

03923-049
Brown Edward Lewis
P#6000 Federal Correction Inst.
Sovereign
Glenville, WV 26351
United States

03923-049
Rudy Davis
PO BOX 2088
Fomey, TX 75126
United States

CHARLESTON WV 25301
27 MAR 2016 PM 4:1

75126-2088



Three United States: Definition
See Page 5. Hoover v. Evatt
There is one more:
UNITED STATES INC.;
Vatican owned

FROM: [REDACTED]
TO: 03923049
SUBJECT: H.F. #1 of 2.
DATE: 02/22/2016 07:37:41 AM

Ed, Correction: not The Two U.S. at <http://deoxy.org/lib/2us.htm> but I found this <http://deoxy.org/lib/3us.htm> of The Three United States with a link at the bottom right of the page:

"The Three United States

The standing 1945 Supreme Court definition of the term United States:

The term "United States" may be used in any one of several senses. [1] It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations. [2] It may designate the territory over which the sovereignty of the United States extends, or [3] it may be the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution. [Hooven & Allison Co. vs Evatt, 324 U.S. 652 (1945)]

Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, definition of United States:

United States. This term has several meanings. [1] It may be merely the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in family of nations, [2] it may designate territory over which sovereignty of United States extends, or [3] it may be collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution. Hooven & Allison Co. v. Evatt, U.S. Ohio, 324 U.S. 652, 65 S.Ct. 870, 880, 89 L.Ed. 1252. [Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition]

Which One Are You? by The Informer:

1. I am a Citizen of the United States¹ like you are a Citizen of China. Here you have defined yourself as a National from a Nation with regard to another Nation. It is perfectly OK to call yourself a "Citizen of the United States¹." This is what everybody thinks the tax statutes are inferring. But notice the capital "C" in Citizen and where it is placed. Please go back to basic English.

2. I am a United States² citizen. Here you have defined yourself as a person residing in the District of Columbia, one of its Territories, or Federal enclaves (area within a Union State) or living abroad, which could be in one of the States of the Union or a foreign country. Therefore you are possessed by the entity United States² (Congress) because citizen is small case. Again go back to basic english. This is the "United States²" the tax statutes are referring to. Unless stated otherwise, such as 26 USC 6103(b)(5).

3. I am a Citizen of these United States³. Here you have defined yourself as a Citizen of all the 50 States united by and under the Constitution. You are not possessed by the Congress (United States²). In this way you have a national domicile, not a State or United States² domicile and are not subject to any instrumentality or subdivision of corporate governmental entities.

A Ticket to Liberty, by Lori Jacques:

It is noticeable that Possessions of the United States² and sovereign states of the United States³ of America are NOT joined under the title of "United States." The president represents the sovereign United States¹ in foreign affairs through treaties, Congress represents the sovereign United States² in Territories and Possessions with Rules and Regulations, and the state citizens are the sovereignty of the United States³ united by and under the Constitution After becoming familiar with these historical facts, it becomes clear that in the Internal Revenue Code, Section 7701(a)(9), the term "United States²" is defined in the second of these senses as stated by the Supreme Court: it designates the territory over which the sovereignty of the United States² extends.

The federal zone over which the sovereignty of the United States² extends is the District of Columbia, the territories and possessions belonging to Congress, and a limited amount of land within the States of the Union, called federal "enclaves".

The Federal Zone by ?:

The Secretary of the Treasury can only claim exclusive jurisdiction over this federal zone and citizens of this zone. In particular, the federal enclaves within the 50 States can only come under the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress if they consist of land which has been properly "ceded" to Congress by the act of a State Legislature. A good example of a federal enclave is a "ceded" military base. The authority to exercise exclusive legislative jurisdiction over the District of Columbia and the federal enclaves originates in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution. By virtue of the exclusive authority that is vested

in Congress by this clause, Congress shall have the power:

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States², and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;

The power of Congress to exercise exclusive legislative authority over its territories and possessions, as distinct from the District of Columbia and the federal enclaves, is given by a different authority in the U.S. Constitution. This authority is Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2, as follows:

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needed Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States²;

Within these areas, it is essential to understand that the Congress is not subject to the same constitutional limitations which restrict its power in the areas of land over which the 50 States exercise their respective sovereign authorities:

[T]he United States² may acquire territory by conquest or by treaty, and may govern it through the exercise of the power of Congress conferred by Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution In exercising this power, Congress is not subject to the same constitutional limitations, as when it is legislating for the United States³. ... And in general the guaranties of the Constitution, save as they are limitations upon the exercise of executive and legislative power when exerted for or over our insular possessions, extend to them only as Congress, in the exercise of its legislative power over territory belonging to the United States², has made those guaranties applicable. [Hooven & Allison Co. vs Evatt, 324 U.S. 652 (1945)]

In other words, the guarantees of the Constitution extend to the federal zone only as Congress makes those guarantees applicable, either to the territory or to the citizens of that zone, or both.

Langdell, The Status of Our New Territories
12 Harvard Law Review 365, 371:

Thirdly. -- ... [T]he term "United States" has often been used to designate all territory over which the sovereignty of the United States² extended.

The conclusion, therefore, is that, while the term "United States" has three meanings, only the first and second of these are known to the Constitution; and that is equivalent to saying that the Constitution of the United States³ as such does not extend beyond the limits of the States which are united by and under it, -- a proposition the truth of which will, it is believed, be placed beyond doubt by an examination of the instances in which the term "United States" is used in the Constitution.

No court is to be charged with the knowledge of foreign laws; but they are well understood to be facts which must, like other facts, be proved before they can be received in a court of justice. It is equally well settled that the several states of the Union are to be considered as in this respect foreign to each other, and that the courts of one state are not presumed to know, and therefore not bound to take judicial notice of, the laws of another state. [Hanley vs Donoghue, 116 U.S. 1, 29 L. Ed. 535 - 6 S.Ct. 242, 244 (1885)]

Try applying sections 1:8:17 and 4:3:2 to the Secretary of the Treasury's jurisdictional claims for the "internal" revenue laws:

The term "United States²" when used in a geographical sense includes any territory under the sovereignty of the United States². It includes the states, the District of Columbia, the possessions and territories of the United States², the territorial waters of the United States², the air space over the United States², and the seabed and subsoil of those submarine areas which are adjacent to the territorial waters of the United States² and over which the United States² has exclusive rights, in accordance with international law, with respect to the exploration and exploitation of natural resources. [26 CFR 1.911-2(g)]

Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, definition of foreign state:

The several United States³ are considered "foreign" to each other except as regards their relations as common members of the Union. ... The term "foreign nations," as used in a statement of the rule that the laws of foreign nations should be proved in a certain manner, should be construed to mean all nations and states other than that in which the action is brought; and hence one state of the Union is foreign to another, in the sense of that rule.

Congress still refers to the 50 States as "countries":

(b) The Congress consents to the acceptance and retention by any judge so authorized of reimbursement from the countries referred to in subsection (a)
[28 U.S.C. 297, 11/19/88]

FROM: Haas, Joe
TO: 03923049
SUBJECT: H.F. #2 of 2
DATE: 02/22/2016 07:37:39 AM

" [C]ongress must be considered in two distinct characters. In one character as legislating for the states; in the other, as a local legislature for the district. In the latter character, it is admitted, the power of levying direct taxes may be exercised; but, it is contended, for district purposes only, in like manner as the legislature of a state may tax the people of a state for state purposes. Without inquiring at present into the soundness of this distinction, its possible influence on the application in this district of the first article of the constitution, and of several of the amendments, may not be altogether unworthy of consideration. [Loughborough vs Blake, 15 U.S. (5 Wheat.) 317 - 5 L.Ed. 98 (1820)]
In exercising this power [to dispose of and make all needed Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States²], Congress is not subject to the same constitutional limitations, as when it is legislating for the United States³. [Hooven & Allison Co. vs Evatt, 324 U.S. 652 (1945)]

Various definitions of the term UNITED STATES

Black's Law Dictionary definition of State defines one of the 50 States of the Union:

The section of territory occupied by one of the United States³. One of the component commonwealths or states of the United States of America.

Uniform Probate Code, Section 1-201(40) defines a federal state:

Any state of the United States², the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession subject to the legislative authority of the United States.

IRC 4612(a)(4)(A):

(A) In General. -- The term "United States" means the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, any possession of the United States, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands..

IRC 6103(b)(5):

(5) State -- The term "State" means --

(A) any of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

IRC 7701(a)(9):

When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof-- ...

(9) United States. -- The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense includes only the States and the District of Columbia.

(10) State. -- The term "State" shall be construed to include the District of Columbia, where such construction is necessary to carry out provisions of this title.

IRC 3306(j)(2):

For purposes of this chapter --

(2) United States. -- The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense includes the States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. "

Private international law assumes a more important aspect in the United States than elsewhere, for the reason that the several states, although united under the same sovereign authority and governed by the same laws for all national purposes embraced by the Federal Constitution, are otherwise, at least so far as private international law is concerned, in the same relation as foreign countries. The great majority of questions of private international law are therefore subject to the same rules when they arise between two states of the Union as when they arise between two foreign countries, and in the ensuing pages the words "state," "nation," and "country" are used synonymously and interchangeably, there being no intention to distinguish between the several states of the Union and foreign countries by the use of varying terminology. [16 Am Jur 2d, Conflict of Laws, Sec. 2] Foreign Country. A foreign country is any territory (including the air space, territorial waters, seabed, and subsoil) under the sovereignty of a government other than the United States². It does not include U.S.² possessions or territories. [Instructions for Form 2555: Foreign Earned Income, Department of the Treasury, Internal Revenue Service]

(h) Foreign country. The term "foreign country" when used in a geographical sense includes any territory under the sovereignty of a government other than that of the United States². It includes the territorial waters of the foreign country (determined in accordance with the laws of the United States²), the air space over the foreign country, and the seabed and subsoil of those submarine areas which are adjacent to the territorial waters of the foreign country and over which the foreign country has exclusive rights, in accordance with international law, with respect to the exploration and exploitation of natural resources. [26 CFR 1.911-2(h)]

This issue of jurisdiction as it relates to Sovereignty is a major key to understanding our system under our Constitution. [The Omnibus, Addendum II, page 11]

A Ticket to Liberty, by Lori Jacques:

When reading the various acts of Congress which had declared various people to be "citizens of the United States", it is immediately apparent that many are simply declared "citizens of the United States³" while others are declared to be "citizens of the United States², subject to the jurisdiction of the United States²." The difference is that the first class of citizen arises when that person is born out of the territorial jurisdiction of the United States² Government. 3A Am Jur 1420, Aliens and Citizens, explains: "A Person is born subject to the jurisdiction of the United States², for purposes of acquiring citizenship at birth, if his birth occurs in territory over which the United States² is sovereign ..."

On one hand, Congress is empowered to enact public laws for the 50 States, subject to certain restrictions. On the other hand, it is also empowered to enact "municipal" statutes for the federal zone, subject to a different set of restrictions.

[C]ongress must be considered in two distinct characters. " 

**THIS IS THE MOST IMPORTANT
"LITTLE BOOK"
I EVER WROTE
WHY DO YOU BELIEVE YOU ARE A STATE OR
A UNITED STATES CITIZEN?
BECAUSE WHO SAID SO?
DO YOU CALL YOURSELF A FOLLOWER OF
CHRIST BETTER KNOWN AS A CHRISTIAN?
WOULD YOU BELIEVE THE UNITED STATES
WANTS TO BE YOUR GOD**

**By
STATUTE
YOU BETTER READ WHAT IS INSIDE
THIS LITTLE BOOK
Or
REMAIN THEIR SUBJECT
FOREVER**

1

Approximate representation of the U.S. grade level needed to comprehend the text:
Coleman Liau index: 7.75

Flesch Kincaid Grade level : 7.54

ARI (Automated Readability Index): 5.63

by the Informer, printed 2012

NO ONE has ever been a **US** citizen **BY LAW** of **STATUTE**.

- But when they register to vote they are? By **PRESUMPTION ONLY** on the part of the corporation. All courts are private as stated in my Which One Are You book. Published 20 years ago, on page 119. All agencies are Private corporations. All law is based on Presumption. I am giving this to you as I speak. This was not put on atgpress. This is now November 10th 2011. What do I mean by Presumption? The law of contracts is by presumption and the corporations use it all the time. Who are these corporations? The **UNITED STATES** and all 50 **STATES**. Why do they all appear in caps? Because artificial corporations have to use all caps in their name. Check out your **STATES** Secretary of **STATE'S** UCC Section. When corporations are registered to do business. All have to have their names in capital letters. That is why they have tagged you a **US** Citizen. By presumption on their part, you are their subject, as you are now deemed by them, to be a **PERSON**. An artificial entity By presumption. Lets look at that word **PRESUMPTION**. You, reading this, have no clue what it really means. Now look that word up in Websters 1828 dictionary even though I put it here. I could be lying to you just like the corporation **UNITED STATES** does.

1828 Definition

PRESUMPTION, n. [L. proesumption.]

- * 1. **Supposition** of the truth or real **existence of something without direct or positive proof of the fact**, but grounded on circumstantial or probable evidence: which entitles it to belief. Presumption in law is of three sorts, violent or strong, probable, and light.

WHAT is the very first word defining PRESUMPTION? So look that up. You have to, to get what I got in 1998. So we go back to Websters.

SUPPOSITION, n. The act of laying down, imagining or admitting as true or existing, **what is known not to be true, or what is not proved**. How many times has IRS used this **PRESUMPTION AND SUPPOSITION** in letters to you or the court used it on you?

- * 1. **The position of something known not to be true or not proved; hypothesis.**

This is only an infallibility upon supposition that if a thing be true, it is impossible to be false.

- * 2. **Imagination; belief without full evidence.**

1913 Definition Supposition (supposition) n

(?)

Sup'po*si'tion

[F. supposition, L. suppositio a placing under, a substitution, fr. supponere, suppositum; to put under, to substitute. The word has the meaning corresponding to **suppose**. See Sub-, and Position.]

- * **The act of supposing, laying down, imagining, or considering as true or existing, what is known not to be true, or what is not proved.** Lets suppose john doe is a taxpayer when he is not. Lets suppose John Doe is a drug user. **DO YOU SEE HOW PRESUMPTION WORKS WITH SUPPOSITION** That which is **supposed; hypothesis; conjecture; surmise; opinion or belief WITHOUT SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE.**

*This is only an infallibility upon supposition that if a thing be true, it is impossible to be false. Tillotson.

- * So how can you break the Presumption YOU are NOT a US Citizen turned PERSON, INDIVIDUAL in TAX LAW. The ARTIFICIAL ENTITY? BY doing something constructive for once in your life instead if griping all the time? You want to be Free?
- * Then YOU are the only one able to do it. "I can't," a attorney won't if they could. Your best friend can't, only you can. "How? By simply going back a couple of hundred years Not 20 50 Or 100 years." Back to the time these commercial corporations of STATES and UNITED STATES were formed. So we find a statute at large or a case using the statute at large. FOLKS this is not jumping out and saying HERE I AM. Freedom is never Free, when you have corporate criminals claiming by PRESUMPTION, THEY OWN YOU. YOU ARE A PERSON and the corporation statute says so. *You allow them to capitalize your name without objection so they used the "NOT OTHERWISE" condition because

they cannot prove their **PRESUMPTION**. Tax law says ALL PERSONS LIABLE, AND BY PRESUMPTION YOU ARE A PERSON AS A UNITED STATES citizen. Well how can you prove you Are not a US citizen? Pretty hard is it not? Has any one ever beat the PRESUMPTION, as I have in 1998, that you really have evidence of that?

WELL LET'S SEE WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT THAT The Statute at large to become a US citizen is The act of Congress of April 14, 1802, (2 Stat. 153, c. 28, § 1; Rev. St. § 2165, YOU MEAN YOU NEVER WENT BACK THAT FAR? WHY? DON'T YOU HAVE TO KNOW WHAT THEY DID to SCREW YOU ROYALLY OUT OF YOUR FREEDOMS FOR LIFE?

THAT ACT SAYS, and **PAY ATTENTION**; provides that "**an alien may be admitted to become a citizen of the United States in the following manner, AND NOT OTHERWISE.**" DO YOU understand what **NOT OTHERWISE MEANS?** OF COURSE YOU DON'T. 4th grade mentality can't understand. This is what the corporations education system has done to every MAN in AMERICA. YOU ARE A PERSON because you pay taxes don't you? You have a DL, right? VOTE, right? Have a birth certificate? Do everything the corporation tells you, right? **WRONG, THESE DO NOT MAKE YOU A SUBJECT** unless you agree by silence. Well I found a case that will knock these preconceived ideas for a loop. That if not heeded will keep you a subject of the corporation for the rest of your life and your kids and their kids lives.

The case is in 1893 called CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS v. REUM. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. May 29, 1893.) Now I said **PAY ATTENTION**. To what? Of course dummy, **THE BOLD WORDS "AND NOT OTHERWISE"**. JUST because you voted DOES NOT

MEAN YOU ARE A US CITIZEN OR GOT ANY LATCHES, FILING TAX FORMS, GETTING LICENSES, ETC., ETC, BIRTH CERTIFICATES ARE ALL IN THE CATEGORY OF "**AND NOT OTHERWISE.**" See, you have to pay attention. The case where Mr. Reum actually voted was not germane, said the court. Even though he voted did NOT make him a citizen. Mr Reum went back and forth, I am, I ain't so many times was why the court ruled against him. He had not signed his self away from his king and was not entitled to be a NATURALIZED US citizen. Sure he registered to vote and did vote So the court said the Statute stated you had to **DO THREE THINGS** to become a US citizen. **HAVE YOU DONE ANY** after reading what the court said the statute at large said? I Now quote the court and I know you will not pay attention so I will put in **BOLD** what you will gloss over and never give it a thought.

The process was clearly stated as conclusions of law by the Court. The Court went on to state three factors whereby YOU needed to comply to become a U.S. Citizen and "**NOT OTHERWISE**". They are, quoting the court, "**FIRST**". He shall, two Years at least prior to his admission, declare before a proper court his intention to become a citizen of the United States, (**Mr Reum did this**) and to renounce his allegiance to the potentate or sovereignty of which he may be at the time a citizen or subject. (**Mr. Reum did NOT do this**). **SECOND**. He shall, at the time of his application to be admitted, declare, on oath,

- before some one of the courts above specified, **that he will support the Constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounces and abjures all allegiance and fidelity** to every foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty; and particularly, by name, to the prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of which he was before a citizen or subject, **which proceedings shall be recorded by the clerk of the court.** **THIRD.** It shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court admitting such alien that he has resided within the United States five years at least, and within the state or territory where such court is at the time held one year at least and that during that time he has behaved as a **MAN of a good moral character**, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same; but the oath of the applicant shall in no case be allowed to prove his residence. **Emphasis mine Note: They said "MAN" not person as today's corporate R.I.C.O. statues do not mention MAN.**
- This statute was only amended once. By the act of May 26, 1824, (4: star. 69, c. 186, § 1; Rev. St. § 2167), it removed the two year limit that (2 Stat. 153, c. 28, § 1; Rev. St. § 2165 provided. The **TERM** of their law for **Man is NONRESIDENT ALIEN.** This is correct but they used this **term**, knowing everyone would say "I ain't no Alien." Thereby negating the very thing that would make them free. Now where did all these **ALIENS** come from? Simply put read the Federalist papers 42 and 43, **man** was the **ALIEN**, the "FREE **WHITE inhabitant** that Madison wrote about in federalist paper's 42 and 43. This maxim of law that apply is "expressio tmius est exclusio alterius". Are all statutes either comprising man or person? **MAN** is devoid of Statute. **Non resident alien, A.K.A. MAN**, is mentioned and excluded in statute because he is the **TERM non resident Alien.**
- Meaning Not resident in any contract, there for Alien to the Constitution, policy regs etc., just as Whiting, The solicitor general stated in 1864 "**AN ALIEN OWES NO ALLEGIANCE OR OBEDIENCE TO OUR GOVERNMENT, OR TO OUR CONSTITUTION, LAWS, OR PROCLAMATIONS.**" A citizen subject is bound to obey them all. In refusing such obedience, he is guilty of crime against his country, and finds in the law of nations no justification for disobedience. **AN ALIEN, BEING UNDER NO SUCH OBLIGATION, IS JUSTIFIED IN REFUSING SUCH OBEDIENCE. OVER AN ALIEN ENEMY, OUR GOVERNMENT CAN MAKE NO CONSTITUTION, LAW, OR PROCLAMATION OF OBLIGATORY FORCE, BECAUSE OUR LAWS BIND ONLY OUR OWN SUBJECTS, AND HAVE NO EXTRA-TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION.**
- Over citizens who are subjects of this government, even if they have so far repudiated their duties as to become enemies, our constitution, statutes, and proclamations are the supreme law of the land. The fact that their enforcement is resisted does not make them void. **It is not in the power of armed subjects of the Union to repeal or legally nullify our constitution, laws, or other governmental acts.**
- SOURCE:** The Legal Classics Library War Powers under The Constitution of the United States 1864 tenth Ed Entered by Act of Congress In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts Special Edition 1997. REMEMBER WE WERE

SUBJECTS BEFORE THE 1776 WAR WE LOST and became citizen SUBJECTS AFTER the 1783 peace treaty where the King Dictated to the United States exactly what he wanted, thereby leaving his subjects to become his subjects now known as Citizens of The Vatican's corporations. Do not forget that treaty of April 21, 1214 where the King turned his entire Kingdom and SUBJECTS over to the Pope/Vatican corporation. You are now under Ecclesiastical law of the Vatican since 1787. The books I have showing the Vatican rules every aspect of your movements and daily lives. HE created the IRS in 1861 and you never knew it. How do you think I got free in 1998 from all taxes state or US or any other income tax? AND the SSN is your enemy ID to deal in banking. It was not for social security. The two corporate cases settled by the corporate Supreme court came right out in 1935 and said there never was a Social Security. It was all a fraud and it was admitted in 1953 of which I have that document that I posted two years before ATGPRESS was shut down by powers you never knew existed. Justice Field dissenting, stated in the Erie Railway case of 1892. I paraphrase to keep this short. "The government thus lays a tax, through the instrumentality of the company, upon the income of A **NON-RESIDENT ALIEN OVER WHOM IT CANNOT JUSTLY EXERCISE ANY CONTROL, NOR UPON WHOM IT CAN JUSTLY LAY ANY BURDEN.** The power of the United States to tax is limited to **PERSONS**, property, and business within their jurisdiction, as much as that of the State is limited to the same subjects within its jurisdiction." United States v. Erie Railway Company, 106 US 327. The Court you just might be in, has to Produce to YOU, the Three Facts of evidence, stated by the Court above, #1 that YOU absolutely and entirely renounced and abjures all allegiance and fidelity to GOD our creator. #2 And had given YOUR intentions to the court to become a U.S. Citizen / SUBJECT of a **corporate nature in writing**. There are no other provision of the acts of congress under which YOU could have been naturalized. The Court did State " **AND NOT OTHERWISE.**" #3 And since the statute at large, Not Code, says it's **recorded in fact two.** Either the court has to provide it or you win hands down when the plaintiff cannot produce this fact evidence to you and the court. The Court is the only one that has it not the R.I.C.O. agent coming after you. Why would he have it if all they work from is PRESUMPTION? The court has the record when you became A US citizen as it was "recorded". That destroys their **PRESUMPTION YOU ARE NOT A PERSON, US OR STATE citizen, Taxpayer, or that you are the all cap artificial entity.** It then throws the **PRESUMPTION BACK AT them.** Remember the phrase? See you did not pay attention, to the last sentence in #1 of SUPPOSITION. "This is only an infallibility upon supposition that if a thing be true, it is impossible to be false." This is what kills them You made them prove YOU are a MAN, a **NONRESIDENT NOT IN CONTRACT**, therefore the Alien. So being the supposition is false on you being a US citizen by PRESUMPTION, the reverse is true that you are an alien, MAN and NOT a PERSON. Who Madison wrote about in his federalist paper 42 and paper 43 The Free White Inhabitant (Alien) man. I wrote extensively on this in my books and free stuff on atgpress for 10 years at least. One was TERMS not WORDS explaining they make up their own definitions. This last part of the case in, Which one are you, says a lot Judge Leavy then went on to quote Assessors v. Osborne, 9 Wall. 76 U.S. 567 at 574, 'District Courts are courts of *special jurisdiction*, and therefore, they cannot take jurisdiction of any case, either civil or criminal, where they are not authorized to do so by

an Act of Congress',--he said it is-- 11 a leading case, and has not been distinguished, modified or over-ruled. 11 emphasis his.

••• In 1988 Congress eliminated the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to review decisions on appeal from State Courts and decisions of the United States court of appeals. •••
• Does this sound like a Republican Government under the separation of Powers doctrine,
• or a commissioner form of corporate government (democracy), operating through
• corporate administrative agencies and commercial tribunals (corporation) COURTS of
special jurisdiction." I Know as I was the first case from a state case on appeal that was denied. •

• The INFORMER Started December 2008 finished November 10, 2011 I draw your attention to what one man found after reading this in just two weeks. Terms used in this Virginia regulation... [H 2523]

• (1) "the people of Virginia" are Sovereigns.

• (2) "the citizens of Virginia and the Commonwealth" are the Federal Citizens that are living under the Corporation!

• (3) "The Commonwealth, Local Governments and citizens" are the people that we should be identifying with as Sovereigns too.

• (4) "the citizens of Virginia and the Commonwealth and does not properly respect the rights of (2) the Commonwealth, local governments, and citizens.

<http://legl.state.va.us/cgi-bin!legp504.exe?951ful+CHAP0604>

TREASON!
COUP d'etat

Rick V Womens & Childrens Hospital
2010 US Dist. Lewis 58021 (5th Cir 2010)
May 10, 2010