

## The NAME GAME Explained

Recent research here in Canada shows that the income tax, and all other statutory law, is imposed upon basis of the 'property right', and that property right is the property right of the corporate Crown in Canada, and corporate State (be it a State or the UNITED STATES) in the USA.

The same scheme can be found in any country that is a subject country of the Pontiff of Rome's Holy Roman Empire. Thus, in actuality, the assumed 'property right' is that of the corporate Holy Roman Empire, as the Crown or incorporated State is an agency for the Holy Roman Empire.

The 'Crown' is the administrative corporation of the Pontiff of Rome owned City of London, the financial, legal and professional standards capitol of/for the Vatican, The City of London is

a square mile area within Greater London, England, and is an independent city-state. In the USA, the administrative corporation for the Pontiff of Rome is the UNITED STATES, and that corporation administers the Vatican capitol, for, primarily, military purposes, called Columbia, or the District of Columbia. The UNITED STATES also administers the 50 sub-corporate States of the United States of America, identified with the 2 cap letters – CA, OR, WA, etc.

All adult humans are deceived into using the fiction name, as imprinted on the copy of the birth certificate you receive when ordering it from Provincial/State Vital Statistics, or to whatever source you apply. Although the birth certificate is of somewhat recent origin and used to formally offer 'citizens' as chattel in bankruptcy to the Pope's Holy Roman Empire owned Rothschilds' Banking System, the false use of the family name goes back into the Middle Ages in England. Thus, it is with the family name made a primary, or surname, (example - Mister Jones), and

the given names of the child (example - Peter) made a reference name to the primary name. This is the reverse or mirror image to reality. A 'family name' is NOT a man's name - it is a name of a clan - a blood relationship. [Replace the example names with your given and family name.]

We are then 'forced' or 'obliged' to use that name in all commercial and Government dealings and communications. So, when we do use it, as 99.99% of the human inhabitants of North America (and most of the world) do, we supposedly 'voluntarily' attach ourselves, the free will adult human, to the Crown/State owned property, called the 'legal identity name' as an accessory attached to property owned by Another party. Think of a ship under tow by another ship. Which captain decides what route the ships will take? The 'legal name/strawman' is the tow rope, and the towing ship is the corporate (make-believe ship at sea) Crown of the City of London. As an attachment to the legal name owned by the Crown, you are the towed

ship, and your vessel captain, your free will mind, is now a subservient crewmember to the captain of the Crown.

The State or Crown does not give us authority, grant, license, permission or leave to use the Crown or State owned legal identity name. Thus, our use of it as an adult free will man (male or female) is a form of 'theft' against a maritime jurisdiction entity (all incorporated bodies are 'make-believe ships at sea'). In maritime law, the accused is guilty until proven innocent. This allows the Roman Law system, which we have, to impose 'involuntary servitude' upon an adult man. Involuntary servitude simply means a slave stripped of granted rights of a slave called a citizen, subject or freeman. This stripped rights included 'due process of law' - no jury trial, and charges where no harm has been done against another man, or his property with criminal intent.

We see this Roman Law within the US 13th Amendment (#2) instituted in the mid 1860's:

"Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted," The crime with which you have been convicted is 'unauthorized use' of the State's or Crown's intellectual property - the legal identity name.

The Crown/State then invokes the legal maxim, *accessio cedit principali*, [an accessory attached to a principal becomes the property of the owner of the principal], where the principal is the legal identity name as 'intellectual property'. The owner is the corporation called the Crown/State, or UNITED STATES, and the accessory is the free will human who has supposedly volunteered himself to be 'property by attachment' of the Crown/State. An adult human who is property is, and by any other name, of 'slave status', be it citizen, subject or freeman.

I would point out here that all concepts that teach that the relationship between free will man and Government/corporate bodies is contractual are

incorrect. All supposed remedies in contract law, American UCC or Canadian PPSA are 'red herring' diversions – some intended, and some in ignorance by the teachers, usually 'pay-triots' who see a 'buck\$\$' in teaching this, as it sounds authentic to those who don't realize that Government sees them as slaves without right to find remedy in statutory law.

As a slave, one's property in possession, including body and labor, belongs to the slave owner 100%. And, the property right is a bundle of rights - own, use, sell, gift, bequeath and hypothecate property.

Thus, ALL 'income' resulting from the owned human slave's mental and/or physical labor belongs to the slave owner. That which is left with or granted to the slave for his own use and maintenance is called a 'benefit'. In Canada, the 'return of income' [the phrase itself tells the story] is called a T1 'tax and benefits package'. The T1 or IRS (USA)1040 is an accounting by the slave of his fruits of

labor that belongs to the slave owner, and the prescribed 'benefits' that he may keep or have back from withholding. Thus, all income tax cases against the people', in reality, result from fraud, illegal concealment and theft by the accused slave of the slave owner's 'property'.

Going back to an above paragraph, we find that the attachment of oneself to the Crown/State owned name is 'assumed to be voluntary', as the Crown/State has no valid right to impose slavery upon adult humans against their will, except as stated in the next paragraph. Anyone working as an employee is in a contract of voluntary servitude - direction and time control by, and obedience and loyalty to, the employer. Until we 'assumed to be slaves' get our heads around this key to the lock that holds our chains of slavery around our necks and ankles, we will continue to attempt to swim with that 100 lb ball chained to our leg.

Another factor of the use of the Roman Law system is contained within the 1860's 13th Amendment to the US Constitution, the Constitution of the corporate UNITED STATES,

[and not the 13th Amendment of the US Republic inserted around 1819]. In the later 13th amendment, it says: "Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction." Notice that this applies only to the corporate body called the UNITED STATES.

All corporate bodies are make-believe ships at sea, and are thus, internally, under maritime law, [incorrectly called 'admiralty law' , unless applied to the military]. In maritime law, an accused is guilty unless proven innocent. Thus, a free will adult man who uses, without authority, the property of a corporate body is under maritime jurisdiction. This makes a free will man who



uses a corporate Crown or corporate State owned legal identity name a 'convicted criminal' , and thus subject to the imposition of slavery, involuntary servitude.

You, as a child, were Crown or State property by way of the birth registry, and thus, you could use Crown or State property, the legal identity name. When you became an adult, as a vessel on the 'sea of life' as a sovereign captain/free will mind, you no longer had a right to use (as an 'identity' name) that Crown or State owned legal identity name.

Reports of unsuccessful attempts at paying government imposed debts using the Canadian Bills of Exchange Act or US UCC provisions of settling an account proved that there was no contract issue between a Canadian or American adult human and the Government as is commonly taught by some patriot gurus. Under contract, a 'bill' is a method of equalizing a contract - like value exchanged for like value.

However, under the 'property right' of a slave owner in regard to property in the possession of an owned slave, a 'demand' for the property by the slave owner, or the slave owner's agent (such as the IRS, or county tax collector, or for a court imposed fine), is all that is necessary, without regard to due process of law. Remember, ALL that a slave possesses belongs to the slave owner.

I am NOT saying you ARE a slave. I just point out to you that Government, and its employees, judges and officers SEE you as a SLAVE. See sections 35, 46 and 78 of the "Bills of Exchange Act of Canada" regarding eligibility for use of the provisions of that Act. GOOGLE it. A bill can only be paid with money, and there is no money in Canada or the USA since the early 1930s. All that is left is some form of a 'promissory note'. In Canada, Parliament even converted the Canadian currency to pure Monopoly Game money by declaring that Canadian currency is no longer a promissory note

nor bill of exchange. (Section 25(6) of the Bank of Canada Act).

Now, if you get a mortgage from a bank, instead of the bank lending you the money (credit value created by your signed promissory note) you created by your signature, as they did prior to the late 1970s, they use it as payment for Canadian Bank Notes, or computer values of it, which is just property since Section 25(6) was added. They create it out of nothing if they put a number in a computer, or pay for the printing of the paper notes, and not the value printed on the currency note. You still create the money value for your mortgage by your bill of exchange - the promissory note.

Further, when any 'officer' of the corporate body, be it 'peace officer or police', all the way to King or President choose to declare someone 'homo sacer' (meaning a man who has been stripped of his status of 'person' - that being an obedient corporate slave member of the corporate body politic) - he is

stripped of the rights of due process of law, and can be fined, punished, tortured or killed without repercussion to the officer, or officer involved. This happens all the time in the world of the Holy Roman Empire.

This doctrine of 'homo sacer' is clearly presented in the US Fugitive Slave Act 1850, Section 6:

<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/fugitive.htm>

**Quote: "In no trial or hearing under this act shall the testimony of such alleged fugitive be admitted in evidence; and the certificates in this and the first [fourth] section mentioned, shall be conclusive of the right of the person or persons in whose favor granted, to remove such fugitive to the State or Territory from which he escaped, and shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate, or other person whomsoever. Unquote**

Three major points here: 1. The accused disobedient slave cannot enter evidence in his own defense. Sound familiar? The Canadian Human Rights Tribunal and German 'Holocaust Denial' litigation courts declare that "truth is no defense". Judges constantly ignore offered defenses by Government accused defendants, especially in traffic and income tax issues. And, this may be acceptable if the judge were to explain why he need do that, but almost 100% of the time, no explanation is offered, and that is to hide the 'homo sacer' doctrine, and the fact that a slave is being tried for disobedience to the rules within the slave owner's property right.

2. The 'certificate' presented by the officer or agent of the property owner (declaration of property ownership) is sufficient for conviction of disobedience - (Guilty, unless proven innocent by an officer of the Crown or of the UNITED STATES.)

3. No molestation (such as criminal or civil complaints) can be made by, or on behalf of the accused or

convicted disobedient slave. Anyone know of successful litigation against a police officer or judge who severely abused the unalienable rights of a man? Yes, there may be a few in well publicized cases, where the system has to hide their despotic Roman scheme, but that is rare.

I am not suggesting that the Fugitive Slave Act is still being used. It was likely rescinded at some time; however, what I do say is that the provisions written within that act were directly out of the Roman Law system in dealing with disobedient slaves, and it is Roman Law that is being imposed upon the free will adult people in America and Canada who have had Roman slavery imposed upon them. English common law is, in reality Roman Municipal Law, a form of maritime law, where there is frequent use of the 'notwithstanding clause' of all ships at sea, and make-believe ships at sea - incorporated bodies - (The captain may deviate from any rules when he deems it necessary for the good of the ship). Thus, by using

that, English common law is frequently referred to as 'judge made law' .

## A POSSIBLE REMEDY

However, since we are 'forced to', or 'obliged to' use the Crown/State owned legal identity name in all commercial and government dealings, services and communications, we can make a 'claim of right' under the Rule of Private Necessity – with the necessity being the means to sustain and maintain our life, as all food, shelter, clothing, means of travel and that which answers our need for happiness all has to be obtained or used in the realms of commerce. Briefly, commerce is all communications, contracts, and other interrelations and interactions with other parties, which includes government.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Necessity\\_\(to  
rt\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Necessity_(to_rt))

This should counter the claim that we 'voluntarily' attach ourselves to Crown/State property.

Repeating - The Private Necessity is that we cannot do anything in relation to life, liberty, property or due process of law without using the Crown/State owned name, and thus we cannot sustain or maintain our lives without that fiction name.

The legal name is always the one charged. The Government intent, of course, is to get to the adult man (m or f) attached to that name (identified) - the attached accessory - you. Otherwise you, and your children need to 'use' that legal name in all commerce (communication - action with another party), and you do so under private necessity. So, only in court do you need to prove:

1. That you are a separate party from the named defendant.

2. That you only use the legal name, named as defendant, under private necessity to sustain and maintain your life, and that you are not voluntarily



attached to it permanently as an accessory to Crown property.

3. That the copy of the birth certificate held by oneself has been surrendered to the Court, and I deny any fiduciary responsibility for that Crown property or the name thereon. [Preferably should have been previously surrendered, along with the Canada asseveration, to a judge in chambers hearing.]

4. It all comes right down to this: 'Informed consent'. You do not have to consent to be 'identified' as being the name found on the birth certificate. "I do not authorize you to recognize me as being one and the same as the legal identity name you find on your documents. I do not consent to being identified by any name."

Also, a Freedom Of Information Demand should be sent to the Minister, or Representative

requesting the authority, date, means and methods by which you, a free will man (m or f) became a slave owned by the corporate Crown or State. If they cannot offer such proof - usually your proof is 'no response' - acceptance by 'silence being acquiescence' by them of your assertion that you are not a slave owned by the Crown or State.

A process that has worked recently in Texas is the 'surrender' of the copy of the birth certificate one has in possession to a judge, or the judge assigned to a case where you, in the legal name, are the defendant, in an 'in chambers' hearing. Some call this 'surrender' of the defendant (the legal name) as being on the 'private side' using the Biblical method of settling disputes privately if possible.

This is preferred to 'surrendering it in court' as that is on the 'public side', and as a human presence in the court room, the assumption that you are an attachment to the legal name has already been made.

And being attached as an accessory to it, you become surety, guarantor and do 'represent' the legal identity name defendant.

\* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* \*

## Addendum 1 Name Game

I don't promote or use the Commercial Redemption system. I just suggest showing the 'authorities" that I, and the 'legal name' are not one and the same party. The Statement of Live Birth and the Birth Certificate can be used as proof of that, since, as a child, you had nothing to do with the registration of your birth, nor with the choice of names you were to be called as a child. Don't be tempted to say that the names are your Christian name, or given names. The Crown or State claimed ownership of those names when you birth was registered. As an adult

man (m or f), you simply have 'NO NAME' - you only have an appellation or 'commonly called' term, word or written term or word that gets your mind's attention. You are your mind in a vessel, and thus the sovereign captain of that vessel, regardless who or what corporation may claim ownership of it.

1. The Birth Certificate shows that it belongs to the State/Province where you were born, and thus, is the property of the State or Crown in right of the Province.

2. The name on that shows your family name to be the primary name of the 'legal name' - a 'surname', and the first and second names being referential to it. That is fiction. The family name is a clan name. It is not the name of an individual man (m or f).

3. The Statement of Birth shows that the first and second name is a gift (given names), and as such is a contract. However, names only identify a child - not an adult. An infant (under age 21) cannot be party to a contract. An acceptor of a gift must 'accept', and accept voluntarily. Thus, you have never 'accepted' the given

names. There is no mechanism to do that in the Roman Law we are under. The Roman law only sees the legal identity name, a name that belongs to the corporate Roman Empire of the Pope.

4. An adult man is actually a mind inhabiting a physical human body. Only things can be named. A mind is a process, not a thing.

Thus, when a human becomes an adult, that is akin to the launching of a new ship. The adult mind is equivalent to the captain of a ship at sea. The captain is sovereign or supreme on his ship. The only way a captain of a ship can lose that sovereignty is by putting his ship 'in tow' voluntarily behind another ship. It is then that the tow ship captain gains sovereignty over the captain of the ship in tow.

The legal identity name is the rope that ties our vessel to the corporate Crown of the City of London (owned by the corporate Holy Roman Empire).

The Name Game Blog explains the rest.

Addendum 2 Name Game (Thanks to Vic Beck for this insight)

The name "they" use on all their documents, including indictments, is the legal name. I believe there is no argument with that. In fact, the courts are usually ready to agree with that classification without hesitation.

By presenting the Statement of Birth (SOB) to them and asking them to do an investigation with a view to answering just two simple questions, will repel all attacks from the "system". The two questions are:

1. Who has secured the rights (legal and equitable) in the legal name??? (insert name exactly as it appears on the Birth Certificate even though the all caps aspect is a red herring); and,

2. What rights do I have in the legal name ???

The answers to these two questions will prove (in Ontario SOB's are admissible in any Ontario court as Proof, not just evidence, of the facts so certified) that

1. the government secured the rights (a.k.a. the secured party) in the legal name and, therefore, I have no rights in the legal name.
2. If I have no rights in the legal name, then how can I have any obligations related to the legal name?

The party that the law holds legally responsible for the financial and other obligations of the property (legal name) is the secured party, which is the government in the case of the legal name. This is all proven by the SOB!

It would seem to me that there is no place for the system to go once this truth is on the table. Certainly CRA can be easily defeated with this approach.

However, the judge may make the assumption that by your 'permanent' use of the legal identity name, you have become an accessory attached to that Crown owned name, and thus you are the property of the

Crown by the legal maxim, which arises out of the property right, *accessio cedit principali*.

Thus, to complete the above procedure, you must, by asseveration (formerly, affidavit) or notice, make a claim of right of free will status and claim that the Crown owned name is used under private necessity in commerce to sustain and maintain your life. As such, your use of the Crown owned name is not a voluntary act by yourself.

The following is a further explanation of the name use. The previous explanation was still not fully understood by some respondents:

Explaining name usage

When we are a child, we can have an identifying name because we are property, property that should belong to the natural parents, but by 'registry' of live birth, where the parents identify themselves as being of slave status owned by the corporate Crown, the child becomes the property of the Corporate Crown.



Because the child does not have a matured mind, it is a vessel under construction in 'dry dock'.

When the registry of live birth is performed, the Province, as an agent for the Crown, then changes the family name to a 'sur' or primary name, thus making the Crown owned legal name as intellectual property owned by the Crown.

As the child grows up, the child is taught by society and the education system to identify him or herself by that legal name, and accept the idea that they have a 'surname'.

When the child reaches the age of majority, the human vessel is launched on the sea of life, and the mature moral thinking mind becomes the supreme commander of the human vessel. The supremacy of the captain of a vessel supercedes any claim of ownership when the vessel is on the high sea. This had to be

overcome in the maritime world of corporate bodies, which are make-believe shops at sea.

So, what Government, as agent for the corporate Crown devised was to not give authorization for the adult man to identify him or herself by the legal name, even though they were taught to do so all their life as a child. Thus, a man, identifying him or herself as being one and the same as the legal name, the name one finds on the birth certificate, is an act of theft of intellectual property of another and triggers the legal maxim (requires no further proof) arising out of the property right - *accessio cedit principali* - an accessory attached (without authorization) to a principal becomes the property of the principal. Thus the supposed to be free will man, with the mind being the supreme commander of his human vessel/body, becomes like a ship under tow by another ship - a slave to the towing ship.

In this world of commerce (maritime trade) and make-believe ships/corporate bodies, as all Governments and nations are, we have to be able to communicate to gain our food, shelter and clothing - the essentials of life support for ourselves. Thus, instead of accepting that we are one and the same as the Crown owned legal name, we can see it as the legal name being our 'agent in commerce', and used by ourselves under private necessity. Necessity negates any legal assumptions, such as the *accessio crediti principali* scheme.

So, what about our given or Christian names? When we reach adulthood, we are a mind existing within a human body/vessel. A mind is a process, and not a physical thing, and thus cannot be identified by a name, any physical attribute or a picture. All we can have are sights or sounds that get our attention - called an appellation, or 'commonly called'. 'Appel' means 'call' in French.

Court procedure:

So, in a court situation, it is important to speak up at the beginning and say:

"I am a living flesh and blood soul. I am here to seek  
\* 'remedy' .

And, as such I am here to speak for (legal name). I do not consent to be identified by any name.

And, since the legal system is want to fraudulently assume that I, the free will man and undisclosed principal, am the surety and guarantor of all debts imposed upon the legal name (strawman name here), I inform the court that I use the legal name, (strawman name here) , under private necessity to sustain and maintain my life.

If you use (first name) or Mister (family name), I will respond; however those are only appellations to address me, but I do not accept them as identifying names."

[Note: I would suggest taking this printed on a piece of paper to read, so you don't miss any of the details.]

If asked your status or relationship with the accused, you say:

"(legal name) is my agent in commerce. Because I cannot have an identifying name as a free will living adult man, to communicate with the fiction system, thus, I am the 'undisclosed principal' and creditor and beneficiary of the trust wherein (legal name) is my agent and trustee in trust."

The reason for emphasizing 'living' is that the 'registry of live birth' expires in 7 years, and after 7 years the legal system presumes you to be 'legally dead', and thus just a body owned by the Crown.

If the circumstance should arise that the judge declares a recess, be prepared to make the full speech again

when the judge returns to his bench, except, instead of 'remedy' , you ask for

\*\* 'cure and maintenance' . If the judge were to call a second recess, then again repeat the beginning statement, except this time declare that you are \*\*\*the Son of the Creator Diety, and demand the judges subservience as a representative of a lesser god.

Notes:

\* 'Remedy' is a primary obligation of honour for a judge in English common law.

\*\* 'Cure and Maintenance' is an obligation of a judge in Maritime or Admiralty jurisdiction.

\*\*\* 'Declaring oneself to be a Son of the Creator Diety is to a judge in the role as a priest of Baal or Molech as symbolized by the black robe of holocaust decorated with the crimson blood of human sacrifice. In cannon law, which they represent, they are out of their league or jurisdiction in their fiction role as priest of a lesser diety judging a Son of the Father in Heaven.

Some claim that Her Majesty, or the corporate Crown, has given one permission to use the Crown owned legal identity name. That assumption is arrived at by way of the Ontario 'Change of Names Act' which says: "Ch. C7; Person's name: 2.(1) For all purposes of Ontario law, (a) **a person whose birth is registered in Ontario is entitled to be recognized by the name appearing on the person's birth certificate or change of name certificate**".

As it states, it only applies to 'persons' - which is the combination of the strawman name and the adult man, making that combined entity the 'property and subject of' the corporate Crown. That certainly is not the status we, as free will minded creatures, would wish to be.

Addendum 3 The Name Game

CONSENT

Regarding the use of the legal identity name, this thing comes down to consent. No means no and silence means yes.

In the Government scheme of things we are all of the one individualized, making you source energy flowing through a BC that is always connected to the national treasury. In essence a BC is issued of the treasury so that all we do through the name on it flows to the/our treasury. However, that changes if you are recognized through a legal name.

The Birth Certificate is never un-connected from the treasury, 'For Treasury use only', just as you are never un-connected with the divine. You are the source, source energy, and in legal land, the treasury is source. The Statement Of Birth, as proof, is recognized by the government that it is so. Humans in this world are source energy. Source of commercial energy, to use that term, for without human, nothing happens. Just as



in the bigger picture, without God nothing happens. So if you are searching for access to the treasury account look in mirror.

An old 'Law and Order' show. A woman was after the police to get a man who was stalking her. Again and again she went to the police to get this man to stop stalking her. Finally a detective says, "Mam, that man is not stalking you." "Oh yes he is" she says. "No Mam, he is not. There is nothing in our law books about stalking. So, that man there is not stalking you." This is how law and legal authority work. If it is not on the books, then it does not exist. In the case of that show there was no such thing as a stalker or stalking.

Show me the law or authority upon which anyone may rely that authorizes any agent to recognize you through a legal name? **There is no such authority WITHOUT YOUR CONSENT. How is consent obtained against you by the agents? By your silence. Anytime**

you are getting 'done by', and remain silent, you are capitulating (in agreement). **We are entitled to be recognized THROUGH (by means through) the legal name on the BC, but we are also entitled to say "No. I do not consent to be recognized by the name"**. If as has been the case you make it clear that you do not consent to be recognized through the legal name and the other party ignores you, and you do not take an appropriate course of action to stop it, you are agreeing to get 'done by'.

So what we have going on here is a whole bunch of agents are recognizing us THROUGH a legal name, and we are not doing anything about it = silence. And, by = through.

WHEREAS [I like that word], if you know that there is no authority, legal, lawful or otherwise, for an agent to recognize you through a legal name, and you make it clear that you do not consent to be recognized through the name, that party is in the commission of a crime if he proceeds as if he has the authority because, in fact,

**there is no law that authorizes any agent to recognize you as anything or any capacity without your consent.**

No means no. Yes we must use a legal name, and yes, everything we do in that name is connected to the treasury, and the provinces /Canada, by holding the SOB's is in the loop as beneficiary/treasurer. But not if you are recognized through the legal name. By being recognized through the legal name, I say through because you are not the legal name, you are claiming ownership of property and the value of it; in essence, my stuff.

But if you do not consent to be recognized through the legal name, then the issuer of the BC is, and at that point is the owner of property and responsible for the debts, obligations, securities and undertakings of things you do through the legal name. The BC is always connected to the treasury (matrix), the question is, who then is the beneficiary. If you allow yourself to be recognized through the legal name then you are the

beneficiary, but if you do not consent then the treasury (Canada) is the beneficiary.

Where we have failed ourselves is when we do not address the I do not consent to be recognized through the name on the BC properly. It is your license to do as you please. The license of licenses. There is no law or legislation anywhere that authorizes any agent to recognize you through a legal name. There is nothing that prevents them from doing so or trying either. It is up to you how you react if one does. What I am saying is, no agent has the legal backing to recognize you through the legal name that will indemnify them from harm (prosecution) if they do after you made it clear that you do not consent. In other words, they have ruled over us purely because we did not say **I DO NOT CONSENT TO BE RECOGNIZED THROUGH THE LEGAL IDENTITY NAME, OR BY ANY NAME**; and there is no law that authorizes you to recognize me through a name without my consent.

## Addendum 4 The Name Game Blog

Consent #2      March 09

When you present government ID and you do not want to be recognized through the name on it just say; I DO NOT AUTHORIZE YOU TO RECOGNIZE ME THROUGH THE NAME ON THIS ID.

There is no other source of such authority is what you need to get here. Your it.

Now everything we have learned over the years and in particular lately backs this I do not consent thing. A BC is not and was never intended to be personal identification it evolved as the deputy registrar said and it evolved through our giving consent to be recognized.

The Government holds title to the legal name and entitles you to be recognized through a legal name which it cannot do unless it has rights in the

name. Significance of the government holding the SOB is proof. There is no proof that your parents gave you the name that appears on a SOB, impossible for that to be proven. Look up 'informed consent' at Wikipedia and you know now what's been going on. "Informed consent is a legal condition whereby a person can be said to have given consent based upon a clear appreciation and understanding of the facts, implications and future consequences of an action. In order to give informed consent, the individual concerned must have adequate reasoning faculties and be in possession of all relevant facts at the time consent is given.

Impairment to reasoning and judgement which would make it impossible for someone to give informed consent include such factors as severe mental retardation, severe mental illness, intoxication, severe sleep deprivation, Alzheimer's disease, or being in a coma.

Some acts cannot legally take place because of a lack of informed consent. In cases where an individual is considered unable to give informed consent, another person is generally authorized to give consent on their behalf e.g. parents or legal guardians of a child and care-givers for the mentally ill.

However, if a severely injured person is brought to hospital in an unconscious state and no-one is available to give informed consent, doctors will give whatever treatment is necessary to save their life (according to the Hippocratic oath) which might involve major surgery e.g. amputation.

In cases where an individual is provided insufficient information to form a reasoned decision, serious ethical issues arise. Such cases in a clinical trial in medical research are anticipated and prevented by an ethics committee or Institutional Review Board."

Nolo.com legal definition of 'informed consent':

An agreement to do something or to allow something to happen, made with complete knowledge of all

relevant facts, such as the risks involved or any available alternatives.

For example, a patient may give informed consent to medical treatment only after the healthcare professional has disclosed all possible risks involved in accepting or rejecting the treatment. A healthcare provider or facility may be held responsible for an injury caused by an undisclosed risk. In another context, a person accused of committing a crime cannot give up his constitutional rights--for example, to remain silent or to talk with an attorney--unless and until he has been informed of those rights, usually via the well-known Miranda warnings . end quote