the markings of incredible orchestration over many centuries. That said, it is also a fitting plan to allow His people to learn, and develop an understanding of how creation works, to grow in wisdom, and to come to a realization that love is the answer, made possible when you know who you are so that you can not be tricked by illusions and deceptions. It is all voluntary.

HOW TO IMPLEMENT A BODY POLITIC AND CORPORATE SYSTEM

In the Constitution for the United States of America, Article IV, section 3, Clause 1, authority is delegated to congress to admit new states into the union. If you look at the public records for the various states when a new state was admitted, you will see the phrase “admitted and incorporated”. Could there be two different types of states being addressed in that phrase? Did congress admit two different states in one action? There could be one state according to the original intent, and another one following the modern trend. The second State is a political society with a political superior exercising the rights of sovereignty and at the same time acting as a subordinate political subdivision of the nation. All the corporate political units in the matrix could rightfully be called municipal corporations.

The following quote is in reference to territories, and the concept of incorporating a new state into the union. Justice Brown’s observation is as follows:

Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of the territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of government bearing a greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican state of America.

Mr. Justice Brown, *Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)

England operates as a national political society, a body politic and corporate consisting of a king or queen and subjects, with a matrix of subordinate corporate political units.

Another reference to this point was in an earlier supreme court case, *American Ins. Co. v. 356 Bales of Cotton*, 26 U.S. 511(1828), concerning the Florida territory and Congress creating a body politic.

[The] legality of the powers, exercised by the Court of Key West, which depends upon the powers vested in the legislature of Florida, which finally depends upon the Acts of Congress, which created the body politic of Florida-that creating a body politic, is only creating a body corporate on a larger scale, but essentially the exercise of one and the same power- that whether the one or the other sues or defends, legislates or acts, by itself or its agents, all must be done with reference to the law that creates and organizes it; and in fine, in the language of the Court, in the case

cited, 'the charter, not only creates it, but gives it every faculty that it possesses.

... It is not only itself the mere creature of the law, but all its actions, and all its rights, are dependent on the same law,' &c. ... It will be recollected, that it is not only in the territories that we find bodies politic created by the laws of the United States, but that near one half the states derive their origin and admission into the Union, under laws of the United States.

American Ins. Co. v. 356 Bales of Cotton, 26 U.S. 511(1828)

When we see the words Territory of Florida, State of Florida, or District of Florida, what is really being said is Body Politic of Florida, or Subordinate Corporation of Florida. By this process, the Territory of Florida acts as a sovereign power over that which is within its jurisdiction, and that corporation is also a inferior political society subject to its creator and the source of its so-called sovereignty. This same process is used to incorporate States into a national Union. It is national even though they might use the F word – Federal.

THE KEY POINT. A state is not being created by the people in a state – a State is being created by an act of Congress as stated by the supreme court of the United States. The State that Congress is creating if a body politic and corporate as a political subdivision of the United States. It is a State in the stated called the United States. It is not a state in the union of American states. It seems evident there is no need for, or reliance upon the people being the sovereign

authority, to create political States. Congress is not creating a state to be acknowledged or admitted according the Constitution for the United States of America at Article IV, section 3, Clause 1. In fact it is just the opposite. The people are treated as subjects or slaves of the national independent political society when Congress creates political States. The people (or should we say persons) are required, by act of Congress, to ask permission of Congress before they can write a constitution. There are even some guidelines or directives from Congress that must be followed. Congress, in its national political character, will then determine if it meets their expectations.

When you think of a territory or an America state, you think of land, free people, and other attributes of substance. The fact is – Territory or State are words describing a corporation, a body politic, a corporate political society with rulers exercising sovereign powers derived from Congress or from the corporation called United States of America. Someone is creating a corporation, and the creator controls its creation. I use the word *someone* because Congress could be merely a nominal party to the event. Its name is being used by a real party in interest, usually a creditor.

In the *American Insurance* quote above, we find that creating a body politic is only creating a body corporate on a larger scale. According to my understanding, this is not merely creating a governing corporate body for the territory; but in addition, creating a corporate political sub-unit of a larger corporate matrix under the

control of a national political sovereign corporation. History tells us that this is where you find tyranny and despotic rule, when governments begin operating with assumed inherent rights of a sovereign. Persons and property that are subject to the lower body politic are also under the authority of a superior body politic, the national corporate head. We shall see below that it may not stop there either. According to the original design, if a government of an independent state becomes oppressive to the people, they can attempt to correct the problem, or move to a place more suitable. But, if a national government is instituted, becomes tyrannical, and establishes uniformity throughout its political subdivisions, it is much more difficult to make proper adjustments or to move to another state, as they all are generally uniform in a national system.

Courts in the several states have looked at the question of whether the people of the several states established a national government, which is where you find a political sovereign authority. For example, the supreme court of Ohio, *Piqua Bank v. Coup*, 6 Ohio St. at 393-5, found there was no surrender or grant of the sovereignty of the people in the several states to the government of the United States; and therefore, there could not be a national government or inherent sovereign powers provided to the government of the United States, even though some courts have intimated otherwise. As the Ohio court correctly stated, such an important issue can not be left to supposition or as an implied power. Perhaps this is the reason for the statement quoted below.

As a result of the separation from Great Britain by the colonies, acting as a unit, the powers of external sovereignty passed from the Crown not to the colonies severally, but to the colonies in their collective and corporate capacity as the United States of America... Rulers come and go; governments end and forms of government change; but sovereignty survives. A political society cannot endure without a supreme will somewhere. Sovereignty is never held in suspense. When, therefore, the external sovereignty of Great Britain in respect of the colonies ceased, it immediately passed to the Union.

...It results that the investment of the Federal government with the powers of external sovereignty did not depend upon the affirmative grants of the Constitution.

Mr. Justice Sutherland, *United States v. Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.*, 299 U.S. 304, 315 (1936)

Can you comprehend what that statement means? There are many important issues raised in the quote from *Curtiss-Wright* by Justice Sutherland. We saw the territories and states were incorporated as bodies politic under an Act of Congress which, if acting as a legislature for the United States of America, in its national political sovereign character (which it did), and those territories and states being so incorporated are subject to the creator, then might it be that the corporation named United States of America, in its national corporate character, is also subject to that which created it as a body politic and corporate, whereby it claims the rights of sovereignty? That would be the Crown of England. Yes, that is a perplexing

36

situation. Maybe Justice Brown in the *Downes* case was being more truthful than we first realized. Congress is not just creating territories or states *like* British Crown colonies, but in fact is creating British Crown colonies.

Secondly, according to court documents I have seen, cases prosecuted by U.S. attorneys show *United States of America* as the plaintiff, bringing charges against a named defendant listed as a corporate character or legal person. This corporation, United States of America, might be in fact a foreign corporation if the people through their independent states did not create such a body politic.

Thirdly, it could be said the people in the several states are the sovereign authority “internally”, while the external sovereignty applicable to foreign nations has possibly found its way into the several states by means of congress creating bodies politic.

A fourth point is the importance given to sovereignty by Justice Sutherland, as though sovereignty is a living thing that can not die, but lives on and on. It sounds like sovereignty is the soul or spirit of a political corporation, like man has a spirit and soul from God. It is statements like those quoted above and others, some of which were touched upon in this writing, that gives one the idea that there is more going on with these political societies and their god-like sovereign authority.

Why would someone want to have all the people have a corporate identity in a political corporation, and have all these corporations connected in a national political society matrix? From that position the corporation can be easily controlled by certain influential groups or associations using the principles of the law merchant regarding the rights security interest holder has as holder in due course of bonds or other evidences of debt issued by these various political corporations, especially one deemed to be supreme over a national matrix.

THE ELEMENTS OF A BODY POLITIC AND CORPORATE

Now that we know something about the use of a body politic and corporate, we will see how they are defined and learn of their purpose. A body politic is a different concept than body corporate, but when both attach to a political society, the two concepts are formed into one phrase known as *body politic and corporate*.

Body politic. **The governmental, sovereign power: a city or a State.**

...“Body corporate and politic” is said, in the older books, to be the most exact expression for a public corporation or corporation having powers of government.

The body politic is the “social compact by which the whole people covenant with each citizen, and each citizen with the whole

people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common good. *A Dictionary of Law*, William C. Anderson, 1893

Body politic. **A group of people regarded in a political (rather than private) sense and organized under a single governmental authority.** *Black's Law Dictionary*, 7th ed.

We see that a body politic acts as a government with sovereign power, but not any particular type of government according to other sources. It need not be a true republican form of government. It is a corporation acting like a government, i.e. “governmental”.

We also see in Anderson’s law dictionary that a body politic is a social compact which consists of an implied covenant or contract. I say *implied* because I have never found a document someone signs describing such a covenant as that stated above which, by the way, can be found in many law dictionary defining *body politic* or *citizen*. Also, under this compact or covenant, all shall be governed by certain laws. Those would be the laws of the corporate political society – the sovereign governmental authority. You could not know what laws you are contracting into because new ones will be made tomorrow, and the next day, and so on, but nevertheless, evidently, you have presumably agreed to be bound by them. This sounds like a concept for slaves. This is all for the common good, of course, which is a good expression for a communist or socialist State. The purpose of the covenant is to reduce the pre-existing rights and privileges of the

people of a country to accommodate the incorporation of a new territory or a different race of people. This is especially useful for empires acquiring new territory or states.

In *People of State of New York v Brown*, 27 N.Y.S.2d 241 (1941), and in many other court cases, we find a discussion about police power, which exists in a corporate political society, and that we should be willing to “**give up a little freedom for the benefit of all persons in the community**”.

body politic and corporate. A term often applied to a municipal corporation. A county is such a body. Waterbury v. Board of Comrs. 10 Mont. 515, 26 P. 1002.

Ballentines Law Dictionary, 3rd Ed.

As a "body politic and corporate," a State falls squarely within the Dictionary Act's definition of a "person."

Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58, 70 (1989)

We should now know the origin of the body politic and corporate Country, City, and State. I am not making any additions in the quote below; the parentheses are as found in the case report.

The city of Wilmington is a public corporation. It is a municipal corporation, which is, ...an incorporation, by the authority of the state, of the inhabitants of a particular place or

district, and authorizes them, in their corporate capacity, to exercise subordinate, specified powers of legislation and regulation, with respect to their local and internal concerns.

...The corporation of the city of Wilmington (that is, the people residing in the district known as the "City of Wilmington"), the name and style of whose corporation (that is, the incorporation of the persons and inhabitants of that particular place) is the "Mayor and Council of Wilmington," is merely an agency instituted by the state for the purpose of carrying out in detail the objects of government.

...It possesses two classes of powers and two classes of rights, -- public and private. In all that relates to one class, it is merely the agent of the state, and subject to its control; in the other, it is the agent of the inhabitants of the place, --the incorporators,-- maintains the character and relations of individuals, and is not subject to the absolute control of the legislature, its creator.

Coyle v. Gray, 30 A. 728 (1884)

I did not add anything to the quote above. Among other things, we see the corporate existence is not coming from the people or “persons and inhabitants”.

GLOBAL MERCHANTS AND THE BODY POLITIC

Who ends up controlling and receiving financial benefits from the bodies politic and corporate in the corporate political system? In the *TREATISE – Introduction to the Law Merchant*, there is a more comprehensive study of the global merchants and their law, known as law merchant. One thing that bodies politic and corporate do well is go into debt. The major banking families through their corporations are often the owners or holders of the bonds issued by these political societies. The quote below is a simple example that explains the situation in a few sentences.

[My comment: The city, which had issued bonds to bring in money to benefit manufacturing, had certain property deeded to it as security for the bonds] **The bill alleges that the deed of trust to the city was executed for the purpose of securing the holders of the bonds and coupons, and they are the parties beneficially interested in the same, and the city is a trustee of all the property mentioned in the deed, for the holders of the bonds; that the city was bound to care for the property and protect the title to it for the benefit of the cestuis que trust, and especially as it had induced them to purchase the bonds, as well in reliance on the deed as on the credit of the city; that the city was, as trustee, bound to interpose to prevent the sale of the chattels ... that the owners of the bonds are entitled to the interposition of a court of equity for the care and protection of the property, and to a decree for the sale of such**

of it as remains upon the premises mentioned in the deed to the city, and for the sale of the real estate...

City of Parkersburg v. Brown, 106 U.S. 487, 496, 497 (1883)

The city is really a body politic and corporate. This example could apply to all other similar corporations including the U.S. government. Who ends up directing the actions of the body politic and corporate? Those who hold the majority of the bonds. A government becomes a trustee for the bondholders who have a security interest in the collateral backing the bonds, and possibly all sources of revenue of the City, State, etc. The government, as a trustee for private individuals, is administering or protecting the assets for those who have an equitable right evidenced by the bonds.

Sharpless v. Mayor of Philadepphia, 20 Pa. 147, 187 (1853) is another example where the municipal corporation was obtaining stock of a railroad; and therefore, issuing corporate bonds of the body politic and corporate. How does the City come up with the money? It is **“paid by taxes assessed upon the persons and property of the taxable citizens of the corporation, whose faith is pledged for the redemption of the bonds thus issued.”**

Where have we seen “persons and property” before? The two characters of slaves. As slaves, the master has a higher right to all his possessions and the fruit of the slave persons’ industry. Whatever the slave has, the master can take a percentage. We refer to that as a tax

or assessment. The *Sharpless* case goes on to say: **“There is nothing more easy than to imagine a thousand tyrannical things which the legislature may do”** and **“judges can be imagined to be as corrupt and as wicked as legislators.”**

Obviously, and it is so stated in *Sharpless*, the government (body politic) is not operating according to delegated powers in a constitution or charter. Bodies politic and corporate operate with sovereign power, and we have seen the trail on how that is accomplished. From the words quoted above, does this sound at all like a government the free people of America would have constructed?

SUMMARY

I would like to make a few comments about what one might do to counteract the principalities or municipalities that are demanding your possessions or your liberty. It is sometimes difficult to get things resolved satisfactorily in the political courts of these corporate political societies.

One tactic is called an *informal action*. This is done through correspondence getting the political corporation or its officers and agents to prove certain things, admit facts, or produce a statute that applies to you. If they remain silent, it can be considered that they have no facts, statute, etc., and that they agree with your statements.

This is also called an out of court remedy. The use of a notary will aid in certifying your documentation.

In the English political system, in matters dealing with the foreign merchants, there was reference to the accused bringing in “his law”. I do not have an example of what is meant by “his law”, but the clues suggest the accused would write a declaration. A number of his friends, relatives, or neighbors, after reading the declaration of the accused, could write their own declaration stating they believe the statements in the declaration of the accused to be true and correct. This is like an out of court jury process. You must have volunteered in that corporate system as a person or property, otherwise someone forced you into slavery or servitude, and that is against the law and principles of natural justice.

On a slightly different note, whatever public officer, agency, or court is confronting or challenging you, you might ask if that office or court exists because of delegated authority in a constitution, or if it originates from a sovereign? If it is from a sovereign authority, are they saying you are a subject or slave? Here in America?

Is there a security interest concerning the accused? The name of the accused or defendant is never truly your proper name? Remember the creation of a legal or corporate person – that is the name they use.

Introduction to Corporate Political Societies

To whom or what do you owe allegiance? This is important in their political society, but not really addressed in this writing.

If you understand the nature of money and the accounting system for the corporate political society, you could offer to settle the account by discharge or setoff.

In closing, this is a rather complex subject to put into a few pages. Hopefully, it gives you some insight on how things work, and why many people feel something is wrong but do not know exactly what is the problem. This is only the introduction to the vast topic of corporate political societies.

By Byron Beers

For goingtopeace.com