

Gary M. Northington 193035  
Cotton Correctional Facility  
3510 N. Elm  
Jackson, MI 49201-8877

Bro. Rudy Davis  
P.O. Box 2088  
Forney, TX 75126



U.S. POSTAGE PITNEY BOWES  
ZIP 49201 \$002.05<sup>0</sup>  
02 4W  
0000344127 JUN 26 2018



205

MC

THE  
SOVEREIGN PERSON;  
A GOD-GIVEN RIGHT

By:  
GARY M. NORTHINGTON



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Pages:</u>
PREFACE	..... ii
USE NOTE	..... iii
PERSON	..... 1
THE STATE; A CORPORATION	..... 6
THE CORPORATE JUDICIARY	..... 10
THE KING; THEN AND NOW	..... 12
WAIVER OF RIGHTS	..... 15
CONTRACT	..... 22
UNITED v UNITED STATES	..... 27
CITIZEN, SERVANT, SLAVE	..... 30
NATURAL RIGHTS	..... 36
NATURAL OR CORPORATE PERSON	..... 40
CORPORATE CHURCHES	..... 52
COMMON LAW	..... 54
WAR	..... 55
FIREARM CONFISCATION	..... 62
MODUS OPERANDI	..... 65
FRAUD	..... 69
CONCLUSION & BEGINNING	..... 70
DECLARATION	..... 71
References	..... 73

## PREFACE

I am not a registered attorney, a BAR member, who swears Oath to a secret society, the British Accreditation Registry, aka British Aristocratic Regency.

"The first lawyers were personal friends of the litigant, brought into the court by him so that he might take counsel with them before pleading. Similarly, the first 'attorneys' were personal agents, often lacking any professional training, who were appointed by those litigants who had secured royal permission to carry on their affairs through a representative, rather than personally." Faretta v California, 422 US 806, 820, fn. 16, 95 S Ct 2525, 2534, fn. 16, 45 L Ed 2d 562, \_\_\_\_\_, fn. 16 (1975).

Laymen cannot be expected to know how to protect their rights when dealing with practiced and carefully counseled adversaries ... and for them to associate together to help one another to preserve and enforce rights granted them under federal laws cannot be condemned... Brotherhood of Railroad Trailmen v Virginia ex rel Virginia State Bar, 377 US 1, 7, 84 S Ct 1113, 1117, 12 L Ed 2d 89, \_\_\_\_\_ (1964).

Freedom to write and speak about public questions is as important to the life of our government as is the heart to the human body... If that heart be ... stilled, the result is death. Milk Wagon Drivers v Meadowmoor Dairies, 312 US 287, 302, 61 S Ct 522, 559, 85 L Ed 836, \_\_\_\_\_ (1941)(dissenting opinion).

THE AUTHOR

USE NOTE

Court case citations will be:

"US" for the United States Reporter of the United States Supreme Court, "S Ct" for the U.S. Supreme Court Reporter, and "L Ed" or "L Ed 2d" for the Lawyers Edition of this Reporter;

"F2d" or "F3d" for the federal circuit appellate court reporter books, and "F Supp" of "F Supp 2d" for federal district court reporter books;

"Mich" will refer to the Michigan Supreme Court Reporter and "Mich App" to the Michigan Court of Appeals Reporter books;

There will also be various other State cases from other books across the United States;

The first number of each case citation is the volume number of the book, the second number is the page number of the book; for those who will research at their local library and do a more in depth study of the case law presented herein.

## THANKS

I must thank Don Boetcher, Bo Gritz, Mark Gregory Koernke, Jack McLamb, John Stadtmiller, and many other Patriots, who inspired me to write on fundamental Rights addressed in this booklet and helped me relearn basic God-given principles I had forgotten because of long-term exposure to the **de facto** government-controlled media (Public Law 106-65, Section 1061; funding to use media as mind control). Thanks to Carol who let me know I could use my knowledge to reach out and touch someone" as an "army of one" with God as my guide.

There are many others I could thank but it would take pages. You know who you are!!!

During World War II there was a German U-boat captain named Martin Neimoller who later became a Protestant chaplain. After his arrest by the Nazis he offered the following reflection:

"First they came for the communist, and I did not say anything since I was not a communist. Then they came for the socialist, and still I said nothing for I was not a socialist. Then they came for the trade unionist, and I remained silent because I was not a trade unionist. Then they came for the Jews and neither did I speak out since I was not a Jew. And then when they came for me ... there was no one left to speak for me."

In the words of the English statesman Edmund Burke, "The only thing necessary for evil to flourish in the world is for enough good people to do nothing." The time has come that we can no longer afford our silence. Let us pray that God will give us strength to rule our hearts first and then our world.

## PERSON

The everyday definition of "person" is: "1. A human being, whether man, woman or child. 2. A human being as distinguished from an animal or thing. 3. An individual human being, especially with reference to his social relationships and behavioral patterns as conditioned by his culture. 4. **Philos.** a self-conscious and rational being. 5. the actual self or individual personality of a human being. 6. the body of a living human being, sometimes including the clothes being worn. 7. the body in its external aspect. 8. a character, part, or role, as in a play, story, etc. 9. an individual of distinction or importance." (Person).\*

Most people do not think of an inanimate object or organization as a person. There is, however, a different kind of "person" than a human being, known as an "artificial person." An artificial "person" is an "entity, such as a corporation, created by law and given certain legal rights and duties of a human being; a being, real or imaginary, who for the purpose of legal reasoning is treated more or less as a human being." This term includes the "fictitious person," "juristic person," "legal person," and "moral person." (Artificial person).\*\* These are essentially government-created "persons," a "legal fiction," made out of imaginations of men. Title 1 U.S.C., Sec. 1.

The mediaeval lawyers regarded corporations as endowed with personality by a type of creative act of the State, and received from the Roman lawyers the con-



ception of **hereditas iacens** as representing the person of the deceased rather than itself being a person, and called these things **Personae Fictae** (fictional persons). Roman Private Law.\* "Hereditas iacens (iacens)" is the property belonging to an estate before the heir accepts it. These are the beginnings of the fictional person.

A corporation is: "An entity having authority **under law** to act as a single person distinct from the shareholders who own it and having rights to issue stock and exist indefinitely; a group or succession of persons established in accordance with legal rules into a legal or juristic person that has a legal personality distinct from the **natural persons** who make it up, exists indefinitely apart from them, and has the legal powers that its **constitution** gives it." (Corporation).\*\* A corporation is one form of a legal fiction. "Legal fiction" is: "An assumption that something is true even though it may be untrue, made especially in judicial reasoning to alter how a legal rule operates." Black's Law 7d, (Legal fiction).\*\*\*

Are you confused with the legalese? First, remember you are beginning education of the difference between a Natural Person and a corporate "person;" the corporate person being an entity that can be created out of nothing and not easily discernable as the concrete beings you know as yourself, family and friends. You must learn how they speak but not live it.

To show how meanings of words and law

are incrementally changed, compare this older (circa 1985) definition of "legal fiction" with the year 2000 definition in Black's 7d: "Assumption of a fact made by a court as basis for deciding a legal question. A situation contrived by the law to permit a court to dispose of a matter, though it need not be created improperly." Black's Law Dictionary 5d, "Legal fiction." The older definition hides the fact that a court may commit a fraud in order to determine the outcome of a case. In the same way, the meaning of "person," many other words and the laws have slowly changed through time. The changes are done incrementally so the average person does not notice the change from generation to generation; sometimes incidentally, sometimes deliberately.

Title 42 United States Code, Section 1983 reads: "Every person who, under color or any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State ..... subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any right, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured....." 42 U.S.C., Sec. 1983. This statute (corporate bylaw) is used many times to define and change the definition of "person."

Prior to Monell v New York City Dept. of Social Services, 436 US 658, 98 S Ct 2018, 56 L Ed 2d 611 (1978), the question whether a State is a person within the meaning of Section 1983 was answered by

the U.S. Supreme Court in the negative. In Monroe v Pape, 365 US 167, 187-191, 81 S Ct 473, 484-486, 5 L Ed 2d 492 (1961), the Court held that a municipality was not a "person" under Section 1983. "That being the case," the Court reasoned, Section 1983 "could not have been intended to include States as parties" to a lawsuit. But in Monell, the Court overruled Monroe by holding that a municipality was a person under Section 1983. Will v Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 US 58, 62, 109 S Ct 2304, 2307, 105 L Ed 2d 45, \_\_\_\_ (1989)

Two methods of suing someone in the courts are individual and official capacity. Individual capacity is against someone personally; their income, property, etc. Official capacity is against the person's office. The Supreme Court decided in Will that "neither a State nor its officials acting in their official capacities are 'persons' under Section 1983."\* Many lower courts then began applying the Will ruling to mean a State official could not be sued at all because, even when sued in individual capacity, State officials were allegedly not a "person." This misuse and abuse of Will by various judges is an indication of the often twisted minds of those who claim to be qualified to sit in judgment over the general public. The U.S. Supreme Court effectively spanked these twisted judges when it later ruled State "officials, sued in their individual capacities, are 'persons' within the meaning of Section 1983." Hafer v Melo, 502 US 21, 31, 112 S Ct 358, 365, 116 L Ed 2d 301, \_\_\_\_ (1991).

Will and Hafer further subdivided the definition of a "person" in Section 1983. A State "official" sued in official capacity, when sued for injunctive relief, would be a person under Section 1983 because official-capacity actions for prospective relief are not treated as actions against the State.\* ("Injunctive relief" is not a judgment for monetary damages but for a restraining order to prohibit the official from doing some act or to require the official to do some act.).

Therefore, the State is not a person, a State official sued in official capacity is not a person, a State official sued for injunctive relief or in individual (personal) capacity is a person, a corporation is a person, and a human being is a person within definition of statute (corporate law). These "persons" are each an artificial "person," a legal fiction created in the mind as a work of man, with the exception of the human being. The only person capable of being a Natural Person (like God) is a human being. Holy Bible, Genesis 1:26.

This is not to say that I agree with the corporate government definition of "person." "We the People" was a group or union of Natural Persons at signing of the united States Constitution and Declaration of Independence. (Check the original writing of the Preamble to the Constitution for a small "u" in united; it means something.) Declaration, last pgh.

## THE STATE; A CORPORATION

It was discussed herein that a corporation is a "person" and States are not a "person." In 1793, Justice Cushing dealt shortly with the subject that sovereignty of States should be restricted so that States would be reduced to corporations: "As to corporations, all States whatever are corporations or bodies politic. The only question is, what are their powers?" He observed that the Constitution limits the powers of the States in numerous ways but that "no argument of force can be taken from the sovereignty of the States. Where it has been abridged, it was thought necessary for the greater indispensable good of the whole." Alden v Maine.\* If the State is a corporation, then why is the State not considered a "person" as are other corporations?

The term "person" does not include the sovereign, and statutes employing the word are ordinarily construed to exclude the sovereign. The phrase "white person" contained in Title 25 United States Code, Section 194, an Act of June 30, 1834, 4 Stat. 729, is construed as not including the "sovereign States of the Union." Common usage of the term "person" indicates it does not include a State. Will.\*\*

The idea that the word "person" ordinarily excludes the sovereign can be traced to English Common Law, the "familiar principle that the King is not bound by any act of Parliament unless he be named therein by special and particular words." This interpretive principle applies only

to "the enacting sovereign." Will\* This judicial manipulation of words creates a "legal fiction," based on despotic Old English feudal law, that We the People cannot sue the corporate State because it is sovereign (circa 1989).

Furthermore, even the principle as applied to the enacting sovereign is not without limitations: "Where an act of Parliament is made for the public good, as for the advancement of religion and justice or to prevent injury and wrong, the king is bound by such act, though not particularly named therein; but where the statute is general, and thereby any prerogative, right, title, or interest is divested or taken from the king, in such case the king is not bound, unless the statute is made to extend to him by express words" (circa 1989). Will.\*\* This again uses an Old English feudal law basis to say the sovereign can only be sued when he consents to allow the peasants (who live only at pleasure of the king) to sue him.

Who is the master and servant in the United States? "We the People of the United States in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and to our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America." U.S. Constitution, "Preamble."

Justice Wilson took up the argument

for the sovereignty of the People. Building on a conception of sovereignty he had already expressed at the Pennsylvania ratifying convention, he began noting what he took to be the pregnant silence of the Constitution regarding sovereignty:

"To the Constitution of the United States the term SOVEREIGN is totally unknown. There is but one place where it could have been used with propriety. But, even in that place it would not, perhaps, have comported to the delicacy of those, who ordained and established the Constitution. They might have announced themselves 'SOVEREIGN' people of the United States: but serenely conscious of the fact, they avoided the ostentaciously declaration."

The Framers-Turned-Justice explained in no uncertain terms that the State of Georgia was not sovereign with respect to the federal government. "As to the purposes of the Union, Georgia is NOT a sovereign State" (circa 1793). This was necessarily to reject any natural law conception of sovereign immunity as inherently attached to a State. Alden.\*

The Court ruled "federalism requires that Congress treat the States in a manner consistent with their status as residuary sovereigns and joint participants in the governance of the Nation." "The principle of sovereign immunity preserved by constitutional design thus accords the States the respect owed them as members of the federation." This is a comment on the 11th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Alden\*\* This simply is said the State is given only a residue, the leftover, of

sovereignty that the federal government lets it have.

"The Judicial power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity, commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State." U.S. Const., Amend. 11. This is the 11th Amendment to the United States Constitution. (The term "to" is proper rather than "of" the United States Constitution to differentiate between the original Constitution and the incorporated portion which was added on at a later date.)

Therefore, the State is a sovereign and not a "person" according to corporate State and Federal rules of law but it is less sovereign than the federal government.

Who really is the sovereign? Can the created State be greater than the creator, We the People? Or, in another context: Can the human created by God be greater than the Creator - God? Remember: We the People created the Republic of the United States, the individual Republic States (U.S. Const., Art. IV, Sec. 4), the corporate United States of America, and the corporate States.

At this point, the corporate judiciary says We the People - persons - are less than the corporate State, and the State and United States of America are king. Why? Are you a slave who lives only at pleasure of the king?



U.S. Const. Art. I, Sec. 1, Cl. 1  
Movers

## THE CORPORATE JUDICIARY

This is a sideroad about judges who claimed they can change the U.S. Constitution by their own opinions:

"[T]he federal judiciary; an irresponsible body (for impeachment is scarcely a scarecrow), gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing it's noiseless step like a thief, over the field of jurisdiction, until all shall be usurped from the State, and the government be consolidated into one ... when all government ... in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the centre of power, it will render powerless the checks provided of one government on another and will become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated." Thomas Jefferson (\_\_\_\_\_, 1821).

"If the Constitution can be picked away piecemeal (piece by piece), it is gone as effectively as if a military despot had grasped it, trampled it underfoot, and scattered it to the winds." Daniel Webster (\_\_\_\_\_, 18\_\_).

"Once let the barriers of the Constitution be removed, and the march of abuse will be onward and without bounds." Justice Daniels, U.S. Supreme Court (\_\_\_\_\_, 1849).

Certain 20th and 21st Century judges claim they can change the U.S. Constitution. Don't be fooled when you find a difference between your Lawful Rights and corporate judicial opinions made by an evil, black-robed priesthood of attorneys. Holy Bible, I Peter 5:8.

Quoting ultimate authority on the judiciary: "The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' seat. Therefore whatever they tell you to observe, that observe and do, but do not do according to their works; for they say and do not do. For they bind heavy burdens, hard to bear, and lay them on shoulders of men; but they themselves will not move them with even one of their fingers. But all their works they do to be seen by men.... They love the best places at feasts, the best seats in the [churches], greetings in the marketplaces and to be called by men, "Teacher, teacher." Holy Bible, Matthew 23:1-7.

"But woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you shut up the kingdom of Heaven against men; for you neither go in yourselves, nor do you allow those who are entering to go in. \*\*\* For you devour widows' houses, and for a pretense make long prayers. \*\*\* For you travel land and sea to win one proselyte, and when he is won, you make him twice as much a son of hell as yourselves." Matthew, 23:13-15.

Jesus Christ further said of them: "You are of your father the devil, and the desires of your father you want to do. He was a murderer from the beginning ... and there is not truth in him. When he speaks a lie, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies." Holy Bible, John 8:44.

Therefore, most judges speak a bifurcated language which means one thing to you and another to them.

## THE KING; THEN AND NOW

Blackstone - whose works constituted preeminent authority of English law for the Founding Fathers of the United States - underscored the close and necessary relationship understood to exist between sovereignty and immunity from suit:

"And, first, the law ascribes to the king the attribute of sovereignty, or pre-eminence... Hence, it is that no suit or action can be brought against the king, even in civil matters, because no court can have jurisdiction over him. For all jurisdiction implies superiority of power..." Commentaries of the Laws of England, 234-235 (Blackstone, 1765).

The American colonies did not enjoy sovereign immunity, that being a privilege understood in English law to be reserved for the Crown alone; "Antecedent to the Declaration of Independence, none of the colonies were, or pretended to be, sovereign states. Several colonial charters, including those of Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Georgia, expressly specified that the corporate body established thereunder could be sued." If a person should have "a just demand upon the king, he must petition him in his court of chancery, where his chancellor will administer right as a matter of grace though not upon compulsion" (circa 1793). Alden (dissent).\*

Note that after Blackstone explained sovereign immunity as common law, he went on to say the common-law tradition was compatible with sovereign immunity as

discussed by writers of "Natural Law."  
Alden.\*

As said herein (page 8), Justice Wilson rejected any alleged Natural Law conception of sovereignty as inherent to an American State. Justice Wilson went on to identify the origin of sovereignty in the feudal system that had, he said, been brought to England and to common law by the Norman Conquest. After quoting Blackstone's formulation of the doctrine as it had developed in England, he discussed it in the most disapproving terms imaginable:

"This last position [that the King is sovereign and no court can have jurisdiction over him] is only a branch of a much more extensive principle, on which a plan of systematic despotism has been lately formed in England, and prosecuted with unwearied assiduity and care. Of this plan the author of the Commentaries was, if not the introducer, at least the great supporter. He has been followed in it by writers later and less known; and his doctrines have, both on the other and this side of the Atlantic, been implicitly and generally received by those, who neither examined their principles nor their consequences. The principle is, that all human law must be prescribed by a superior. This principle I mean not now to examine. Suffice it, at present to say, that another principle, very different in its nature and operations, forms, in my judgment, the basis of sound and genuine jurisprudence; laws derived from the pure source of equality and justice must be founded on the CONSENT of those,

whose obedience they require. The **sovereign**, when traced to its source, must be found in the **man**" (circa 1793). With this rousing conclusion of revolutionary ideology and rhetoric, Justice Wilson left no doubt he thought the doctrine of sovereignty entirely anomalous in the American Republic. Although he did not speak specifically of a State's sovereignty in its own courts, his view necessarily requires that such sovereignty would not have been justifiable as a tenet of absolutist Natural Law. Alden.\*

Chief Justice Jay took a less vehement tone but he also denied the applicability of sovereignty to the States. He explained the doctrine as an incident of European feudalism, and said that by contrast,

"no such ideas obtain here; at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people; and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are **sovereigns without subjects** (sic) and have none to govern but **themselves**; the citizens of **America** are equal as fellow citizens, and as joint tenants in the sovereignty." (circa 1793).

From the difference between sovereignty of princes and that of the people, Jay argued that the People were sovereign to a State. Alden\*\*

Chief Justice Jay reserved judgment on whether the United States might be sued by a citizen, given the courts rely on the Executive to implement their decisions, he made it clear that this reservation was practical, and not theoretical. "I wish

the state of society was so far improved, and the science of government advanced to such a degree of perfection, as that the whole nation could be in peaceable course of law, be compelled to do justice, and be sued by individual citizens." (circa 1793) Alden.\*

This dissenting opinion, in 1999, quoting Justices Wilson and Jay in 1793, says We the People are sovereign over the State. To quote the dissent: The "Court's enhancement of [State] sovereignty was at odds with constitutional history and at war with the conception of divided sovereignty that is the essence of American federalism." Alden\*\* The judiciary has, over the years, twisted the rule of law until it is no longer defined as was meant. I would say the dissenting Justices are proper thinkers, just as the United States Constitution and founding fathers say, that "We the People" are creator of the State and federal government, and We are its king - the sovereign.

#### WAIVER OF RIGHTS

Relevant to whether you are a Natural Person or corporate person is a WAIVER. A number of U.S. Supreme Court cases on various waivers will be cited and discussed in this section.

A bank which sold deposit contracts for funding college education brought action against the Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Education Expense Board alleging unfair competition under the Lanham Act,

based on the Board's alleged false advertising. The Federal government intervened to defend constitutionality of applying the Lanham Act to States. The U.S. Supreme Court, overruling Parden v Terminal R of Ala, 277 US 184, 84 S Ct 1207, 12 L Ed 2d 233 (1964), held that sovereign immunity was neither validly abrogated by the Trademark Remedy Clarification Act (TRCA), nor voluntarily waived by the State's activities in interstate commerce (circa 1999). College Savings v Florida.\*

11th Amendment immunity from lawsuit is not absolute; Congress may authorize such a suit in the exercise of its power to enforce the 14th Amendment enacted after the 11th Amendment and specifically designed to alter the federal-State balance, and a State may WAIVE its sovereign immunity by consenting to suit. College\*\* (Amendments after the 10th were part of the incorporation.)

Neither an alleged right to be free from business competitor's false advertising about its own product, nor any more generalized right to be secure in one's own business interests, qualified as a "property right" protected by the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment, so as to provide authority for Trademark Remedy Clarification Act (TRCA) abrogation of State's 11th Amendment immunity as to claims under Lanham Act section affording a private right of action against a person who uses false descriptions or makes false representations in commerce. College\*\*\*

The hallmark of a property interest

protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment is a right to exclude others. The "right that we all possess to use of public lands is not the property right of anyone"; trademark is a private right. College.\*

Simply said at this point, public property is not a private right like your own home, and the State in this suit was in public domain, a public corporation, so that those who were harmed by the State's fraud had no legal right to sue the State for damages, and the State's sovereign immunity under the 11th Amendment was not nullified by Congress giving a statutory right to protection against private property interests under the TRCA against private corporations or other "persons."

The U.S. Supreme Court further stated: The State's sovereign immunity is a "personal privilege which it may waive at pleasure" (Why did they use "personal" on a nonperson?). The decision to waive that immunity, however, is altogether voluntary on the part of the sovereign. "Accordingly, our test for determining whether a State has waived its immunity from federal court jurisdiction is a stringent one. Generally, we will find a waiver either if the State voluntarily invokes our jurisdiction, or else if the State makes a clear declaration that it intends to submit itself to our jurisdiction. Thus, a State does not consent to suit in federal court merely by consenting to suit in the courts of its own creation. Nor does it consent to suit in federal court merely by stating its intention to sue and



be sued, or even by authorizing suits against it in any court of competent jurisdiction. We have even held that a State may, absent any contractual commitment to the contrary, alter the conditions of its waiver and apply those changes to a pending suit." College.\*

Do you understand that last sentence? The State can commit an unlawful act then change the law so it is not held liable; arbitrary, whimsical and capricious control. We put a sword to the neck of the King of England on June 12, 1215 and made him sign the Magna Charta to put an end to such travesty. This is, of course, the corporate judiciary saying this.

Constructive consent is not a doctrine commonly associated with the surrender of constitutional rights. For example, imagine if Congress amended the securities laws to provide with unmistakable clarity that anyone committing fraud in connection with buying or selling of securities in interstate commerce would not be entitled to a jury in any federal criminal prosecution of such fraud. Would persons engaging in securities fraud after the adoption of such an amendment be deemed to have constructively waived their constitutionally protected rights to trial by jury in criminal cases? The answer, of course, is no. The classic description of an effective waiver of a constitutional right is the "intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right or privilege." "Courts indulge every reasonable presumption against waiver" of fundamental constitutional rights." (we "do not presume

acquiescence in the loss of fundamental rights"). State sovereign immunity, no less than the right to trial by jury in criminal cases, is constitutionally protected. And in the context of federal sovereign immunity - obviously the closest analogy to the present case - it is well established that waivers are not implied. See eg. *United States v King*, 395 US 1, 4, 89 S Ct 1501, 23 L Ed 2d 52 (1969) (describing the "settled proposition" that the United States' waiver of sovereign immunity "cannot be implied but must be unequivocally expressed"). We see no reason why the rule should be different with respect to State sovereign immunity (circa 1999). College.\*

In a court proceeding to attack sentence entered upon a defendant's plea of guilty, notice they use a lesser standard against human beings: The Supreme Court held that "where defendant was advised by competent counsel and tendered his plea after his codefendant, who had already given a confession, determined to plead guilty and became available to testify against the defendant, defendant's plea of guilty was not rendered involuntary because of possible fear of death penalty if case were tried by jury." *Brady v United States*.\*\*

"That a guilty plea is a grave and solemn act to be accepted only with care and discernment has long been recognized. Central to the plea and foundation for entering judgment against the defendant is the defendant's admission in open court that he committed the acts charged in the indictment. He thus stands as a witness

against himself and he is shielded by the Fifth Amendment from being compelled to do so - hence the minimum requirement that his plea be the voluntary expression of his own choice. But the plea is more than an admission of past conduct; it is the defendant's consent that judgment of conviction may be entered without a trial - a waiver of his right to trial before a jury or a judge. Waiver of constitutional rights not only must be voluntary but must be knowing, intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and likely consequences. On neither score was Brady's plea of guilty invalid." Brady, supra.\*

Did you notice the difference between the State and human being on WAIVER of rights? A State can use an attorney or legislature to waive a right and it may not be considered waived but when a criminal defendant waives the right through an attorney the human being is deadmeat. Maybe both the codefendant and defendant were innocent and coerced into plea agreements because the prosecutor committed fraud and terrorism to clear the criminal blotter of cases; it happens often.

In an action by a retired police officer to recover money allegedly due him from the United States: The Supreme Court held that a retired army officer's suit respecting right to declaration that he was entitled to have his military records changed to show he was retired for disability was suit essentially for equitable relief of a kind which U.S.

Court of Claims does not have power to grant. Declaratory judgment lawsuits should be brought in U.S. District Court under Title 28 U.S.C., Sec. 2201, **et seq.**, since the Court of Claims is only for money damages against the U.S. The federal government did not WAIVE sovereign immunity to declaratory type cases in the Court of Claims. United States v King.\*

In a criminal case where the defendant was denied counsel for trial the Supreme Court ruled rights were improperly waived. "The courts indulge every reasonable presumption against waiver of fundamental constitutional rights, and do not presume acquiescence in the loss of fundamental rights." Johnson v Zerbst.\*\* Right to trial by jury cited here is called fundamental simply because it is a basic precept in language of the U.S. Constitution.

"A waiver is ordinarily an intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right or privilege." Johnson.\*\*\*

Note that Brady stated a WAIVER "is the defendant's consent that judgment of conviction may be entered without a trial" (page 20 top). You must consent to giving up your rights. They cannot lawfully be taken by force or fraud.

A WAIVER is usually your consent to give up a Right or Rights as a Natural Person. Some examples of giving up your Natural Rights are when you sign your name to an application for a Social Security Number, sign your name to an Internal Revenue Service W4 form to pay an "income"

taxes, sign your name to an application for a drivers license, etc. When you sign these forms you become party to the corporate State or United States of America under corporate rules of law; statutes and administrative rules. These are all contracts that you agree to enter into that limit your Natural Rights in one form or another.

I wouldn't recommend throwing out your drivers license and driving on the roads without it at this time. That is another discussion in itself and very complicated. However, you should attempt to learn why you lawfully don't have to obtain a Social Security Number or pay taxes top the Internal Revenue Service at some time from a qualified source (Check the Internet.).

**CONTRACT**

Right to Contract with other persons is a God-given, Natural Right that can be described as Natural Law. It is written of in the United States Constitution where it says: "No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make any Thing but Gold and Silver Coin as Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, or ex post facto Law, or Law impairing the **Obligation of Contracts**, or grant any Title of Nobility." U.S. Const., Article I, Section 10. (The entire section is quoted to show the

Constitution is ignored by **de facto** public servants. For example, your Gold and Silver Coin is replaced by a fraudulent paper Federal Reserve Note; attorneys take on the title of esquire to the king.)

Natural Law is defined: "In ethics, it consists of practical universal judgments which man himself elicits. These express necessary and **obligatory rules of human conduct** which have been established by the author of human nature as essential to divine purposes in the universe and have been promulgated by God solely through human reason." "Natural" is also defined as being distinct and sometimes opposed to "legal" or, as we discuss here, corporate law - statutes. (Natural law).\*

Compare the "obligatory rules of human conduct" with the constitutional wording, "Obligation of Contracts." Every word put into the U.S. Constitution was carefully chosen in those days when the People were not careless with their words.

The "WAIVER" of a right has led us necessarily into discussion on contracts because every State, the federal government, and State and federal official, have made a contract with the People that will hereafter be described. There are many different types of contracts but this is limited to contract in law.

An implied contract is one not created or evidenced by the explicit agreement of the parties, but inferred by law, as a matter of reason and justice from their acts or conduct, the circumstances, surr-

ounding the transaction making it reasonable, or even a necessary assumption that a contract existed between them by tacit understanding.

Implied contracts are sometimes divided into those "implied in fact," and those "implied in law," the former being covered by the definition just given, while the latter are obligations imposed upon a person by law, not in pursuance of his intention and agreement, either express or implied, but even against his will and design, because the circumstances between the parties are such as to render it just that one should have a right, and the other a corresponding liability, similar to those which would arise from a contract between them. This kind of obligation therefore rests on the principle that whatsoever it is certain a man ought to do the law will suppose him to have promised to do. And hence it is said that, while the liability of a party to an express contract arises directly from the contract, it is just the reverse in the case of a contract "implied in law," the contract there being implied or arising from the liability. (Contract, Implied contract).\*

The State and United States Constitutions are a contract public officials and employees (public servants) must follow. This is a quasi-contract, a "legal fiction," but just as binding as an express contract. UCC 1-207; U.S. Const., Article VI, clauses 2 & 3 (Oath of office), Amendment 14; 4 U.S.C., Section 101 (Oath of Incorporation); Michigan Constitution, Article XI, Section 1 (Oath of office; every State has one of these). (Contract, Quasi contract, Legal fiction).\*\*

The "United States of America" and State are corporate entities, Articles of Confederation (Nov. 15, 1777), respective Constitutions their corporate charter, their organic law and contract with the People.\* The State as a Republic agreed to adhere to the United States Constitution when incorporating into the Union. U.S. Const., Article VI, clauses 2 & 3, Amends. 9, 14; Mich. Const., Article XI, Section 1 (Each State has one); Michigan Assent to Condition of Admission (Dec. 15, 1836)(Each state has one); 4 U.S.C., Sec. 101; 28 U.S.C., Sec. 3002(15)(incorporation).

Therefore, the corporate United States of America (USA, Inc.) and State made a contract to be limited by the United States Constitution with each and every Natural Person within its territorial boundaries. Those constitutional limits were to prevent the tyranny and oppression from which we extracted ourselves in wars to separate from the King of England. This Constitution was and is for the most part a one-way contract between the USA, Inc. and We the People with no conditions imposed on the People except personal punishment for sedition and treason (U.S. Const., Art. III, Section 3), and an inferred requirement to remain forever diligent in electing our Public Servants to represent us in the Public Offices created by We the People. U.S. Const., Articles I, II & III.

Inherent in this constitutional contract was and is the Natural Contract between each and every Natural Person of



the People to form a Republic that was their common agreement to stick together and protect each other with each Natural State running its own Natural Republic. U.S. Const., Article IV, Section 4; Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776), last paragraph ("we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor"). This is no different than you and I forming an agreement for some lawful purpose; the Natural Right to Contract that God created in us. Holy Bible, Genesis 1:26.

Natural Contracts made by the Natural united States formed by the People were carried over into the corporate United States. U.S. Const., Article VI, cl. 2 & 3; Title 4 U.S.C., Section 101; Title 28 U.S.C., Section 3002(15). However, at this point in history, corporations have by force and deception taken over and unlawfully nullified the Natural Persons, Natural States and Natural Republics to a great extent "while your parents [and you] were asleep." The modus operandi of the corporation is to serve MAMMON and gain wealth at the expense of any Person it may subdue and enslave; the modus operandi of the Republic is to serve each and every one of the People. Therefore, it should be understood the public corporation and Republic are effectively opposites.

You have a duty to put the corporations back on their leashes and protect the God-given and Natural Rights of you and your children by learning, then educating to subdue the beast. Holy Bible, Deuteronomy 5:8-9, 30:19. Find and

work with some group such as those at:  
www.landowners.bizland.com or  
www.pbn.4mg.com or  
those who provided this booklet.

#### UNITED v UNITED & STATES

There is a difference between the "united States" and the "United States of America." The united States is that Natural Republic of which each State is itself a Nation State or Country. The United States of America is the corporate entity, "USA, Inc," also known as the federal government which does not have original jurisdiction within any of the States, counties or subdivisions thereof. U.S. Const., Article I, Section 8, clause 18; Declaration of Independence, last pgh.

The term State also includes the federal government in a sense, although the federal government is something less than a State and subject to the Natural States of the united States. The federal government only has jurisdiction over that 10 miles square area known as Washington DC, various military bases necessary to mutual defense of the States, and various federal buildings where the States have given (by waiver) the corporation jurisdiction. U.S. Const., Article I, Sec. 8, cl. 18; 4 U.S.C., Sec. 101 et seq.

Outside the Constitution, the corporate United States also has limited jurisdiction over federal lands, mostly in Western States, that individual territories

contracted to give to the federal government as a condition of each State incorporating into the United States. This was a WAIVER of the Natural Right to property that the People of each State gave up. This and the section on CONTRACT further define THE STATE previously addressed herein, to give a clearer picture that you need to know hereafter.

A State is: "A body of people occupying a definite territory and politically organized under one government. A territorial unit with a distinct general body of law. Term may refer to a body politic of a nation (e.g. United States) or to an individual governmental unit of such nation" (e.g. Michigan). A foreign country or nation is a State. The several united States are considered "foreign" to each other except as to their relations as common members of the Union.\* (State).

A Nation is: "A people or aggregation of men, existing in the form of an organized jural society, usually inhabiting a distinct portion of the earth, speaking the same language, using the same customs, possessing historic continuity, and distinguished from other like groups by their racial origin and characteristics, and generally, but not necessarily, living under the same government and sovereignty. In American constitutional law the word 'state' is applied to the several members of the American Union, while the word 'nation' is applied to the whole body of the People embraced with the jurisdiction of the federal government."\*\* (Nation).

A Country is: "The territory occupied by an independent nation or people, or the inhabitants of such territory. In the primary meaning 'country' denotes the population, the nation, the State, or the government, having possession and dominion over a territory." (Country).\*

A recent example of a Nation is the manner in which the Indiana Baptist Temple (IBT) of Indianapolis was treated by the corporate United States Department of Justice. In August 2000, U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno called in a Special Attorney General to handle the matter where the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) made a fraudulent claim in U.S. District Court that the IBT owed six million dollars in income taxes and penalties while the IRS publicly acknowledged the IBT did not owe any taxes. The IBT was a free, First Amendment Christian Church not encumbered as a government-controlled non-profit corporation under Title 26 U.S.C., Section 501(c)(3). The calling in of the Special Attorney General was invoking of Abraham Lincoln's War Powers Act and declaring the IBT as a belligerent Nation. The IBT was one "engaged in lawful war" with the corporate United States. (Belligerent).\*\*

The term "country" is also addressed to the individual States of the United States in title 28 U.S.C., Section 297. It refers to "the freely associated compact states" in section "(a)" that refers to the States as "countries" in section "(b)".

Therefore, each of the united States

are an independent country or Nation State up to the point that each State waived certain Natural Rights when incorporating into the United States of America by agreeing to be limited. These limitations were and are in the U.S. Constitution - the Bill of Rights, the First ten Amendments - to prevent tyranny and oppression.

### **CITIZEN, SERVANT, SLAVE**

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." U.S. Const., Amend. 14, Section 1.

Section 1, clause 1, of the Fourteenth Amendment says all "persons born or naturalized" in the United States are "citizens," and clause 2 says no State "shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens." However, Section 1, clauses 3 and 4, say no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property ...; nor deny to any person ... equal protection..." There must be a difference between a citizen and person, and between privileges or immunities and life, liberty and property.

Life, liberty, property and equal protection are God-given, "unalienable Rights." Holy Bible, Matthew 7:12, Luke 6:38 (equal protection); Genesis 1:26; Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776) (unalienable). It was discussed earlier that a Natural Person is a sovereign who must WAIVE personal Rights. Unalienable Rights are those against which no lien or encumbrance can be held, from which a Person cannot be alienated. They cannot be revoked as the Privileges and Immunities which can be taken from citizens.

Privileges are a particular advantage or benefit given to one "beyond the common advantages of other citizens." Immunities are an exemption from "duties which the law generally requires other citizens to perform." (Privileges, Immunities).\* These are "civil rights" with civil meaning that which is applied to a citizen.

A citizen is: "Members of a political community who, in their associated capacity, have ... submitted themselves to the dominion of a government." Dominion means "perfect control in right of ownership." "The relationship of master and servant exists where one person, for pay or other valuable consideration, enters into the service of another and devotes to him his personal labor for an agreed period." Therefore, the citizen is a servant and the government becomes master. (Citizen, Dominion, Master, Master & Servant, Servant).\*\*

It was said of one type of servant, the public servant, at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia, in 1787, when

one of the delegates rose and said, "Sirs, if we create the office of President, what is to prevent the president from becoming a king?" A gray-haired gentleman arose and said, "Sir, you misperceive what we are doing here. You see, we are a nation of SOVEREIGNS. If someone leaves the exalted position of sovereign, and becomes a servant to the People, the only way he can return to the exalted position of sovereign is to resign his post, or after his time in office is up, leave public life and return to private life." That gray-haired gentleman as Benjamin Franklin. Therefore, intent of our Constitution at the time of writing was that all public officials and employees are public servants and something less than each Natural Person of the People. In other words, a public official or employee has given-up his sovereignty or become a citizen-servant in employment of the People.

There was a time, not so very long ago, when prisoners were regarded as 'slaves of the State,' having "not only forfeited their liberty, but also their personal rights." **Ruffin v Commonwealth**, 62 VA 790, 796 (1871). This was in a context where State prisoners were forced to work without pay (circa 1977). Jones v N.C. Prisoners.\* In united States v Azanka, Vasantha Katudeniye Gedara, a native of Sri Lanka, was forced to work for Talal Alzanka in a New York apartment for \$120 a month, sleep on the floor and never leave the apartment; this was called involuntary servitude.\*\* In Iwanowa v Ford Motor Co., Iwanowa was kidnapped at Rostock, Russia by the Nazi army, trans-

ported to Wuppertal, Germany, bought by a Ford Motor official and forced to work in the Ford Motor factory for no pay. This was deemed to be slavery. Iwanowa.\* The difference between a servant and slave is that a servant gets paid, and a slave does not get paid, compensation for labor done but both are forced labor.

Use of unpaid forced labor during World War II violated clearly established norms of customary international law. Iwanowa "was literally purchased along with 38 other children from Rostock, by a representative of Ford Werke." That a person "knowingly accepted the benefit of and approved the use of forced labor" may be considered "slave trading." All sources of international law expressly provide that enslavement of civilians during war time violates the law of nations. The Nuremburg Tribunals "for the first time made explicit and unambiguous what was theretofore ... implicit in International Law[; that] to exterminate, enslave or deport civilian populations is an international crime." Further, Nuremburg Principle IV(b) provides that "deportation to slave labor ... of civilian populations of or in occupied territory" constitutes both a "war crime" and a "crime against humanity."\*\* Genocide and slavery are "heinous actions - each of which violates definable, universal and obligatory norms." Iwanowa.\*\*\*

Slavery was allegedly condemned after World War II at the Nuremburg Trials. Look around the present day world and ask yourself how many instances of slavery you



still see in progress. At this writing, to name a few: Prisoners in Red China are forced to work in factories for goods sold in the United States. Thousands in Sudan are treated as slaves and murdered daily by the 200,000 Red Chinese soldiers (Peoples Liberation Army) who work for the Sudanese government. Do actions of the Internationalists equal their words?

Taking a trip back to 100 years prior to Nuremburg: Note the 14th Amendment only recognized "citizens" and the "person." These terms were also used when the Constitution was written and indicate two types of "persons" were recognized at the beginning of this country. The original citizens of the united States were dominated by the corporations known as the East India Company and Hudson Bay Company. "East India, Inc." had it's own army and we sovereigns dumped its government subsidized tea at the Boston Tea Party. Some original inhabitants of the united States were sovereigns (Natural Persons), some corporate persons (citizens), and some slaves (non-persons, property) which remained the status until the 14th Amendment was enacted in 1868.

In 1857, the United States Supreme Court ruled that citizenship was enjoyed by two classes of individuals: (1) White persons born in the United States as descendents of "persons, who were at the time of adoption of the Constitution recognized as citizens of the several States and [who] became also citizens of the new political body," the United States of America, and (2) those who, having been

born outside the dominions of the United States," had migrated thereto and had been naturalized therein. The States were competent, the Court continued, to confer State citizenship upon anyone in their midst, but they could not make a recipient of such status a citizen of the United States. The Court ruled the Black man was a non-person insofar as the corporate United States was concerned. Scott v Sanford.\* This same Court that ruled the Black man, Dred Scott was property, a non-citizen and non-person, first gave corporations - non-citizens and non-persons, legal fictions - the sacred rights of citizenship in 1886 in Santa Clara County v Southern Pacific R. Co.\*\*

With enactment of the 13th Amendment in 1865, slavery was allegedly abolished but there are many slaves who don't even recognize their demise. The 14th Amendment allegedly made every Person born or naturalized in the United States a citizen. However, depending on one's understanding of each individual situation, it is likely that most persons in the corporate United States of America are multiple persons, both a corporate person under Uniform Commercial Code (citizen or slave) and Natural Person (sovereign), depending on the Natural Rights a Person has, either in ignorance or for some alleged social security, WAIVED.

The 13th Amendment created a new form of legal slavery, by the State instead of private slavery. The 14th Amendment took us many steps backward into ancient Roman civil law. At this point, you have the

choice to assert your God-given and Natural Rights as a sovereign or, maybe soon, be a servant or slave without choice under Uniform Commercial Code of the corporation. Be forever diligent! Holy Bible, Galatians 4:31, I Peter 5:8.

### NATURAL RIGHTS

The word "travel" is not found in the text of the Constitution. Yet the "constitutional right to travel from one State to another" is firmly embedded in U.S. jurisprudence. indeed, the right is so important that it is "assertable against private intference as well as governmental action..., a virtually unconditional **personal** right, guaranteed by the Constitution to us all." Saenz v Roe.\* The U.S. Supreme Court ruled: "The constitutional protection of the right to travel freely from State to State is independent of the 14th Amendment." United States v Guest.\*\* The Right to Travel was firmly embedded in U.S. jurisprudence and independent of the 14th Amendment because it is a God-given, Natural Right that existed from the beginning. Holy Bible, Genesis 1.

The "right to travel" embraces at least three different components. It protects the right of a citizen of one State to enter and leave another State, the right to be treated as a welcome visitor rather than an unfriendly alien when temporarily present in the second State, and, for those travelers who elect to become permanent residents, the right to be trea-

ted like other citizens of that State. Saenz.\* Such Rights can be traced back to Common Law. Magna Charta (June 15, 1215), pghs. 41 & 42.

Saenz changes God-given and Natural Rights into corporate rules of law in ruling on Right to Travel. (Remember, the judiciary twists things until they are not what they were; page 10 herein.) Saenz ruled "The second component of the right to travel is expressly protected by the text of the Constitution" which says: "The Citizens of each State shall be entitled to all Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the several States." U.S. Const., Art. VI, Sec. 2. Saenz used the first sentence of Article IV, and clause 1 of the 14th Amendment, of the U.S. Constitution to turn the Right into "Privileges and Immunities." Saenz.\*\*

In corporate rule of law (statutes), the Court ruled the Secretary of State did not have a right to deny passports to Communists going abroad to further Communist activities: "The right to travel is a part of the liberty of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment." Kent v Dulles.\*\*\* President Bill Clinton further corporatized such Rights in a United Nations treaty: "Everyone lawfully within the territory of a State shall, within that territory, have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence." The Int'l Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Dec. 15, 1998), Article 12, Section (Clinton was an attorney, a BAR member).

A covenant is a contract of sorts but not between men of equal status. A covenant is about revocable privilege given to servants of a sovereign who is usually king. Maybe you should ask at this point who thought he was king.

A license is a permit given to a citizen or person to do something that would otherwise be unlawful. Why do you get a drivers license or marriage license to do what you have a Right to do without a license? You WAIVED your God-given, Natural Right for corporate State privilege.

Again, I am not saying to drive without a license. You must consider at this point that certain public servants, and agencies run by them, think they are king and have an ARMY behind them. The sovereign, which you are supposed to be, can not rule without your "regal retinue," an army of sovereigns to protect your Natural Rights. Get politically active and make a difference; join a group or start one; do something. Holy Bible, I Peter 5:8.

Another Natural Right is to raise one's children. Using a corporate decision to describe this Right: "The Court has frequently emphasized the importance of the family. The rights to conceive and to raise one's children have been deemed essential, basic civil rights of man, and rights far more precious ... than property rights. It is cardinal with us that the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first with the parents, whose primary function and freedom include preparation for obligations the State can

neither supply nor hinder. The integrity of the family unit has found protection in the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Ninth Amendment. Stanley v Illinois.\* Stanley uses the term "civil" to turn a Natural Right into a corporate rule of law but eliminate "civil" and read it in the real context, "basic rights of man." The Ninth Amendment says all our Natural Rights and Lawful Rights which existed before the U.S. Constitution continue to exist.

Stanley helps to understand the Natural Rights. They are those designed into the being when created. A man and woman were designed with the Natural ability to procreate children and with the intellect to raise and teach the child.

God gave you legs for locomotion; hence, your Natural Right to travel.

Within the scope of Natural Liberty, you have the right to do anything you see fit, without restraint or control, unless by law of nature, so long as you do not harm anyone or interfere with equal exercise of the same rights of other persons. (Natural law, Natural liberty, Personal liberty.)\*\*

God is the ultimate sovereign. You were made in his image and to be a sovereign, subject only to God. You were made to be free. Holy Bible, Genesis 1:26, 9:1-2, Acts 5:29, I Corinthians 7:23. This is a Natural Right. Be subject to no man except as the Lord intended. Matthew 5:44-48, 7:12, John 14:27.

## NATURAL OR CORPORATE PERSON

Self-defense was discussed in a U.S. Supreme Court case on a Natural Person, John Bad Elk. Mr. Elk, as a Natural Person, exercised his Lawful Rights as a Sovereign; he was not a corporate or incorporated person who had given up Natural Rights. He was living on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in 1899, in South Dakota. John Bad Elk v United States (1900)\* (A case on Natural Right of self-defense).

In another case which appears to be the same person, John Elk attempted to exercise the corporate "right" to vote in an election. Mr. Elk sued the registrar of one of the wards of the City of Omaha, Nebraska, for refusing to register him as a qualified voter therein. John Elk v Wilkins.\*\*

John Elk filed complaint stating: He was an Indian, born in the United States, who severed his relationship with the Indian tribes more than one year prior to the period in question, and had fully surrendered himself to the jurisdiction of the United States, and still continued to do so. Elk averred that he was a citizen of the United States and entitled to the rights and privileges of a citizen by virtue of the 14th Amendment to the United States Constitution. He averred he was a citizen of Nebraska, and a **bona fide** resident of Douglas County wherein the City of Omaha was located for more than forty days before April 6, 1880.

On April 6, 1880, in the City of Omaha (a first class city, incorporated under general laws of the State of Nebraska, providing for incorporation of cities of the first class), an election was held to choose members of city council and officers for said city. Charles Wilkins held the office of registrar in the Fifth Ward of Omaha and it was his duty to register names of all persons entitled to exercise the elective franchise in said ward at the election.

Mr. Elk further averred in his complaint: On or about April 5, 1880, prior to said election, John Elk presented himself for purpose of having his name registered as a qualified voter, as provided by law, to Charles Wilkins at the registrar's office and had complied with all provisions of relevant statutes. Mr. Elk claimed he was a citizen of the United States under the 14th and 15th Amendments entitled to exercise the elective franchise, regardless of his race and color, and that Wilkins designedly, corruptly, willfully, and maliciously, did then and there refuse to register Mr. Elk for the sole reason that Mr. Elk was an Indian and, therefore, not a citizen of the United States nor entitled to vote, on account of his race and color. On April 6, 1880, Mr. Elk presented himself at the voting place, presented a ballot and requested the right to vote, but Wilkins declared Mr. Elk was an Indian, not a citizen and not entitled to vote. Judges and clerks of the election refused to receive Mr. Elk's vote because he was not registered as required by law.



Charles Wilkins filed a general demurrer (answers): (1) That the complaint did not state sufficient facts to constitute a cause of action; (2) that the court had no jurisdiction over the person of Mr. Wilkins; and (3) that the court had no jurisdiction to the subject of the action. The complaint was dismissed by the U.S. circuit court for the district of Nebraska and Mr. Elk petitioned for writ of error to the U.S. Supreme Court.

By Nebraska Constitution, Article 7, Section 1, "every male person of the age of twenty-one years or upwards, belonging to either of the following classes, who shall have resided in the state six months, and in the county, precinct, or ward for the term provided by law, shall be an elector: First, citizens of the United States; second, persons of foreign birth who shall have declared their intention to become citizens, conformably to the laws of the United States on the subject of naturalization, at least thirty days prior to an election." It is the duty of the registrar to enter in the register the name of every person who applies to him to be registered, and satisfies that he is qualified to vote under provisions of election laws of the state; and at all municipal, as well as county or state elections, the judges of election are required to check the name, and receive and deposit the ballot, of any person whose name appears on the register. Comp. St. Neb. 1881, c. 26, Sec. 3; c. 13, Sec. 14, c. 76, Secs. 6, 13, 19. These were corporate State rules on "right" to vote.

Mr. Elk's petition "clearly implies that he was born a member of one of the Indian tribes within the limits of the United States which still exists and is recognized as a tribe by the government of the United States." Though Mr. Elk alleges he "had fully and completely surrendered himself to the jurisdiction of the United States, he does not allege that the United States accepted his surrender, or that he has ever been naturalized, or taxed, or in any way recognized or treated as a citizen by the State or the United States. Nor is it contended ... that there is any statute or treaty that makes him a citizen." Elk, 112 US at 99-100, 5 S Ct at 44, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_.

The question is whether an Indian born of a tribe within the United States is by reason of his birth within the United States, after voluntarily separating himself from his tribe and taking up residence among white citizens, a citizen of the United States within the meaning of the first section of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Under the U.S. Constitution, as originally established, "Indians not taxed" were excluded from the persons whose numbers were counted to apportion representatives and direct taxes among the several States. Congress had exercised power to regulate commerce within the Indian tribes, within or without the boundaries of one of the States of the Union. The Indian tribes, being within the territorial limits of the United States, were not foreign States; but they were **alien nations, distinct political communities**, with whom the United States did

habitually deal, either through treaties made by the President and Senate, or through Acts of Congress in ordinary legislation. The members of those tribes owed immediate allegiance to their several tribes, and were not part of the People of the United States. They were in a dependent condition of pupilage resembling that of a ward to his guardian. Indians and their property, exempt from taxation by treaty or statute of the United States, could not be taxed by any State. General Acts of Congress did not apply to Indians, unless clearly expressed so as to include them. Elk, 112 US at 100, 5 S Ct at 44, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_.

Take time to think this over: The Indiana Baptist Temple (IBT), when seized by the federal government (page 29) was treated much like the this ruling in Elk, an alien nation and distinct political community. And, as said of the sovereign (page 7 herein), no law applied to the Indian unless specifically expressed by Congress/Parliament. The Indian was a sovereign subdued by use of force as was the IBT. Also note intent to re-educate the Indian as a ward of the State.

"The alien and dependent condition of the members of the Indian tribes could not be put off at their own will without the action or assent of the United States. They were never deemed citizens of the United States, except under explicit provisions of treaty or statute to that effect, either declaring a certain tribe, or such members of it as chose to remain behind on the removal of the tribe west-

ward, to be citizens, or authorizing individuals of particular tribes to become citizens on application to a court of the United States for naturalization and satisfactory proof of fitness for civilized life." Elk, 112 US at 101, 5 S Ct at 44, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_.

"By the Thirteenth Amendment of the Constitution slavery was prohibited [by private persons]. The main object of the opening sentence of the 14th Amendment was to settle the question, upon which there had been a difference of opinion throughout the country and in this court, as to the citizenship of free negroes, and to put it beyond doubt that all persons, white or black, and whether formerly slaves or not, born or naturalized in the United States, and owing no allegiance to any alien power, should be citizens of the United States and the State in which they reside." Elk, 112 US at 102, 5 S Ct at 45, 28 S Ct at \_\_\_\_.

"Indians born within the territorial limits of the United States, members of, and owing immediate allegiance to, one of the Indian tribes (an alien though dependent power), ... are no more born in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, within the meaning of the first section of the 14th Amendment, than the children of subjects of any foreign government born within the domain of that government, or the children born within the United States, of ambassadors or other public ministers of foreign nations." Elk, 112 US at 103, 5 S Ct at 45, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_ . To whom does any Christian owe

first allegiance? Holy Bible, Acts 5:29. Why do you think the corporate U.S. will be any less brutal with Christians than it was with the Indians in the coming conflict? Holy Bible, Revelation 19.

The "language used, about the same time, by the very Congress which framed the 14th Amendment, in the first section of the civil rights Act of April 9, 1866, declaring who shall be citizens of the United States, is 'all persons born in the United States, and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians not taxed.' 14 St. 27; Rec. St. Sec. 1922. Such Indians then not being citizens by birth, can only become citizens in the second way mentioned in the 14th Amendment, by being 'naturalized in the United States,' or by some treaty or statute." Elk, 112 US at 104, 5 S Ct at 46, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_.

"The treaty of 1867 with the Kansas Indians strikingly illustrates the principle that no one can become a citizen of a nation without its consent, and directly contradicts the supposition that a member of an Indian tribe can at will be alternately a citizen of the United States and a member of the tribe. That treaty not only provided for the naturalization of members of ... [various] tribes, and their families, upon their making declaration, before the district court of the United States, of their intention to become citizens (15 St. 517, 520, 521), but, after reciting that some of the Wyandotts, who had become citizens under the treaty of 1855, were 'unfitted for the responsibilities of citizenship,' provided that "no one who has

heretofore consented to become a citizen, nor the wife or children of such person, shall be allowed to become members of the tribe, except by free consent of the tribe after its new organization, and unless the agent shall certify that such party is, through poverty or incapacity, unfit to continue in the exercise of responsibilities of citizenship of the United States and likely to become a public charge. 15 St. 514, 516." Elk.\*

Therefore, the ability to be both a Natural Person and a corporate U.S. citizen, or go back and forth between the two, was prohibited by the corporate judiciary. This contradicts, in some respects, what I said on page 35, that "most persons in the corporate United States are multiple persons" but many countries recognize dual citizenship.

Title 4 United States Code, Sections 101 et seq., are part of incorporation of each State into the corporate "United States of America" (USA, Inc.). Section 101 reads: "Every member of a State legislature and every executive and judicial officer of a State, shall, before he proceeds to execute the duties of his office, take an oath in the following form, to wit: 'I, A B, do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States.'" 4 U.S.C., Sec. 101. Compare this to Article VI, clauses 2 and 3, of the United States Constitution: "The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be

bound by oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution." U.S. Const., Art. VI, cl. 2 & 3. Why was a statute made for something already in the Constitution? This is because the original Constitution was a Natural contract between Natural Persons at the time. The statute (4 U.S.C., Sec. 101) was to incorporate State officials, just as the 14th Amendment was to incorporate the State, into U.S.A., Inc. so Natural Rights could be silently and slowly stolen.

Another question this raises: If public officials are required to swear an Oath to adhere to the Constitution, is the person acting as a public official and not adhering to the Constitution an agent of a foreign nation? - a subversive, a wolf in sheep clothing, seeking to subvert your Natural Rights by deception. He is if he has sworn an Oath to another corporation such as the Council on Foreign Relations.

Why jump from Mr. Elk's case to Oaths of State officials? The U.S. Supreme Court ruled: John Elk, "not being a citizen of the United States under the 14th Amendment of the Constitution, has been deprived of no right secured by the 15th Amendment, and cannot maintain this action." Elk.\* This referred to the fact that Indians as Natural Persons were not taxed and, therefore, could not claim citizenship. Mr. Elk had not paid taxes as a servant of the corporation. Title 4 U.S.C., Sections 101 and sequence, pertain to collection of State motor fuel taxes on government reservations such as military bases when the fuels were not for exclusive use of the United States, Inc.

Section 109 states: "Nothing in sections 105 and 106 of this title shall be deemed to authorize the levy or collection of any tax on or from any Indian not otherwise taxed." 4 U.S.C., Sec. 109. Indians as Natural Persons do not have to pay taxes on fuel, income, property and other things that the corporate person has agreed to pay. Dillon v Montana (income); Valandra v Viedt (property). Indians who WAIVED their Natural Rights have to pay taxes as a servant. Dillon, supra.\*

Immigration statutes allow American Indians to exercise Natural Right to travel without restriction: "Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed to affect the right of American Indians born in Canada to pass the borders of the United States, but such right shall extend only to persons (not citizens) who possess at least 50 per centum of blood of the American Indian race." 8 U.S.C., Sec. 1358.

An Oath of an official is an agreement, a contract with We the People, that the official will be our servant and follow our instructions, most of which are in Constitutions and laws of the United States and each State, and many based on God-given, Natural and Common Law Rights. The public servant WAIVED his Natural Rights just as Ben Franklin answered at the 1787 Constitutional Convention (page 31). In the same way, you have been conditioned with a form of mind-control to unknowingly WAIVE many of your Natural Rights for some corporate form of alleged security, by public servants in the



corporation (U.S.A., Inc.).

Some examples of WAIVING Natural Rights are:

(1) When one signs an agreement to become part of the Social Security Administration; a corporate agency formed on August 4, 1935; 42 U.S.C., Sec. 301 et seq. There was never a Social Security System before 1935. This makes you a federal employee. (This was shortly after President Roosevelt declared the People as enemy of government and confiscated gold, 12 U.S.C., Sec. 95a).

(2) When one signs W2 and W4 forms of the Internal Revenue Service (IRS), the person contracts to pay alleged Income Taxes that are voluntary and only required to be paid by federal employees. Title 26 United States Code. The alleged income tax laws are only a CODE and only apply to internal operation of the Executive Branch of the United States of America. The federal government only has jurisdiction over the ten Miles square area known as Washington DC, and places purchased with consent of each State, from each State, "for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings." U.S. Const., Art. I, Sec. 8. The U.S.A., Incorporated does not have jurisdiction to require taxes paid unless you give it to the corporation by signing an agreement. There was no IRS before 1954 and the united States did very well by collection of tariffs on incoming goods from foreign countries.

(3) You WAIVER right to travel by signing for a drivers license and volunteering to be a part of the corporate

State and to follow their rules under Uniform Commercial Code. Before drivers licenses existed, the People followed very much the same rules out of personal consideration for others and didn't need the corporate rules. (Personal Liberty).\*

(4) Inherent in travel is when you apply for a Certificate of Title for the vehicle you paid for. You gave up your personal Right of property on the vehicle and put it into ownership of the State which then determines criteria of your "personal" vehicle, and makes it subject to confiscation by the State, without due process of law, for any reason the corporate State may deem. A Certificate of Title is not your Deed to the property.

(5) You give up your God-given and Natural Right to worship God freely when you join a Title 26 United States Code, Section 501(c)(3) church that preaches only what the government allows, a white-washed doctrine meant as mind-control of you. You gave more than money to Caesar. See Matthew 6:24, 22:21.

(6) You gave up the Right to be free by using a monetary system of a Non-Government Organization (NGO) known as the Federal Reserve Bank (FRB) that enslaves with an ever-increasing 6 percent per annum interest and debt that can never be paid in kind. 12 U.S.C., Secs. 222, 244, 289. The only lawful currency is gold and silver. U.S. Const., Art. I, Sec. 10.

The above are at least five planks of the Communist Manifesto.

There are many more ways than these to give up your Natural Rights; this is only the "tip of the iceberg." Your duty

is to instruct your public servants on what to do and not do, and fire them when they refuse to follow orders. You surrender more and more of your Natural Rights as you sit and do nothing, watching television propaganda while you should be watching your public servants in government offices.

The corporate government, like any other business such as Ford, Chrysler or General Motors, exists to make a profit and continually gain power. The *de facto* government creates problems - legal fictions - fraudulent reasons to validate its own existence and increase at your loss. eg. The WAR on Drugs, WAR on Crime, etc. It is a predatory beast.

Quoting the God-given, Natural version of the Elk case (from page 46): "No one can serve two masters. He will hate one and love the other, or be devoted to one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and Mammon." Holy Bible, Matthew 6:24, Deuteronomy 5:8-9, 30:19. Therefore, whether you are a Natural Person (sovereign) or a corporate person (servant or slave) comes down to who you choose to serve.

#### CORPORATE CHURCHES

Another question raised in the last section was corporate churches. Most government-controlled churches operate under Title 26 United States Code:

**Section 501. Exemption from tax on corporations, certain trusts, etc.**

(a) **Exemption from taxation.** - An organization described in subsection (c) ... shall be exempt from taxation under this subtitle unless such exemption is denied under section 502 or 503.

\*\*\*\*\*

(c) **List of exempt corporations.** - The following organizations are referred to in subsection (a):

\*\*\*\*\*

(3) Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or to foster national or amateur sports competition (but only if no part of its activities involve the provision of athletic facilities or equipment), or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation (except as otherwise provided in subsection(h)), and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of (or in opposition to) any candidate for public office. 26 U.S.C., Sec. 501(c)(3).

Section 501(c)(3) is used to prohibit pastors of a church from lawfully talking out against any political official. For example, on February 13, 2001, the Indiana

Baptist Temple (IBT) of Indianapolis, Indiana, was seized by United States Marshals because the pastor had spoken against sinful sexual conduct of President Bill Clinton with White House Intern Monica Lewinski. The U.S. District Attorney said on August 7, 2000, "An uncontrolled church in America is untenable (unacceptable)." The IBT had rescinded its 501(c)(3) status before speaking out against the President but was still treated as a 501(c)(3), outside scope of corporate law (statutes). This means the pastor of a 501(c)(3) church cannot speak freely and has sold his birthright for Mammon. Holy Bible, Genesis 25:29-31.

"Freedom is what we have - Christ has set us free! Stand, then as free people and do not allow yourselves to become slaves again." Holy Bible, Galatians 5:1.

#### COMMON LAW

Corporate judicial decisions were used herein to define Natural Rights. These were carefully chosen to be those that used mostly Natural Law (which is inherent in Common Law) and the Common Law. Using another decision of the corporate judiciary to define this:

"It has long been established that statutes which invade the common law ... are to be read with a presumption favoring the retention of long-established and familiar principles, except when a statutory purpose to the contrary is evident.

Congress is understood to legislate against a background of common-law principles, and thus does not write upon a clean slate. As a result, common-law doctrines ought not be deemed repealed unless the language of a statute be clear and explicit for this purpose." Oubre v Entergy.<sup>\*</sup> Clearly said: All corporate statutes and decisions are based on Common Law unless clearly stated otherwise.

Prior to 1187 every Shire (county) in England had a different set of laws. King Henry II wanted a set of laws common to all England. He assigned Ranulf de Glanvill to compile all laws common throughout English counties and this became the Common Law. Common Law in the United States is that which existed in England in 1789 when our Constitution was written.

#### WAR

The Federal Reserve Banking Act which is in part the War Powers Act and also, in part, the Trading With Enemies Act, was first enacted on December 23, 1913 by President Woodrow Wilson, then modified on October 6, 1917, and again on March 9, 1933. The relevant part discussed here is the Trading With Enemies statute affecting you as a U.S. citizen:

**Sec. 95a. Regulation of transactions in foreign exchange of gold and silver; property transfers; vested interests, enforcement and penalties**

(1) During the time of war times of increased international tension or financial crisis the President may, through any

agency that he may designate, and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, by means of instructions, licenses, or otherwise -

(A) investigate, regulate, or prohibit, any transactions in foreign exchange, transfers or credit or payments between, by, through, or to any banking institution, and the importing, exporting, hoarding, melting, or earmarking of gold or silver coin or bullion, currency or securities, and

(B) investigate, regulate, direct and compel, nullify, void, prevent or prohibit, any acquisition, holding, withholding, use, transfer, withdrawal, transportation, importation or exportation of, or dealing in, or exercising, right, power, or privilege with respect to, or transactions involving, any property in which any foreign country or a national has any interest,

by any person, or with respect to any property, subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and any property or interest of any foreign country or national interest thereof shall vest, when, as and upon the terms directed by the President, may prescribe such interest or property to be held, used, administered, liquidated, sold, or otherwise dealt with ~~out~~ in the United States.... 12 U.S.C., Sec. 95a. (The dashes signify a deleted word and the underline is a new word added to the statute. This is only part of 95a.)

On March 9, 1933, President Franklin D. Roosevelt modified language of Section 95a by changing the word "out" to "in." He then decreed a "banking holiday to

close all banks, then forced bankers to open every safe deposit box and take all gold in them. Every citizen of the United States and all Persons were required to turn in any gold coins and bullion they owned or be considered a felon and put in prison for years. This subtle change in wording was a Declaration of WAR by President Roosevelt against WE THE PEOPLE.

Although corporate rule 95a only lawfully applied to U.S. citizens who gave up their Natural Rights, most Natural Persons who had not given up their Rights were terrorized by brute force and deception of the *de facto* government into turning in their gold so they could be enslaved by a fiat, paper-money system of the privately-owned Federal Reserve Bank.

The corporate U.S. has slowly confiscated Natural Rights in a manner only noticeable to those with time for close study and attention. It is "incrementalism." Corporations never die; people do die. From generation to generation the corporation with continuing memory seeks to gain more power and propagate itself after each generation of persons die and the new generation is accustomed to the lost Right it never had. Thus, it has been a slow taking of Rights listed on pages 49 to 52.

The earliest well-known taking of Rights began in 1863 with the Civil War when President Abraham Lincoln issued an Emancipation Proclamation based on his WAR Powers Act. 12 Stat. 1267. The 13th Amendment did not eliminate slavery but created a new class of slavery and invol-



untary servitude as "punishment for crime" for everyone with-in the United States; private slavery became State slavery. U.S. Const., Amend. 13. The War Powers Act of Lincoln raised an ugly, predatory head of the corporate beast when it eliminated States' Rights cited in the 10th Amendment (Bill of Rights).

The present corporate WAR began in 1913 without an open declaration when the Federal Reserve Bank (FRB) became a government-chartered, private corporation much like the Red Cross. 12 U.S.C., Sec. 222. The FRB was instituted by Jacob Schiff and Paul Warburg (brother of Hitler's Chief, Max Warburg; In 1917, Schiff and Warburg donated \$48 million to the Bolshevik Revolution to start communism in Russia.). The FRB Act instituted a fiat paper monetary system where money is made "out of thin air" and the only backing is labors and property of every U.S. citizen, a plank of the Communist Manifesto. The Federal Reserve Note, a bank draft, is a debt-based monetary system, unlike the U.S. Dollar which is the only lawful tender and backed by gold and silver. U.S. Const., Art. I, Sec. 10. Title 12 United States Code, Section 95a, was the first open declaration of WAR against WE THE PEOPLE by the corporation.

To bring this quickly up-to-date: The WAR POWERS ACT of 1917 was never rescinded. The corporation has been in a constant state of WAR for one reason or another since 1917 which allows the President to issue Executive Orders under Section 95a as if they are statutes made

by Congress. In 1999, President Bill Clinton issued Executive Order 13083, later revised as 13132, which makes all States subservient to the corporate federal government. In 1999, he issued 13107 which makes the corporate federal government subservient to the United Nations and Communists. On October 18, 2000, fifteen (15) members of U.S. Congress, in special session, ratified the UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION TO COMBAT DESERTIFICATION IN COUNTRIES EXPERIENCING DROUGHT..., Executive Report 106-25, which turned 70% of the land mass of the United States over to control of the U.N.

HR701, the CARA Bill, in U.S. Congress in 2001, sponsored \$45 billion to force U.S. citizens off millions of acres of rural property that has been in their families for generations. It creates more U.N. Biospheres which are then fenced off and no citizen can enter. On these biospheres, dangerous predatory animals are being introduced that will attack defenseless humans because their firearms were confiscated under U.N. Treaty. Such land grabs and prohibited entry have been going on since 1990 and forces humans into "sustainable developments" (controllable cities) like Hitler's Jewish Ghetto. ("www.discerningtoday.org", "www.landowners.biznet.com", "landrights.org", and "www.sovereignty.net").

**This is "rural cleansing".**

Applied Digital Solutions Corporation began beta testing on June 16, 2001 of a biochip implant known as Digital Angel. This chip has a homing beacon to track the person it is in, a memory to contain the

entire personal and financial history of the person, monitors body functions and can control body functions. It is powered from the body. Two listed intents of the chip are to buy and sell goods, and law enforcement tracking. This is nothing new because a similar IBM biochip was tested on Texas and California prisoners in 1995. The U.S. military is using chips to track soldiers. However, particularly telling of the corporation's intent was when U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell, on June 17, 2001, spoke on nuclear materials and scientists missing in Russia: "Finding the Russian scientists may be a problem being that Russia does not have a Social Security System, as here in America, that allows us to monitor, track down and capture American citizens" (Fox News Sunday, June 17, 2001). Colin Powell sat stunned and speechless for a while after realizing what he said. Would you trust a corporation that thinks of you as a servant or slave to know everything you did and where you go?

Flouride in water and toothpaste is a deception of the corporation, a method of disposing of waste product. Flouride is rat poison and a waste product of aluminum manufacture. Russian scientists learned in the 1950s that flouride caused a dumbing down of the human mind.

The corporate USA is designed at this time to protect the interests of other corporations, and cause a long, slow death of the People. Unless you put a leash back on it, if you don't do something, it will be a death of many cuts for you and

digitized original

Flouride is a toxin by itself

yours. Most major corporations are now international, larger than the corporate United States, and have lobbyists en masse influencing your Congressmen for their benefit, to your demise. Is your army subjugated to a mind-controlling media device (Public Law 106-65, Sec. 1061) or keeping your public servants in line.

Every word means something: The WAR on drugs and crime were terms chosen to invoke use of U.S. military against citizens. Public Law 106-65, Section 1067 (Apr. 9, 2000) put the U.S. Attorney General in charge of military for use in the United States against U.S. citizens; open WAR on We the People in the near future.

The deliberate dumbing-down of children in the Public Fool (School) System under GOALS 2000 and with chemical and biological agents is intended to more effectively implement their WAR. The large-scale confiscation of farms, ranches and livestock under a fraudulent guise of environmental statutes is a "rural cleansing" that will lead to corporate control of the food supply. "Food is power. We use it to change behavior. We use it as a weapon. We do not apologize" Katrine Burkini, July 1995, at the U.N. Beijing Conference on Women). Once the People are herded into controllable cities, they can easily be starved into turning in firearms for a bowl of pottage. Holy Bible, Genesis 25:29-31. After firearm confiscation, you have no protection against tyranny and being herded into concentration and death camps.

There are none so hopelessly enslaved as those who think they are free. Are you like my friends whose families were ignorantly led to slaughter in detention camps of Hitler's Germany?

## FIREARM CONFISCATION

### "FREEDOM FROM WAR THE UNITED STATES PROGRAM FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD"

\*\*\*\*\*

#### "THIRD STAGE

During the third stage of the program, the states of the world, building on the experience and confidence gained in successfully implementing the measures of the first two stages, would take final steps toward the goal of a world in which:

- States would retain only those forces, non-nuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.

- The U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

- The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those agreed types and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order. All other armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful purposes.

The peace-keeping capabilities of the United Nations would be sufficiently strong and the obligations of all States under such arraignments sufficiently far-reaching as to assure peace and the just settlement of differences in a disarmed world." Document 7277, pages 9-10 (U.S. Dept. of State, Sep. 1961).

The above quote of State Department Document 7277 led to Public Law 87-297 and Title 22 United States Code, Sections 2251 and sequence, which pertain to total disarmament of the United States civilian population and military under the United Nations treaty of 1954 and subsequent U.N. treaties. Stages 1 and 2 call for disarmament of the U.S. military. Presidential Decision Directive 25 issued in 1993 by Bill Clinton gave U.S. military over to control of the United Nations. Stage 3 calls for total disarmament of We the People and occupation of the United States by foreign troops of the United Nations. They are in Stage 3. *The U.N. votes on confiscation of personal firearms in December 2002.*

The United Nations is building a 12-lane highway from Mexico to Canada with 42 offshooting corridors throughout the U.S. that will be used to implement 7277. This highway will be patrolled by U.N. Peacekeepers who presently say that U.S. citizens will not be allowed on the highway (Media Bypass, May 1999, (800) 4 BYPASS). President Bill Clinton stated on implementing U.N. treaties: "We can't be so fixated on our desire to preserve the rights of ordinary Americans" (USA Today, page 2, March 11, 1993).

Since 1995, corporate U.N. and U.S. soldiers (mostly Russian) have trained in the U.S. for United Nations confiscation of all firearms from civilians (videotapes at infowars.com), just like Hitler did in 1933 before he went on his genocide program. The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) intends to cut population of the United States to 145 million by year 2015 (Foreign Affairs Journal, p. 11, March/April 1996). Most recent Congressmen, Presidents and major news media persons are members of the CFR, an elitist cult. Cutting the population of the United States can only be done after firearm confiscation and We the People do not have defense against tyranny.

"At what exact point ... should one resist... What would things have been like if every [Soviet] Security operative, when he went out at night to make an arrest, had been uncertain whether he would return alive?"

"Or, during periods of mass arrests people had not simply sat there in their lairs, paling in terror at every bang on the downstairs door and every step on the staircase, but had understood that they had nothing to lose and had boldly set up in the downstair's hall an ambush of half a dozen people with axes, hammers, pokers or whatever else was at hand."

"... the Organs (police) would very quickly have suffered a shortage of officers ... and, notwithstanding all of Stalin's thirst, the cursed machine (police state) would have ground to a halt." The Gulag Archipelago, Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

Don't be deceived by bifurcated language of the corporate NEW WORLD ORDER (U.N.). The term "peace," when used by them means when they have killed off (murdered) everyone who opposes them, who has a different opinion or way of life, who will not serve them blindly.

#### MODUS OPERANDI

Who is the corporate war against? "We are a Christian people, and the morality of the country is deeply ingrafted upon Christianity." Church of the Holy Trinity v United States.\*

"Prochoice" is a fuzzy, feel-good term for promurder, genocide and population control by the corporation. The U.S. Supreme Court based its 1973 abortion decision on the Stoics who worshipped Zeus who was Jupiter Olympus to Romans, and Baal to Hebrews. Sacrifice of children is a tenet of Baal worship. The Supreme Court decision in Roe v Wade is WAR against over 100 million Catholics and Protestants in the United States, Roe v Wade,\*\* by the worshippers of Molech in the corporation (see infowars.com).

The author personally knew some persons in the organizations from which **modus operandi** herein is determined:

The Court stated of one group: "On February 7, 1985, DEA Agent Enrique Camarena was kidnapped outside the American Consulate in Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico.



One month later Camarena's mutilated body was found." U.S. v Caro-Quintero.\* The DEA believes "a medical doctor, participated in the murder by prolonging Agent Camarena's life so that others could further torture and interrogate him." U.S. v Alvarez-Machain.\*\* The organization that murdered Camarena involved government officials who were never prosecuted.

In another organization, one man told me that they intended to control our politicians "all the way to the White House" by getting them involved in illicit sex and drugs. This group involved some major U.S. politicians in Congress, and some in the White House, who worship Molech at Bohemian Grove in California. They rent, lease, sell and murder children. They eat their young. (See The Franklin Cover Up, Sen. John DeCamp (AWT, Inc., P.O. Box 85461, Lincoln, NE 68510, Phone (800) 404-8274)(infowars.com).

I lived in Omaha when I knew these two groups, in the mid-1970s, both of which involved some of the same city officials. Some of these people are U.S. Congressmen. Some U.S. Congressmen are controlled by these people. You are nothing to them but a "useful idiot" at best. You are a "useless eater" who lives only at their pleasure, or so Ted Turner said on September 6, 2000 at the Millenium Group Conference (U.N.) in New York (Fox News, Sep. 7, 2000).

John Elk was treated as a ward of the corporate State because he was a Natural Person but not a corporate Person

(page 44). A ward is someone deemed to be incompetent. For example, if you accept an attorney to represent you in a court case, you are deemed a ward of the court and to be incompetent. John Elk was obviously an intelligent man who just didn't know all the rules but learned some. The barristers probably kept the law books hidden away where Mr. Elk couldn't find them to learn the necessary corporate rules, much like the present day where "law" is twisted, manipulated and hidden by an evil, black-robed priesthood of attorneys known as JUDGES.

The barristers say that ignorance of the law is no excuse. Count d'Toqueville said the more corrupt a government is, the more laws it enacts. So many laws have been enacted by the corporation that no competent person could ever keep up with them or learn them all. The present situation is a *de facto* government gone wild with so many predatory politicians out for their own gain and agenda that no one man or group could ever keep up with their shotgun approach to lawmaking which seeks to make every person guilty of something and a slave to the corporation.

This is a WAR where you must actively put a leash on the BEAST or lay down and lick your body parts when your master kicks you, with hopes he doesn't euthanize you pursuant to the plan. Holy Bible, Ephesians 6:12. Do something before it is too late, before the beast eats you and yours. The government big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take everything you have.

Who has this **modus operandi**?

Two seals are on the back of a "one dollar bill" between the four number 1s and "ones." These seals were officially adopted by Congress as the Great Seals of the United States, on September 15, 1789, and were originally the Two Great Seals of the Illuminati. The Seal on the left:

Directly above the capstone of the pyramid is "ANNUIT COEPTIS," and below the base is "NOVUS ORDO SECLORUM." The Latin expressions in English mean, "Announcing the birth of the New World Order." The capstone pointing upwards means man "invading the heavenlies." The three sides of the pyramid in occult mysticism mean Satan, the Antichrist, and the False Prophet.

The rest of the pyramid is 13 steps, the Organizational Chart of the Illuminati. The first block of the first level represents the "Council of Thirteen," the Grand Druid Council, the 13 most powerful witches alive. The second block represents the "Council of 33," the Masonic Grand Council, the 33 highest ranking Masons in the world. The third block is the "Council of 500," the Fortune 500, the 500 richest people and corporations in the world.

At the base of the pyramid are Roman numerals MDCCLXXVI which equals the year 1776. It represents May 1, 1776, the founding date of the Illuminati; also a Communist holiday.

These are the **de facto** government of the United States of America; controllers who are doing a hostile takeover of the corporation.

## FRAUD

The one-way CONTRACT made by your public servants was described earlier herein. It is wise to reread it now, then come back and finish this section.

In contract law, fraud voids a contract or anything derived of the fraud. UCC 1-207, 1-308; Oubre v Entergy, (1998)(contract voided); United States v Hyde (1997) (criminal plea agreement voided); Kyles v Whitely (1995)(criminal conviction voided); Tanner v United States (1987)(Common Law & 3rd party fraud); M & D v McConkey (1998)(Common Law & silent fraud, fraudulent misrepresentation).\*

Using the corporation's own words:

"Fraud is a difficult thing to prove. It is impossible to look into the recesses of another's mind. Conclusions, usually, must be reached by a process of reasoning and the logic of analysis applied to facts and circumstances that are known or disclosed in the record. **The lower animals act from knowledge and instinct. Human beings act from knowledge, reason and belief.** The dog knows and believes in the master whom he has seen. Man believes in the Creator whom he has not seen save as revealed in the genius and works of the **Master Builder** and in the perfection of **natural law.** The reasoning power is the primary difference between the brute and man." Carrier Corp. v United States.\*\* This was a masonic discourse by a masonic judge sitting in judgment over a masonic corporation that protects members of the Society described in MODUS OPERANDI. To

the **de facto** government this means you are no more than a dog if you don't understand what they are doing.

Most infringements of your Natural Rights were derived of fraud by officials in corporate government who are actually controlled by the illegitimate, behind the scenes, **de facto** government; those described in MODUS OPERANDI. Once you learn of the fraud by your public servants, it is your duty to put an end to it. If you take too long the doctrine of laches applies to mean you accept the fraud. Don't hesitate; get active; be an ARMY of one if necessary.

### CONCLUSION AND BEGINNING

This booklet isn't the ultimate authority on whether you are a Natural or corporate Person; whether you are free or have sold yourself for a bowl of pottage. Genesis 25:29-31. It's just a primer to get you started in the right direction.

What you do is like a stone thrown in a pond that makes waves in all directions and affects something. As you learn and become more experienced, you may join or gather an ARMY. The difference between We the People and the stone is that each one of us can cognitively direct our efforts to affect change more strongly than a general splash in the pond. Do something now or lay down and lick your master's boots with expectations of the coming whip on your back.

Don't use an excuse that you are only one person and can't do anything. I am only one person using abilities God gave me. I am not rich nor highly educated. I even have memory problems derived of a head injury in 1996 when a corporate public official and employee set me up to be murdered for putting out the TRUTH. Everything you do makes a difference. You will pay severely for your inaction.

Civil WAR or tyranny is inevitable in the U.S. by 2005 if you do nothing. The U.N. will likely attack citizens to take firearms, a precursor to genocide. Only you can prevent tyranny and oppression. Are you a sovereign, servant or slave?

#### DECLARATION

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them to another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation. - We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. - That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. - That whenever any Form of government becomes

destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter and abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing of its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them to absolute Despotism, it is their Right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government." Declaration of Independence (July 4, 1776; contemporary).

The illegitimate government is Communist and uses brute force rather than law; it acts without lawful jurisdiction. Do you acquiesce to being a slave for Corporate Communism, and coming gun and land confiscation under the United Nations? You do if you do nothing. "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are always ready to guard and defend it" (Sen. Daniel Webster). All EVIL needs to triumph is for GOOD to do nothing.

George Washington called firearms our "liberty teeth," our protection against tyranny. You should become active while words and votes still work; to prevent bloodshed, if at all possible. Revelation 19.

No King but King Jesus.

Send comments to:

GARY  
c/o P.O. Box 272  
Sylvania, Ohio 43560  
or the distributor of this booklet

REFERENCES

- | Page: | Reference:   |
|-------|--|
| 1*    | Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary, "Person" (Random House Publishing, 1994)                   |
| 1**   | Black's Law Dictionary 7d, "Artificial person," "Person" (West Publishing, 1996)                         |
| 2*    | Elementary Principles of the Roman Private law 16 (W.W. Buckland, 1912)                                  |
| 2**   | Black's Law 7d, "Corporation"  |
| 2***  | Black's Law 7d, "Legal fiction"  |
| 3*    | Black's Law Dictionary 5d, "Legal fiction" (West Publishing, 1985)                                       |
| 3**   | Monell v NYC Dept. of Social Svcs., 436 US 658, 98 S Ct 2018, 56 L Ed 2d 611 (1978)                      |
| 4*    | Monroe v Pape, 365 US 167, 187-191, 81 S Ct 473, 484-486, 5 L Ed 2d 492 (1961)                           |
| 4**   | Will v Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 US 58, 62, 109 S Ct 2304, 2307, 105 L Ed 2d 45, _____ (1989)  |
| 4***  | Hafer v Melo, 502 US 21, 31, 112 S Ct 358, 365, 116 L Ed 2d 301, _____ (1992)                            |
| 5*    | Hafer, 502 US at 27, 112 S Ct at 362-363, 116 L Ed 2d at _____   |
| 6*    | Alden v Maine, 527 US 706, _____, 119 S Ct 2240, 2281, 144 L Ed 2d 636, _____ (1999)(dissenting opinion) |
| 6**   | Will, 491 US at 64, 109 S Ct at 2308-2309, 105 L Ed 2d at _____  |



- 7\* Will, 491 US at 73, 109 S Ct at 2313,  
105 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 7\*\* Will, 491 US at 73, 109 S Ct at 2313,  
105 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 8\* Alden, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2280, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_ (dissent)
- 8\*\* Alden, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2263, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 12\* Alden, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2271-72, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_ (diss)
- 13\* Alden, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2272, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_ (dissent)
- 14\* Alden, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2280-81, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_ (diss)
- 14\*\* Alden, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2281, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_ (dissent)
- 15\* Alden, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2281, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_ (dissent)
- 15\*\* Alden, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2269, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 16\* College Savings v Florida Prepaid  
Postsecondary, 527 US 666, \_\_\_\_\_, 119  
S Ct 2219, 2220, 144 L Ed 2d 605,  
(1999)
- 16\*\* College, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2223, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 16\*\*\* College, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct  
at 2224, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_.
- 17\* College, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2224, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 18\* College, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2226, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 19\* College, 527 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at  
2229, 144 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 19\*\* Brady v United States, 397 US 742, 90  
S Ct 1463, 25 L Ed 2d 747 (1970)
- 20\* Brady, 397 US at 748, 90 S Ct at  
1469, 25 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_.
- 21\* United States v King, 395 US 1, 89 S  
Ct 1501, 23 L Ed 2d 52 (1969)

- 21\*\* Johnson v Zerbst, 304 US 458, 464, 58 S Ct 1019, 1023, 82 L Ed 1461, \_\_\_\_\_ (1938)
- 21\*\*\* Johnson, 304 US at 464, 58 S Ct at 1023, 82 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 23\* Black's Law Dictionary 5d, "Natural law" (West Publishing, 1985)
- 24\* Black's Law 5d, "Contract," "Implied contract"
- 24\*\* Black's Law 5d, "Contract," "Quasi contract," "Legal fiction"
- 28\* Black's Law 5d, "State"
- 28\*\* Black's Law 5d, "Nation"
- 29\* Black's Law 5d, "Country"
- 29\*\* Black's Law 5d, "Belligerent"
- 31\* Black's Law 5d, "Privileges," "Immunities"
- 31\*\* Black's Law 5d, "Citizen," "Dominion," "Master," "Servant," "Master & Servant"
- 32\* Jones v N.C. Prisoners' Labor Union, 433 US 119, 139, 97 S Ct 2532, 2544-2545, 53 L Ed 2d 653, \_\_\_\_\_ (1977)
- 32\*\* United States v Alzanki, 54 F3d 944 (1st Cir, 1995)
- 33\* Iwanowa v Ford Motor Company, 67 F Supp 2d 424 (D NJ, 1999)
- 33\*\* Iwanowa, 67 F Supp 2d at 440 (citations omitted)
- 33\*\*\* Iwanowa, 67 F Supp 2d at 440-441
- 35\* Scott v Sanford, 60 US 393, 19 How 393, 15 L Ed 666 (1857)
- 35\*\* Santa Clara v Southern Pacific R. Co., 118 US 394, 396, 6 S Ct 1132, \_\_\_\_\_, 30 L Ed 118, \_\_\_\_\_ (1886)
- 36\* Saenz v Roe, 526 US 489, \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct 1518, 1524, 143 L Ed 2d 689, \_\_\_\_\_ (1999)

- 36\*\* United States v Guest, 383 US 745, 760, 86 S Ct 1170, \_\_\_\_\_, 16 L Ed 2d 239, 250 (1966)
- 37\* Saenz, 526 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at 1525, 143 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 37\*\* Saenz, 526 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 119 S Ct at 1526, 143 L Ed 2d at \_\_\_\_\_
- 37\*\*\* Kent v Dulles, 357 US 116, 125, 78 S Ct 1113, \_\_\_\_\_, 2 L Ed 2d 1209, \_\_\_\_\_ (1958)
- 39\* Stanley v Illinois, 405 US 645, 651, 92 S Ct 1208, 1212, 31 L Ed 2d 551, (1972)
- 39\*\* Black's Law 5d, "Natural law," "Natural liberty," "Personal liberty"
- 40\* John Bad Elk v United States, 177 US 529, 20 S Ct 729, 44 L Ed 784 (1900)
- 40\*\* John Elk v Wilkins, 112 US 94, 5 S Ct 41, 28 L Ed 643 (1884)
- 43\* Elk, 112 US at 99-100, 5 S Ct at 44, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 44\* Elk, 112 US at 100, 5 S Ct at 44, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 45\* Elk, 112 US at 101, 5 S Ct at 44, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 45\*\* Elk, 112 US at 102, 5 S Ct at 45, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 45\*\*\* Elk, 112 US at 103, 5 S Ct at 45, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 46\* Elk, 112 US at 104, 5 S Ct at 46, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 47\* Elk, 112 US at 104-105, 5 S Ct at 46, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 48\* Elk, 112 US at 110, 5 S Ct at 49, 28 L Ed at \_\_\_\_\_
- 49\* Dillon v Montana, 451 F Supp 168 (DC Mont, 1978);  
Valandra v Viedt, 259 NW2d 259 (SD, 1971)

- 55\* Oubre v Entergy, 522 US 422, \_\_\_\_\_, 118 S Ct 838, 845-846, 139 L Ed 2d 849, 860-861 (1998)
- 65\* Church of the Holy Trinity v United States, 143 US 457, 471, 12 S Ct 511, \_\_\_\_\_, 36 L Ed 226, \_\_\_\_\_ (1892)
- 65\*\* Roe v Wade, 410 US 113, 161, 93 S Ct 705, 730, 35 L Ed 2d 147, 181 (1973)
- 66\* United States v Caro-Quintero, 745 F Supp 599, 601-602 (DC Cal, 1990)
- 66\*\* United States v Alvarez-Machain, 504 US 655, 657, 112 S Ct 2188, 2190, 119 L Ed 2d 441, \_\_\_\_\_ (1992)
- 69\* Oubre v Entergy, 522 US at \_\_\_\_\_, 118 S Ct at 841, 844, 139 L Ed 2d at 853, \_\_\_\_\_  
United States v Hyde, 520 US 670, 677-678, 117 S Ct 1630, 1634, 137 L Ed 2d 935, \_\_\_\_\_ (1997);  
Kyles v Whitely, 514 US 419, 433-434, 115 S Ct 1555, 1565-66, 131 L Ed 2d 490, 505 (1995);  
Tanner v United States, 483 US 107, 129, 107 S Ct 2739, 2752, 97 L Ed 2d 90, \_\_\_\_\_ (1987);  
M & D v McConkey, 231 Mich App 22, 28-29, 585 NW2d 33 (1998)
- 69\*\* Carrier Corp. v United States, 328 F2d 328, 334 (U.S. COC, 1964)

THE

CONFIDENTIAL

Copyright  
2005  
FWM, Inc.

---

THE  
SOVEREIGN PERSON;  
A GOD-GIVEN RIGHT

By:  
GARY M. NORTHINGTON

