


THE ERRANT SOVEREIGN'S HANDBOOK

by

Augustus Blackstone



THE ERRANT SOVEREIGN'S HANDBOOK

Copyright (c) 1996 by Augustus Blackstone

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Affidavit of Copyright recorded as Instrument No. 4004469 by the official custodian of Public Records for Spokane County, Washington State, United States of America.

PREFACE

If you happen to find yourself reading this handbook, you are probably one of those who have had a belly-full of bureaucratic nonsense and incompetence, and want to get "the government" out of your wallet and out of your life. If so, you've come to the right place. Pull up a chair and get comfortable. After only 200 years (not very long as nations go) old Uncle Sam is exhibiting all the signs of going senile, and it's time for old Uncle Gus to start setting matters aright for you with this little handbook. We're all in this together and we don't want anyone getting hurt.

This handbook addresses the three grievances most common to most people in this country. The I.R.S.; property taxes; and traffic enforcement. This handbook contains the mechanics of how to disentangle yourself from these three aspects of "the system" in a simple way with minimal risk to personal liberty or property. Uncle Gus can show you how to find and open the *escape hatch* but you will have to supply the gumption to swing it open and step through. It will change your life in ways you've never dreamed of. Whether for better or for worse will depend entirely upon you and, like all momentous occasions, it should be given careful consideration before making a decision and acting on that decision. Once it is done, there is no going back. If you are content with your life the way it is and if you are satisfied with the bureaucratic supervision of your affairs, both at home and in public, then you should not be reading this handbook. It will only upset you. If your interest is only in starting another revolution, you should not be reading this handbook. Instead, you should consider moving to a location in the world where such activities are more popular.

Unlike other "how-to" books, which deal with subjects of more specific interest and application, this handbook addresses subjects of interest to a broad spectrum of audience. The variety of individual interests, talents, education, experience, financial status, and social standing make it a formidable undertaking indeed. In light of that fact, Uncle Gus is going to keep the vocabulary and grammar of this handbook at a level that should be easy to understand by most everyone (except for maybe lawyers).

In other words; where a "\$2.00 word" can be substituted for a "\$20.00 word" without seriously impairing the accuracy of the intended comprehension of the information, we'll use the "\$2.00 word". There is no shame to anyone in referring to a suitable dictionary when encountering an unfamiliar word. More is the shame if they do not do so. There will unavoidably be a few Latin terms and phrases scattered throughout the text, but they will be defined/translated as they are used. Those of you who are, or consider yourselves to be, skilled literary acrobats will just have to be patient. There is something useful to everyone in this handbook. Uncle Gus isn't writing this to grind any political axes or to promote some hidden agenda beyond that of getting his many friends and acquaintances to quit hounding him to write this handbook.

The information in this handbook is a distillation of hundreds of thousands of hours of research and efforts by thousands of men and women all across this nation over a period of decades. The actual cost of that activity easily runs in the millions of dollars. These people dedicated their "lives, fortunes and sacred honor" to finding out the truth about our government, how it went awry, how to fix it (or to abandon it) and so forth. In their efforts to regain their individual sovereignty and correct a "servant" gone criminal, a few of these men and women have paid with their lives, many have gone to prison, and many more than these have been forced to live their lives as homeless political fugitives in their own homeland. If there is anyone this writing should be dedicated to, it is these courageous people. You may regard them as fools, but that does not alter the fact that they were willing to gamble the highest of odds to find out what works and what doesn't work when taking back the responsibilities of individual sovereignty and commanding constitutional obedience of their public servants and institutions.

It would test **anyone's** credulity to say that each and every one of these people was motivated by some altruistic notion. Probably more than a few did what they did for purely selfish reasons. Nothing unusual in that. Even some of the founders of this nation were motivated more by personal necessities than by noble ideals. A sentiment common to both eras is best expressed as an unwillingness to continue supporting "a bunch of useless and destructive parasites". That's pretty strong language, but there is no denying the fact that inept politicians with "good intentions" probably account for more ruined or destroyed lives in this country than any single war it has ever fought. Various fiscal policies would head the list of "why".

You, the reader, now have all the benefit of this information. Uncle Gus can only hope that you try to appreciate the magnitude of the price that was paid **by others** to obtain it. Thanks to the efforts of these *patriots* there is an overwhelming accumulation of authenticated documentation and evidence to support the statements of Fact and Law in this handbook, protestations of the "professionals" notwithstanding. Because of the sheer volume of supportive data, Uncle Gus is going to be making some bald statements with only one or two (maybe three) examples or references so that those who want to check it out for themselves will know where to look and how to test it. You may not, and probably will not, agree with everything Uncle Gus has to say, but make no mistake, he can back-up (multiple times over) everything he says with hard evidence. The test is always, "Where's the proof?" It is out there, if you know where to find it. A surprising amount of it is public record. The problem for most people is they are too busy raising their family and keeping the bills paid to go find this information. Then too, there is the problem of knowing how to use it once you have it. That was perhaps the most persuasive argument used in getting Uncle Gus to sit down and write this handbook.

Some of you are no doubt wanting all the information you can get while at the same time are intimidated (and rightfully so) by all those thousands of law books you have seen or heard about in the local library. Don't worry; those are for attorneys. Since they have discarded a good deal of their common sense, they need those books to help them *practice* their craft. Those who go on to be judges and politicians are the terminal cases. Please don't make fun of them; they really can't help themselves.

This is not a textbook. It is a practical **handbook**. Most of the problems have been defined; the causes of those problems have been identified; and workable solutions have been tested. It's now time to put them into broad practical application. That is the objective of this handbook. If you wish to know more background information about the fundamental Laws and institutions of this country as well as their history and development (or degradation), you'll have to find it elsewhere or wait until Uncle Gus gets the time and motivation to produce a **textbook** addressing those subjects.

It is strongly recommended that you read the **entire** handbook **at least once** before you attempt to **do** anything with the information it contains.

It should be noted that wherever the format of a letter or affidavit is provided, you should not change the wording in the body of the document when you prepare your own. Nearly **every word** has been selected with care to avoid the legal snares and pitfalls one might expect to encounter. The path you'll be walking is safe, but it is extremely narrow. It is not for the faint of heart or the weak-willed.

Remember: **don't** try to **fight** "the system". It is not necessary, and besides, it's bigger and better financed than you. It doesn't matter if *right* is on your side or not. When you announce, by words or actions, that you intend to **fight** someone, the natural sense of self-preservation dictates that your opponent knock you flat if he can, any way he can. "The system" (being composed of people) will react in much the same fashion.

Some have said that this information is like a breath of fresh air after having their mental sense of smell abused by noxious odors of bureaucracy for so long a time. Maybe you'll agree with them. As you read this handbook, take your time, enjoy yourself, and don't forget to use a good dictionary when needed. Uncle Gus is no slouch when it comes to the English language, but only because he uses a wide variety of dictionaries continuously and frequently. The glossary at the back of this handbook is provided for quick reference, but it is no substitute for a good dictionary close to hand.

Chapter I

"Hear ye, hear ye; this 'court' is now in session, the Honorable Augustus Blackstone presiding. Know all ye that, as pertains to evidence and testimony, the word 'inadmissible' does not exist within this forum. It either happened or it didn't happen. It either exists or it does not exist. It is either genuine or it is not genuine. No fictions of law or fact are recognized. All riseand cheer and clap for the unfettered truth!"

A most appropriate beginning for the first chapter of this handbook. It is a constant source of wonder to me that judges in today's courts will bind a witness by solemn Oath to testify the **whole** truth (as perceived by the witness*) and then proceed to place restrictions on how much the jury can listen to. It would be refreshing to see a witness toss the insult back at the Judge by asking, "If you know so much about the truth of this matter, why aren't **you** on this witness stand?" Better still if a juror were to ask, "If you think we are that incompetent, why even bother with a jury?" **My** question in that situation would be, "Is this a 'jury trial' or a **Trial by Jury?**"

Education in this country has been systematically supplanted with political **indoctrination** to such an extent and in such a way as to obtain a largely unquestioned conformity from our social behavior and attitudes. It is likely that you, the reader, are a product of this program. This is not intended or to be taken as a disparaging remark. However, it does make it necessary to re-affirm or re-orient your understanding of reality with a few basic facts that you are going to need to be aware of. Then we'll get into the *meat* of what this handbook is about.

* A witness is actually testifying the truth of his perceptions which may or may not accurately describe what actually happened. It is not at all unusual to have a number of versions of 'truth' where there are numerous witnesses to a single incident. It is the jury's function to determine which version of 'truth' (if any) best matches or will support the available physical evidence and, by extension, define the intent of the accused whenever that is a necessary element of the case. Interfering with that function is, by definition, **jury tampering**.

Some of you may question the need to re-hash these basics which "children learn in the 3rd grade". If it could be avoided, I would gladly dispense with the exercise. However, a casual and random but extensive survey of young adults and teenagers has revealed to me an alarming lack of working knowledge of these basics. Although there was some recall of having to memorize certain notable people, events, and dates pertaining to the American war for independence, the recall was vague, uncertain, and fragmented. Far too many of those surveyed failed to recall receiving any **meaningful** instruction about the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights and related fundamental documents or the causes which impelled their necessity. For example; only a handful of those surveyed were familiar with and not one could define the word "consanguinity" which appears in the Declaration of Independence and which was a highly significant factor in the events of those times.

Few of those surveyed were aware that the Bill of Rights has its own Preamble which, by its own language, exempts those ten Articles from the amendment provisions of the Constitution. Of those who were able to exhibit some understanding of the Bill of Rights, only a small fraction could tell me what Articles 3, 8, 9 & 10 were about. None of those surveyed were aware that the original draft of that document contained more than 10 Articles, let alone what the additional Articles were about or why they were not included in the finished document. It was apparent to me that most of those surveyed had not realized the full importance of the fact that those Yankee rebels in the American colonies were in revolt **against their own Lawful government!** Even when full realization of that fact impinged, there was no apparent ability to apply the information to current government activities or the probable consequences of those activities.

It has been said many times over by distinguished scholars and statesmen that those who are unaware of the past are condemned to repeat it. What is the **value** of knowing the common denominator between modern gun control legislation, Ruby Ridge, Waco, Texas and the reason the British military was ordered to march on Concord and Lexington? I think I'll let you tell me the answer to that one. It became more and more evident to me as time went on that there is a direct correlation between the amount of actual working knowledge of these basic facts and the age of the survey subjects. That told me quite a lot about the debilitating trend of "education" and the school systems in this country.

Those who could recall receiving instruction of this sort told me that it amounted to a few days of exposure to the information. Whether or not it actually amounted to more than that is of no great importance when measured against the obvious result.

Mere exposure to information, regardless of its duration, does **not** assure assimilation of the data. Likewise, *instruction* which fails to fully consult the **understanding** of the student is no guarantee of ability to **apply** the information to real life. All the information in the world is of zero **value** to anyone if it is not **useful** or if it is not **understood** well enough to be **applied** to real life. To say to me that children have "learned" these basic facts "in the 3rd (or any other) grade", *presumes* a very great deal indeed. In light of what my survey yielded, I make no such presumptions with this handbook.

Although the reasons may vary, it comes as no surprise to me to see growing numbers of young parents schooling their children at home. Those who can afford it are filling seats in the private schools which demonstrate higher academic standards. Neither is it any surprise to me to see a growing number of young adults expressing a desire to return to the older ways, getting back to the basics, and letting the sophisticated* forms of government feed on themselves until wholly consumed. The original design must have been pretty good. The country flourished and prospered under it; became the leading world power under it. Under the newer "socialized" system, the country is failing miserably. It's time to discard what obviously doesn't work well and go back to what **does** work. It is nearly impossible to argue against that viewpoint when demonstrable **results** are the measure. However, in terms of *practical implementation*, the sentiment of getting back to the "good old days and ways" also *presumes* a very great deal.

When this country enjoyed its greatest prosperity, there were vast frontiers rich in natural resources to conquer, grow and expand into. Opportunity abounded. Today, the only remaining frontiers of any real magnitude are the oceans, outer space and inner space. The oceans don't seem to stimulate a broad enough popular interest. Inner space, as a *frontier*, doesn't offer enough monetary incentive. Outer space programs have gone stagnant and will probably remain so until someone comes up with a cost effective method of propulsion that is more efficient than chemical combustion.

* Sophisticated: Less than pure, as in corrupted. [Noah Webster's Dictionary - 1828](#)

Without a challenging frontier to "push against", a nation will begin feeding on itself. Eventually, other nations will join in the feast. The rapidly increasing influx of people from all over the world to this country for their share of the pie should serve as a clear warning of where this country is in that process of decay. Given all these factors, this country is over-ripe for **explosive** change and social reform. **Cultural** conflict may very well be the "detonator" that sets it off. This is much more likely than purely religious or political differences.

This brings us to one of the favorite justifications used by attorney generals, judges, legislators and others of that ilk to explain away their many abridgements and circumventions of constitutional restraints on government. These supposed professionals would have us believe that "law" and its methods of application have to grow and develop along with society and its technological advances; and that the Constitution therefore could not be intended or applied as an 18th century 'straight-jacket' on government exercise of power in the 20th century world. I do not have the stock form immediately before me, but the foregoing paraphrase of it is close enough to serve for now.

It is disappointing but hardly surprising to see these legal "experts" resort to such flimsy deception. An enduring straight-jacket is **exactly** what the framers of the Constitution intended! Those men were not fools and, by comparison, apparently far better educated in statecraft. They could and did envision technological advancement and innovation and provided for protection of intellectual property. They even provided more than one method of amending the Constitution. That doesn't sound like a 'straight-jacket' to me.

The Constitution does not address technological changes and was not intended to. It addresses the temptations and tendencies of any human being and his governmental institutions. It addresses certain character weaknesses and corruptibility and those attributes **never** change. Nowhere in recorded history have they changed. Our country today is adequate proof of that. How did that come to be? Mostly because the framers of the Constitution were not as explicit as they could have been in its writing. At the time, most everyone was fully aware of what was meant and the reasons for it. It was **assumed** the knowledge would be accurately passed on to posterity. In that assumption they obviously did err. If those wise and learned men could be capable of mistakes of that magnitude, one must consider the possibility of even greater capability in that regard among today's "experts".

More than a few doctors and medical personnel would starve to death or have to seek other employment if a certain level of illness and disease were not maintained or permitted to continue in the world. That is a fact of life that does not necessarily reflect upon the personal integrity of any particular doctor. Likewise, legal professionals have a vested interest in keeping the subject of their profession as seemingly complicated and confusing to the average man or woman as possible. Some of the material in this handbook may conflict with what you have been lead to believe about the Constitution and fundamental Laws of this nation. It would be presumptuous of me to expect you to believe I'm right and the professionals are not. For my part, all I **do** expect you to do is consider the possibility and ask yourself who stands to gain or lose the most from the acceptance of either point of view.

Keep in mind too that government and the legal profession are unavoidably parasitical in nature (as are certain other institutions and professions). On a more personal level you may want to ask yourself how many parasites you wish to support as well as which are beneficial to you and which are not. Some may enhance your general well being while others may do nothing more than drain you. Personal relationships are sometimes evaluated in this context on a subconscious level by some and consciously by others.

You may notice a distinct lack of court case citations in this handbook. That is due in part to the fact that this is not written for practicing law students. It is primarily written for the layman and is intended to consult his inborn powers of observation and reasoning, sometimes referred to a "common sense". The scarcity of citations is largely due to the fact that many of the court cases from which the material is taken or derived are **unpublished** cases. There is nothing to cite. I know of these matters only because I have had the great good fortune of meeting one or more of the successful parties involved who were willing to share their personal case files and memories with me in some detail.

Out of respect for their privacy, I will refrain naming these people. Some have a genuine fear of retribution or harassment while others simply have no desire for notoriety. In either event, I do not have express permission to use their names in print. Much of their material I will have to paraphrase because I was not permitted to make copies for myself. Any minor flaws in the legal theory or reasoning will be left unaltered.

Skillful litigants who seek a **written opinion** from the high court will **deliberately** put minor flaws in their pleadings which, of course, obligates the court to correct the flaws when deciding in favor of that litigant. That is how most "case law" is created.

The next chapter begins with the first of those bald statements you were warned about.

Chapter 2

THIS COUNTRY WAS ESTABLISHED AS A WHITE (CAUCASIAN), CHRISTIAN NATION INsofar AS WHO CONSTITUTES THE **BODY SOVEREIGN** AND, DESPITE ALL APPEARANCES TO THE CONTRARY, THAT HAS NOT CHANGED TO THIS VERY DAY.

If that statement greatly distresses you or makes you feel like parroting the politically correct media by calling me a media *buzz word* such as *racist* or *white supremacist* or *neo-nazi* or whatever else those journalistic hate mongers can dream up, realize this: whether I **agree** or **disagree** with the fact stated is **not relevant**. Whether **you** agree or disagree with it is not relevant. Stewing over it or denying it's established reality isn't going to make it go away or magically invert. I have another reason for choosing that as the first bald statement, beyond that of quickly weeding out those who simply refuse to face reality as it is. When we speak of *government* we're talking about an **organization** and **all** organizations, in order to **function**, must have some sort of **structure**. Any competent engineer will tell you that, in order to examine and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a structure in a meaningful way, one must first ascertain the type of base or **foundation** upon which the structure rests. Keep this in mind as I highlight the evidence in support of the first bald statement.

That the status of *body sovereign* is exclusively reserved to whites (caucasians) is discussed in exhaustive detail in a court case entitled, Dred Scott v. Sanford, 19 How. 393, 426. While minor portions of this case have been slightly modified by more recent decisions of the courts, black political activists continue to complain that no significant part of the Dred Scott case has been overturned. It is still the controlling "case law" for this business of classes of citizenship and sovereign status and standing.

All of the *original* State Constitutions that I have examined (and that is most of them) contain more than one specific reference to "white inhabitants" or "white males" usually in reference to the militia, the voting franchise, and property rights. Some of those constitutions have clauses which make specific **exclusions of** non-whites, e.g., Chinamen, Mulattos, Indians, etc., and that's **not including** constitutions for the Confederate States!

Today's political indoctrination would have us believe that the 14th Amendment and all the Bills and Acts of Congress since spawned under its authority changed all that. It did, didn't it? Not exactly, my friend, not exactly.

About 15 years ago or so two convicted black murderers (whose guilt was proven beyond question) petitioned the Supreme Court to set aside the verdict of the jury and release them from prison. Without a lot of media fanfare, for obvious reasons, it did so! What is even the greater surprise is the reasoning presented to the court. It was the same in both cases. These are unpublished cases and I'll have to paraphrase what was shown to me, but the argument went something like this: Under this form of government, citizenship cannot be forced on anyone without his consent. Since the black man was not a citizen at the time and therefore had no voice through the voting franchise in the adoption of the 14th Amendment, no consent was given. Thus, there is no "evidence" that citizenship was accepted **or even wanted** by **all** the blacks in America. Non-citizens are not subject to the domestic laws, civil or criminal, of this country. Thus blacks and other non-whites in America enjoy an immunity that is very little different from that afforded to visiting foreign diplomats and their families. The **only** recourse available to the government against such individuals is their expulsion from the country. Since the black man was brought here against his will, that option is not available either.

Despite some technical flaws, the Supreme Court agreed with that line of argument and granted the petitions of both men! Since that time, how many more have been released from prison with the same sort of argument? Actually, not as many as one might think. Today there are a multitude of ways to prove the indirect acceptance of citizenship, not the least of which is a cashed welfare check. Be that as it may, the affirmation of that line of reasoning by the Supreme Court in more than one case poses a serious question as to the actual validity of that portion of the 14th Amendment ...which brings us to the other part of that "foundation" of which I was talking: *Christian*. There is little to argue concerning the religious persuasions of the original colonists in this country. One of the earliest published criminal codes in the American colonies was the Laws and Liberties of Massachusetts (1641). Aside from a few adaptations taken from the common law of England, that portion addressing crimes and their punishments was taken verbatim out of the Old Testament of the Christian Bible, primarily the book of Deuteronomy.

It is surprising how many public servants of today, especially those acting as judges, who will tell you that with the ratification of the constitution came a separation of church and state. There is only one place that I know of where that is specifically mandated. You will find it at Chapter 10, Article 124 of the Constitution for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. No such requirement is to be found **anywhere** in the Constitution for the United States of America. The judges in America's courts created **for themselves** a *doctrine* of a separation between church and state. The only basis I've heard offered for this doctrine is a comment Jefferson made in one of the Federalist Papers which, when you read it (**all of it**) was taken entirely out of an obvious context.

One must certainly question the integrity of anyone supposedly learned in the law who would try to rationalize such a doctrine. The Constitution itself concludes with, "...in the Year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and Eighty seven..." No official document or record is considered valid unless dated in reference to "...the Year of our Lord..." The Oath of Fidelity/Office public servants must make **before** performing **any** official act concludes with, "...so help me God." Until only recently, **all** official Oaths were administered after the placing of one hand upon a Christian Bible. Black's Law Dictionary defines "Christian" as:

"Pertaining to Jesus Christ or the religion founded by him; professing Christianity. As a noun, it signifies one who accepts and professes to live by the doctrines and principles of the Christian religion; **it does not include** Mohammedans, Jews, pagans, or infidels. One who believes or professes or is assumed to believe in Jesus Christ, and the truth as taught by Him."

It seems odd to me that we are expected to believe such rubbish when nearly all the observable evidence points in the opposite direction. And don't think I beat the drum for Christianity with this book. There are those who are better equipped to beat that drum. You will find them in your local churches. If what they have to offer is the **whole** truth of the matter, it will stand on its own. Actual *truth* doesn't need any help from me or anyone else. It **demonstrates** itself.

As religions go, Christianity is a relatively young one, and some black scholars are quick to point out that, except through the device of adoption, it is essentially a **white man's** religion.

Some fragmentary evidence has been brought to my attention that strongly suggests that the black man's history, culture(s) and religion(s) may very well pre-date those of the Indo-Chinese peoples, which are **known** to date back over 10,000 years! Remember; by legal definition, Christianity is not quite yet 2,000 years old.

Now, you may be wondering what all this has to do with that "foundation" of which we're talking. If so, go back to the first bald statement and read it again. Notice that we have both **white** and **Christian** being used in relation to "the body sovereign". Remember, a *sovereign*, by definition, makes the rules of acceptable behavior for a political structure as well as many of the more social attributes. The men who framed the Constitution for this nation were all white and most of them professed to be or were assumed to be Christian. Those who were not at least had the good sense to express their views in a way that was acceptable to those who were. With that assemblage came a whole set of established moral codes, ethics, beliefs, and many other cultural influences that would have acted upon and been relied upon by these men as they considered the formation of a "more perfect" form of government. And they made it pretty plain (in the preamble) that they were doing it for themselves and their "posterity."

Notice, too, that the phrase used was "**more** perfect" **not** perfect. Although their reasons were a bit more practical and immediate than that, I can't help but wonder if at least some of those men were wise enough to realize that so long as there is more than one human being on Earth, there will be no such thing as absolute "perfect," not without some kind of direct intervention by a superior intelligence, that is.

As the Constitution neared completion and even long after it was finished, it was repeatedly said that it was written for a moral and righteous people and **wholly inadequate for any other**. We have only to look around us at what this country has become to see the truth of that. The adulteration of any body of moral or ethical codes with another or others is unavoidably going to wreck havoc on established standards.

A cubic inch of earth is supposed to contain thousands of living organisms. The same is supposed to be true of a cubic inch of water from the oceans. Mixing the two creates *mud*, in which few, if any, of those organisms (from either environ) can survive. There is more than one lesson to be learned from that simple observation.

You probably have heard the old adage, "When in Rome, do as the Romans do." That generally works if you're just passing through. If you plan on settling down there, you'd best find out *why* the Romans do what they do before the facade starts leaking, and it will with time.

What this country and its people have become is by no means an accurate measure of what it started out to be. However, the organic Laws of this nation have not changed. They've mostly been forgotten for lack of use. The underlying principles have not changed. They've merely been obfuscated through legal embellishments.

Much of what has been said in this chapter will become more meaningful to you as we proceed into the next chapter and those which follow.

Chapter 3

This chapter begins with a bald statement that seems to be widely known in this country, but apparently is not that well understood. Whole volumes could be, and have been, written on this subject. For our purposes here, I will only address those aspects which will have a direct bearing on the "how-to" portion of this handbook. For that reason alone, it is vital that you get a good grasp of what is discussed in this chapter and the next. You should try to get all the way through this chapter without interruption; so if you need to take a potty break or a snack break or whatever, do it now; then start.

THIS NATION WAS **NOT** SET UP AS A "DEMOCRACY" AND WAS NEVER INTENDED TO BECOME ONE: IT WAS ESTABLISHED AS A **CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC** AND THE INTENT WAS CLEARLY THAT IT REMAIN ONE.

Probably the purest form of democracy was tried by the Greeks who invented it, **and it failed**. It failed because of human nature. And unless human nature evolves (or **devolves**) into something quite different than it has always been, democracies, no matter how pure in form, **will always fail**. In fact, the purer it is, the faster it will fail. Why is that? Democracy cannot function well with loose cannons on the deck. Democracy is not set up to afford *individual* diversity, ambition, curiosity, innovation, and the like. Democracy, to function even minimally, requires a general uniformity that you just aren't going to find where there are two or more human beings having social intercourse. Everyone has their own ideas on the way the world ought to be, and it takes a pretty slick talker to get them to all agree on anything for any length of time.

For the past few decades, all we've heard from the White House, Capitol Hill, and an irresponsible media is how America needs to "preserve democracy" in the world. That is a good choice of words. For crying out loud let's get it *preserved* like you would any other old fossilized bone, stick it in a museum somewhere, and hang a sign in front of it that says, "This went the way of the dinosaur because it doesn't work on planet Earth." Then, let's get on with the business of living with what **does** work, however clumsy that might be.

A patriot educator and speaker of the 1970's by the name of George Gordon once said, "We may all be 'created equal' but we sure as hell don't stay that way!"

This statement just about sums up the human nature factor I mentioned. That factor is as disruptive to communism, as practiced, as it is to democracy. Although these two systems have a *slightly* different **form**, it is difficult to distinguish between the **effects** of either system, particularly on those who must live under them. If you can still find it in you local library, get the *original* version of the children's story "**The Little Red Hen**" and read it. Then imagine what kind of ending the story would have under a democratic system. Then envision the ending under a communistic system. In terms of net effect, about the only difference I can see is that under democracy the hen would have been locked away in the barn and the bread equally divided among her jailers, "by the will of the majority." Under communism, as we have seen it practiced, those with the right connections would have received a piece of fried chicken along with the bread.

Like many of those "old" children's stories, "The Little Red Hen" was as much a political statement as it was a great way to imprint a simple work ethic on the minds of our young so they might succeed in life on their own efforts. It teaches them how to be independent and self-reliant. As a political statement, the story illustrates that when someone has something for which they've worked and which they've earned, s/he has an inherent Right to keep it and dispose of it as s/he may choose. If one wants to share it with others, that's fine. That's called *charity*. But when someone else comes along and just takes it, that is called *theft*. When someone else comes along and obtains it by threats and intimidation, that's called *extortion*. And if that someone else is or claims to be *the government*, the labels don't change. "What about caring for the needy," you say? That has always been a function of the churches, **not the government**. There are many more churches in this country than there are post offices, and it's a lot more difficult to lie to a priest than it is to a welfare clerk or case-worker. The churches that still perform this function, put these people to work so they can keep their dignity and self-respect. That kind of program also weeds out those who are just plain lazy and looking for a handout.

The thing to remember is that *government* is a **fiction**; it is an artificial mechanism or device created and employed by human beings to facilitate social/commercial intercourse without killing one another to the point of extinction. *Government*, being a fictional entity, has nothing of its own. That reality must be supplied by real people. When government *gives* something to someone, it must first *take* that something from someone else.

The Constitution of this nation, as it was *originally* framed, created for each individual the opportunity to make what he could and would of his life **on his own efforts**. Today, we look at the results of legislative attempts to "improve" on that freedom and we see "equal opportunity" in practice looking more like a gang-rape handout laced with nepotism. Opportunity to succeed in life carries an equal opportunity to *fail*. All the democratic legislation in the world is not going to guarantee success to a born moron.

Like a lot of things in life, *equality* is **not** something you can **effectively** legislate. To make such an attempt makes about as much sense as team harnessing a Clydesdale and a Shetland pony to a singlebottom plow and expecting to plow a straight furrow. They're both horses; that should make them "equal," right? Using the now prevailing tendency of substituting one word with another of similar **but different** meaning as well as the corrupted method of reasoning that practice fosters, the point might be argued. However, when the *individual* capabilities and limitations of each horse are added to the computation of the specific task to be performed, that argument will break down rather suddenly. When measured in terms of individual *ability*, "equality" between human being follows a similar course in much greater magnitude of diversity. Just because someone has a high ability to dance is no guarantee of being able to tie their shoe laces.

When a society begins to reward its indigents and the lazy at the expense of its wealthy and the industrious, it will become a lazy and indigent society. When a society begins to cater to and give preferential treatment to its cripples and the incompetent, it will become a crippled and incompetent society. Its government will perfectly reflect those conditions. I've taken pot-shots at a couple of governmental systems, and I'm likely to take a couple more before this book is finished. You need to realize that all of these "isms," "archys," and "ocracys" are nothing more than governmental *systems*. None of those systems will perform any better or any worse than the *people* who use them to govern or by which to be governed. It doesn't matter which particular system of government you care to name. If that system is behaving irresponsibly, it's a sure bet that the **people** who use that system are behaving irresponsibly. So before you go blaming the government or the system for your problems, take a closer look at **your** part in that. What's that you say? You haven't done anything? Maybe that's the real cause of your troubles.

Perhaps you should try **doing** something about the problem instead of leaving it for someone else to handle? Self-government means exactly that.

Our Declaration of Independence states that the **purpose** of government is to secure to the **individual** certain unalienable Rights, **among** which are "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness." Some of the men who participated in the preparation of that declaration also participated in the creation of our Constitution. Many of them came from families in the British and European aristocracy. By the many writings they left to us, it is evident that they were well educated men with a keen understanding of the various governmental systems devised and tried throughout history. Apparently, **none** of the known systems were considered adequate. So these men constructed a Constitution, a system of government, that they felt would best fulfill its purpose, as they had declared it. By defining the general purpose of **any** government, these men provided themselves, and us, with a simple, *workable* standard or yardstick by which to measure the relative value of most, if not all, forms of government.

That our form of government, as *originally* established, has a greater relative value over all the others is demonstrated by the fact that our nation was pushed into the lead as a *solvent* world power in less than a century. We are still moving on the inertia of that initial launch thrust! No other system can make that claim within the parameters of the declared purpose of government. As recently as 1976 the Ninth Circuit Court confirmed this by stating, "...despite all its obvious delays and potential for abuse, we have yet to devise a better way..." Nevertheless, our form of government has one very critical weakness. Strong safeguards were built into the Constitution against government abuses and accroachments, but there was no practical way to build in safeguards against neglect and irresponsibility by the People themselves. Through that one weakness, the Constitution, and the system of government it established, came under attack almost as soon as it was signed. It has been under attack through that one weakness since that time.

Today we are seeing unauthorized changes being made to the system that the founding fathers would regard as ludicrous. Given the firmness of their opinions, they might have even called it "treason". There is a considerable amount of hard evidence to show that our Constitution, our system, our way of life is actively being sabotaged **from within**; most frequently under the guise of Treaty Power.

Some of today's patriots blame our country's ills on the bankers; others blame the Jews; others blame the Masonic Orders; and on; and on; and on. Quite often one hears these .finger pointing professionals say that it is time for America to **wake up**. I say it's time for the People of America to *grow up*.

I don't care if the saboteurs are little green men in spacesuits. Our ship of state is taking on water at an alarming rate. We haven't the time or energy to waste on an adolescent finger pointing contest. We need to get the leaks plugged and the water pumped out of this ship's hold. **Then** maybe we'll have time to lash a plank over the side. But I think by then you'll discover that the **real** culprits will have already made off with some of the lifeboats and slipped away in all the commotion. That works just as well and saves us the trouble of feeding them to the sharks. Now, we don't want to accidentally punch a bigger hole in the hull and sink the ship, so we're going to have to understand how this ship was built and what keeps it afloat before we can repair it. You might think of this handbook as "damage control, phase one". What qualifies me as the best authority on the subject? Well, I'm a poor swimmer, and I have an aversion to drowning that you cannot even begin to imagine. How's that for openers?

I would be remiss if I did not make it clear that my remarks about today's patriots are not intended to hold them up as objects for ridicule. What they are doing takes guts, and many of the people who founded this nation were no less zealous. However, it is my opinion that the situation we have requires a more productive expenditure of time and energy than pounding the podium. That attitude may consign me to "hell" in the eyes of some, but you can be sure I'll have plenty of company. Better that than to be one of the many who complain but do nothing to solve the problem. By my view, if you are not part of the solution, you are part of the problem. That simple fact of life encompasses all considerations of race, creed, religion and politics.

Chapter 4

This handbook will be of little value to you if you fail to comprehend what is set forth in this chapter. Read it more than once if needed in order to form a good picture of the rationale. In this chapter I will be addressing the subject of *power* which is the principle attribute of *sovereign*. A thorough treatment of the latter will be necessary in order to fully grasp the former. The attitude as well as the altitude of the sovereign point of view is, for some, difficult to fully adopt and maintain. The difficulty lies in the extent of the **responsibility** one is willing to comfortably confront and accept. This is further compounded when we consider a multitude of *sovereigns* acting and interacting within the same venue. The founding fathers understood it. It's time you understood it as well.

WHATEVER THE MAGNITUDE, POWER **DOES NOT** CORRUPT. IT IS IMMUNITY
FROM ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE (AB)USE OF POWER THAT CORRUPTS;
ALWAYS.

This bald statement encompasses the very heart of the danger and the fatal flaw of any government system which operates as, **or in the name of, majority rule**. Two prime examples of this are democracy and communism, as we have seen them practiced. The framers of our Constitution placed the heaviest restrictions against government institutions being used to impose *the will of the majority* upon the **individual** sovereign Citizen without his/her Consent. Anyone who has read the **Preamble*** to the Bill of Rights would have to concede that the intent was clearly to protect the **individual** against government excesses and abuse for as long as the Constitution remains the Law of the Land in this country.

* "THE Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further **declaratory and restrictive** clauses should be added: And as extending the ground of public confidence in the Government will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution.

RESOLVED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, two thirds of the Houses, that the following Articles be proposed to the Legislatures of the several States as Amendments to the Constitution of the United States, all or any of which Articles, when ratified by three fourths of the said Legislatures, to be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the said Constitution, viz!

ARTICLES in addition to, and Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America, proposed by Congress, and ratified by the Legislatures of the several States, pursuant to the fifth Article of the original Constitution." (Ratified in 1791)

As we follow this rationale all the way through, it may very well make hamburger of some rudimentary sacred cows. If you have any of those of which you are particularly fond, you may want to remove them from harm's way before you read on. However, that would be self-defeating. The purpose here is to examine and compare the veracity of information.

The government, through Congress, represents the will of the majority. Who are the majority? Voters, right? Voters are qualified electors. That implies rather plainly that there are *electors* who are **not qualified**. So what is this "qualified" business about? We know that to register to vote there are age, citizenship and residency **restrictions**. Is there anything else to be considered? Perhaps we should examine the word "qualify." As a verb, its root meaning is to **limit**, to **reduce** from a general to a specific form. The word "limit", as a verb, essentially means to **restrict**. "Reduce" means to lessen, to **diminish** the quantity or **quality** of something. Since the object of the limitation or reduction is the *elector*, we must then ask, **what** is being diminished or restricted? What is the elector losing or giving up to obtain a *qualified* status? What does an elector still have that a *qualified* elector no longer has? To ascertain we will have to determine what an elector is, what an elector does or is capable of doing, and what an elector has or may have as a matter of course.

As a verb, the root meaning of *elector* is *to choose*. An elector is one who chooses or has the capacity to choose **at will**. In Law, **that** is a power and a right possessed by a **sovereign**. So it would seem that the elector must limit or diminish some aspect of his individual **sovereignty** in order to obtain a *qualified* status. What's that, you say? It's the qualified elector who gets to choose this country's leaders? Let's take a moment to examine that idea. First, a sovereign IS a leader. Second, how many qualified electors do you know who voted for a certain candidate but **someone else** got the job? That kind of *power to choose* doesn't sound very *sovereign* to me. And third, this country's "leaders" are in fact **public servants**. The platitude "to lead is to serve" may sound noble in a speech, but the hard fact of reality is that a servant works for and answers to a higher authority.

It follows that *the body sovereign* would have to be comprised of electors who have **not** qualified or diminished any part of their own sovereignty.

Just as it is with **truth**, anything less than sovereign is **not sovereign**. Likewise, it could only be to the body sovereign that all who take public office must give solemn Oath of Fidelity as required by Article VI of our Constitution. That "all" includes **anyone**, right down to the janitor, who gets their pay out of the Public Treasury. Why would that pledge be given to sovereign body electors and not to qualified electors? Actually, there are several reasons and we will start with the most obvious. In Law, except for instances of covert disobedience, the *master* (the sovereign) is always **responsible** for the acts of his servant(s). A qualified elector, having given his own responsibility over to the nebulous *political* entity called *the majority*, cannot be considered a **responsible** party. Similarly, the *political* entity called *the majority*, being a *fiction of law*, also cannot be considered a **responsible** party. So who does that leave? Body sovereign electors, that's who.

This precept permeates all of our government institutions. For example, when an individual files for bankruptcy, **the filing itself** is a public announcement that: 1) he has behaved irresponsibly; 2) he is **not competent** to manage his own affairs; and 3) he needs supervision by authority **external to himself**. By definition, that condition is not *sovereign* and a *trustee* will be appointed to **supervise** him and his affairs.

Another example is how the Law views appearance and **representation** by an attorney in the courts. By their own rules, the judges know that an attorney cannot make appearances and represent someone in court unless that someone has **conveyed** his *power* of attorney to do so, or unless the judge has ordered it. Again, **the conveyance itself** is a public announcement that the litigant is **not competent** to manage his own legal affairs. A **competent sovereign speaks, writes, and acts for himself**, with or without the **advisory** assistance of **counsel**. As soon as that power of choice and expression transfers to an attorney, the Law places the actual party to the suit in the same category as infants and the insane who obviously are not competent, and who just as obviously require **representation** by another person. And if one is not competent In Law, s/he is not sovereign in any practical sense. For these persons, the Law and the courts will recognize the sovereign *rights* of the individual, but it will **also** recognize that the individual lacks the *powers* by which the rights may be **responsibly exercised**. In Law, that is the difference between *rights* and *powers*. A *right* is a statement of authority. The attendant *power* is the means by which the authority is exercised and given effect.

Some of you who consider yourselves veteran patriots may feel that you have been badly mistreated by certain judges when you demanded that your rights be recognized. The fact is, **they probably were recognized.** It should be obvious that you failed to **demonstrate** your ability to responsibly exercise those rights. You may have had the authority, but did you actually show the judge your **power** to give it effect? Realize this too: a *sovereign commands. S/he does not demand* what is already his or hers. The word *demand* signifies that the one making the demand wants something that *s/he does not already have.* It also signifies that *s/he* to whom the demand is directed has the **power to choose** its disposition. Remember, the power to choose belongs to the sovereign.

The third example is really just an extension of the preceding one. The moment you give your sovereign Consent to majority rule by registering to vote, **whether you vote or not,** you publicly announce that: 1) you are no longer **competent** as an individual sovereign; 2) you are no longer **responsible** for your individual acts nor the acts of your servants; 3) you need to be **represented** by another or others in the affairs of state; 4) you need to be *externally* regulated, supervised, and policed; and 5) you have transferred your sovereign powers to choose to legislative or majority rule *statutes.* Do you really wonder why so many politicians are attorneys? **Representing incompetents** is what they have been trained to do for a living! It could be said that ignorance of the Law may apply to incompetents, but never to the sovereign.

In effect, the sovereign elector who obtains a *qualified* status is giving Consent to *the majority* to **politically** modify (via statute) the powers by which his or her **sovereign** Rights may be exercised **or not exercised.** That is why a purely political statute, although **not Law,** carries "the force of law" over, and *only* over, the **qualified** elector who gave his Consent to it. The Consent of the *former sovereign* provided the **force** of law; get it? Now, don't get the idea that I'm making this up or exaggerating it to make points. I know of at least one case where the judge, in order to settle a jurisdictional challenge, ordered the prosecutor to enter into evidence the defendant's voter registration card to show his Consent to the statute under which he was being charged and prosecuted. Our government, being a fictional or artificial mechanism, has no **Rights.** It only has **delegated powers,** which must **all** come from the body sovereign via our Constitution or from individual sovereign electors via Consent *by contract.* We'll get into the **contract** aspect of it later.

Being a *sovereign* involves a tremendous amount of power to choose and freedom from **external** limitations. *How* you go about the exercise of that freedom and, power to choose is the **responsibility** side of that same coin. There's no escaping the fact that either will determine the exact magnitude of the other. History shows us repeatedly that a sovereign who fails to show some degree of responsibility for the well-being of the realm which supports him will not long remain a sovereign. The founding fathers of this nation well understood this and, in the fashioning of our system of government, they set down the guidelines of how all of us *sovereigns* are supposed to exercise our freedoms and responsibilities in relation to each other and in relation to our administrative servants (public officials). Without those guidelines, we *chiefs* would be stumbling and stumbling over each other's teepees and a whole lot of Indians would be getting trampled to death in all the confusion.

Now having shown you nearly all of the *sovereign* aspects of this thing called *power*, we'll bring this back to the point of beginning: **immunity**. We can see that a **responsible** *sovereign* enjoys only a limited amount of immunity from censure. Even that amount of immunity is conditioned upon his ability and willingness to rectify his mistakes. However, the one thing from which an **individual** has no natural immunity, regardless of how *sovereign* he may be, is that of being mobbed or being overwhelmed by sheer numbers. As I mentioned in a previous chapter, our Constitution and especially the Bill of Rights were established to set up a protective barrier between the **individual** sovereign elector and *the will of the majority* as administered by *the government*. That protective barrier provides a form of immunity from unwanted **accroachments**. Yes, there is such a word; look it up in the glossary.

We are **also** vested with the power to choose to become part of and participate in *majority rule*. The catch is we first have to give up the immunity, the protective barrier. You cannot rationally expect to be a part of majority rule and still retain all the individual protections against majority rule. That just doesn't work. In the course of such a transition from individual sovereign elector to *qualified* majority rule elector, there are necessarily two principal items of sovereignty which must transfer. Neither, being intangibles, can be destroyed. The first is the **power to choose at will** and the second is immunity.

Thus, the *qualified* elector's power to choose is **no longer at will**. His power to choose becomes subject to and is regulated, supervised and policed by majority rule, **political** statutes.

The statutes tell him what, where, how and when he may choose with licenses, permits, etc. We can also see that the qualified elector, by having **consented** to abide by the rules (statutes) of the majority, has no legal ground to sue the government for enforcing his compliance to those statutes. The **individual** government administrators are immune from lawsuits on the obvious grounds that they are merely carrying out the will of the majority. so it comes as no surprise that there is a statute which says *the government* cannot be sued without its permission.

Contrary to popular opinion, the *qualified* elector is the **least likely** to change or keep government under control. He no longer possesses the *sovereign* power(s) to correct or discipline misbehavior. The only guarantee he has **at the polls** is that his vote will be taken and **counted**. That's what *poll* means as a verb. He has no guarantee as to who is going to end up getting the job or even how well the one who does get the job will perform. By this means, a form of immunity is created for those public administrators who handle a great deal of political power and the temptation to misuse that power must surely test the mettle of even the most virtuous human being.

The individual *sovereign* elector, on the other hand, is not so encumbered. He still possesses the power(s) to **directly** require an accounting of his administrative servants and to discipline them on an **individual** basis when it becomes necessary. Please note that I used the word *discipline* and not *punish*. There is a significant difference between the two. Because of the mandatory Article VI Oath of Fidelity, not even the President is immune from the individual *sovereign* elector; but **only** when it can be shown that the misbehavior **directly** breached the guaranteed individual protections of the sovereign elector, and **only** on an **individual** basis. Thus, it should matter little to the individual *sovereign* elector **who** is in which public office so long as the officer is bound by that Oath and can be held accountable by it.

If you're wondering who will hold those public offices if nobody voted; not to worry. Human nature guarantees that there will always be a few who want to play the game of politics. Let them. So long as they are bound by that Oath, who cares?

Chapter 5

In this chapter we'll make a more thorough examination of something upon which I merely touched previously. Perhaps we can simplify and consolidate all those descriptive *labels* I've been tossing at you. Here is your next bald statement:

A "PERSON" IS A POLITICAL "FICTION."

The first thing we had better do here is get these terms defined and well understood. We'll begin with *political*. Its general definition is: **of or pertaining to or participating in the organization and administration of government**. "Of or pertaining to or participating in" is a rather sweeping quantitative phrase. The two qualifying words are "organization" (noun) and "administration" of (verb).

You may recall that *government* is a **fictitious mechanism**. The foregoing definition means that anything and anyone **directly** or **indirectly** involved with that *fiction* would, In Law, be considered a part of that *fiction*. That would certainly include anyone who gets a paycheck and/or expenses from the Public Treasury. As made plain in the previous chapter, it would include all *qualified* electors. And it obviously includes all "elected" officials who must be *qualified* electors in order to run for and hold office.

We see that there are two major divisions or classifications of *anyones* in this country. There are body sovereign Electors who are **non-political**, real, live human beings, and who do not publicly represent themselves as being anything else. Then there are all the *qualified* electors who, In Law, are **political** fictions, either directly or by association. These distinctions of status were also used in our Constitution. The capitalization and non-capitalization of certain nouns in that Instrument **were not accidental**. You may note that I have begun and will hereafter do the same so you will know which classification I'm referring to, e.g., Elector (sovereign) and elector (qualified), Citizen (sovereign) and citizen (political), and People (body sovereign) and people (majority rule *persons*). The Roman Empire used a similar bi-level system, so it shouldn't be a difficult concept to grasp.

This bald statement makes even more sense when we examine the meaning of "person." This term is derived from a Latin word which literally means "a mask, as is worn in theatre."

It is important that you know that at the time this Latin word came into use, actors and other stage performers would wear a mask while performing. This was so the audience would not mistake the actor himself for the fictional character being portrayed. When not performing, the actor was just himself, but when he wore the mask he was being someone or something not himself, a *fiction*. Get it?

Whenever an individual is role-playing or publicly **representing** to be something or someone not his natural self (a *fictional identity*), he is considered as and referred to as a *person*. This concept is the basis of the rationale which makes a "corporation" a *person*. The significant difference between a **corporate person** and an **individual person** is that the former enjoys **limited liability**, while the latter enjoys **total liability**. A sovereign Elector, on the other hand, is not *liable*. He is **accountable** because his is **responsible**. He is not playing "let's pretend." He does not present himself to the public behind a *mask* or an assumed identity. In this one instance, it doesn't matter if the "P" is capitalized or not. A person or person, In Law, is a **fiction**, and if this assumed identity is in any way connected with *government*, it is a **political** fiction.

A simple example of this would be: Bill Clinton is the identity of a natural born human being. "Mr. President" or "President Clinton" is a **political fiction identity**. Ordinarily, he would become Citizen Bill Clinton again when he goes off duty. However; since he must be a qualified elector to obtain **and hold** the office, his *mask* cannot be removed. He's a **political fiction** 24 hours a day, 365 days a year unless or until he publicly reverts back to his natural self as a **non-political** Citizen/Elector.

The analogy to theatre is well suited to this application. While the actor is wearing the mask of another identity on stage, who is it that dictates what he will say and do **as that identity**? It would be the scriptwriter or the playwright, correct? **Politically**, this would be the legislature writing the *script* in the form of **statutes**. Who would make certain the actor performs the role correctly, according to the script? That would be the director, right? Politically, this would be the **police** carrying out the executive function. And who is it that would determine how well the actor performed the role according to the script? Critics and fellow actors would decide, don't you think? Politically, this would be the judges and their *person* juries. By this analogy, we can readily see that whoever controls the "mask" also controls the actor who is wearing it, until he takes it off and leaves the stage.

It follows quite naturally that **political** statutes **do not apply to non-political** Electors. They apply **only** to political fiction identities called "persons." Nearly every political statute uses the word *person* to identify the entity to whom it is directed or intended to control. Now, there are a few (and I mean **few**) **non-political** statutes, and they carry the force of Constitutional Law. These are the rules by which we sovereign Electors play the game with each other. These statutes will usually identify the entity or status of entity at whom they are directed with "whoever" or "anyone," but **not** "person."

Thus we have "Law" and we have "law." While Law is an expression of the will of the body sovereign via the Constitution, law is an expression of the will of the political person majority via a fictional entity called the legislature which was created by and is **subordinate** to the Constitution. While Law applies to sovereign Electors (and their agents or servants), law applies only to political persons. The focus of law is *prevention* (supervision) against **possible** "injury" or "loss." The focus of Law is to repair the damage **after** injury or loss **actually has been caused**. There is no *suppose* or *maybe* or *what if* as far as the Law is concerned. The Law requires an **inured party** in fact, but law does not so require. This makes perfect sense because law is for **fictions**, and it is a maxim of Law that you cannot *injure* a fiction.

How does one discern a political statute from a non-political statute? It just so happens that the statutes have been codified and the codes are fairly uniform from state to state as well as with the federal codes. Even though the codes are only *evidence* of the statutes, the classification of the subject matter will remain constant between the codes and the statutes. It just happens that Oregon's "revised codes" contain a "Table of Titles" in the introductory section which makes a very clear distinction between political and non-political codes (statutes) by subject matter classification. This provides a very handy tool for those who seek some degree of enlightenment upon an otherwise confusing and thorny body of information.

The first major classification in this Table of Titles is called the **REMEDIAL CODE**. These statutes are mandated or authorized by the Constitutions of the States and of the nation. These statutes define the various courts and processes by which **remedy** may be obtained.

The subject matter of the titles of chapters under this major classification will include:

- Courts of Record
- Court Officers, Juries, Procedure in civil cases
- Evidence and Witnesses and
- Inferior Courts and Proceedings Therein.

This major classification will usually include the Rules of Civil Procedure. These rules are written for persons and attorneys. However, they can be informative to the inexperienced sovereign Elector on how the courts normally conduct their day-to-day business.

This major classification also usually includes one more title/ chapter that is of utmost importance to the sovereign Elector. Oregon titles it "Remedies and Special Actions and Proceedings." Since the **sovereign** is *special*, it comes as no surprise that this section will include **Writs**. The *sovereign* always wages his Law with **Affidavits** and **Writs**. Indelibly inscribe this fact on your memory. If the Writ is uncontested, nothing else is required. If contested, the courts must sit in a **Judicial** capacity. Most of the time, the courts of today act as mere *ministerial tribunals*. A ministerial tribunal is a **non-judicial** tribunal which, among other things, enforces political statute law on *persons*. A *police court* is a prime example of a ministerial tribunal. A *tax court* is another. **Judicial Courts**, on the other hand, declare the Law of a controversy brought before them. I will get into this in more detail later in the handbook. Just keep in mind that the "courts" have the ability to perform more than one function, but **you** have to know (or find out) in which capacity it is acting in any particular instance. And it doesn't matter if it is a court of *record* or not. The "judges" are under no Constitutional obligation to tell you unless you ask.

The second major classification in this Table of Titles is referred to as the **CIVIL CODE**. **Most** of these statutes are also mandated or authorized by the Constitutions of the States and of the nation. They detail many of the Judicial and non-judicial processes by which both People and people may obtain remedy in civil disputes. There is a very great deal of established Contract Law to be found in these statutes. Each statute will, by its own language, tell you if it applies to a **political fiction identity** or to a real, live, warm, breathing, human being **sovereign** (as I have herein described the two species of identity). Your ability to differentiate these things will increase in direct proportion to your ability to adopt the **sovereign** point of view as your own.

The subject matter of the titles/chapters under this major classification will include:

- Corporations and Franchises
- Commercial Transactions
- Mortgages and Liens
- Property Rights and Transactions
- Domestic Relations
- Probate Law and
- Guardianship, Conservatorship, Power of Attorney, Trusts.

The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) will usually be found under this major classification. As you sort through these statutes, if you ever find a need, always remember a *sovereign commands*, a *sovereign acts*, he does not *complain*. A *sovereign acts* and *commands* through **Affidavits** and **Writs**.

The third major classification in this Table of Titles is called the **PENAL (CRIMINAL) CODE**. *Most* of these statutes are also mandated or authorized by the Constitutions of the States and of the nation. The **police power** of the state **does** extend to these statutes, but under heavy restriction by Constitutional restraints. The subject matter of the titles/chapters under this major classification will include:

- Crimes and Punishments
- Procedures in Criminal Matters Generally and
- Procedures in Criminal Actions in the Inferior Courts.

More will be discussed on this in relation to the police power of the state later in this handbook.

Although there will be several statutes that **do not apply** to the sovereign Elector, the statutes in these three major classifications (REMEDIAL CODE, CIVIL CODE, and PENAL CODE) are mandated or authorized by the Constitutions of the States and of the nation. These are the **only statutes** with which the sovereign Elector need concern himself. As with most other states, Oregon prints its "revised codes" in volume (book) form. We have just covered **three** of those volumes. Not counting those dedicated to indexes, there are NINE more volumes which take up about **four-fifths** of the shelf space occupied by the set. That's 80% of the shelf space and about 90% of the statutes, which proportions will remain fairly constant from state to state. these **nine** volumes comprise the fourth and final major classification, and it is called POLITICAL CODE. The political code consists of those statutes which apply to **political persons** who are wholly subject to the **political "venue."** and **police power** of the state.

These statutes **do not apply** to the sovereign Elector unless his Consent by Contract can be produced or shown by indirect means. Today, in **most** cases, but not all, this is not too difficult to do.

In order to hold this chapter to acceptable limits and for the sake of simplicity, I will list the titles/chapters of each volume in sequence, as they appear in the Oregon Table of Titles. My notations will immediately follow the listing of each volume. These notations are intended only to create points of reference for use later in this handbook. They are **not** necessarily intended to give summary treatment of the titles/chapters they address or relate to. Here we go:

"Volume 4"

(Government Structure and Finance, Part 1)

- State Legislative Department and Laws
- State Executive Department and Administrative Organizations
- Miscellaneous Matters Related to Government and Public Affairs
- Counties and County Officers
- Cities
- Public Officers and Employees

Although the Constitutions make no authorization for it, in relation to the sovereign Electors, this is where the political or so called "statutory jurisdiction" is created and defined. There is no Constitutional authorization for such "jurisdiction" in relation to the body sovereign Electors because it would **directly** violate the **Separation of Powers** requirement of the Supreme Law of the Land.

"Volume 5"

(Government Structure and Finance, Part 2)

- Elections
- Public Organizations for Community Service
- Public Lands
- Public Facilities, Purchasing, Printing, Economic Development
- Public Borrowing and Bonds
- Public Financial Administration

This is a continuation of the preceding volume with one additional feature. This is where the "statutory (political) *person*" is created and defined, contingent on the Consent factor, of course.

"Volume 6"
(Revenue and Taxation)

- Revenue and Taxation

Registered voters (*qualified electors*) are **enfranchised*** *taxpayers*.

"Volume 7"

(Public Services, General Welfare - Part 1)

- Education and Cultural Facilities
- Highways, Roads, Bridges and Ferries
- Military Affairs; Emergency Services
- Privileges and Benefits of Veterans and Service Personnel
- Human Services; Corrections

"Volume 8"

(General Welfare - Part 2)

- Mental Health & Developmental Disabilities; Alcohol and Drug Abuse
- Public Health and Safety

"Volume 9"

(General Welfare - Part 3, Natural Resources)

- Alcoholic Liquors, Controlled Substances, Drugs
- Protection from Fire
- Wildlife
- Commercial Fishing and Fisheries
- Mineral Resources
- Forestry and Forest Products
- Water Resources; Irrigation, Drainage, Flood Control, Reclamation

"Volume 10"

(Agriculture & Food, Trade Practices, Labor)

- Agriculture
- Agricultural Marketing and Warehousing
- Animals
- Food and Other Commodities
- Trade Regulations and practices
- Labor and Industrial Relations

* **INCORPORATE:** To create a corporation; to confer a corporate **franchise** upon determinate **persons**. **CORPORATION:** An **artificial** (fictional) **person** or legal (political statute) entity **created by or under** the authority of the laws (political statutes) of a state or nation. Black's Law Dictionary - **ENFRANCHISE:** To incorporate a man in a society or body **politic** (a fiction). **FRANCHISE:** A special **privilege** conferred by government on individuals, and which does not belong to the Citizens of the country generally by common **right**. In the United States, they (franchises) are usually held by **corporations** created for the purpose, and can be held only under legislative grant. These (franchises) are also **liable** for the **debts** of the owner, but cannot be sold or assigned without the **consent** of the **legislature**. Bouvier's Law Dictionary. **FRANCHISE:** In this country a franchise is a (taxable) privilege or immunity of a public nature, which cannot be legally exercised without legislative grant. Black's Law Dictionary - Nearly all the Constitutions and virtually all of the election laws of the several states designate "suffrage" (voting) as a political **franchise** or **privilege**. The foregoing definitions help to illustrate the rationale.

"Volume 11. "

(Occupations, Business Regulations - Part 1)

- Occupations and Professions
- Insurance and Finance Administration
- Financial Institutions
- Loan Associations and Lending Institutions
- Insurance

"Volume 12"

(Business Regulations - Part 2, Vehicle Code, Watercraft, Aeronautics)

- Utilities; Railroads and Other Carriers
- Shipping and Navigation
- State Vehicle Code
- Ambulances and Emergency Medical Personnel
- Aeronautics

The statutes codified in the last volume are where "colorable" or quasi **admiralty** jurisdictions are created and bring that authority inland from the Seas. Although the national Constitution recognizes Admiralty jurisdiction, it does **not** authorize its extension inland. It would be silly to suppose that the framers of our Constitution would authorize such accroachment when that was one of the **major** factors that lead them to revolt against England in the first place. They had had a bellyfull of that particular jurisdiction. The Declaration and Resolves of the First Continental Congress of 1774 makes that point very clear.

In summary of this chapter, let me reiterate. The body sovereign Elector is **not** subject to **any** *political* codes or statutes except through Consent by Contract. Registering to vote makes him subject to **all** of those statutes. They constitute the *specific performance* clauses of the "Contract." Even if **not** registered to vote, the Elector can still become subject to certain specific portions of the *political* codes or statutes by Contract via licenses, permits, etc.

Regardless of how your state goes about arranging the codification of its statutes, each statute will, by subject matter, fall somewhere within the classifications listed in this chapter. Thanks is due Oregon for providing a simplified chart for reference. The chart makes it ever so much easier to **quickly** identify a purely *political* statute.

Chapter 6

In light of the information about statutes and their *political* orientation in the previous chapter, it is most appropriate to begin this chapter with the following bald statement:

ALL "GOVERNMENT" FORMS, PRINTED OR OTHERWISE, ARE NOTHING MORE OR LESS THAN CONTRACT SIGNATURE SHEETS/CARDS.

It is most amusing to watch a bureaucrat, especially one with a chip on his shoulder, insist that you "sign the form", and you say in return, "No, I don't want to sign that contract." Many will come back with, "It's not a contract." And when you say, "If it's not a contract, why do you need my dated signature on it to make it operative? Why don't you sign it?" there is never a clear answer to that question. If the badgering continues, you could go on to ask, "What are you going to do to me if I don't sign this contract?" Usually there will be some mention or reference to a *political* "regulation" or "statute" whereby some governmental agency "**may**" do this or that. Then you say, "I did not ask what **may** be done to me if I don't sign this contract. I asked what **are** you going to do to me if I don't sign it." At this point, your antagonist may give up or actually threaten you with agency action of some sort. Once he has made a *threat* to get you to sign, it voids the (signed) contract by operation of Law. No contract is valid if it is obtained by coercion.

That is why so many of the forms you are *encouraged* to sign are titled "Application" at the top of the form. In Law, it is considered a **voluntary** act to "apply" for something. That is the most binding part of any contract. The other word frequently used in these forms is the word "authorization." Civil servants and their agencies have **no authority** to exercise compelling power over you without your signed "authorization." If you intend to play this sort of game, it would be wise to have a recorder and/or a witness or two nearby to verify the conversation (if needed later). Better still would be to keep all of your communications with "government" **in writing** as with letters, memos, etc. My personal policy is: "If it's not in writing and signed, it is or it contains a lie." This helps to keep troublesome bureaucrats on their best behavior with you. If they are going to lie anyway, regardless of possible consequences, this policy enables you to obtain the **evidence** by which you can **prove** misconduct and hold them accountable.

One of the more obvious examples of this is the marriage license. A "license" is permission from the state to do something (or not to do something) that would be "illegal" to do (or not to do) otherwise. No one has yet been able to tell me when and by what authority it became generally *illegal* to get married in this country. The device of marriage licenses actually began in this country in New York state to *permit* individuals of different races to marry because, at the time, it was unlawful to do so under both the common law and ecclesiastical law. But that is a specialized application. The question has been and remains, when and by what authority did this device of marriage license extend to **anyone**?

Marriage is a contract by Consent, or one would reasonably expect it to be "by Consent." By qualifying the contract with a license, the state comes into the contract as a third party of interest. Since it is in the form of a *license*, the state's "interest" (control) is **senior** to that of the other two parties to the contract. It is by this means that the state dictates (through *political* statutes) the disposition of such fruits of the contract as property and children. The state, through its political statutes, will tell you, the parent, how and when *your* children will be cared for, "educated," groomed, and disciplined.

Any day now there could be a new political statute on the books making it *illegal* to wipe the kaka off your baby's bottom because it would constitute "child molestation." If you just dip the child in the toilet a few times to rinse it all off, that would constitute child "abuse." And if you just let the diaper fill up and empty by force of hydraulic pressure through the highly acclaimed no-leak seams, that would constitute a case of "negligence." That doesn't leave too many other options, does it? Laugh if you will, but I want to impress upon you that we are **very** near that point in this country today. The solidarity of family is under attack. **As I write this**, there are many responsible and loving parents being arrested and separated from their children for no better "reason" than I just outlined. *Why* would any sensible human being want to **contract** into that kind of mob insanity? If you are so irresponsible as to need direction from the state in the raising of your children, you aren't fit to be a parent in the first place. Taken one or two steps further and the state will be dictating whether or not you will even be permitted to have children.

If you decide to forego the marriage *license* and just tie the knot, the justices of the peace aren't permitted to marry you.

Nor are the mainstream "churches" which are now all **incorporated** and thereby instrumentalities of the state under the control of political statutes. That fact alone makes rubbish out any notions of separation of church and state. About all that is left is marriage by the Common Law or by one of the many splinter religious entities, Christian or otherwise, which the media and the mainstream churches call *cults*. They are called "cults" because they won't join the insanity of majority rule. This too does not leave one with many choices, but I might suggest that sincerely interested couples approach the Amish to perform the marriage ceremony. They are a recognized and well established (Christian) religious order that has **not** given Consent to political involvement. No *license* from the state would be required.

For those of you who are already married and are now concerned about the state's involvement in your marriage contract, there is a way to expel the interest of the state from the contract. The method will vary according to the circumstances of how, when, where and by whom you were married. Unfortunately, it is not a subject which I can address in this handbook with any degree of brevity. I suppose if enough people ask me to write another "how-to" book covering this topic, I will find the time to write it.

I should also point out to those who want or intend marriage without *license* from the state, that a lot more care (a LOT more care) is needed in selecting your mate for a number of reasons. Getting a divorce at some future time is going to be **much** more difficult. In the case of inheritance (as well as divorce) property and rights appurtenant thereto will be handled differently. It will also have a telling effect on bankruptcies and other forms of *relief* to which many people have grown accustomed. Some public programs and "benefits" will no longer be available at all. The state can only do or provide what you Consent to be done by **contract**, be it in the form of a license or otherwise.

I think this one example is sufficient to impress upon you the **contractual** means by which the majority rule mob is **directly** allowed to bring its political statutes into your home, so I won't belabor the point. However, there is also the **indirect** Consent by contract. The **indirect** Consent by contract will enter your life and your home with every bit as much velocity and impact as the **direct** method. Indirect Consent by contract is done by a thing called *agency*, and the "agent" through which you are contracting is called *corporation*.

A corporation, whether public, private, open, closed, municipal, or otherwise is a *political fiction created by* and **totally controlled by** the state through its political statutes. When you sign a form or card at the bank, you give your **indirect** Consent by contract to all the political statutes involving banking and financial institutions. **Your own** financial affairs will then be indirectly **regulated** by those statutes, whether federal or state. This will be the case whenever you evidence contractual ties with any corporation, including incorporated "churches."

Taking a moment to digress, I am remembering a court case where the defendant marched into the courtroom up to the railing, held up a Christian Bible and told the judge, "This is my law book. I recognize and authorize no other." The judge immediately dismissed the case for lack of jurisdiction. One can only speculate what might have happened if the judge had **also** been an ordained minister. Most likely it would have devolved into a shouting match between defendant and judge over 1st Amendment protections. I know of no judges who are also ordained ministers of any church. That is probably so to reinforce the doctrine of separation. It could constitute a conflict of interest on the part of the judge.

The four primary elements of a contract are: **voluntary offer**; **voluntary acceptance** and agreement; *consideration*; and *specific performance*. For those of you who cannot see these four elements in the licensing schemes of the state and federal governments, I will make it clearer. Regardless of whether it is for a "business" license, or a "driver's" license, or a "pet" license, or whatever kind of *license*, the **application** for the license constitutes the *offer* of **Consent**, or more accurately, it is an offer of **sovereign power** to supervise, regulate and police the applicant. The issuance of the license card or similar instrument is conclusive evidence of the *acceptance* of that offer. As for the *consideration*, can you name one license that does not involve a direct or indirect *fee*? The *specific performance* clauses of the contract are, of course, contained in the political statutes governing the licensed activity.

It is no accident that we find the word *fee* used in connection with *licensing*. The word has a very significant meaning in property law as well as **feudal** law. The reason I mention this is so you understand that *Rights* and *Powers* are **sovereign PROPERTY** and follow the same forms of *conveyance* as **real** property. There is a long legal history surrounding the word "fee" and it has its roots in **feudal** law. This is something well worth checking out for yourself, if you have the time and inclination.

The founding fathers of this nation well understood that the sovereign Elector's *powers to choose at will* was the most valuable *property* in his possession. Its *conveyance* was and still is not something to be lightly undertaken.

Legal definitions contained in law dictionaries are largely formulated from opinions of the courts, as pertains to former cases that involved those forms of expression. The cases involved will be cited in various parts of the legal definition. I have had so called "professionals" tell me that a license is not a contract and then show me where it says that in a law dictionary. They utterly neglected to review the cited cases to determine the specific jurisdiction in which the courts were moving or the status and standing of the parties to the cases involved. I did. Not one of the cases cited in the definition involved a **sovereign Elector** or the jurisdictions in which he normally moves. Thus; that portion of the definition does not apply. Where it concerns a **sovereign Elector** moving **In Law**, a license **IS** a **contract** **In Fact** which he may **Lawfully** refuse as a condition to the free exercise of his **Rights and Powers**.

Whenever your signature is requested or demanded on any government or corporate form, always ask yourself **and the agent with whom you are dealing**, "Exactly what is my signature authorizing? Is there anything that has not been disclosed to me which might dissuade me from signing?" Then, if the agent fails to **fully** disclose **all** the material aspects of the contract to you, the contract is voidable on the basis of fraudulent misrepresentation. Quite frequently corporate contracts, particularly those involving banking, will bind you to a separate contract between that corporation and another corporation and/or government agency. If that is not fully disclosed to you, it constitutes **contract by adhesion** which is unquestionably **fraud**.

Chapter 7

We are nearly ready to begin your sovereignty restoration instructions. However, I think it would benefit you to give you a sampling of the *why* this country is in the shape it is in. One chapter should handle that nicely. There are a number of samples to choose from and, as with everything in this handbook, I have a very specific reason for choosing this particular one.

"ENVIRONMENTALISM" IS COMMUNISM OPERATING OUT OF A REMODELED "STOREFRONT." THE NAME MAY HAVE CHANGED, BUT IT'S THE SAME BUNCH OF HOODLUMS WORKING THE SAME AGENDA.

This bald statement is **not** intended to bring all your patriotic juices to a boil. Nor is it intended to incite all you red-blooded, gun toting Americans to go grab your assault rifles, pistols and shotguns and go out and blow away every "environmentalist" you can find. Many of these "culprits" are nothing more than dupes or fools who are about as gullible as a 5-year old. Besides, if you're that intent on "cleaning house," save your ammo and use rope. It can be used over and over again at no additional cost.

What, exactly, is this thing called *communism*? Dictionaries aren't much help because they merely define what it is in its **pure** form. They only tell us what it **should** be. This falls short of the mark in telling us what *communism* is **as we have seen it practiced**. For this we need to have a look at a thing called the *communist manifesto*. A *manifesto* is defined as a declaration of **political** intents and purposes by an organized body of people. Let's have a look at just ten of the more prominent intents and purposes of these advocates of what is being passed off as "communism."

1. **Abolition of property in land and the application of all rents of land to public purposes.**

This sounds an awful lot like those "taxes" you pay to the city and/or county which are spent, or supposed to be spent, on schools, roads and other "public purposes." And if you don't pay, *your* property gets taken away from you and auctioned off by the sheriff to someone more willing to pay the "rent" on time. Naw. I must be mistaken. There couldn't possibly be any connection between these two.

2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Do I really need to articulate this one? I didn't think so.

3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

That right sort of goes out the window along with the "property in land" feature, doesn't it?

4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

Say; doesn't the D.E.A., B.A.T.F. and the I.R.S. do that sort of thing all the time?

5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

Is any of this beginning to have a familiar ring to it in your head? Maybe I'm just imagining it all, eh?

6. Centralization of the means of communications and transport in the hands of the State.

7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State, the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.

8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies especially for agriculture.

9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of population over the country.

10. Free education for all children in schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc., etc.

For those of you who need a little encouragement, this *manifesto* isn't a declaration of a political platform. It is a blatant **Declaration of War** against our Constitution, our American way of life, and everything they stand for! This "war," however, doesn't use bullets, hand grenades or bombs. It is waged with **words**, and the *battlefield* is the **mind** of every individual in this country. The technique used is called *psychopolitics** which employs half-truths and outright lies to change the way you think about certain things in life. The technique is even better facilitated by a broad, general use of drugs, both medicinal and street, by the populace. Psychopolitics is being used extensively and routinely now in virtually every governmental institution in the nation. Of course the "communists" want to have free education for all school children.

This makes it ever so much easier to tinker with the thinking apparatus of the children to achieve a *fait accompli* **conquest** of this nation via intellectual sabotage!!

If this sounds like the ravings of a mad *extremist*, just be thankful I'm only giving you a mere sample here. You'd probably choke to death on the whole wad of it. Remember too, I'm not telling you anything that I can't support with multiple layers of conclusive evidence and proof positive. I have no ready answer to the psychopolitical warfare technique beyond that of advising you to really concentrate on separating the truth from the lies and to rely on your common sense at all times. Two helpful standards to employ are: 1) anything less than the **whole** truth is **not truth**, and 2) the most **BELIEVABLE lie** is the one which contains the greatest amount of the truth, but **not ALL** the truth. The use of **some** truth in the fabrication of a lie gives the lie its credibility. Do you see that?

A ready example of how this works is the second sentence of the tenth item in that *manifesto* which declares, "Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form." At first glance, that may sound pretty decent to some of you. The phrase, "in its present form" is the *key* that *unlocks* the **lie**. All that is being declared with that statement is that the commies don't have a problem with children's factory labor. They just want to change the way it is being done. And that leads right into the next statement, "Combination of education with industrial production." Regardless of whether you call it *education* or *apprenticeship* or whatever label, children's factory labor is still children's factory labor. If something looks like a duck, walks like a duck, quacks like a duck and flies like a duck, it's a pretty safe bet that it's a duck. Don't you think?

Those of you who are teachers may wish to take exception to my remarks of intellectual sabotage. That's okay; the schools are the first point of attack in psychopolitical warfare and, in this country, that insurgency action took place many decades ago. The odds are you have been psychopolitically *programmed* and aren't even aware of it. Those of you who are aware of it ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Psychopolitical techniques do not so much address **what** you think as they do **how** you think or reason. In effect, it is a deadly political **control** mechanism. It is **not** a coincidence that we see the use of the term *programming* in relation to radio and television broadcasting.

* "BRAINWASHING: A Synthesis of Russian Psychopolitical Warfare"

I can think of no better way to sabotage an entire country's mental integrity than to package the poison in a wrapper labeled *entertainment*, *news*, or *education* and pump it through the nation's television sets. It sure beats going door-to-door. A small dose of arsenic day in and day out will kill a body just as surely as a single lethal dose. The only difference is how subtle you want to be about it.

As soon as the psychopolitical operatives were viably established in this country, the "Communist Party" in America, to all appearances, dropped out of the scene. At about the same time *environmentalism* began to foment on the college campuses. What followed that is recent enough history, most of you should be able to follow it.

As a result of the Environmental Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and related political statutes, the base resource industry which supports our **entire** culture/society has all but vanished. When a nation can no longer provide for its own needs from its own resources, it is **not independent**. In this context, I'd say the commies have just about succeeded in their conquest of our nation. And they did it without firing a single cannon shot. As far as I can see, about the only thing preventing them from delivering the *coup-de-grace* is that we still have our arms. So there is still a chance, however slim it might be, that we can turn this thing around and not only keep our ship of state afloat, but make it wholly seaworthy again.

There are some who are going to say, "But what about the environment?" Well, what about "the environment?" All of those computers, automobiles, toilets, paper products, VCR's, toys, fuels, etc., etc., that you continue to demand, buy and consume; don't they come from "the environment?" Does it make it less painful to have it come from "the environment" in some other part of the world where you can't see it? In terms of "the environment," is it somehow more *sanitary* to put the *degradation* and *pollution* somewhere "over there" rather than here? That kind of thinking is not very much different than that of thinking dirt swept under a rug is going to magically disappear.

Do you think that taking the lead out of solder, with which your copper plumbing is joined, is going to make your water safer to drink? Where does water come from, "the environment?" Where does the lead come from, "the environment?" Do you think the lead has somehow magically disappeared from "the environment?"

Do you think replacing asbestos insulation with fiberglass insulation will make the air you breathe safer or healthier? Anyone who has handled fiberglass insulation can tell you what its "dust" is like on the skin. Would you prefer to breathe tiny shards of glass or fibrous stone dust? I'll take the stone dust over the glass any day. The stone dust may clog, but it doesn't cut or puncture. Dow Corning must have made a bundle on that political sleight of hand. I'll refrain from further indulgence of one of my pet peeves. At least now, you should be able to see why I say it's time for the people of America to **grow up**.

The motto I have heard most often is "preserve the environment." There's that word *preserve* again. The first thing that comes to mind is, *preserve* what, for whom, for how long? Another popular motto is "*protect* the environment." Again, the first thing that comes to mind is, "protect" what, from whom, *for whose benefit*, for how long? What ever became of the old American practice of **conservation**? The only thing these two words have in common is the concept of saving something for the future. The **difference** between them is what takes place between *now* and *the future*. When something is "preserved," it is put into a state of slow decay with the intent to use it before the level of decay makes it unfit for use. As with strawberry jam, if you wait too long, it will spoilor lose all its nutritional value. The concept of **conservation**, however, is the frugal and wise but **continual use** of something, so there will perpetually be something for *now* as well as *the future*. I guess the concept of **conservation** is just a little too old-fashioned for most people today. Heaven forbid even the thought that corporate profits might suffer a diminution of the general throw-it-away mentality.

What about the "endangered" species? They will either have to adapt to environmental changes or go the way of the dinosaur. We live in a universe where **change** is an immutable physical law. This world is constantly undergoing change and it's not going to be put on hold by any human being or group of human beings. You adapt or you die. That's a fact of life here. Whether you agree or disagree with it, is not relevant to what is. That does not rule out the possibility of states of existence higher than that of homo sapien, where it **would** make a difference. But then, that would be **somewhere else**, wouldn't it? Hold onto your dreams, but don't confuse them with where you are.

In summary of this chapter, I would say to you, strive to become a keen observer.

Look at what is actually there in front of you and, if what you're being told about it doesn't match what you see, reject the lies and validate the truth of your own observations. Refrain from forming an opinion about something until you know what it is that you are forming an opinion upon. Do make an effort to ferret the truth out of the lies. **Most** of what you are now being told by the media and government are subtle *half-truths*, intended to deceive you. Having given you that cautionary warning, we're now ready to get to the "meat" of this handbook.

Chapter 8

Whether your interest in this information concerns the I.R.S., property taxes, traffic enforcement, or all three, there are a couple of preliminary conditions which must be satisfied before all else. The first, which I previously detailed, is repudiating the evidence of Consent to majority rule (voter registration) on the basis of incomplete disclosure (misrepresentation) and mistake. We will do that with a letter which will function as a Writ of Praecipe. *Praecipe* requires no seal of any "court," nor the signature of any "court officer" to make it valid. It is a simple Writ used by the sovereign to politely command a servant to perform a duty imposed by Law. Remember, the sovereign Elector handles **all** his affairs of Law with Writs and Affidavits. Writ of Praecipe will operate to take action on any public, elective officer so long as the duty commanded by the Writ is one which belongs to that office.

The letter will also function as a *legal notice without citing* any political statutes to insure there will be no factual basis for any future claim of "defective process." In case you haven't figured it out yet, disentangling yourself from this monster is somewhat like negotiating your way through a (legal) minefield. So don't even think of changing the way this letter is written. It doesn't matter if the officials know you copied it from this handbook, so long as it meets all the necessary criteria of "sufficiency."

Those of you who are not registered to vote and never have been obviously have no need for this letter, but it won't hurt to have the information. Those of you who were previously registered to vote but let it lapse also need not bother with this letter, especially if it were in a different state. However, if you are the meticulous sort and want to make it certain, then go ahead and use the letter. Nothing is changed except you will have to put *nunc pro tunc* immediately above your signature. This is a Latin legal phrase which means, "now as (it should have been) then." You will also have to change the present tense reference to the voter registration to a past tense reference and give the last known year of registration. Those of you who are currently registered to vote, or were at the last election, and desire to "undo" that will need to copy this letter, adding your own name and particulars. Hand written is okay if it is legible. Typed is better.

Doc Holiday
 c/o postal service address:
 1829 Primrose Lane
 Sagebrush, Nevada CF82151CF

July 4, 1996

Office of the Secretary of State
 for Nevada State
 Elections Division/Department
 Nevada State Seat of Government

RE: Notice & Praecept, Elector Status Change.

Greetings:

You will please take notice that I recently discovered that there are certain political liabilities which attach to the voter registration/roll which, if they had been fully disclosed to me at the time I was induced into the Consent Contract, would have dissuaded me from doing so. For that reason and on that basis, I am hereby repudiating the said Consent contract and rescinding my signature from and Declare void any and all forms, cards and Instruments which may evidence the said mistake.

You will also forthwith please remove my name from the voter roll for Nevada State and any political sub-division thereof as well as notify any and all interested parties of this Elector status change. My individual sovereign Consent is withdrawn and reserved until further notice. No answer to this instruction is required, but acknowledgement of compliance would be appreciated. In the event you are unable or unwilling to comply with this instruction, I shall alternatively require of you evidence of your Article VI Oath of Fidelity as well as the policy number and name and address of the underwriter of your Bond.

Respectfully,
 (signature)
 Doc Holiday,
 Nevada Elector

cc: Humbolt County Clerk

Okay, hold the questions and I'll explain some of the details. The c/o postal service address is so they don't mistake **you** for the political person *mask* using your name. That box or street number address belongs to the U.S. Postal Service, **not** to **you**. It is a kind of "station stop" number along a designated public right of way. I haven't met anyone yet who actually lives **inside** their mailbox, have you?

The use of "CF" on both ends of the zip code is strongly advised, but remains your option. It signifies that you regard the number as a *constructive fraud* and that your use of it is in no way to be taken as a Consent to or acknowledgement of its validity In Law. It is a jurisdictional precaution that costs you nothing to take. The fact is, the zip code is what you might call a numerical designation for a *precinct* or *suburb* of Washington, District of Columbia. It is one of the legal devices that can be used to "prove" that you are subject to the purely political statutes of Congress. When you do not *qualify* your use of the zip code, you're helping Congress to extend and exercise political power over you that it doesn't otherwise have.

Our Constitution, at article I, Section 8, Clause 17, authorizes the exercise of **absolute federal authority**, but **only** if you live in or on "Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, Dock-Yards, and other needful 'Buildings," and **only** if such "Place" is "**purchased** by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be..." Unless you live in or on such a "Place," the use of the zip code is a fraudulent attempt to extend federal authority beyond Constitutional limits. Still, it's your choice. If you have some concern about your letter getting to the intended addressee, not to worry, it will get there. Can you imagine **any** public functionary or postal employee admitting to not knowing where the Seat of Government for the State is located?

The body of the letter requires little explanation. It suggests that you have been defrauded without actually saying so. If there is anything that is most likely to make a public official nervous, it is the idea that you might put a claim and lien against their bond. In most areas of the country, if this happens they become *unbondable*, and without that bond, they cannot perform **any** official function without **personal liability**. There may be a few who try saying that they are "bonded" by "the government." That is pure horse-pucky. It is common knowledge that "the government" is **broke** and incapable of "bonding" **anyone**, unless the "national debt" has been paid off or cancelled and nobody was told about it, that is.

A copy of the letter is sent to the local county elections functionary (usually the County Clerk) as a courtesy so your name can be removed from the local poll and jury lists. Remember, these are those *person* juries. You will still be subject to serve as a Juror in an Action In Law* (not likely any time soon).

Your instructions are simple. You mail the originally signed letter to the Secretary of State, addressed as shown, using a *Certificate of Mailing* slip which can be used to evidence that you actually mailed it. If the letter is not returned to you (undelivered) in a reasonable amount of time, it is legally presumed "delivered." Do the same with the copy sent to the local elections functionary. Keep a third copy of the letter and the two *Certificate of Mailing slips* in your own files/records. Should it ever become necessary, that is your "proof" that you have met all the necessary criteria of withdrawing your **general** Consent to majority rule and re-claiming that aspect of your sovereign Elector status.

It doesn't matter if your letter is answered or not. If it is, put that in your files/records too. There may come a day when you will need that evidence, so don't be careless with that file/record. Think of it the same way you would an insurance policy. Please note that I said "Certificate of Mailing" and not "Certified Mail". Those are two different services offered by the postal service. If you are not familiar with the *Certificate of Mailing* and how it works, just ask your nearest postal counter *person*. S/he will be happy to explain it to you. This concludes the **first preliminary** step to be taken.

The **second preliminary** item is one that most, if not all, of you will have to deal with. With this one you have a choice of two alternatives, depending on your individual circumstances and preferences. The choice centers on whether or not you want to pull out of the social security program. Whether you do or don't, you will still need to withdraw the **general power of attorney** aspect of that contract. We will do that in a very similar fashion to pulling the voter registration Consent. Most of you probably are surprised by the power of attorney aspect, right? That's because you weren't told.

Opening a social security account is not very much different than opening an account at a bank or a department store. Unlike those types of accounts, however, the very nature of the social security account, In Law, implies a voluntary transfer of your **general and perpetual power of attorney** to the government. By opening a social security account, you authorize government to manage any and all of your legal affairs whether public or private in nature. Those of you who had a social security account opened in your name by your parents or someone else before you were of Lawful adult age will find it exceedingly difficult to repudiate it on the basis of incompetency to Contract due to age. That is because, at the time, you were considered under the care and *guardianship* of a presumably responsible adult. The acquisition of the social security account by your *guardian* constituted a transfer of power of attorney to the government and thereby made you a *ward of the state*.

* A more technical term signifying a Judicial Action wholly within and contained by Law, involving **no political statutes**, and under the direction of a sovereign Elector; a **special** action or remedy. It is the **Jury** and not the judge who decide both Law and Fact in this type of action.

Certainly there are means In Law to challenge that aspect of it, but it is not nearly as easy or simple as one might think. You avoid complications by taking the approach of personal acquisition in the usual manner and using the data provided herein for divestment.

Those of you who are seniors and who have been paying into the social security account for many years would be foolish to toss it all away. However, you do need to void the power of attorney aspect of the Contract. Once that is done, the social security program operates much like any other retirement program. The power of attorney aspect is not necessary to the performance of the basic contract **by either party!** Its **only** purpose is to extend an otherwise unwarrantable jurisdiction (compelling **political** authority) over you. It also gives **immunity** (from you) to those who have been spending or authorizing the spending of those funds on other things than was originally intended. Once you have taken hack your power of attorney (and the immunity), you might wish to try doing something **effective** about that irresponsible spending, eh? The purpose of this next letter format is to retract the power of attorney aspect **without** "closing the account" or canceling the entire contract. The retirement program will remain operative.

Lewis Carroll
c/o postal service address:
1884 Croquet Court
Victoria, Florida CF27003CF

Social Security Acct.
No. 292-56-1183

July 4, 1996

Commissioner of Social Security
Social Security Administration
6401 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, Maryland 21235

RE: Notice & Praecipe, Power of Attorney Cancellation.

Greetings:

You will please take notice that I recently discovered that there is a power of attorney Consent attached to the above numbered social security account which, if it had been fully disclosed to me at the time I was induced to authorize the opening of said account in my name, would have dissuaded me from doing so. It is my further understanding that the power of attorney aspect is not necessary to the performance of the contract between the parties to said social security account. For these reasons and on that basis, I am hereby repudiating, nunc pro tunc, the said power of attorney Consent effective the date of opening of said account. You will also forthwith please notify any and all interested parties of this Elector status change and action as well as direct/order that all forms, cards, documents and Instruments bearing my signature in connection with said account be amended to well and truly reflect this change. No answer to this instruction is required, but acknowledgement of compliance would be appreciated.

In the event you are unable or unwilling to comply with this instruction, I shall alternatively require of you evidence of your Article VI Oath of Fidelity as well as the policy number and name and address of the underwriter of your Bond.

Respectfully,

(signature)
Lewis Carroll,
Florida Elector

cc: file

You may notice that this letter is constructed in a very similar fashion to that user to "pull" the voter registration Consent. As is evident, this letter will preserve your ability to receive any social security benefits to which you may be entitled as well as to **compel** that particular contract performance, if necessary, according to the intent of the original contract.

For those of you who want to pull out of the social security program altogether, a different letter will be necessary because the Consent contract is between the government and the **political person bearing your name**. If you have paid into the program, you're going to have to "bite the bullet" on it. Those who have previously attempted to pull out of the program and collect what they had paid into it, were unsuccessful because the funds in "their" account belonged to the **political person** having that name. Get it? They may have *applied* for the account, but "government" **created and opened the account**; and only the "government" can legally **close** the account. About all you can do is own up to the mistake and *divorce* yourself from the account and the political person (with your name) **to which the account belongs** as well as all the "assets," liabilities, and obligations appurtenant thereto.

The letter format is as follows:

Daniel Boone
c/o postal service address:
14 Pinetree Avenue
Camptown, Kentucky CF31104CF

Social Security Acct
No. 445-95-1758

July 4, 1996

Commissioner of Social Security
Social Security Administration
5401 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, Maryland 21235

RE: Notice & Praecipe, Power of Attorney Cancellation & Divestment.

Greetings:

You will please take notice that I recently discovered: 1) that there is a power of attorney Consent attached to the above numbered social security account and; 2) that there are certain purely political liabilities and obligations attached to said account which, if either of these two facts had been fully disclosed to me at the time I was induced to authorize the opening of said account in my name, would have most definitely dissuaded me from doing so. It is my further understanding that the power of attorney aspect is not and never was necessary to the performance of the contract between the parties to said social security account. For these reasons and on that basis, I am hereby repudiating, nunc pro tunc, the said power of attorney Consent effective the date of opening of said account. Said power of attorney, whether general, limited, or implied, is hereby expressly withdrawn and reserved until further notice.

You will please take further notice that I am most displeased with the gross mismanagement of the social security trust funds by an irresponsible Congress who have depleted the same to a state of insolvency. Prudence dictates that I must therefore and do hereby Declare void any and all forms, cards, documents and Instruments bearing my signature which may evidence my Consent and authorization in connection with the said social security account. I renounce all association with the political person bearing my name and disclaim any and all the purported benefits, liabilities and obligations attached to the said person in connection with said account. I will attend to and provide for my own old age support by alternative Private means.

You will also forthwith please notify any and all interested parties of this Elector status change and action as well as direct/order that all forms, cards, documents and Instruments bearing my signature in connection with said account be amended to well and truly reflect this change. No answer to this instruction is required, but acknowledgement of compliance would be appreciated. In the event you are unable or unwilling to comply with this instruction, I shall alternatively require of you evidence of your Article VI Oath of Fidelity as well as the policy number and name and address of the underwriter of your Bond.

Respectfully,
(signature)
Daniel Boone,
Kentucky Elector

cc: file

Now, you're going to have to place your state and local authorities as well as the general public on notice of this change so they may have opportunity to adjust to this new state of affairs. The simplest and least expensive way to do that is to have your local County Clerk record into the miscellaneous records your **originally signed** letter. They usually won't record copies because they have no way to verify a copy as genuine. Since some locales require it, you should wait and sign the letter in front of the Clerk when you take it in to have it recorded. That public record constitutes legal notice to the world at large. In some places you'll get the letter back after a few minutes of waiting. In other places, you will have to wait until they mail it back to you. Either way is okay. As soon as you have the **recorded** letter back, make a copy of it for your own file/record and mail the original signed letter to the addressee shown in the format, using a Certificate of Mailing, just as you did with the voter registration letter. Nothing more should be required, whether the letter is answered or not.

This concludes the **preliminary** steps needed to be taken to withdraw your **general** Consent to majority rule. All that remains now are the more limited Consents by Contract to specific political statutes, which usually will pertain to a license, etc.

Now we are ready for the main event of this handbook. **Do not attempt to apply or use any of the information which follows unless you have first completed the preliminary steps outlined in this chapter.**

Chapter 9

Much has been said and written about the I.R.S. and a good deal of it would not be suitable to repeat in polite company. Probably the best way to start this chapter is at the beginning, right? Okay; in the beginning .. the Internal Revenue Service wasn't called that. It was called the Internal Revenue Tax and Audit Service which was incorporated in Delaware in 1933 by three citizens of New York. My proof? I have a certified copy of the Articles of Incorporation as filed with the Secretary of State for Delaware. Good enough?

The I.R.S. is a "private" corporation presumably under the **regulatory supervision** of the Treasury Department. It is **not** part of the duly Constituted united States' government. It is a collection agency for the Federal Reserve banks which are also **not** part of the duly Constituted united States' government. Not one nickel of "income tax" that is collected by the I.R.S. goes toward running the government. It all goes to the Federal Reserve banks. So where does the revenue come from to run the government? Why, it comes from Constitutional sources, e.g., "Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises." There is so much revenue collected by these means that Congress cannot Lawfully "spend" it all. What do I mean by that? I mean that the actual amount collected so far exceeds what is actually needed to run the government, Congress has to **give it away** in the form of *foreign aid, disaster relief*, etc. in order to stay within Constitutional limitations. That's **your** "money" they are giving away, and it's so much fun, they just keep giving away more and more of it every year.

Again I say, this financial activity has nothing to do with the "income tax" collected by the I.R.S. They are two separate activities. How do know that? It's not hidden. It's all there In one of the most formidable and intimidating tomes of facts and figures one could ever hope to find. It's called *the federal budget* put out by the General Services Administration, **not** the "summary" that comes out of the White House. You can take my word for it, or you can get a copy of the federal budget and figure it out yourself. I wouldn't place my trust in a C.P.A. to do it for you. He has a vested interest in the "taxing" system staying just the way it is. It's called a job.

There have been many books written about the I.R.S., the 16th Amendment, income taxes, and the like.

For example: a couple of private Citizens devoted a great deal of time, effort and money collecting certified copies of the official records from all the states involved in the 16th Amendment process to prove that it was not Constitutionally ratified. These fellows published a book containing all that proof called "The Law That Never Was." The evidence the book contains is indisputable. However, the courts refused to allow it entered into evidence in a subsequent I.R.S. case on the basis of relevancy or lack thereof. And the court was correct for so refusing. The primary reason for this will immediately follow. A secondary reason is that no attempt was made to address the fourth section of the 14th Amendment which was the **primary** reason behind its proposal. It says, in part that "the public debt of the United States ...shall not be questioned." Today, that equates with "thou shalt not question the Federal Reserve banking system" for which the I.R.S. is a *collection agency*.

There have been so many cases filed in the courts on these issues that several railway boxcars would be needed to hold all the legal briefs and related papers. The U.S. Supreme Court is now almost routinely refusing to hear any such case and I, for one, do not blame it. Why? Because from the very beginning the court said it in one simple statement, **the 16th Amendment created no new taxing authority**. All the court has done since is to say that same thing a little differently each time. The English language only permits a limited number of ways to communicate the same concept and I'm not surprised that the high court ran out of ways to say it.

So what does that statement mean? It means, quite simply, that the taxing authority originally delegated to Congress in the Constitution remained unchanged by the 16th Amendment. Yes, I know, the very next question is what **did** the 16th Amendment do or change, right? We need to add another recurring statement of the courts. The taxation system administered by the I.R.S. is a **voluntary** system. The taxing authority originally delegated to Congress is **not** "voluntary." So it seems that the 16th Amendment created a second **voluntary** "taxing" system that is independent of the system which Congress is authorized to use. Now we begin to see why Congress has never enacted the Internal Revenue Code as *positive law*, and never will. Congress doesn't have the Constitutional authority. If Congress doesn't have the authority and it's a **voluntary** system, from where does the authority to compel compliance come?

Yup, you guessed it. It comes directly from the body sovereign by means of **individual** Consent by contract. Ever see that word on an I.R.S. form? It has to be **voluntary** to be **enforceable** under **Contract Law**.

The evidence routinely used to establish your Consent by contract is that Form W-4 you sign, or are supposed to sign, each year. That is the authorizing signature sheet of the contract which authorizes your employer to act as a withholding agent and which authorizes the I.R.S. to **compel** your compliance to the Internal Revenue Code. The code contains the *specific performance* clauses of the contract. After the annual "tax return" is filed and accepted, the contract is completed and extinguishes by operation of Law. So each year you have to *volunteer* all over again and sign another Form W-4, which activates a new and current contract.

Without that signed Form W-4, your employer has no authority to withhold from your pay. Without that signed Form W-4, the I.R.S. has no Authority to compel your employer to withhold from your pay. The Lawful Authority must come from you, and it must come from you each year **voluntarily**. That is why the year is printed on I.R.S. forms. If you signed a Form W-4 only once and your employer has been withholding ever since, he has had no Authority to do so beyond your tacit Consent or Consent by silence.

If your employer attempts to coerce you into signing the Form W-4 by threatening to not hire or fire you, you then have the right to compel him to produce, if he can, his Article VI Oath of Fidelity and his Bond. All public functionaries who handle public funds must be **individually** bonded. I know of no *private* employer who would be likely to have either of those items. That makes him vulnerable not only to civil suit, but criminal charges as well. And **that** is the sort of issue the courts **will** entertain. In all fairness, you should realize that your employer is in the same boat as you are and, in most cases, would probably be inclined to ignore the whole W-4/withholding scenario if he knew how to do so without getting hammered by the I.R.S. If that is the case, make your employer aware of this handbook and urge its immediate acquisition. If it just won't wait, lend yours until the "urgent" need is handled. Whatever the case may be for you, use your own best judgment in the matter.

To those of you who **are** the employer, you simply discontinue withholding. The **voluntary** aspect applies as much to you as it does to your employees.

Contrary to what one might expect, it doesn't seem to matter whether you operate your business as an individual, a partnership, or even as a corporation. Sunbeam Corporation has never withheld from its employees, and I know of at least one major airline that doesn't withhold, if the employee refuses to Consent. Frankly; I'm not sure how a **corporation** manages that, but I suspect it has to do with a certain widow back in the 1940's who inherited a factory from her late husband and who refused to withhold from her employees. The I.R.S. took her to court three times and all three times they went away empty handed. They could not overcome her argument; which was:

- 1) Neither she or her company was under the Article VI Oath of Fidelity that is Constitutionally required of all public functionaries, including "tax collectors."
- 2) Neither she or her company was bonded to handle any public funds, as is mandatory under Law.
- 3) Neither she or her company was receiving just compensation from the I.R.S. for the "tax collection" work performed and, since no conviction of any crime was on any court record, neither she or her company was bound to involuntary servitude.

While this is **not** necessarily a valid argument against **state** and **local** taxing authority, the I.R.S. has never overcome that argument in or out of court. Whether you mail the I.R.S. advance notice or wait until they contact you to send them the above "explanation" doesn't really matter. The only *weakness* in this for you is if your business is wholly dependent on "government" contracts or frequent bank loans. In either case, I don't think I need to explain to you why that is a weakness. Not to worry though. The name of the game in this business is "c.y.a."(cover your arse) right? The simplest and safest way you do that is to discontinue withholding on any employee who refuses to contract or give Consent in the form of a **written** directive that you cease and desist withholding from their pay without their authorization or, alternatively, produce evidence of 1 and 2 above, which you will not be able to do. At the end of the year, instead of issuing them a Form W-4, you issue a 1099 Misc. which covers you with the I.R.S. and which has no binding effect on the employee without a signed Form W-4. Then if the I.R.S. contacts you wanting to know what is going on, you can honestly tell them, and **prove** it, that you did all you could to stay within the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code without running afoul of the civil or criminal Law with your employee.

In the event the I.R.S. directs you to withhold from that employee's pay anyway, without a signed Form W-4, you **insist** that the I.R.S. put that in writing and sign it. **If** they do, you then have a Lawful Right to demand that they place you or your business under **valid** Bond and the Article VI Oath of Fidelity. The I.R.S. has no authority to compel you to break the law with those two requirements. They won't be able to do either of those things and it will stop right then and there. Odds are very much in your favor that it won't even get that far. I'm just being thorough with this.

This all presumes that you haven't any desire to pull you or your business out of the **voluntary** "income tax" system administered by the I.R.S. If, on the other hand, you **do** so desire, the course you follow will not greatly differ from that which I have and am about to outline for both employer and employee. It depends largely on what **contracts** by which you and your business are currently bound in relation to the I.R.S. You will just have to use your best judgment on it.

There should be sufficient data herein for you to figure out the best way for your circumstances. The main thing to remember, is don't try to **fight** with them. If the I.R.S. gets insistent with you, simply go with the flow and tell them, **in writing**, "Why, I'd be delighted to be a tax collector for you, just as soon as you put me under Oath and a valid Bond and pay me for the work. No problem. How soon can you do that? You wouldn't want me to break any civil or criminal Laws, would you?" Get the drift of this? Getting mean, nasty or vulgar with them will only compound the problem. It's **their** problem, **not yours**.

Many of you, I know, fear or have a grave concern over the very real prospect of having your bank account(s) arbitrarily seized by the I.R.S. if you stop doing business with them. In that respect, they are required by law to follow the same claim/lien processes as anyone else. If they cannot produce a valid contract/Instrument bearing your signature **on demand**, their "lien" is not valid. In that event, your local authorities can most expeditiously declare the "lien" void and restore your property to you, probably with some degree of enthusiasm. The unfortunate part of this prospect is that you would have to go through the time, inconvenience, and expense to see it through. However on the brighter side, you would **never** have to go through it again. Okay, all you *employees*, we're going to get back to your part in all this, with the very next chapter.

Chapter 10

Although this is essentially a continuation of the previous chapter, we're going to narrow the focus a bit and get right to the nuts and bolts of it from the *employee's* vantage. This is for those of you who want to take home more of the pay you have rightfully earned. Be warned that there will be many others who don't want the system to change, who like to have all those "benefits" and "services," whatever those might be, and who are willing to pay for them. That's okay; not everyone wants the responsibilities of being a sovereign. It's their choice to make.

Some of these people will, no doubt, try to make you feel guilty or ashamed about "not paying your fair share" or some such rubbish as that. Just remember that while they are busy supporting the Federal Reserve banks with "income tax" and taking home less to spend, you will be spending **more**. And every time you purchase something, you will be supporting the duly Constituted government through legitimate, Constitutionally authorized taxes. So, in actual fact, you may well be far **more** supportive of Lawful government than **they** are! It would be ridiculous in **anyone's** eyes to try to label you as a *tax protestor*, wouldn't it? The only **genuine tax protestor** I've ever seen was at a filling station. There was a fellow there who was having a fit over the cost of gasoline and the amount of tax on it. **That's** a tax protestor. After he voiced his protest and got his breath back, he bought his fuel, just as everyone else was doing. Just thought you might like to know what one of those tax protestor creatures looks like, in case you ever run across one.

Those of you who have not ever signed a Form W-4 need only to keep it that way. Remember; it's a **voluntary** contract. The same will apply to those of you who signed one in a previous year, which is now expired, and haven't yet signed a Form W-4 for the current year. However, you **will** need to notify your employer to discontinue all further federal withholding. The next letter format is for that purpose. Those of you who **have** signed a Form W-4 for the current year are best advised to wait until the contract expires at the end of the year and then decline to sign thereafter. I advise this because about the **only** way out of an **established** contract is a claim of fraud/misrepresentation which is far more difficult to **prove** than one might think. Besides, the idea here is to pull away from the mob with the least amount of disturbance as possible to all concerned. People grow comfortable with a routine and it upsets them when you change the routine too aggressively.

If your employer tries to get you to sign a new Form W-4 before the previous contract is completed, just decline to *volunteer*. As soon as you are certain that the old contract is completed (that would be when you receive your "refund" or the I.R.S. receives your "deficiency" payment for the year) or that you are in no other way bound by any contract to the I.R.S., you prepare and **mail** to your employer your cease and desist letter formatted as follows:

Gabriel Hornblower
c/o postal service address:
4-A Divine Way
Sublimity, Nebraska CF68004CF

July 4, 1996

Prairie Seafood Company
515 Tornado Terrace
Sublimity, Nebraska CF68004CF
ATTN: Paymaster

RE: Notice & Praccipe, Cease and Desist Directive.

Greetings:

You will please take notice that I recently discovered that the "income tax" system administered by the Internal Revenue Service is a voluntary contract relationship evidenced by a signed Form W-4 for the current year. I have no desire to participate in said system and there is no current binding contract between myself and the Internal Revenue Service or its agents. Therefore, I henceforth deny any authorization for your company to act as a "tax collector" or "agent" for the Internal Revenue Service and hereby command you to Cease and Desist from any further/future federal withholding(s) from my pay.

You will please take further notice of the attached copy of my Notice and Praccipe directed to the Social Security Administration and amend those "collection" practices accordingly.

No answer to this instruction is required, but acknowledgement of compliance would be appreciated. In the event you are unable or unwilling to comply with this instruction, I shall alternatively require of you evidence of your Article VI Oath of Fidelity (required by Law) as well as the policy number and name and address of the underwriter of your Bond (also required by Law).

Respectfully,
(signature)
Gabriel Hornblower,
Nebraska Elector

cc: file

Keeping a copy of the letter for your own files/records, you mail the originally signed letter to your employer using a Certificate of Mailing, just as you did with the other letters. Nothing more is required of you In Law. However, your employer is very likely going to want to have a word with you. That's fine. Set up an appointment with him and introduce him to this handbook. Encourage him to get his own copy and read it. A second appointment could be far more productive if he reads the handbook first so you will both understand each other when discussing this matter.

If, on the other hand, your employer takes a "hardline" stance and threatens to fire you if you don't knuckle under; you could say something like, "That could get very costly in terms of the mandatory Bond and Oath of Fidelity you don't have." You are in a position to cause him some very serious legal problems (civil and criminal) and he knows it or will soon find out. Perhaps your employer says something like, "What am I supposed to tell the I.R.S. now?" You could point out, "There isn't a valid Form W-4 authorizing them to compel you to tell them anything about me; so you don't say anything until the end of the year when you issue a Form 1099 Misc. which is not binding on me, but it does protect you."

Now, don't be smug in your manner. You've got this fellow in a legal vise and you want his cooperation. That isn't generally accomplished by adopting a belittling attitude or manner. Be firm, but not hostile. It would be better for everyone if you can win him over to the idea of supporting our government instead of the Federal Reserve banks. This handbook is your best means of gaining that change. Let him make his own **informed** decision on the matter. It's his business. A word of caution here: if you belong to a union and/or work in a union shop, you need to make certain you are not bound to the I.R.S. through your union contract. If you are, you will need to disengage yourself from that contract **before** you send a letter to your employer. Since there can be such a wide variance on these matters, I'm not prepared to address collective bargaining contracts in this handbook. "Besides, a *sovereign* doesn't belong to **any** form of majority rule organization, which is what a union is. If you doubt that, refer back to Chapter 5 and re-read the portion addressing *political code*."

Assuming that you have sent all your letters (three so far) and that your employer is complying with your instruction, you are now, **In Law**, *unplugged* from the whole I.R.S. income tax system. In so doing, you have also reclaimed a large portion of your individual sovereign, status and authority **and responsibility**. You can't go run to the "big brother" anymore and expect him to lend a hand after you just evicted him from your home and your life. But that is what *American* is all about. That is what being **INdependent** is all about. **Self-Reliance** is the name of the game now. If you're up to that kind of challenge, it can be a lot of fun and is seldom boring. Life takes on a whole new sense of vitality and interest.

Odds are very much in your favor that you'll not hear from the I.R.S. again; and those odds grow more favorable as time goes on.

If the I.R.S. **does** contact you about this matter, it normally takes them 1 to 5 years to get to it. If they do, it will usually be in the form of a computer generated letter (often unsigned) wanting to know why you haven't filed a tax return and may threaten some sort of agency action against you if you do not comply. If this should happen, you can ignore the empty threat, but you **do** need to respond **immediately**. The I.R.S., like any other corporation, operates under Commercial Law (U.C.C.) and you need to respond within 72 hours of receipt of their letter to you.

As before, we're going to *go with the flow* on this demand and condition any *compliance* on certain requirements that you have a Lawful Right to require, and which the I.R.S. is **not** authorized or able to do. We are **not** going to challenge or try to fight them. It isn't necessary. Keep in mind that the I.R.S. has its own legal staff, not all of whom are stupid or incompetent. They most likely will advise their client to back off and pursue easier prey. They are in the business of **collecting** revenue, not **spending** it. Going after you would cost them a bundle and it's not something they have even a hope of winning. Always address your reply to the person who authorized or who signed the I.R.S. letter. If there is only a job title and no name or signature, then you address it to the job title, e.g., "Unidentified Investigations Officer." Your response is formatted as follows:

Paul Bunyan
c/o postal service address:
357 Magnum Road
Logtown, Michigan CF48025CF
July 4, 1996

Dudley Doright, District director
Internal Revenue Service
477 Michigan Avenue
Detroit, Michigan 48226
RE: Your file number XXXPORNO

Greetings:

I am in receipt of your form letter dated June 30, 1996 which was delivered today and must admit some perplexity as to the nature of its contents. First, it suggests that, I am obligated in some way to report or file financial data with your organization. I am unaware of any valid, binding and subsisting Instrument or contract bearing my signature which authorizes you to compel that performance of me. Nor am I aware of any such involuntary requirement imposed upon me by Positive Law.

Second, your letter suggests that I may owe some unpaid "tax" to the duly Constituted united States' government. I was unaware that your organization is authorized by Law to collect "tax" for that said entity. However; I could be mistaken, and I don't want to be indebted to anyone. Since I am unaware of any such obligation, prudence dictates that I verify the particulars of your claim. If everything checks out and appears to be in order, I will tender payment without question or hesitation. For that purpose, I shall require of you or your organization all of the following:

- 1) A Certified True Bill showing the exact amount I am supposed to owe to the duly Constituted united States' government; and

- 2) An itemized statement of account showing all goods and/or services delivered to me by said entity upon my request or demand; and
- 3) A Certified True Copy of the valid, binding and subsisting Instrument or Contract bearing my signature which authorizes this or any related collection activity; and
- 4) A Certified True Copy of the mandatory Article VI Oath of Fidelity for each individual in your organization who is involved with this collection activity; and
- 5) The policy number and name and address of the underwriter of the Bond(s) required by Law that insure said individuals in the handling of public funds; and
- 6) Positive identification of all real parties of interest to any valid Instrument or Contract which authorizes this collection activity, including all holders in due course on the Instrument.

Please send these items to me as soon as possible so I may attend this matter expeditiously.

Respectfully,
 (signature)
 Paul Bunyan,
 Michigan Elector

cc: file

As usual, you make a copy of this letter for your own records and mail the originally signed letter to the I.R.S. addressee. This time, you will want to use Certified Mail with Return Receipt Requested (the green card). Should it become necessary (not likely), this letter is the "proof" that you would use to show the local authorities that the I.R.S. has no basis In Fact or In Law for a lien or a Writ of Attachment on your bank account. Why? *Tax protestors*, as typically characterized by the I.R.S. and the media, do **not** immediately respond to such a demand with what amounts to: "Send me a bill and I will pay it." All the other items required by your letter are no more than would reasonably be expected of **anyone** when receiving an unfamiliar demand for payment or compliance. As far as *enforcement* goes, this is now a *no-win* situation for the I.R.S., because they either cannot or dare not produce all the items you listed. 99.9% of the time you will not hear from them again or, if you do, it will be a computer generated form letter showing an "amount owing" of \$0.00.

What about the other 0.1% of the time? Although they do make an effort to screen out the incompetents before they are hired, the I.R.S., like any other corporation of that size, will occasionally hire someone who has mostly vacuum between the ears. It is even less likely that such an individual reaches a position that would be dealing with your letter. However, it has been known to happen at least once before and, in that case, an unsigned Estimated Form 1040 was sent out as the reply. The form wasn't Certified as true and correct under any Oath and there wasn't any of the other required items sent along with it.

If you are one of those lucky few who can pull thousand to one long shots to you, and you get a reply of this sort to your letter, it's not difficult to remedy.

Immediately after receiving the bogus 1040, make a copy of it for your records and make a copy of the original letter you were sent by the I.R.S., as well as a copy of your file copy of your response letter. Put the copy of the original I.R.S. letter on top, the copy of your response in the middle and the bogus 1040 you were sent on the bottom and attach these to a cover letter or memo addressed to the District Director of the I.R.S. for your area or, if the idiot who sent you the bogus 1040 is the District Director, address it to the Regional Director for the I.R.S. in your area. The cover letter or memo is short and to the point. It will say:

"Please peruse the three items attached hereto and notify me as soon as possible if you or any of your office staff are authorizing this action."

Remember; the name of the game for these people is always going to be "c.y.a." This fellow isn't about to let a subordinate do anything that might get him demoted or fired. You will probably be sent a notice to disregard the bogus 1040, and that will be the end of the whole affair. If not, you have earned my congratulations for being the most successful victim in the history of mankind. However, there is one more step that can be taken to put this thing to rest once and for all. Using your own money or that borrowed from private sources (relatives and friends), go to the nearest post Office and purchase postal money orders in the amount shown on the bogus Form 1040. Do **not** use personal or business bank checks, drafts, or any other kind of money order than **postal** money orders. There are legal reasons for this which I will explain later. Also; do not sign or in any way mark or alter the bogus Form 1040. These postal money orders are going to be enclosed (not attached) in another letter sent to the representative in Congress for your area. Notice I did **not** say, "your" elected representative. The correct term for you is: designated agent.

Make the postal money orders out to: "United States' Treasury, Seat of Government, Washington, D.C. " **Do not use a zip code.** On the bottom line, where it says "used for," put: "Direct Taxes." Then fill in your own information on the other side. Again, do not use a zip code. The postal money orders are to be **enclosed** in your letter. The receipt slips go in your file record. **Attached** to the letter will be copies of the three pieces of correspondence between you and the I.R.S. in the same sequence as was sent to the I.R.S. Director.

Your letter is formatted as follows:

Helen Havapie
 c/o postal service address:
 101 Pumpkin Place
 Garden City, Kansas CF57488CF

July 4, 1996

Representative Gabby Blowhard
 House of Representatives
 Seat of Government
 Washington, District of Columbia

RE: Conditional Tender of Direct Taxes.

Greetings:

This is being sent to you because you are the designated agent in Congress for this area and because I am uncertain of the validity of the attached uncertified demand for Payment of direct taxes to the duly Constituted united States' government. I want to take care of this as soon as possible and would like you to review the attached correspondence copies at your earliest opportunity or convenience.

I have, in a timely manner, requested certain items in order to verify all the particulars of this demand and collection activity which have not been provided to me. Please attend to the production of those said items and, before sending them to me, peruse them and determine if they are genuine and valid In Fact and In Law. If all seems in order, I would appreciate it, if you would see that enclosed postal money orders nos. 52750793542 and 59260791543 in the total amount claimed are delivered directly to the united States' Treasury and a written receipt for same sent directly to me. Thank you for your help in this matter and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Respectfully,
 (signature)
 Helen Havapie,
 Kansas Elector

cc: file

After making a copy of this letter for your own file/records, mail the originally signed letter, with attachments and enclosures, to the addressee in the usual fashion with Certificate of Mailing. Then wait. That representative is going to return your postal money orders with a carefully crafted letter explaining why s/he cannot do as you requested. The **real** reason is s/he would be actively participating in and confirming a **criminal fraud** if s/he did do as you requested. You would have the *proof* of it. Odds are very high that word will reach the I.R.S. to back off where you are concerned. Whether or not that happens is of no great consequence. That postal money orders are a **valid tender** for public or private debt is **indisputable**. You now have all the evidence you need to show that you have, with *good faith* and *due diligence*, made a valid tender **which was refused**. By operation of Law, as well as statute, you are now discharged from the obligation. The I.R.S. isn't likely to go through all of this again for no better result.

After making a copy of the returned postal money orders **and** the receipt slips for your own file/records, take the returned postal money orders **and** receipt slips back to the post office where you obtained them and get a refund. The service fees won't be refunded, but the amount on the face of the money orders will be. Then, after paying back yourself or your loan sources, you may want to have a celebration party. You are now free of the I.R.S. and there is nothing more to be done, except for spending that extra take-home pay and supporting duly Constituted government.

Chapter 11

We are now ready to proceed with that portion of this handbook pertaining to *property taxes*. Unlike the **corporation** we know as the I.R.S., we will now be dealing with a Constitutionally recognized segment of government called **County**. Most of the delegated Powers of both national and state government are **given effect** at or through the County level. That puts a great deal of *Power* close to home, doesn't it? And that's exactly what the founding fathers intended. It's much easier for **We the People** to control government that way.

George Washington once said, "Government is not eloquence; it is not reason; it is **force** and, like fire, it is a dangerous servant and a fearful master." Congress can enact all the asinine statutes it likes, but if those statutes cannot be enforced at the County level, they don't have much *power*, do they? The deputizing power of the County Sheriff, the posse comitatus, acts as a formidable deterrent to the use of compelling force against a County. The same would apply to the states and their militias. The reason for this is, quite simply, the closer you get to the County level of government, the closer you get to the **body sovereign** and its "Castle Guard." The "Castle Guard" are deemed to be trusted or known "retainers" in immediate attendance to the sovereign, whose activities are presumably in **direct** view of and under the **direct** control of the sovereign. The English system of *shires* or counties had a very strong influence on this aspect of the concept even in America.

The County Clerk or Recorder is the functionary attending to the record keeping of the *court* of the *sovereign*. That is why all official records involving **property** are kept there. All the *processes* involving **property** and **taxes** must be handled through the **sovereigns' court**. The County Sheriff is the only legitimate "tax collector" in this country, because that is the only Office vested with Lawful Authority (within that county) to impound and **take** a property whether for taxes, eminent domain, or similar process. It may be others who direct the process, but only the Sheriff has the Lawful Authority to execute it. Unlike other "law enforcement" entities, the Office of the County Sheriff gets its Powers **direct** from the body sovereign. The qualified electors of the County may put him in Office, but it is the sovereign Electors to whom he is accountable.

There is much more to this subject of counties, and it deserves a textbook coverage. My only purpose in highlighting the sovereign aspect of the subject is to make sure you understand what and with whom you will be dealing. If you have an interest in this portion of this handbook, it is assumed that you own real property. Regardless of all else, that property is going to be situated within the surveyed boundaries of a county somewhere in this country. If it's **not** in this country, you picked up the wrong handbook.

Have you ever heard the expression, "A man's home is his castle where none may order his affairs?" That statement **presumes** a PRIVATE and **complete** OWNERSHIP of the castle. If you are in partnership with a lending institution whereby the property can be taken from you if you default on the loan contract, you do not have the authority of a sovereign over the castle. If that is your circumstance, you may not find much **useful** information in this portion of the handbook. In order to do what must be done in relation to property taxes, you have to own the property free and clear of any loans, liens or similar encumbrances. This is equally true of private or family trusts as well as private contracts with the previous owner. Why? Because "trusts" are deemed to be **fictions**, the same as corporations. As for a contract with the previous owner, as far as the records of that **sovereigns' court** show, he is still the owner until actual transfer of title to the property is recorded. And that isn't likely to take place until you've paid off the contract.

This paints a pretty grim picture for the majority of property "owners" in this country today. Those few of you who have managed to keep your property unencumbered may wish to make use of this information. Those of you who's property is hopelessly encumbered may wish to start over and rebuild a more conservative "castle" on more solid footing in terms of sovereign ownership. Those of you who are just getting started and wondering how you can possibly pay cash for a piece of real property with today's real estate prices being what they are, do not despair. There are still plenty of 1 to 20-acre parcels of what is regarded as "marginal" land in the more rural areas of the country, particularly in the western states. These parcels should be within your means, especially if you are industrious and if you no longer support the Federal Reserve banks with "income tax." You will need to stay away from loans, credit cards and charge accounts. It is mathematically impossible to outrun usury, which is what all "deficit" or credit systems employ.

Operating on a cash basis may be slower than you would like, but it is more certain to get you to your goal(s), and everything you acquire in the building of your "castle" will be 100%, **yours**. As a new sovereign, your kingdom may not amount to much, but nobody else is going to be telling you how to run it.

From this point forward it will be presumed that you own your property free and clear of any loans, liens or similar encumbrances, and that the title has transferred into your name which has been duly recorded with the County. It will also be presumed hereafter that you have pulled your voter registration and restored your sovereign Elector status. The reason for the latter condition is so there is no evidence of your Consent to **future** majority rule encumbrances against your property called **Bonds**. Do you remember the motto, "No taxation without representation?" If you do not participate in majority rule, you are not "represented." And if you are not represented, you cannot be taxed. That precept includes your property.

Neither can you reasonably expect the County to blade your road or provide or perform other services for you without being paid for it. It's a two-way street and you have to decide if you want to travel that way or another. It will cost you either way. The choice is: who do you want to do the job(s) and will they give you the best service for the best price? We see many examples today where government will contract the work to the private sector because it can be done cheaper and better. You can do the same or not. This is something you may wish to give very careful consideration before you make any decision.

How would the County operate if everyone did this? The **basic** functions would not change and are paid for by those who make use of them **when and as they use them**. When you use the services of the County Clerk or Recorder to record something, you pay a fixed fee for the service. When you use the court as a forum of redress, you pay a fixed fee. When you have the Sheriff serve some process for you, you pay a fixed fee. All the other services the County provides or performs today are what the qualified electors want and demand. They pay for it with salaries and the like. Let them. The basic Constitutional functions of the County Offices are set up on a **use as needed** and **pay as you go** basis and always have been. It may occur to some of you that the basic functions of the County are provided or performed by means of individual **contract** for each service. The U.S. Postal Service operates on the same basis, or is suppose to.

Getting your property free and clear of all financial obligations is the hardest part of this whole activity. Once that is done, eliminating property taxes on it is very simple by comparison. It is so simple that you may feel a bit disappointed or let-down after all this introductory build-up. Those property taxes you have been paying go toward revenue bonds which the qualified electors of the County approved by majority vote. The tax statement sent to you by the County will list each bond you are paying on. The first thing you do is take that list down to the County Treasurer or whoever handles the financial affairs for the County and tell them you may want to pay off the entire obligation. Ask them to tell you **in writing** what the *payout* amount is for each bond listed in relation to your property. Remember; these are usually **long term** bonds, so most of what's owing on them is the **interest** which you shouldn't have to pay if you pay off the principal amount early. The principal amount owing will probably be a lot less than you expect and may even surprise you.

Once you have a written payout statement, you need to decide if your budget can handle it. If so, you will need to come up with the cash for the total amount of all the bonds listed in the statement, either out of your own pocket or by arranging a **private** loan with a friend or relative. Then you convert the cash to **postal** money orders, not bank checks, drafts, commercial money orders or the like. There are two reasons for the exclusive use of **postal** money orders as explained in the previous chapter, they are **indisputable** legal tender for all debts public or private. The other reason is that the postal money order, by the terms printed on its face, is the only remaining negotiable instrument in this country (of which I'm aware) which is restricted to payment in *Lawful Money* by definition. *Lawful Money* and *legal tender* are **not** synonymous terms In Law. The difference is crucial for property transactions.

Both Congress and the courts have held *Lawful Money* to be equivalent to land in possession and fully capable of **extinguishing** a debt involving real property. *Legal tender*, on the other hand, is merely an **offer** of an exchange that has been made legal to offer. It may or may not be equivalent to land in possession and generally **does not extinguish** a debt In Law or In Fact. Federal Reserve notes, for example, have been made legal to offer (tender), but they **do not extinguish the debt**. They merely "discharge the obligation" to extinguish the debt. This means that **someone else** will eventually have to pay the debt.

This is another subject which deserves a **textbook** coverage and which I am not prepared to deal with to any extent in this handbook.

Next, you will need to prepare a *Quitclaim Deed*. Do not get lazy and try to use one of the stock forms available at most stationery stores. Those are **statutory** forms and the wording is insufficient In Law. Typed is best, but hand written (or printed) is okay as long as it is legible to anyone else. You will notice that in the sample format, the word "of" is not used in the **body** of the document whenever identifying the county and the state; e.g., _____ County, _____ State, **not** County of _____, State of _____ . This is a **sovereign** "form," **not** a statutory form. In the event you are challenged on that point, your response should be, "This has little to do with your statutory duties. It involves your Constitutional Duties. Are you refusing to perform them?" (Their Oath of Fidelity and their Bond are at risk in the answering of that question.)

As you prepare your own Quitclaim Deed document, those portions of the sample format which I have underlined will have to be changed (or filled in) to suit your own particulars, but the rest is to remain unaltered. Once you have reached the recording part of the document, you will need to conform it to whatever the local County Clerk/Recorder requires as sufficient to make the document recordable. It should not be very much (if at all) different than what appears in this format. The Quitclaim Deed sample format is as follows:

Quitclaim Deed

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS, That Lincoln County, Wyoming State, acting by and through it's Office of Sheriff and hereinafter called grantor, for the consideration hereinafter stated, does hereby remise, release and quitclaim unto George Freeman, hereinafter called grantee, and unto grantee's heirs, successors and assigns all of the grantor's right, title and interest in that certain real property with the tenements, hereditaments and appurtenances thereunto belonging or in anywise appertaining, situated in Lincoln County, Wyoming State, described as follows, to-wit:

(Put in the full legal (surveyed) description of the property here)

To Have and to Hold the same unto the said grantee and grantee's heirs, successors and assigns forever. The true and actual consideration paid for this transfer, stated in terms of Lawful Money "U.S. DOLLARS AND CENTS," is Twelve Hundred Forty-Three Dollars and Six Cents (\$1,243.06) tendered in the form of United States' Postal Money Order(s) serial numbered 62269723644 and 62260723646 as payment in full for all existing tax liens and similar encumbrances of Record against the above described property.

In construing this deed and where the context so requires, the singular includes the plural and all grammatical changes shall be implied to make the provisions hereof apply equally to corporations and to individuals.

In Witness Whereof, the grantor has caused its name to be signed and seal affixed by and through it's Office of Sheriff, the tax collection executor of same, duly authorized thereto by the Organic Law of Wyoming State, as embodied in the Constitution for same, this 4th day of July, 1996.

(seal) X _____
Sheriff for Lincoln County, Wyoming

STATE OF WYOMING, County of Lincoln) ss.

Personally appeared Sylvester Sixgun who is known to me to be the sheriff for Lincoln County, Wyoming and who, being duly sworn, did say that the seal affixed to the foregoing instrument is the official seal of his Office and that said instrument was signed and sealed in behalf of said County by authority of the Constitutional Powers vested in said office, and acknowledged said instrument to be a voluntary act and deed. Before me:

(Seal) X _____
Notary Public in Wyoming

My commission expires: _____

Lincoln County, Wyoming - Grantor
Lincoln County Courthouse
123 Main Street
Ashcan, Wyoming

STATE OF WYOMING)
) ss.
)

George Freeman - Grantee
c/o USPS address:
44 Magnum Road
Figtree, Wyoming

I certify that the within instrument was received for record on the ____ day of _____, 20__ at _____ o'clock __ M., and recorded in book/ reel/volume No. _____ on page _____ or as document fee file instrument/microfilm No. _____ Record of Deeds of said County.

After recording, return to:

George Freeman
c/o USPS address:
44 Magnum Road
Figtree, Wyoming

Witness my hand and seal of said County affixed:

X _____

By _____, Deputy

When you have the above document prepared and ready for signing, you will need to fill in the postal money orders. Make them payable to the " County Treasury." Do **not** use "County of" and do **not** use "Treasurer." In the address portion, do **not** use zip codes. As soon as you feel that you are ready, find a couple of competent witnesses to go with you to the Sheriff's office. The witnesses need to be at least 21 years of age and should not be related to you. You may also have to make an appointment in advance to see the Sheriff. If the Sheriff is competent, he should understand what you are doing. Even so, you do not assume it. Tell him that you are there to pay off all the tax encumbrances against your property and show him a **copy** of the written payout statement. Also tell him that the people with you are only there to witness and verify, if necessary, any refusal of your tender of payment in full.

If the Sheriff tries to send you to another county office to make payment, politely tell him, "I don't think that county officer is Constitutionally authorized or bonded to **collect** taxes. **You are**, or are supposed to be." Let him see the postal money orders, but **before** you hand them over to him, inform him that since it is payment **in full**, you will require the Quitclaim Deed be signed as a condition on your tender of payment. This is not an unreasonable condition to place on such a tender and the county has no basis In Law to refuse the condition if you are not a registered voter. If attempt is made to talk you out of it or to give you the run-around, you simply ask, "Is my tender being refused?" If the response is unclear, repeat the question until you get a definite yes or no.

It would come as no great surprise if the legal counsel for the county is called in for advice. If so, and if s/he is at all competent, s/he will know that if the tender is refused with witnesses present to verify it, the obligation to pay the remaining taxes owing on your property will be discharged by operation of Law. Besides, most **any** county wants your money. Odds are very much in your favor that they will accept the tender and sign the Quitclaim Deed. As soon as that is completed, take the Quitclaim Deed to the County Clerk/Recorder, pay the fee with postal money order or **coin**, have it recorded, thank your friends and go home. You're done. That's all there is to it.

If, on the other hand, your tender is refused, regardless of the reason, your friends will have to **each** sign an Affidavit stating exactly what was said and done in their presence (just facts, no opinions) which you will need to have the County Clerk/Recorder record. That will be your proof that you are discharged of the obligation. **Then** you are done. If the county later tries to place a tax lien or execute a foreclosure and tax sale on your property, you respond with an alternative Writ of Prohibition with those witness Affidavits in support of it. That will **really** put an end to it.

For those of you who have not ever registered to vote and have been paying taxes on your property, don't make the mistake of thinking you aren't obligated to pay them. When you bought the property (even if you paid cash for it), the **recorded** Instrument of transfer is going to contain language expressing your acceptance of all existing tax obligations against the property.

Those of you who inherited your real property have a similar problem in that there is no way for you to **prove** the Elector status of any previous **recorded** owner of the property at the time the Bond obligation attached to the property. Neither the County or the State keep voter registration records very long. Even if it was a family member whom you know with certainty never registered to vote, there is still no practical way to **prove** that knowledge.

This concludes this chapter. We'll address all the loose ends in the next.

Chapter 12

In the previous chapter I outlined the method by which you may free your property of tax obligations owing to the county and return it to **private** ownership. The method outlined is **not** intended for use in situations involving property located within the boundaries of a corporate municipality. most of **those** matters involve simple contract relationships for actual services rendered, such as water, sewer, and garbage. As for the rest of it, you're dealing with a corporate fiction, the charter for which comes from the **state** and **not** the **county**. I have no dependable **non-political solutions** to offer you beyond selling your city property and acquiring new property outside the property lines of any corporate municipality. That is not to say that a **dependable** method doesn't exist. It simply means that I'm unaware of any such method that is **non-political** and **non-adversarial**. Things continually change, however, and who knows what the future may bring.

Municipal corporations aren't all that different from other corporations in the business world, either in structure or function. The biggest difference is that regardless of how many "shares" (property) you buy, you are limited to only **one** VOTING "share" in the corporation of a municipality. The major liability of being a "shareholder" in a city corporation is that it makes you subject to a great many of those **political** statutes listed in Chapter 5 that you wouldn't otherwise be, whether you're registered to vote or not. The recorded Instrument of transfer of the property contains the language which binds you to the **political** statutes (Consent by contract).

There may be some who fail to see any advantage in pursuing the method outlined in the previous chapter, even if their property is outside the limits of a municipal corporation. I never once suggested that it was going to be without cost. What you save in dollars and cents is several years (or decades) of *interest* payments on the bonds. That amount will always greatly exceed the amount of principal owing. The elimination of annual tax payments on your property is of minor importance, however, when compared to the other advantages, most prominent of which is the recovery of your ability to be **undisputed** "king" over your own "kingdom." When your property is restored to PRIVATE ownership, it may as well be situated in a foreign country as far as all those political statutes are concerned.

Property which is under PRIVATE ownership, In Fact as well as In Law, is **outside** the venue or territorial authority of majority rule statutes. And it is **outside** the venue of any "court" or **public** office trying to enforce such statutes. When you require nothing of "government" beyond that which is guaranteed to you by the Constitutions (state and national), "government" can require nothing of you beyond that which is Constitutionally imposed. About the only thing the Constitution(s) requires of a sovereign Elector is that he exercise his sovereign Rights **responsibly** without causing **actual** injury, loss or damage to another. The civic duties imposed on the sovereign Elector by the Constitution(s) include: maintaining Law and Order in his area, keeping the peace, serving as a Juror, helping to repel invasion whenever necessary, and "instructing" the Legislature(s) from time to time. That's about all there is for the sovereign Elector.

When you have restored your property to PRIVATE ownership, all those land use plans, zoning ordinances, building codes, environmental regulations, endangered species requirements, and the like, stop at your front gate. They have no force and effect inside the surveyed boundaries of your property. It is equally true of many *equity devices* such as **injunctions** which may issue out of the "courts." The inside of your fence line is outside their Lawful venue. The only public official who can come on the property **uninvited** without being in TRESPASS, In Fact and In Law, is the County Sheriff (or his Lawful deputy). Even then, it must be for the purpose of serving a **valid** Warrant, Subpoena or Summons. For a Warrant or Summons to be valid it must be supported by and served with a Sworn Affidavit identifying a **non-fictional** "injured party" in Fact claiming an **actual** injury, loss or damage In Fact. Without the Sworn Affidavit, the Instrument of Process is **not valid** In Law, and acceptance of service may be refused. The only exceptions to this are: 1) serving Jury Process, 2) exercising the Power of Posse Comitatus, and 3) active pursuit of an escapee in flight. All other exercise of authority requires your individual Consent by contract.

Today, for reasons largely addressed in Chapter 7, we see the courts entertaining suits against individuals by environmental groups or agencies. In all such cases either the property involved was **not** under PRIVATE ownership or the individual being accused is a political "person" or both. I have yet to hear of such a suit involving any sovereign Elector enjoying PRIVATE property ownership, as I have described that status in this handbook.

Since "environmental" issues seem to be a popular media item, I'm going to give you a couple of examples to illustrate that there are always two sides to such issues. For the sake of making my point in an economical fashion, these two examples will both address the activity of mining in relation to "damage" to the environment. The common sense principles involved, however, will apply to **any** activity involving "the environment."

It has been previously argued (successfully) that placer mining operations are detrimental to the health of fish because the increase of solids suspended in the water reduce the ability of the fish to absorb oxygen through their gills. That is "true" as far as it goes, but it is **not** the **whole** truth. If that is all there is to it, one must wonder how fish managed to survive annual spring run-offs in centuries past. A great many of those "suspended solids" in the water are fish **food**. I have actually seen fish go into a feeding frenzy near placer mining operations to the point of trying to swim up the sluice box into the washing plant. The miners had to (**voluntarily**) install a screen to keep the fish from injuring themselves in the equipment. I did **not** see any fish die of "oxygen starvation", and there's nothing more obvious than a dead fish in a shallow stream. Additionally, the washing plants used by the miners employ high pressure spray nozzles which "oxygenate" the water in much the same fashion as many cities do with their water treatment plants. Remember what was said about *half-truths*?

It has also been argued that mining excavations are a surface disturbance that "degrades" the environment. This is a half-truth that borders on being an out-right lie. I once saw a "surface disturbance" caused by mining that just happened to be in an old forest fire burn area, all of which was being re-forested by natural seeding. The young trees were far more numerous and healthier looking where the soil had been "disturbed" by mining excavations than in the areas where it had not been so disturbed. Any competent farmer or soil engineer will tell you that cultivation of soil is **enhanced** by loosening and agitation of the surface because: 1) it *oxygenates* the soil, 2) it increases its water absorption capability and, 3) it more thoroughly mixes and distributes the various constituents of the soil. In many cases, the elements the miners **remove** from the soil are toxic to and inhibit the growth of plant life!

Bear in mind that I am not referring to the larger corporate mining operations. I'm talking about the multitude of smaller mom and pop mining operations.

Even if we were to lump them all together, do you think that all the obvious "damage" to "the environment" they may have caused would even come close to comparing with the square miles of land that have been buried under concrete and asphalt by the very same people who condemn them? I think not. I think it would take some very creative fabrication to convincingly "explain" how all those sanitary land fills and toxic/hazardous/nuclear/chemical storage sites are supposed to "enhance" the "environment." Did the miners do that too? I think not.

My choice of examples should make it more obvious that the rabid *concern* for "the environment" is not what the media or the government would have you believe. If the concern were **genuine**, the *solutions* would be of a different sort altogether. There are environmental limitations which cannot be long ignored, but committing national suicide isn't exactly a **viable** "solution." You don't *clean* the ship by sinking it. You break out the brooms, rags, mops, dust pans and pails and you apply liberal amounts of elbow grease. What that translates to for our immediate purposes is: apply liberal amounts of common sense when evaluating environmental problems and their solutions. One would expect a **responsible** sovereign to display an equal if not greater amount of common sense and respect for the environment of his domain as well as that of his neighbors. Be that as it may; when your property is fully under PRIVATE ownership, **none** may tell you how to go about managing it. If *the majority* doesn't like what you are doing with your property, they have the 'Constitutional option to **buy** it from you under Eminent Domain or similar process.

There will no doubt be a few readers who see this as a golden opportunity to set up for cultivation or manufacture of a controlled substance without worry of interference from the local constabulary. Up to a point that is true; just so long as the activity is confined to the property under PRIVATE ownership. Although there are many who would question the sanity of a *sovereign* who masturbates his mind and biochemically alters his personality, it is still his choice to make in his own domain. However, any attempt to *export* his "treats" **outside** the boundaries of his PRIVATE property is going to come under the scrutiny and censure of sovereign authority that does not share his views. In all likelihood it will result in the issue of a **valid** search and/or arrest warrant authorizing the Sheriff to come onto the PRIVATE, property and put the "castle" under "siege." The use of this information for illicit purposes is neither intended or recommended.

There are some who would say that the property is not entirely under your **sovereign** authority without having the actual **TITLE** to it in your own name; and I won't argue the point. There is a relatively simple way to bring the **original** Title to the property forward in your own name, but that is not a subject I promised to address with this handbook. I promised and have addressed "property taxes." Even so, it is only fair that I inform you that there is a way to perfect the title to your property **in your own name**. The information is available to those who ask. This concludes this chapter as well as this portion of the handbook. As always, it is your choice as to whether or not you want to make use of the information it contains.

Chapter 13

We are now going to embark upon a perilous journey down the information highways and byways of *traffic enforcement*. Of the three topics this handbook addresses, traffic enforcement is the toughest to explain with any brevity and it is the most difficult to approach from a **non-confrontational** angle. You can expect the greatest degree of resistance from state government on this subject because it is among the most lucrative revenue rackets they have going. It is also very much in accord with item 6 of that Communist Manifesto set forth in Chapter 7 of this handbook.

There has been a considerable amount of research and experimentation done on this subject and volumes of material have been written about it. Much of the information is accurate, but improperly understood and applied. These schemes mostly attempt to **fight** the system using its own political statutes. That's a *no-win* situation on the basis of jurisdiction alone. There have been some very clever methods devised to beat the system using the traffic codes, the rules of court, and the Uniform Commercial Code. Those who perfected these methods were successful, but when others tried to do the same, results were mixed and sometimes disastrous. The problem with most of these methods is that it requires an intimate understanding of a huge body of legal data that the average man or woman hasn't the capacity, time or inclination to learn.

Having acquired a large fund of knowledge about Law and law, and having examined a great many of these methods in detail, I can tell you with certainty that if you don't *win* on **jurisdictional** grounds **at the very beginning**, you aren't going to *win* at the end. A dismissal or an acquittal of the case *after it has cost you your time and money* is **not** a "win" by my reckoning. The only way that would be a win is if the final result is a *hands off* directive issuing to **all** traffic enforcement personnel. That can only happen if all doubt is removed that you are **not** subject to that **political jurisdiction**, which is a lot easier said than done for most people. And you will never see a **published** case in the law books where that change in status has been done. Do I need to articulate the reason for that? I didn't think so.

The Constitutions, both state and national, impose a duty and Power upon government to insure or provide for public health and safety.

The state has no other basis In Law or any other Constitutional Authority with which to justify many of its political statutes, including the vehicle code statutes. That **some rules** are necessary is an indisputable fact when one considers that an automobile in motion carries as much potential for mortal injury as a bullet in flight. What the automobile lacks in velocity, it more than makes up for in sheer mass. In that sense, one might regard an automobile in the same light as a firearm - a lethal weapon. The same care and caution needs to be observed in the handling of either.

All those speed limit and cautionary signs you see along the road are there for good reason. all those rules of the road are there for good reason. They have been developed over several decades and established, by Custom and Use, as optimum practice and conduct on the streets and highways. Then too, there are a lot of **unwritten** rules involving courtesy and manners which are not very much different than those observed between people meeting face to face. If you habitually abuse those rules, you can be sure that sooner or later someone will come along who can and **will** make you painfully aware of your deficiency in the social graces. A **responsible sovereign**, however, will seldom exhibit such deficiencies. Remember that.

For these reasons and on that basis of Law, the state **does** have the Authority to require that you submit to a **standard** test of **competency** in the **safe** handling of an automobile. Upon successful finish of such a test, the state could discharge it's duty by issuing a Certificate of Competency. There is no Constitutional Authority by which the state can Lawfully **convert** the exercise of a guaranteed **Right** to travel into a **licensed privilege**;; none whatsoever, UNLESS the **individual** sovereign *applies* for and gives Consent to a license. Remember; if the body sovereign did not grant the Authority to the state via the Constitution, the only other way the state can obtain the authority is from the **individual** sovereign Elector via Consent by **contract**. The same would be true of professional licenses, contractor's licenses, etc. A *Certificate of Competency* is a declaration of fact, and does not constitute a **contract** with the state.

An example of this is when an individual who is being cited for some traffic violation asks the police officer if the *acceptance* of the citation Instrument is **voluntary** or **mandatory**. If it is known that the individual being cited has no contract (license) with the state, any competent officer is going to say, "voluntary." IF the individual then **voluntarily** *accepts* the Instrument, he has by the act itself, given the officer the Authority to *present* it.

If, on the other hand, the officer knows that the individual **does** have a license, he will say that acceptance is **mandatory** "because that is one of the specific performance provisions in the contract, as set forth in the vehicle code statutes.

Don't make the mistake of thinking that if you don't have a license contract with the state you are free to go 80 MPH down a congested urban street with impunity. That is not only irresponsible by **anyone's** reckoning, it is reckless endangerment of lives and property as well as being a public menace. No matter how skilled you may think you are, if an animal or child darts out immediately in front of your four-wheeled rocket, you're going to end up taking a life or re-arranging the decor of the street. If you have an undeniable urge to fly low, join a racing club and use the facilities set up for that purpose. That's what, a **responsible sovereign** would do.

This would be a good time to point out how a **responsible sovereign** comports himself in public. Any *sovereign* who is worthy of that status treats his peers and his "servants" with dignity and respect, unless they give him an **intolerable** reason to treat them otherwise. It is important that you remember that whenever you are dealing with a police officer, a Judge, or any other public servant some allowances should be made for improper conduct because a true **sovereign Elector** is a pretty rare bird. Many of the public servants today don't even know what one is, let alone how to properly deal with one. If you want these people to treat you with the dignity and respect due a true **sovereign**, your public behavior will have to be exemplary and beyond any reproach. **Nobody** respects a snob or childish brat or an uncultured slob. And I might add that a **true** sovereign considers his HONOR to be **more important** than his immediate life. That is why, to this very day, there is no **criminal** penalty for dueling in most areas of the country.

Any organization as large as government has become is bound to hire a few "bad apples." There are few things more repulsive or more inducive of sovereign wrath than a bully behind a badge pretending to be a *peace* officer, or a judge who thinks he's above the Law. The majority of the people in government are, however, decent folks trying to do a job that seemingly gets more impossible every day. I, for one, am not inclined to hold them accountable for their ignorance. *Stupidity* is an entirely different matter. You will be able to tell if they are a "bad apple" by their conduct, so start out by treating each of them as a good guy and let their behavior determine how you treat them thereafter.

The sovereign may treat the servant with dignity and respect, but it is **never** forgotten **who is the sovereign**, and who has the Lawful Authority to discipline misbehavior.

Unfortunately, *law enforcement* seems to attract a much higher percentage of bad apples or closet bullies, largely because of the nature of the job. These people are in potential mortal danger every day, and that's bound to affect their attitude toward others. They are trained, for their own safety, to treat **every** encounter with an **armed** public as one which could end their life. When a cop approaches an automobile on a roadside stop, he has no way of knowing if the occupant is a responsible sovereign or a hardened cop killer, and allowances must be made for that. Once he has been informed, however, you can require an appropriate attitude and behavior of him. Thus, it begins with him assuming the worst and you assuming the best, and polite communication hopefully bringing you both to a common understanding. It is by this means you find out if you're dealing with a bad apple or a good guy.

You will occasionally encounter a third personality type in law enforcement. It is called, "Myrmidon." The term originates with the Thessalonian Tribe at the time of the Trojan war. It is a term which describes a soldier or subordinate civil officer who executes all orders of a superior without hesitation, protest, pity or remorse. The term has sometimes been applied to bailiffs, constables, etc. This is the guy who will poleax his own mother "without hesitation, protest, pity or remorse" if ordered to do so. This is the guy who is the government paid assassin. Fortunately, this personality type gravitates more toward organizations like the C.I.A., F.B.I., B.A.T.F., etc. than to local law enforcement. My recommendations on how to treat this type can be expressed in one word: extermination. Why? Because this guy is nothing more than a robotic killing machine who has no conscience and who has discarded all contact with his humanity. My choice of words is as dispassionate as his nature. You cannot reason with a robot of this type. Self-awareness is simply not there.

Before all you hot-blooded, patriotic Americans go out gunning for a myrmidon, let me say that most of you probably don't have the requisite skills to take one of these guys on. Leave that to the professionals. There are much more productive ways to expend your time, energy and talents right where you are. Helping to maintain Law and Order in your own community is a good way to start. Whether you believe it or not, this country cannot afford the luxury of another War of Independence which is where it is headed by all indications.

Those of you who **are** in local law enforcement need to realize that, by my experience, **most** of these "radical" patriot groups are only being "radical" because they are being actively **obstructed** in the restoration of their sovereign status. They are attempting, however poorly, to take sovereign **responsibility** for their country. If you were to make an effort to work with them in that endeavor instead of against them, you might be surprised to find that they constitute your greatest and most reliable resource in making your job easier. Without a doubt, there will be a few bad apples in **that** barrel also, but they tend to weed themselves out with proper organization. Don't get the idea that it's going to be easy. These people have been lied to, deceived and betrayed by government too many times for that. You will have to work diligently, genuinely and persistently to win their trust back. Do you have the backbone to take on that magnitude of a challenge? The reward will be proportionate to the effort you expend to that object. If nothing else, you should be most thankful that these people are not yet as "radical" as those who founded this nation.

By now, it should be obvious to most of you that this handbook attempts to address these topics as fairly and objectively as humanly possible, regardless of my own opinions, some of which are **very** strongly felt. If there is a little leakage, here and there, it is simply because those are topics which require a nearly inhuman exercise of will power to restrain the more emotional side of those opinions. As I stated at the beginning, my primary concern is keeping this ship of state afloat. At this point I don't really care who is to blame. We can deal with that later.

Some years ago I ran across a very profound statement, made by a modern day philosopher, which is apropos. He said, "There is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us that it behooves none of us to talk about the rest of us." Think about that the next time you read a newspaper engaging in character assassinations, will you?

I think we were on the subject of traffic enforcement. Let's move on, shall we?

Chapter 14

Traffic enforcement may seem to begin with that roadside stop to which you were so much looking forward. However, it begins much earlier. By now it shouldn't be very hard to guess what I mean. It begins with a Consent by contract (license) with the state. In order for a police officer to act with any semblance of **authority**, he must first **observe** some form of **evidence** that the chosen *prey* is subject to **political** interference. One of the first and most highly visible pieces of *evidence* is the vehicle **license** plate.

The vehicle license plate is pretty convincing evidence to most anyone that the contraption under observation is a **state utility**. The state has the authority to and does require that all of its mobile utilities be *operated* by **licensed drivers**. What's that you say? "That automobile belongs to **me**, not the state." That isn't what the **evidence** shows. Can you produce the actual **title** to the property to **prove** that it belongs to you? The "Certificate of Title" which **the state** issued to you is **not** the actual title. It merely *certifies* that the title may have been in your name at one time, but it **also** is undeniable proof that you **voluntarily transferred actual possession** of the title over to **the state**. It can't be certified unless you do. Want to know what the state does with those actual titles when they get them? They are either destroyed, voided on their face, or used as a form of collateral on state debts. Do I have to explain what all that means? Does the word *conversion* ring any bells?

That is why the state regards the use of an automobile as a political *privilege*. It is a privilege to use property which **the evidence shows** belongs to the state. The state may impose whatever conditions or restrictions it chooses to on the use of its property. The statutes do not, and Lawfully cannot, require you to turn over to the state the actual title to your property. The statutes only so require if you elect to **voluntarily license** the property. Do you need a *license* to use your home? Do you need a *license* to use your hair dryer or your golf clubs? Since some automobiles are now selling for as much as a small house, why would any sensible man or woman want to gift the state with the actual title to the property? Would **you** care to **voluntarily** gift the state with the title to your home? The police are there to supervise and regulate the proper use of mobile utilities belonging to the state, **not** the sovereign and responsible use of PRIVATE property.

If you went into a partnership with a lending institution to buy the automobile, there's not a whole lot you can do to prevent the title from being sent to the state. That is because lending institutions are political statute controlled fictions that are required to turn over the actual title to the state, license it, get insurance on it, etc. For those of you who don't know, the actual original *title* to an automobile is the Manufacturer's Certificate of Origin (MCO). If you pay cash for an automobile, you have a Right to demand that the MCO be given to you. As for used automobile purchases; some locales recognize the Bill of Sale as a **new title** but other locales do **not**. It is best to assume the latter in most cases.

The only other way, that I know of, to obtain an original **true** title that will be recognized as valid is to construct or assemble your own automobile using standard parts purchases from various wrecking yards. The state will have *retired* the V.I.N. of the automobiles from which those parts are taken. Once completed, you can make your own MCO for your "new" automobile. Most stationery stores carry stock MCO forms. Just fill in the blanks and record the MCO with your local County Clerk/ Recorder's Office. That will constitute an original **true** title to the property in any locale.

So before you go snarling at that cop who pulls you over "for no reason" or "without authority," realize that you are displaying his authority on your bumper. You might just as well go about with a sign hanging on your neck that says, "rape me." Like all such contracts with the state, the *license* contract is of limited duration. You could just let the contract expire, but you still will **not** get the original title to the property back from the state. It would not put the **evidence** of actual true title physically in your hands. When you are in *physical possession* of the property **and** the actual title, it is pretty hard to argue that the property doesn't belong to you. If you happen to have actual title to the automobile, it isn't advisable to carry it around in the glove compartment. You wouldn't do that with the title to your home, would you? Keep it in a safe place and use a certified true copy of the actual title to carry around in the automobile. That is acceptable evidence In Law as well as In Fact whenever you find it necessary to **prove** your ownership.

Yes, I know. The thought uppermost in your mind at this point is that if you go about without a license plate on your automobile, you're definitely going to attract unwanted attention. You are quite correct.

It upsets the local natives and the initial reaction of a traffic cop is going to be that you might be one of those rebellious political persons in need of some tender ministrations by the local traffic court. Probably the most **honorable** way to handle that would be to use a plate that simply says PRIVATE PROPERTY. There are businesses in many locales which make custom plates. Such a plate would accurately inform any traffic cop what he is dealing with. A V.I.N. or similar information on the dash where it can be seen through the windshield would enable positive identification of the property and/or owner In Fact. With so many specialized plates (exempt, dealer, disabled, classic, veteran, etc.) as well as *custom* plates being issued by the state, such a plate should pass largely unnoticed by the general public.

In addition to this, it would be a good idea to not give a cop any other excuse to interfere with your use of **your** PRIVATE property. That means keeping the property in good working order and diligently observing all those rules of the road, not because you are necessarily subject to the political traffic code statutes, but because it's just plain good common sense and safe conduct for everyone involved. If you **really** want to take the *sovereign* approach, **voluntarily** set a **responsible** example for others to follow in the safe and courteous handling of an automobile. Accident statistics make it very evident that the state isn't doing a very good job of it. Maybe it's time you display a little sovereign leadership, eh? This is one of the many small ways in which the sovereign can help the "servants" in the performance of their duties.

The concept of *title* and *ownership* by the state, as a fictional entity, does **not** extend to the highway itself. That highway is the *right of way* common to all and belonging to us sovereigns who in Fact paid for it. The state merely administers and maintains the highway in our behalf. By definition, the origin of *highway* is the sovereign right of passage over or through the countryside, formerly called the "king's road." The right of passage over the king's road was then enjoyed by all Citizens of the realm. Those who wished to use that road for personal gain or profit were **licensed**, policed and taxed for that *privilege* of **commercial** enterprise. This was justified on the basis that those who more frequently used the king's road for commercial purposes could help with the cost of maintaining it. Since commercial enterprise attracted and was more susceptible to highway banditry, the taxes also helped defray the cost of suppression of the bandits.

In addition to this was the sovereign duty to insure the **safe** passage of Citizens over the king's road. The most frequent use of the king's road for commercial purposes was the movement of livestock to and from market. Herds of larger size could be very destructive of the road surface as well as bridges and unfenced fields. Stampedes were a hazard any way you want to look at it. Professional handlers were usually employed to *drive* these livestock herds over the king's road and that is where the term *driver* originates in connection with the term *highway*. This same concept and the terms associated with it carried forward into this country and are still in use today. Those big rigs which use the highway for commercial purposes can be very destructive to road surfaces, bridges, etc. from excessive weight, size or speed of movement. When stampeded (out of control), they present a very real hazard to other Citizens using the king's road. Thus, it comes as no surprise that such commercial use of the highways of today entail licensing, policing, and taxation for the **privilege**. All of these terms, including "vehicle" pertain **only** to a **commercial** use of the king's road.

Those of you who own (have actual title to) your own big rig, own the load it carries, and are not *driving for hire*, are not Lawfully subject to certain licensing and tax statutes, but you will still come under the regulatory authority of the state in terms of safety and weight/size restrictions. The state is charged with that duty.

The *sovereign* does not *drive* anything. That's what he **hires** others to do for him. The *sovereign* requires no *license* (permission) to **travel** over his own right of way. In times of need, the sovereign's army has superior right of passage in order to rapidly deploy forces in defense of the realm. That concept **also** carries forward into this country. If you care to check the appropriations records from the Eisenhower administration, you will find that the **freeway** system in this country is designated as a system of "military corridors," supposedly for "defense" purposes. I say supposedly because it was the same bunch of people setting the policy for and orchestrating **both** sides of the Iron Curtain/Cold War scenario. Again, that is a subject that lies beyond the purposes of this handbook.

At this point, we've pretty well established that the primary reason for the *driver's license* is to supervise and regulate (police) the use of *mobile utilities* belonging to the state as well as the *commercial uses* of the highways. Why do you think that is the first thing a police officer asks for on a traffic stop? He needs to verify his authority over you or the lack thereof.

Even if you have no license contract with the state and tell him so, that still does not tell him your status In Law. Remember; if you are registered to vote, you are subject to **all** political statutes--including the traffic code. Even if you **are** a sovereign Elector, if the automobile you are in has license plates, he is justifiably going to want to know why you are using a mobile utility belonging to the state without a license to do so. The only way either you or he can obtain the necessary information by which to determine appropriate conduct is by communication. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that if you're going to go *sovereign*, you'll have to eliminate **both** *vehicle* and *driver's* licenses. The first divestment has already been covered.

Now we come to the question of how to divest yourself of the Consent by contract with the state called *driver's license*. Since the state isn't likely any time soon to start issuing Certificate of Competency instruments, the driver's license is about the only existing means by which you can obtain acceptable **proof** of your competency to safely use an automobile type carriage according to the standards set by the state in its discharge of its duty. Those of you who have never had a driver's license will need to obtain one in the usual fashion if you wish to travel as a sovereign. However, you **also** need to *qualify* your signature on the form, which will appear on the wallet card with your picture. You do this with a rubber stamp and black ink. **Before** signing the form, stamp the form immediately above your signature with a rubber stamp using the smallest point size lettering possible (and still be legible) to read:

Signature for identification purposes only; does not constitute contractual endorsement hereof.

or; Executed under necessity. Grant of sovereign power expressly withheld.

Either will preserve your status In Law as well as anything can. Then keep a clean record and let the license run its course until it expires.

Those of you who have a current valid driver's license need only keep your record clean and let the license run its course until it expires. Those of you who have had their driver's license *suspended* will have to do whatever is necessary to get it re-instated, keep a clean record on it and let the license run its course until it expires. The necessity of re-instatement of a "suspended" license is that it is a compelled performance provision of the contract and the duration (time) of the contract is also "suspended." The contract will **never** "expire" until the suspension is cleared up.

Those of you who have had their driver's license **revoked** by the state need to find another way to get about.

A revocation by the state is, for all intents and purposes, a declaration of incompetency according to the minimum standards set by the state. In my experience, it has to be a pretty extreme reason before the state will revoke a license, so you probably are incompetent or irresponsible or both. The object of this exercise is to obtain **proof of competency** according to the state's standards.

Regardless of which of the first three of the above categories you fall in; when the driver's license **expires** with a clean bill of health, take the wallet card (which is the **evidence** of the license contract, which is the evidence of **competency**) to your local County Clerk/ Recorder and have that public functionary make a **Certified True Copy** of it. There will be a fee for that service. Then put the original Certified Copy in a safe place and carry an ordinary copy or two of that in your automobile glove compartment. You do this in case you ever need to produce proof of competency according to the standards set by the state. You will then need to return the expired wallet card to the DMV state office or whichever state office handles licensing. Enclose it with a Notice & Praeceptum letter, containing your own particulars, formatted as follows:

Bernie Gumshoe
c/o postal service address:
7515 N. Vermont
Los Angeles, California CF90028CF

July 4, 1996

License/Account
No. 16172193

State of California
Department of Motor Vehicles
P. O. Box 932328
Sacramento, California 94232-3280

RE: Notice & Praeceptum, Contract Termination.

Greetings:

You will please take notice that I recently discovered that there are certain political liabilities which attach to the above numbered driver's license account which, if they had been fully disclosed to me at the time I was induced into the said Consent contract, would have dissuaded me from Consenting to same. As evidenced by the enclosed wallet card, which is being returned to you, said Consent contract is "expired" on its face. For these reasons and on that basis I am hereby expressly terminating said Consent contract and do hereby rescind my signature from and Declare void any and all forms, cards and Instruments which may evidence anything to the contrary. My sovereign Consent is hereby expressly withdrawn and reserved until further notice.

You will also forthwith please notify any and all interested parties of this termination action as well as direct/order that all forms, cards, documents and Instruments bearing my signature in connection with said account be amended to well and truly reflect this change. No answer to this instruction is required, but acknowledgement of compliance would be appreciated.

To the event you are unable or unwilling to comply with this instruction, I shall alternatively require of you evidence of your Article VI Oath of Fidelity as well as the policy number and name and address of the underwriter of your Bond.

Respectfully,
(signature)
Bernie Gumshoe,
California Elector

cc: file

Keeping a copy of the foregoing letter for your own file, mail the originally signed letter, with expired license wallet card therein enclosed, to the appropriate state office. Use and put in your files a Certificate of Mailing to prove, if ever necessary, that notice was in fact sent. In order for you to cash checks, enter certain establishments, etc., you are going to need some form of acceptable I.D. Most states issue picture identification cards that look much like a driver's license, but will have printed on the card, "Not a License to Drive." Couldn't ask for more than that, eh? Just go to the nearest appropriate state office and apply for the I.D. card. **Before signing anything**, restrict your signature with that rubber stamp that I mentioned earlier. With that stamped on the form (and appearing on the wallet card), nobody will be able to construe even an **implied**, Consent "contract" between you and the state for **any** purpose.

That's all there is to reclaiming that specific aspect of your sovereign Elector status. The method will not much vary when used for other *licensed* activities. It took you more than a couple of hours to get tangled up in all this, so don't expect to undo it overnight. With patience and diligence, you can get it all **properly** straightened out to most everyone's satisfaction.

If you are now wondering whether or not this frees you to drive your car without a license, the answer is **no**. As a **sovereign Elector**, you are free to **USE** or **consume** your **PRIVATE PROPERTY** or your **automobile** to **TRAVEL** or **move**, with or without **COMPANIONS**, for the purpose and act of **PEACEABLE ASSEMBLY** with others. The terms *vehicle, motor vehicle, drive, operate, traffic, passenger*, and the like, all belong to such **commercial** activities as are regulated and policed by the state through its *vehicle* codes. When you use those terms used in the vehicle codes to describe your activities, you are *testifying* that you are engaged in an activity that requires licensing. Discipline yourself to use the correct terms to describe what you are doing as a **sovereign Elector**.

Peaceable assembly occurs whenever two or more individuals are in close proximity to each other and interacting with each other in a manner that is Lawful. It makes no difference whether the activity is regarded as work or as play. **Traveling** (to and from) for the purpose of **peaceable assembly** are both Constitutionally protected Liberties belonging to the **sovereign Elector**.

Chapter 15

As I mentioned at the beginning of Chapter 13, traffic enforcement is an activity of which the state will most strenuously resist any change. It would be irresponsible of me to not give you some idea of what to expect and how to deal with that resistance **as a sovereign Elector**. After all, they aren't exactly giving courses on how to be a sovereign in the schools, and it is doubtful you received such training at home. **From this point forward, it will be presumed that you have done all the necessary steps thus far outlined in this handbook. If you have not done so, do not attempt to apply the material which follows.** You cannot straddle the fence, with one foot in the system and one outside the system. Those who have tried to do that generally ended up being made examples **severely**.

Dealing with cops and courts is something that most people go to great lengths to avoid. That is usually because they are uncertain of themselves and can be very intimidated by it all, especially when confronted with a *closet bully* type. Likewise, most people are or become mentally paralyzed, to various degrees, when appearing in court. I won't make any attempt to instruct you on how to deal with a courtroom scene. It requires a considerable amount of knowledge, certainty and understanding of Law, statutes, and procedures, as well as a quick wit and good duplication and evaluation of incoming data. It's not something you can memorize in advance. Most people aren't going to be able to handle that very well no matter how *sovereign* they are. Besides, as I told you earlier, the sovereign **acts** and **commands**, and Wages his Law with **Writs** and **Affidavits**. You don't have to be a Perry Mason for that.

Of all the many methods tried and developed in the handling of cops and courts, what I am suggesting herein is, in my estimation, the approach that is the most successful and, at the same time, the least confrontational or adversarial. A lot depends on the attitudes and knowledge of the people involved in each instance. Until the information in this handbook becomes widely known and applied, it's a pretty safe assumption that you are going to experience at least one roadside stop concerning your lack of license plate and driver's license.

When **you** are the *sovereign*, it is most appropriate for **you** to **initiate** the conversation during a traffic stop.

If the officer beats you to it with his request to see your license, you'll just have to exercise bad manners, ignore the request, and ask him the "Big Q" which is, "**what is your probable cause for this stop?**" It is better if you ask the Big Q politely. Belligerence will only needlessly antagonize him. You'll find out soon enough if he is one of the closet bully types and, if so, you can thereafter get as firm with him as seems necessary. As a sovereign Elector, you have the Power and Authority to cost him his job for misconduct and he knows that or should know it. Do not threaten him and avoid the use of vulgar language with him. That is behavior unbecoming of a sovereign and it is not necessary between civilized beings.

It is important to remember that police officers are in contact with a lot of people, day in and day out, many of whom try to (and **intend** to) impede the officer in the performance of his duties for no better reason than that of making his job more difficult. Thus, it is not uncommon for police officers to cynically regard these types as "sidewalk lawyers" because these types, as a general rule, are anything but **sovereign**. So don't be surprised if, in response to the Big Q, the officer *tests* you by saying, "I don't need probable cause." In most cases, he doesn't. Now it is incumbent upon you to politely but firmly inform him, "**With me, you do. Now, what is your probable cause for this stop?**" With that statement you have just informed him of your status as a **sovereign Elector**, because that is the only status In Law to which the Constitutional protection of *probable cause* applies. Additionally, you have asked the Big Q for the **second** time. If you ask the Big Q a **third** time and it goes unanswered, it is presumed that probable cause doesn't exist and that the officer is acting outside the scope of his Constitutional Authority, protections and immunities. When that occurs, he is subject to civil liability and his bond may be liened.

In order to satisfy the Constitutional requirements of probable cause, the officer must have *reasonable suspicion*, by his own **direct observation** or that of a complaining witness, that you have just committed, are in the course of committing, or are obviously about to commit a **crime**. When you ask for probable cause for interfering with you, you are primarily asking the officer to **name** or **identify** the **crime** involved. Nearly all *traffic violations* are classified as *infractions* which are **not** "CRIMES" and will **not** support probable cause authority. If the officer attempts to justify his interference by citing one of the traffic *infraction* statutes, you simply ask, "Is that a **crime** in this state?"

He will then have to admit that it is not a crime whereupon you can say to him, "Then you have not given me probable cause for this stop. For the **third** and **final** time, what is your probable cause for interfering with me?"

The only other basis the officer may have In Law for probable cause is that of serving a valid Warrant of Arrest on an individual matching your description. If probable cause is in fact stated, the officer has properly established his authority to interfere with you in an official capacity. If probable cause has **not** been stated, you are under no obligation In Law to even identify yourself to the officer. He knows that or should know it if he's competent. If you're dealing with one of the good guys, the conversation seldom goes very much further than that. The officer may tell you he made a mistake and to have a nice day. You should be gracious in your reply. Alternatively, he may say something like the only reason he stopped you was to tell you that one of your tail lights is burned out. It would be appropriate for you to say, "Thank you. I will attend to it immediately. Can you tell me where is the nearest parts vendor?" Then **attend** to it.

If, on the other hand, you are dealing with one of the closet bully types, you can expect a complete disregard for probable cause and a stubborn insistence that you produce a driver's license or otherwise identify yourself. In extreme cases (they are **rare**), he may even get threatening or verbally abusive with you. In such a case it would be foolish to provoke him further because he is armed and obviously not very rational at that point in time. There are many ways to deal with this type at a later time. If that is your situation, you can simply identify yourself to him or you can point to the dashboard and tell him that all the information he needs is there to be read through the windshield. Do not try to reason with or argue with this type of mentality. Your conversation should be restricted to asking for the probable cause and, if that is disregarded, informing him that he is acting outside his Lawful Authority, and nothing else. The latter "notice" to him establishes *malfeasant intent*. In all likelihood, he is going to issue you one or more traffic citations. Don't berate yourself because of someone else's stupidity. You've done all that is humanly possible to do at this stage. You have yet to use the most powerful *weapon* in your Constitutional *arsenal*.

Many locales require you to sign the citation or be hauled off to the local hoosegow for booking.

The reason for that is not a bit different than that of getting you to sign any other government form. They have no Constitutional Authority, so they must obtain it from **you** by a **direct** Consent contract. Your signature on the citation authorizes its issuance and authorizes the traffic cop to *present* it to you. It is the **evidence** of your APPARENT **voluntary acceptance** of the instrument UNLESS you *qualify* your signature. To avoid unwanted confrontation, go ahead and sign the citation. But **before** you sign it, **print** immediately above your signature "**Under Duress, vi et armis,**" or just "**vi et armis**" is sufficient. This is another Latin phrase which translates as and means "by force of arms." Now the citation will be evidence that your "Consent" was obtained by **armed assault**. Armed arrest without Lawful Authority is In Fact armed assault.

If you happen to be in a locale that does **not** require you to sign the citation, ask the officer if your acceptance of the instrument is mandatory or voluntary. If he is competent, he will tell you it is **voluntary**; whereupon you say to him, "I don't volunteer. Please don't litter the highway." Go on about your business. The citation is then usually mailed to you. So in either event, you're going to end up receiving a traffic citation. That's fine. We will now pull out that *Big Gun* in your Constitutional *arsenal*.

Before we move on, it should be noted that what has been outlined for you to do and say in the event of a traffic stop is the necessary **bare minimum**. If you do not think you can handle even that much, you may want to reconsider your decision to be a *sovereign* on the "king's road." There are many attributes to being a sovereign; timidity with the hired help isn't one of them.

The "Big Gun" addresses the very framework of our form of government. It's called **Separation of Powers**. It is **expressly** stated in most state Constitutions and is clearly implicit in the remaining few that do not, as well as the national Constitution. The form of its expression in the Supreme Law of each state remains constant from state to state, and it goes something like this:

The powers of government of this state are divided into three distinct departments: The legislative, the executive and the judicial, and no person or collection of persons charged with the exercise of powers properly belonging to one of these departments shall exercise any powers properly belonging to either of the others, except as in this Constitution expressly directed or permitted.

What that says is so unequivocal that I need not belabor it. However, not everyone is aware of the fact that, in addition to the Article VI Oath of Fidelity required of all public servants, nearly all public offices **also** require an Oath of **Office** which, in most locales, is embodied with the Oath of Fidelity. The Oath of a **Judicial** Officer is **DIFFERENT** than those for the other two branches of government. The Oath by which a police officer is bound is an **Executive** Oath and is **DIFFERENT** than the other two branches of government. The same is true of the Oath for a **Legislative** Office. If a public servant is bound by Oath to exercise one of these powers of government, he is **expressly forbidden** from exercising the powers belonging to the other two. The reason for all of this is probably best expressed in the Constitution for Wyoming at Article I, Section 7: "**Absolute, arbitrary power over the lives, liberty and property of freemen (sovereign Electors) exists nowhere in a republic, not even in the largest majority.**"

What you have experienced with the traffic citation is a **direct** violation of that "Supreme Law" requirement of **Separation of Powers**. The traffic citation directs you to "appear" in what is a Constitutionally designated **Judicial** tribunal or "court." It will also unavoidably have the word "SUMMONS" printed somewhere on the front or back. Those two elements appearing in the same instrument make it a **Judicial instrument** the use of which is reserved **exclusively** to the **Judicial Power** of government. To be valid In law it must either bear the official **Seal** of that court or the endorsement (signature) of an officer of that court who is bound by **Judicial Oath**.

The only official signature on that **Judicial** Instrument (citation) is that of the police officer who is under **Executive** oath. The police officer, as an **executive** officer, may be Constitutionally empowered to **serve** a Judicial Instrument, but s/he is not so empowered to **issue** or "authorize" such an Instrument. And the Supreme law of the state **expressly forbids** the Legislative Power from authorizing (by statute) the Executive power to exercise Judicial Power(s). "False Personation" of a judicial or public officer is a **crime** under both national and state Law. And you have the indisputable **proof** of that crime (the citation) in your possession. Anybody care to guess the direction we're going to go with this? I didn't think so.

We'll address the how-to nuts and bolts of that in the next chapter of this handbook. In the meantime, thoroughly digest the information you have just been given.

Chapter 16

The revenue racket known as *traffic enforcement* is operated according to commercial law (U.C.C.) because it involves Contract Law in relation to **commerce**. In keeping with the requirements of the U.C.C., you need to do something about that citation within 72 hours of receiving it, and preferably within 24 hours. The date set for an "appearance" on the citation is deliberately set **after** the time allowed by the U.C.C. for "timely" challenge has **expired**. The state takes no chances. As always, we do not cite the U.C.C. as "authority," but we **do** meet its requirements in order to eliminate any possibility of a future claim of "defect." We're going to plug **all** the holes **before** we put this boat in the water.

Immediately after you have enjoyed the thrill of a roadside stop and collected your evidence (the citation), you need to find out the name of the judge of the court appearing on the face of the citation. This can usually be done with a quick telephone call to the court clerk. Then prepare a letter addressed to that judge and court, containing your own particulars, following this format:

Larry Leadbottom
c/o postal service address:
2-A Slow Lane
Idle, Indiana CF46461CF

July 4, 1996

Judge Jerome Judas
District Court for Indiana
15 Justus Square
Peacock, Indiana 46005

Ref: Summons No.
§ 27182
also known as:
"traffic citation"

RE: Notice & Praecipe, Judicial Determination - Production of Instrument.

Greetings:

You will please take notice that yesterday I was, by force of arms, served/ presented with the above referenced "summons" by executive officer Ralph Rookie. Since there is no official Seal of the named court affixed to the document and no endorsement by a judicial officer of that court appearing therein, its validity In Law is very much in question. Before I can proceed further in this matter, I shall require a Judicial Determination as to whether or not the said document is In Fact a Judicial Instrument and, if so, whether or not the separation of powers requirement of the Supreme Law of this state authorizes Ralph Rookie, who is an executive officer, to endorse and issue a Judicial Instrument. It is my understanding that false personation of a judicial officer is a crime under both state and national Law. In the event you are not Constitutionally empowered to make a Judicial Determination, as set forth hereinabove, you are hereby commanded to forward the matter to a tribunal that is so empowered for that purpose.

You will please take further notice that in the event the said "summons" is In Fact a "commercial presentment," you are hereby commanded to produce or cause to be produced the valid, binding and subsisting Instrument, bearing my signature, which authorizes this collection activity; including positive identification of all real parties in interest to said Instrument as well as the holders in due course thereto. It is my understanding that failure to timely produce such an Instrument on timely demand, discharges any obligation claimed by operation of Law.

It is my further understanding that you may also perform ministerial acts. In the event you proceed in a ministerial capacity in this matter, I shall also require a true copy of your Article VI Oath of Fidelity, your Oath of Office, and the policy number, name and address of the underwriter of your Bond.

A copy of said "summons" is enclosed herewith for your convenience. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Respectfully,
(signature)
Larry Leadbottom,
Indiana Elector

1 enclosure
cc: file

This letter is, for the most part, self-explanatory. Whether acting in a **Judicial** capacity or in a **Ministerial** capacity, the Lawful course for the judge to take is to dismiss the citation. If s/he disregards all of this and proceeds against you, then we are much closer to a **second** War of Independence than I thought. The courts of today may no longer recognize Constitutional Law, but as far as I know, they are still following commercial law. With this letter you just outfoxed them under that law as well. The instrument you are commanding be produced is the valid Contract (license) signed by you, which they will not be able to do. Under the U.C.C., that discharges you from the obligation to pay or to perform. Under commercial law, that "citation" is, in effect, no different than any other "bill" you might get from a creditor.

When a judge acts in a **Ministerial** capacity, s/he enjoys absolutely no **Judicial** "immunity" and can be liened, sued, etc. The portion in the letter which addresses that subject is there primarily as a reminder of that fact. When you have the letter prepared and signed, you will need to make a copy of it for your own file record. You will also need a copy of the citation (front and back) to enclose with the originally signed letter. Fill out a postal Return Receipt Requested, (green) card and mail your letter to the court via **Certified mail** as soon as possible. Whichever way it goes, you will be notified by mail. If clarification is requested, **immediately** respond with a letter of your own design, but keep it strictly to the two main issues. If it's **Constitutional** where is the authority to circumvent the separation of powers requirement?

If it's **commercial**, where is the valid Instrument authorizing the collection activity? Nothing else matters.

Those of you who receive a citation through the mail may be surprised to find that it will usually have a judicial officer's signature on it as well as that of the traffic cop. That eliminates the separation of powers challenge. Not to worry. It is, after all, a **commercial presentment** as far as the state is concerned. So your letter will only address that issue and should be formatted as follows:

Shirley Madd
c/o postal service address:
3030 Winchester Way
Sureshot, Montana CF85114CF

July 4, 1996

Judge William Cody
District Court for Montana
4-A Commercial Way
Robber's Roost, Montana 85119

Ref: "traffic citation"
no. C 39155

RE: Notice & Praecipe, Production of Instrument.

Greetings:

You will please take notice that yesterday I received by mail your presentment styled as "traffic citation no. C 39155." You are hereby commanded to produce or cause to be produced the valid, binding, and subsisting Instrument, bearing my signature, which authorizes this collection activity; including positive identification of all real parties in interest to said Instrument as well as the holders in due course thereto. It is my understanding that failure to timely produce such an Instrument on timely demand, discharges any obligation claimed by operation of Law and statute. Since you are obviously acting in a ministerial capacity, I shall also require of you a true copy of your Article VI Oath of Fidelity, your Oath of Office, and the policy number, name and address of the underwriter of your Bond.

I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Respectfully,
(signature)
Shirley Madd,
Montana Elector

cc: file

Follow the same instructions as previously outlined; except you will not need to enclose a copy of the citation. In either of these cases, if the courts are still following commercial law as they are supposed to, you should receive notice of "dismissal" in the mail not long after that. Additionally; it is very probable that a directive will be placed in the state's computer file on you instructing all law enforcement personnel to not interfere with you unless an actual **crime** is involved.

As I indicated before, if the courts are no longer even abiding by commercial law, then the courts are entirely **lawless**. In that case you have three choices: 1) run and hide, 2) prepare for war, or 3) send the judge a tube of K-Y jelly so that when he "legally" rapes you it will be less painful.

I hope you will excuse the use of a more base literary form in that last comment. My intent is to "shock" you into realizing that we are dangerously close to having **lawless** government in this country. I have, to the best of my ability, fulfilled my promise to address the subjects of I.R.S., property taxes and traffic enforcement with this handbook. I hope you found it enlightening and maybe even a little entertaining. Use the information it contains or not. That is still, for a little while longer, your choice to make. Make the most of it.

Your friend,

UNCLE GUS

The Survivor

Epilogue

Although Uncle Gus used a lot of \$2.00 words in this handbook and refrained from using \$20.00 words, he did slip in a few \$8.00 and \$13.00 words. A glossary has been added for those who do not have or don't know how to find a dictionary. It will immediately follow this epilogue. Words having more than one meaning will only be defined according to their use in this handbook. As for a bibliography of sources, that would require a book larger than this handbook. You'll just have to find that for yourself. You might start with the Constitutions for your state as well as for the United States of America. It was hard enough to get Uncle Gus to sit still long enough to write this handbook. Let's not push it, eh?

This handbook probably raised as many questions as it answered. If you haven't the time or energy to find the additional answers for yourself, you can always write to Uncle Gus about it. However, his life is of limited duration and, like a fixed amount of money, every minute *spent* is a minute irretrievably **gone** from his *treasury*. His time is very precious to him. If you want him to spend **his** time to **your** benefit, you will need to entice him with some Lawful coin of the realm. For no more than it cost you, this handbook is a real bargain. The value of the information it contains is measured well beyond mere dollar cost. You can always be sure to obtain good value in any dealings with Uncle Gus. He's a bit old fashioned in that regard.

For those of you who intend to put the information in this handbook to use, Uncle Gus invites you to share your experiences with him. He is always interested in how well you are doing with it. The address by which you can reach him by mail will be given at the end of this handbook. Those of you who would like Uncle Gus to write another how-to book about different but related subjects, such as expelling the state from a marriage contract or bringing the original title to your property forward in your own name, or the like, will need to let him know what you would like him to write about or what you think such a book should contain. You may not always agree with what he writes and even he does not always agree with what he writes, but you can be sure that the information is accurate and sensible.

You are cautioned not to go on any *crusades* with this information. *Murtyrdom* is no longer in vogue or effective. If it is your desire, share this information with your family and friends. Encourage them to obtain their own copy of this handbook **directly** from Uncle Gus.

Drawing undue or unnecessary public attention to yourself defeats the non-confrontational aspect of this handbook. Attend to the needs of your family first, **then** attend to community and country. The family unit was the basic building block for this nation. Repair that and you will repair the country.

GLOSSARY

Accroachment - An attempt to exercise or usurp power or authority belonging exclusively to the sovereign. Originally in reference to a royal status or position.

Altruistic - Characterized by an unselfish devotion to the welfare of others with or without an obligatory motive.

Analogy - A similarity or resemblance between things not otherwise identical. Expression of a concept by similar example.

Appurtenant - Appertaining or belonging to something.

Apropos - Suited to the time, place or occasion; pertinent.

Articulate - To express clearly in words.

Asinine - Of or like an ass. Silly, thoughtless, stupid, etc.

Aversion - Extreme dislike; repugnance; antipathy.

Behoove - To be fit, needful, or right for; used impersonally.

Berate - To scold harshly.

Blatant - Obtrusively obvious.

Brevity - Condensation of language; conciseness.

Circumvent - To avoid by or as by going around; bypass.

Constabulary - Constables (peace officers) of an area, collectively.

Conversion - An unauthorized assumption and exercise of the right of ownership over goods or personal chattels belonging to another, to the alteration of their condition or the exclusion of the owner's rights.

Corporate municipality - A public corporation, created by government for political purposes, and having subordinate and local powers of legislation.

Coup de Grace - A death stroke, as to one mortally wounded or suffering; a finishing stroke.

Covert - Concealed; secret; hidden from view.

Disparage - To speak of slightly; undervalue; to bring discredit or dishonor upon.

Divest - To strip; to remove a vestment. To deprive, as of rights, privileges, immunities, power, etc.

Eloquence - Graceful, articulate, and convincing expression.

Epilogue - A concluding section, as of a play or novel.

Ethic - A guiding principle of thought or conduct which experience has shown produces or is capable of producing optimum effect.

Euphemism - Affected elegance in language.

Exemplary - Serving as a model or example worthy of imitation; commendable. Serving to exemplify.

Expediently - In a manner that is quick or speedy.

Facade - A false or deceptive look or manner.

Fait accompli - A thing done beyond recall or opposition.

Fidelity - Faithfulness in honoring an obligation, vow, duty, pledge, Oath, etc. Strict adherence to truth or fact.

Foment - To stir up or incite, as rebellion or discord.

Format - The form, size, content and general style of a book or other publication. Used also to describe a written or printed document provided for the purpose of illustration or example.

Frugal - Exercising economy; saving; sparing.

Gullible - Easily duped or deceived.

Gumption - Initiative; enterprise; spirit.

Hoosegow - Slang term for jail or police precinct house.

Illicit - Not permitted; unlawful.

Immutable - Not changing or altering; unchangeable.

Implicit - Implied or to be understood, but not specifically stated. Virtually contained or involved in, though not immediately apparent or stated; inherent.

Impunity - Freedom from punishment or from injurious consequences.

Indelibly - In a manner or by such a means that cannot be removed, erased, etc.

Indigent - Needy; poor. In lack or want.

Indoctrination - To instruct in doctrines without regard or question to their relative value or usefulness.

Invert - To turn upside down or inside out. To change to the opposite.

Jurisdictional - Of or pertaining to the lawful right to exercise official authority. The range or scope of such authority - also designated as "venue."

Kaka - Slang term for feces or excrement.

Locale - Locality; a definite place, location or position.

Lucrative - Productive of. wealth; profitable.

Ludicrous - Exciting laughter because absurd, incongruous, ridiculous, etc.

Malfasant - With an unlawful or wrongful intent.

Mandated - Commanded or ordered by superior authority.

Maxim - A brief statement of a practical principle or proposition.

Meticulous - Extremely or excessively careful about details.

Mettle - Inherent quality of character.

Nepotism - Favoritism by those in power toward relatives, especially by appointing them to desirable positions.

Noxious - Causing or tending to cause injury to health or morals; poisonous.

Peeve - To make or become peevish or irritable.

Placer - A deposit of sand, gravel, etc. containing gold or other mineral in particles that can be isolated by washing.

Podium - A raised platform usually with some means of supporting written or printed material at a height that facilitates easier reading by whomever is standing on the platform.

Poleax - A medieval battleaxe. To strike or fell with a poleax.

Posse Comitatus - Translates from Latin as "power of the county;" said in reference to all able-bodied men within a county capable of bearing arms and subject to attend the sheriff in time of need or emergency.

Precept - A prescribed rule of conduct or action.

Psychopolitics - The art and science of asserting and maintaining dominion over the thoughts and loyalties of individuals, officers, bureaus, and masses, and the effecting of the conquest of enemy nations through "mental healing."

Rabid - Unreasonably zealous; fanatical.

Rationale - A logical basis or reason for something. A rational exposition of principles.

Rectify - To make right; correct; amend.

Reiterate - To say or do again.

Remiss - Lax or careless in matters requiring attention.

Reproach - To charge with or blame for something wrong; rebuke. A cause of shame or disgrace.

Repudiate - To refuse to accept as valid, true, or authorized; reject.

Rescind - To cancel or make void, as an order or an act.

Scenario - An outline or plan of a projected series of actions or events; includes use in a figurative sense.

Siege - The surrounding of a town or fortified place in an effort to seize it, as after a blockage.

Sluice box - A sloping trough in which gold is washed from sand.

Solvent - Having means sufficient to pay (extinguish) all debts.

Supplant - To take the place of, as of something inferior or out of date; displace. To take the place of (someone) by scheming, treachery, etc. To replace (one thing) for another.

Sovereign - A chief ruler with supreme power; one possessing sovereignty. It is also applied to a king or other magistrate with limited powers. In the United States of America the sovereignty resides in the body of the People (collectively **and** individually).

Tacit - Existing, inferred, or implied without being directly stated. Not spoken; silent. Emitting no sound.

Tender - To present for acceptance; offer. To proffer, as money, in payment of debt, etc.

Timidity - The condition of being timid; lacking in self-confidence; being easily frightened or fearful.

Tome - A large, heavy book; a massive volume.

Truism - An obvious or self-evident truth; a platitude.

Unequivocal - Understandable in only one way; not ambiguous; clear.

Usury - The act or practice of lending money and charging interest that is excessive or unlawfully high; charging interest on mere **credit** lent.

Vendor - One who vends; a seller.

Venue - See 'jurisdictional' hereinabove.

Verbatim - In the exact words; word for word.

Vested - Not dependent on any contingency; fixed; inalienable; absolute, as in a 'vested' right.

Viably - Not needing outside support or assistance.

V.I.N. - Abbreviation for 'Vehicle Identification Number.'

Vulgar - Lacking good manners, taste, etc.; coarse; unrefined. Offensive or obscene in expression.

Waging Law - An old term and practice that does not greatly differ from the term 'Waging War' in all its elements except for that of mortal combat.

The senior purpose of this handbook is to enable you to generally restore **and maintain** your own status of **sovereign Elector**. In keeping with that status, it is intended that you prepare your own letters/documents in accordance with the sample formats provided herein. They are generic models which should easily adapt to individual circumstances. If you are uncertain about your documents, Uncle Gus will "qual-check" them for you and make any needed corrections for \$10.00 per document, plus return postage.

Uncle Gus charges \$50.00 per hour for all litigation consulting and document preparation. This rate includes any evaluation of and advice given in a case in progress. The first hour of evaluation of a case in progress is payable in advance and is not refundable. Case files sent to Uncle Gus must include all documentation pertaining to the status and standing of the party.

There is no charge for letters sent to Uncle Gus sharing your progress and success with him. Self-reliance is validated and encouraged, always.

SENIOR POLICY: all mail received by Uncle Gus will be answered by him without undue delay.

You can reach Uncle Gus at the following address:

Augustus Blackstone

c/o postal service address:

9986 N. Newport Hwy #221

Spokane, Wash. CF 99218 CF

This book is not sold in retail stores. Additional books may be ordered directly from Uncle Gus for \$18.50 (U.S.) each and includes all shipping and handling charges. The manuscript for Vol. II of this handbook is in progress. When it is ready for distribution, you will be notified.

Corrections yet needed to be made to The Errant Sovereign's Handbook:

Note: When the last sentence on a page ends short of the right margin and the first sentence of the following page begins at the left margin without indent, they are both part of the same paragraph and should not be thus separated. There are several instances of this throughout the handbook and need to be corrected.

Page 5: the last paragraph is a footnote and should be smaller print.

Page 8, Paragraph 1, Line 2: change "alt" to "all".

Page 9, Paragraph 2, Line 2: remove extra "and" from within parenthesis.

Page 12, Paragraph 1, Line 1: change "lath" to "14th".

Page 22, Paragraph 3, Line 1: change "elector" to "elect".

Page 42: footnote should be on the bottom of Page 41.

Page 49: footnote should be on the bottom of Page 48.

Page 57, Paragraph 2, Line 11: change "Form W-4" to "Form W-2".

*Page 81, Paragraph 2, Line 2: remove extra "all those rules of the road
are there for good reason".*

Page 86, Paragraph 2, Line 2: change "constrict" to "construct".

Page 86, Paragraph 2, Line 3: change "purchases" to "purchased".

Page 95, last sentence on page: change "locates" to "locales".

Page 96, Paragraph 2, Line 1: change "he" to "be".

Page 96, Paragraph 2, Line 1: change "locate" to "locale".

These are all the errors I could find. - Gus