

The unified laws of the Bills of Exchange.

By: Dr Johan Joubert

At the airport the lady brought a man who was very polite. He said, 'we are not going to have any trouble are we?' I said 'no we are not,' I would like to declare some documents. He said 'would you like anything to drink.' I said yes I would like a glass of water. He was a very polite immigrations officer and he said that I was going to receive a notice of detention for possible deportation. I said since you are going to notify me, here is my notice of understanding and intent of claim and right. Before I left I created a document by which I drafted a fee schedule that if I get harassed or detained or incarcerated I have a fee schedule, just like I have in my practice. When you walk through my doors, and you gave me an order to work on my animals, I had the right to give you a bill. I gave them the bill but they didn't understand it at the time. They read it and gave it back. I told them I am doing this under duress and protest. They locked me up for the night and sent me back to South Africa. I sent them a bill for 976 thousand British pounds in the form of a commercial lien that became effective.

When my wife discovered that I was deported she was hysterical and my daughter as well. The immigration officer while he interrogated me he said, 'I am going to do something that you won't like, I am going to phone your wife.' I said you don't have my permission to call my wife. He said yes I do. He said that in a little office of 3 M by 6 M with the table and chair bolted into the floor. I realised then that they either anticipate violence or adverse behaviour and I knew I must just stay calm and not let these people instigate anything or aggravate myself.

Did you feel they were deliberately aggravating you ?

Yes, he said I am going to call your wife and I said you don't have my permission to speak to my wife. In fact I had the right to make the first phone call. My title was deported back to South Africa, not me because I made a very clear distinction between myself and that legal entity.

There are two worlds in an international airport. There is a hidden world behind the doors. I was taken onto the plane as a normal passenger. But my legal person was in a brown envelope that changed hands from the immigration officer to the captain of the plane.

I was led from this hidden world where they detained me, through the door and I could walk onto the plane as a passenger. Once I walked through that door I was free. I made sure that when they detained me I signed everything under duress and protest, and all rights reserved. **I signed with accommodation.**

When I was on the plane I saw the documents change hands but it was from the immigration officer to the captain. They said to me you will receive your passport when you get to Amsterdam.

A port is something you go to on a ship ? And you have an airport, it is almost a contradiction in terms and you have a passport. We are still under the laws of the sea and your passport got handed over to the captain of the airship.

The immigration officer said to me you will receive your passport back. When we got to the other side, I told them I wanted all the documents back as **I am a holder in due course** on all those documents. That means I have the last say on those documents because I signed on accommodation and all rights reserved, I had the right to revisit any agreement whether hostile or friendly.

All rights reserved means I am agreeing on the basis that I can revisit that at any stage I want to; opposed to signing it and standing under these terms and conditions.

Correct. I used those documents as the foundation for the commercial lien I filed against them which I referred to earlier as the Bill. My fee schedule made it very clear. It said if you detain me my fee schedule is 4600 pounds per hour or portions thereafter.

Effectively you made them an offer.

Yes and in their personal capacity. The immigration officer I made him first lien debtor and all the others thereafter. I billed them from the moment they handled me to the moment I set foot back onto my home soil.

My wife was incredible upset. She is an incredibly brave woman to have gone through that and stayed with me is a tribute to the love that we have for each other. She said to me you have gone too far because they received, immediately afterwards, a letter saying 'your husband Nikolas Johannes Joubert 13th November 1959, as if she doesn't know who her husband is, has been deported and they have 28 days to follow suit. My daughter was busy with her final year A levels, my son is playing premiere league football and basketball and the dad has just corrupted the whole future plans and everything has been destroyed.

She sent me the documents. I still remember on Christmas Day 2008 I wrote a letter to KLM who were the airline that were in cahoots with the UK border agency. The plane ticket costs 120 pounds so they are doing each other a favour. This was like a fact finding mission. If people knew there is this hidden world behind immigrations that could be eradicated. That stuff shouldn't be there. What happened to me shouldn't happen to anybody else no matter what they have done, especially not based on the fact that you don't have **permission to PASS a PORT**.

I tried to bring across to the immigrations officer that he had a **responsibility to distinguish between a law and a statute** and they acted pre-emptively. They could not distinguish between my law and a statute. When you do express a law they should acknowledge that, or they should consider it, and they didn't.

Effectively you have created your own bubble around you and said this is my law and jurisdiction.

I started a commercial lien and I hammered them. I kept them so busy. I told them if they touch my wife and children there will be war. I immediately started filing documents on them. Now that I was back in South Africa I was with notary publics that I trusted as a South African not the notary publics that I used in UK because there they said, you will never get anywhere with this. It is almost like being on your own home turf. And I was focused.

What is a notary public ?

My understanding of notary public is like the ancient Jewish tribes: When people couldn't write they would go to a scribe and verbally profess something or put something into affidavit form and the scribe notarise that and put their seal on it and that would become that persons law.

A notary public is a much more solid foundation from which to express yourself.

If you look at the commission of oaths, you can also do an affidavit, but the furthest it goes is a declaration whereby you can lie by omission. You can say my understanding is this is true, but you can lie by omitting some material fact.

But when I do an affidavit with a notary public I say that **this is in my knowledge and first-hand experience, correct, true and complete**. You declare you are dealing with **the whole truth and nothing but the truth**.

I look at your own conscience. If you are prepared to lie to yourself, you put yourself into an eventual confrontation with **natural law**. It is going to catch up to you at some stage or another.

So one you got home you put down on paper point by point everything that happened to you in detail and had it notarised and said this is my truth. It adds to the bubble around me which is my law. Where did you send this document ?

I sent the document to the UK border agency and the head officer who served the document on my wife and also the immigration officers.

You gave them their bill ?

Yes, but I warned them upfront because the first thing to ensure was the my family could stay where they want and they would not harm them and not threaten them. I sent them a courtesy letter with the affidavit of truth and told them I was going to follow with an international commercial claim, which I did.

They didn't know what had struck them until they got the true bill. And they dishonoured it, they didn't respond in the time granted. They ignored the bill I sent them, but they left my family alone

totally, after I served the affidavit of truth on them. They backed off completely and when I served them the affidavit of obligation and the commercial lien. I gave them three days to respond, except the day of receipt. She sent me an email about a week later to say she is very sorry to only respond now but something happened. I wrote back and said I cannot accept your apology, you have dishonoured a notary public so send your apology to him, because I am carrying forward with this action. The whole thing ran through right to the end where it is valuable security. It has perfected and it has served its purpose. And my wife and family came back the next year in July from their own decision.

This is effectively a powerful process that can be used on anybody, say someone in business who has taken you for some money, it could be a corrupt politician, this is an opportunity to put a commercial claim against someone. What backing does this claim have? What legal foundation does it have? And how do we get this to work? How do you get the 900 thousand pounds out of somebody? Or do you need to ?

You don't need to. When you understand the difference between your limited capacity and your unlimited capacity, is that people want unlimited capacity but they still want cash back. When you act with unlimited capacity in the public you don't need cash back. Lets take this bill as an example. I have unlimited capacity and I want to add 976 thousand pounds to it, we still have unlimited capacity, so why would we do that? We don't need to because with unlimited capacity you can contract any claim or agreement that comes your way, you act now as principle and surety with equity interest and you can contract, any agreement that has expanded to a debt value of whatever the case may be, so you turn the tables around on them.

You have that document which is a claim which is as good as money. Money exists as paper or digits on a computer screen. So, you have taken your unlimited capacity as a human being and you discount this to a certain amount and that should be more than enough to get what I want in return. So, you are not using it because you want physical money but you are using it as a leveraging tool.

What I really did was to teach an immigration officer who could not distinguish between a statute and a law, to prime him that if anybody ever goes into Manchester airport terminal 2 and says **"I am a**

freeman on land," he will think twice before he detains him again. The claim was also not targeted at him. I targeted his **public liability insurance fund**.

You brought him out from behind the shield of his corporation and said you are still responsible for your actions. You brought them from behind that corporate veil.

From the insurance perspective he has now got a cheque against his name for 900 odd thousand pounds. If he gets another two his public liability insurance company will not indemnify him any longer. He will have to go home. An immigration officer has to be ensured to act in the public against someone else. So the claim hangs as a sword over his head, if he gets another one and another one, the insurance company will say I cannot ensure you any longer. I put him at notice that he had to adhere to his own rule of law and **distinguish between a statute which is a corporate rule and regulation and a law** which a man physically wrote down and had it attested to by a notary public saying that this is my fee schedule and if you transgress on my rights as a human being in terms not only of my constitution, but my rights that you can't take away from me or give to me, that we are born with, the unalienable rights or unleanable rights we have as people, that we don't understand.

What is a law ?

A law in my understanding is something like gravity. If I get on the roof and jump off I confirm gravity. That is a natural law. If there is a rhino with a calf are you prepared to walk up to her and say it is my law to take your calf away from you? In nature there is no insurance. You better stay away.

You are coming from a realm of natural law, saying my law just is? If you play in my space be prepared to suffer the consequence of natural law.

Law can also read 'agreement that went into breach.' If you and I had an agreement and the agreement is breached it creates a **leaned right** and that leaned right is based on the law.

And that law is the initial terms and conditions of our agreement. That is common law or the natural law that you don't harm one another or steal or act facetiously in your agreements and you don't go back on your word.

You are approaching this from absolute truth?

The officer broke his oath to protect people's rights in terms of the constitution. He transgressed on that.

A statute is a legislated rule of a society that has the force of law.

You need to be careful when using the force of law because it requires certain rules to be undertaken.

When they detain you they come with three people. One a policeman with a tazer and his hand is drawn on that tazer. I realised that if I caused any disturbance they would probably want to taze me. I said to them, why do you come in threes? **I thought equality before the law was paramount and mandatory.** That means strictly speaking there should have been one person dealing with my issue. I was unarmed. That is the force of law. And they come with a statute, in terms of regulation this that or the other, we now come to detain you.

You brought a body of law with you that had already been established through notary publics. Your law was expressed. You wanted to express your jurisdiction and they didn't let you.

The essence of what I want to bring across is the so called **economic crisis**. Do you really believe it is an economic crisis like a thunderstorm coming up?

It was completely man made. It is certainly not natural.

I believe there are certain things happening that are synchronistic, almost congruent to something that is unfolding at this point in time. There is no doubt in my mind that this crisis was created and it was created with military precision and it was based on **mortgage backed securities that goes into SPV's (special purpose vehicles)** and sold on the capital market under written and dressed up as valuable instruments for investment opportunities and this is how they created the bubble that is about to burst.

It is just paper money that is accumulating and all of it is worthless because money is not backed by anything since the creation of the fiat currency. All we have is pieces of paper floating around and numbers on a computer screen. There is a huge body of statute law, rules and regulations. It looks like you have taken a step right out of that and created your own kind of bubble. And when you fire a claim at someone you don't really fire it into the system.

What we do is we take natural law and we use commercial law as an extension of natural law and project that onto an individual. It is almost like targeting lightning onto someone's breastbone. It is very effective and very dangerous.

What other examples have you got in terms of your own experience where you have seen this happen.

When I got back I had this thing with Nedbank. Do you mind if I call them the bank, the ones that sponsor the 2 million dollar golf tournament. And I keep on asking them where do you get that money to do that sponsorship? Whose money is that really? I had an investment property and they were the mortgage provider or mortgage holder.

When I was in the UK I realised they never gave me the consideration of money. **They used my security of person and they converted that into credit facility.** By making available your details in terms of your ID document and by being in a limited capacity and RICA FICA rules and regulations and details so you say I am limited you need to borrow me some money. They go on your loan application and they take it as your first promissory note, your promise to pay the loan back based on your labour and the product of your labour. **That is all that spins around the globe at this time, our potential labour and the product of our physical labour.**

They are borrowing your own property from you and you need to pay it back with interest. If you look at the South African Reserve Banks own information booklet, they talk about the **exit policy** and managing distress in banks. They say banks acquire liquid and certain liabilities and convert that liquid certain liabilities into illiquid and uncertain assets, such as bank loans. Essentially it is the transfer of an accounting system.

Giving you the finer details, I did not apply for the loan it was offered to me through a scheme called 'money skills for life,' that said you can buy an investment property off the books and we will provide you with a **110% bank loan**. All I did was signed for it based on my so called credibility in the UK

because in that point of time I was earning pounds as a veterinary surgeon so my income potential was massively inflated.

So, Nedbank had no problem in providing that on what I thought was based on my credibility where in fact it was based on my security in person. When 'money skills for life' went belly up (by intervention from the South African Reserve Bank) my liability turned into an obligation because I couldn't service the mortgage debt without putting in my own money. So I confronted them and told them that they did not loan me anything. They did not give me **full disclosure** on the original agreement in terms of your lack of consideration. There were no lawful terms and conditions. They were legal terms and conditions. **And there is only one signature on the piece of paper and it is mine.** Where is yours?

They handed it over to a lawyer whom I spoke to and he said that they are just waiting for an execution date to sell my property on an auction. And I said hang on I am sending you documentation now as I have the first lien right on that property. I sent the documentation off and a very bright young lawyer in the firm saw the documents and he said he is not going to pursue it further and he referred it back to Nedbank. They withdrew as attorneys of record on that case.

Another law firm came to take over and said they are going to take me to court. I said to them you are **third party interlopers**, I have no business with you whatsoever. It should be between me and the bank.

I have asked the bank to show me the original promissory note, they just don't supply it. If it was really such a legitimate transaction they would say here you go, here it is. There is something that they are hiding, so when you say they use your security of person to make credit it is really starting to make sense.

I filed another commercial claim against Nedbank and their legal counsel. I filed a commercial lien against them and that went also to maturity. That is when Nampad popped up and said they were going to take me to court. I told them they can't. I told them that Nedbank was already under estoppel with a perfected commercial claim. They said that they don't regard that at all as estoppel to start with. They don't recognise anything from a business perspective that is non-judicial, they want to create conflict.

They did not see your jurisdiction. They did not see that you had gone through a process of speaking your truth. They just followed their own process and said you know what to hell with you.

They don't recognise anything from a business perspective that is non judicial. They want to create conflict They want to draw you into a court room, and they set a date with the honourable Judge Kekama.

Why honourable ?

In the court system it is not about truth, it is about honour and dishonour. They want to know who is the debtor and the creditor and if the debtor is going to honour the bill.

They operate like an accounting system?

Yes, it is an administrative tribunal to settle an account. It is a commercial adjudication to decide who is going to settle the matter, the account.

A summons is an invitation to go to court ?

It is an offer to come do business. I accepted the invitation to go to court.

The act of ignoring it is actually playing their game, the worst thing we can do is actually ignore it. You didn't ignore it, you actually said lets take this one step at a time. There was no reason for this to go to court.

Nedbank as a fiction and cannot state a claim upon which remedy can be granted. How do you avert a piece of paper? Only a human being can state a claim upon which remedy or relief can be granted,

nothing else. So I went to court. They informed me on the 11th August 2009 and on the 14th August I was sitting outside court G8 with my heart pounding in my throat. I thought this is surreal at first I

was with Ken Woodachre in the magistrates court as an expert witness then I was detained and deported and now I was sitting as a criminal in front of a South African high court.

I knew a few things, one of which was to not let them **settle their jurisdiction** on me.

Explain

When you go into a court and they say for the record state your name and your birth date. Or they say please stand and you do, you accept an order. You make yourself submissive. When someone says state your name and your birthdate for the record and you are asked to witness something through penalty of perjury you just lied through your teeth, because when I crawled out of my mother's birth canal I couldn't read a calendar. I cannot tell anybody my birthdate; it is here-say evidence. You become immediately an unreliable witness. Any testimony is therefore null and void. I knew I wasn't going to play their game. I was sitting outside and a guy with a batman suit came to me and said are you Mr Joubert, and I said no I am the beneficiary of a trust you are trying to take on, so he said well the court is about to proceed will you please come in. I went in with the whole entourage and they were standing, bowing and doing their bit. I went in, sat down, put the date on a piece of paper and said, 'God help me.'

No legal representation, an alien environment, speaking a language you probably didn't understand.

Not at the time they were just bowing to each other. I don't bow to anybody other than my creator, if He appears. The Judge looked at me and she said we are going to proceed in the matter of Nedbank vs. Mr Joubert. Immediately I said to her I am not Mr Joubert. I am Nikolas Johannes of the family Joubert. Don't put a title in front of my name. I am back in my home country as a sovereign, don't put a title in front of my name. That is when it looked like lightning struck her and she said to me, "you have to stand when you address the court." I realised that was the first order so I said to her, **"I have to breathe everything else is negotiable. I told her a piece of paper cannot breathe."** A judge cannot practice law from the bench. Her role is to adjudicate. I asked her, "do you have an oath of office." Her finger came forward and she said I am going to charge you with contempt of court. So I said you can't charge me with contempt of court I am asking you a question. And then the guy in the

batman suit, said in Afrikaans 'jy moet staan as jy die hof aanspreek.' I said thank you there is order number two. So I decided to stand up otherwise this was going nowhere, and now I was ready, the butterflies had gone, so I said now "I am going to ask you again for the record whether, state for the record whether you have an oath of office." I was standing and I was very assertive. She went a pale colour, a light coffee colour, she pushed the files back, she stood up and said this court is adjourned and she raced out the door. Her black and red batman suit was flailing behind her. I fell back in my chair, it was literally as if there was some other presence in that court room. I realised it was over. I had now subrogated the rights and defences of the court case. Because that morning I had filed my indemnity bond on the judge, because I wanted to ascertain whether she had an oath of office in order to get a neutral ruling from the bench.

Effectively she was a stand in, an unoathed corporate employee.

They liquidated themselves. They jumped ship. If you consider on sea if someone jumps ship they are in the water and shark meat. There was no ruling in terms of Nedbank vs Joubert. That course case that took place at 10am in court G8 does not even reflect on the record. They pretend that never took place. Between the 18th and 25th November I got confirmation that the property is still registered in my name. The execution sale was cancelled. Nedbank said to the body corporate that the debtor had paid their arrears. I didn't even know, the property had been sitting empty for over a year.

So the whole situation is effectively dissolved and you are left exactly where you were in the first place. It is almost like the commercial law maxim, whoever is the last to leave the battlefield wins by default.

When I ended up with a retired judge in the motion court I didn't feel the need to retaliate against a 65 year old man who had already retired, who was not indemnified as well.

You were thinking about the very people you were expecting to put a claim against. You actually indemnified those people before you actually took them on.

I filed a petition to say that someone must take them under review to show why they are not in contempt of their own court.

If they did an execution on the property based on a void agreement, do you agree that you now deal with theft. You are now dealing with the common law crime of theft. They were prepared to do it, they had the property on auction and the auction was cancelled. The commercial lien process works but you need to treat it with the respect that it has.

The Nedbank thing is deep, there is a rabbit hole that is impossible to discuss with one issue. All I want to say is the commercial lien process works, but you need to treat it with the respect that it is supposed to have.

What you have effectively uncovered is a South African precedent, that is pre judicial. You don't need to go into the judicial system unless absolutely necessary, without using a lawyer and without paying their fees. For all those people out there who are suffering financially who can't pay off their home loans and can't pay off their vehicle finance, and of these so called liabilities, these huge burdens we are carrying on our every day lives are number one completely our own fault but number two there is a process we can take that can relieve us ?

Yes, it is guaranteed and it is a strategy. You put things in place in such a way that you immediately stop the bleeding out of your cash flow, you create a safety net by gathering the cash that normally you would pay out to debt collectors or debt reviewers, you keep for yourself in that ninety day grace period and there after wards you settle the accounts the way it is supposed to and it is guaranteed.

When you stop a payment you get nailed. And you feel that it is the right thing to do to pay your debt, however the dishonour is the bankers who have defrauded us into paying for something we should not have to pay. We created that in the first place.

What you do is void an agreement and let them contract away from that in the first place and that is staying honourable in the public.

You are not ignoring it, you are not getting out of liabilities, you are finding a remedy that you can employ to alleviate this extraordinary tension that is growing every day caused by a banking system that has no scruples.

You don't need to go find liability. You have liability. You move from a perspective where you express yourself in the public, no longer as a limited entity with limited liability, but you express yourself as a sovereign with unlimited liability to contract the agreement which you should have done on the day you signed the note. You are in fact keeping the notice of interest alive by doing monthly payments, which is almost a bail payment and you can rectify that by contracting that agreement and you should have 72 hours from the time you did it in the first place.

END OF TAPE 2 START OF TAPE 3 ...

The more we get under the skin of the financial system, the more one wonders how natural is the monetary system? I am convinced it has all been set up ?

When you look at an agreement where they have got terms and conditions apply. You need to look at the words in a very literal sense. When you say the set-up you end up with eventually a set-down in a court system, because you did not do the set off of the account.

So you have an agreement that is given to you, a cellphone contract for example. It is effectively a set-up. If you stop paying your contract after six months if it is a two year contract, or your bond or your vehicle finance, what happens is a legal process that involves something called a set-down.

They drag you into a system where an advocate will do a set down on behalf of the claimant or the plaintive because you did not do a set-off in the beginning on that agreement.

Are you saying we have effectively been set up so we can eventually default on our payments and then we are set down. Is this a deliberate exercise on behalf of the banks?

Yes, it is inevitable. If you do a contractual agreement in the time span that is lawfully allowed there is a very good chance you will end up in a default position especially when the economy goes belly up, like now. People are defaulting on these loans because of extraneous circumstances. It is not willingly. And because you did not contract the agreement within the seventy two hours allowed for it, lawfully, then they will prosecute you based on your dishonour and an advocate will put in an application for a set down.

I thought a contract was an agreement? You are using the word in a different way now.

I am trying to be more specific. We had an agreement to meet this morning and discuss these issues, is there a contract involved?

There can only be a contract where there was a monetary value that was expanded in the first place. **A contract you use in a verb context.** If something has been expanded to a value of R400 000, for instance for a vehicle and there is now an obligation or a liability to contract that value back to zero, to settle the account.

When you have a monetary liability that is created, like a cellphone contract, they have expanded it from zero. You are saying we need to contract that back to zero. The set-up is the expansion and if we don't contract it, they will set us down and they will contract it on our behalf.

The set-up is to get you to depend their obligation, to prevent you realising that they have an obligation in the first place. Secondly, they minimise your liability to a future event over a period of monthly instalments because you act in a limited capacity without the ability to contract that value. It is also about inflation and deflation. If you look at how currency is put into circulation. It is done by inflation. If you are inflating something you are talking about fresh air and that is why I keep on saying, and I do facetiously, they are printing money out of thin air. The initial inflation is done by inflating a system with air.

How are we supposed to pay a debt which is air in the first place?

You can't and that is why the National debt has escalated to 1.6 trillion Rand.

Every country in the world with the exception of five countries are in exorbitant debt, even South Africa is struggling to get through the interest payments on our debt. The money supply has expanded and expanded, there is more hot air going in, what can we do to contract this?

First of all you need to understand how to do it and that you have the liability to do it. It is almost a responsibility, no-one else can do it. When you contract the agreement you basically **deflate**

inflation. It is controlled mechanism by which we can prevent this inflated bubble to literally burst.

This is what happened since the early eighties but really took momentum from 2000 onwards. If you look at the amendment act 56 of 2000 relating to the Bills of Exchange Act, that was done pre-emptively. The act 34 of 1964 was amended with very specific provisions. There were five of them. The first one is, provisions for certain technological advancements, for protection of the users ...

They wouldn't have made changes to a statute that wasn't being used.

They apply it and take this legislation seriously as someone getting a heart attack.

Who is they ?

They who enacted the Bills in the first place. It boils down to the monetary system. They use our security as a charge back for this elastic fiat paper currency that goes into circulation. We are backing this paper currency with our labour and our pledges and our children and our own bodies as collateral because the gold and silver has been taken out of circulation, in terms of South Africa since 1920.

Was this a deliberate plan ?

Yes there is documentation. It is so deliberate. If you look at how this system was designed, the ones who were responsible for it, I found in hindsight have a very strong ego. Many of these men before their death came out and admitted that firstly they created the federal reserve system. They admit we did it. I am talking about people sitting together planning a strategy, calling it a strategy, allowing it to evolve as a fraud, but making provisions for it to be put into circulation in such a way that people don't realise it is a fraud.

A lot of this is documented, if you look at the Fema camps in America, concentration camps that are clearly there to house civilians, what are they there for? If you look deeper at the Bills passed by senators, you can read up on it.

The first governor of the South African Reserve Bank was Henry Winston Clegg an Englishman that was born in Bloemfontein. When his father died his mother took him back to England. He was literally coached to become the first auditor for the bank of England and on the 17th December 1920 he was appointed to the position of first governor of the South African Reserve Bank. They admitted he had no economic or banking training. He started as a clerk in the bank of Craven which was later incorporated into the bank of Liverpool, the paper trail was buried and he became the first governor of the South African Reserve Bank.

Do you feel that he was primed externally by the existing system to be responsible for co-creating the new system that we have today.

Yes, This coincided with what happened in the United States between 1913 and 1923 with a man called Edward Mandell House. He was a colonel even though he never served in the military. They gave him the honouree title of colonel. He became the security advisor to Woodrow Wilson. I found some of his private memoires where he explains in detail how the system is going to evolve. I use this as a forensic framework of how this was pre-ordained long before we were even born.

Can we look at that because we should be living right in the thick of the nightmare that is created.

Yes we are but we can also use this as a framework to set ourselves free. If you can recognise and deal with the principles he brought out, how they are going to enslave people.

He said, “very soon every American (this can read every South African) will be required to register their biological property in a national system that is designed to keep track of the people and will operate in the ancient system of pledging. By such methodology we can compel people to submit to our agenda which will dictate their security as a charge back for our fiat paper currency. Every American (or South African) will be forced now to register or suffer not being able to work or earn a living. They will be our chapel and we will hold the security interest over them forever by operation of the law merchant under the scheme of secure transactions. Americans unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of laden to us, will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent forever to remain economic slaves through taxation secured by their pledges. They will be stripped of their rights and given a commercial value designed to make us a profit and they will be none the wiser. Not one man in a million can ever figure our plans and if by accident one or two will figure it out we have in our arsenal plausible deniability.”

“After all this is the only logical way to fund governments, by floating loans and debts to the registrants in the form of benefits and privileges. This will inevitably reap us huge profits beyond our wildest expectations and leave every American a contributor to this fraud which we will call social insurance.”

We sit in south Africa with the same problem now where they have created SASSA : South African Social Service Agency. They literally tell people to apply for grants, social security grants.

Social insurance is a fraud. It is not insurance. It is basically a tax that you pay in the hope that one day you are going to get some benefits and privileges from. A good example is in the UK where you have single mothers who get grants from the state. Where does the money originate from. It is basically using someone's security to draw interest on.

That becomes a growing pool of money?

Correct. He makes it very clear, it is a fraud. He says, “every American will ensure us for any loss we may incur and in this manner every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly.”

By he is referring to the bankers, the global elite?

Yes, or in my understanding the banking cartel that was created. If you look at the definition of a cartel or the essence of a cartel, it is normally a group of people that try to prevent any opposition or competition by having a monopoly and they use the government to enact certain rules and regulations in order to protect that monopoly. You have two beneficiaries. The cartel itself or the institution that creates the monopoly and the government that gets the benefit from it. As he says, “that is the only logical way to fund a government.”

And the government being a corporation?

Exactly. If you can fund the government and the government has the ability to fund the people then the creditors of that government has the say. Mayor Rothschild said, “if you give me the power to regulate a countries money system I care not who makes the rules.” That's essentially what it boils down to.

Finally Mandell House says, “The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and we will employ the high office of the president of our dummy corporation to ferment this plot against America.”

The dummy corporation meaning the government?

Yes, if you look at the word president and you take the p out you have resident. Or you take the not out you have reside. They keep asking you where do you reside and of what country are you a resident because then they have a president. And it is all a dummy corporation.

It is about getting us to be a part of their jurisdiction, their game, their rules.

It is about control. The point is it is about control, as he said “forever.” “We will hold a security interest over them forever.”

To put this in simple terms, you have the people when they are born have birth certificates. The government uses that to loan collateral, money, from the banks, who effectively charge interest on those loans we then have to pay off. We are unwittingly contributing to a fraud that we perpetuated through lack of knowledge. You have discovered that there is a remedy? What have you been doing since 2010 ?

I have been assisting people in preventing them from having their property executed or foreclosed upon and taken back by these banks, because these banks cannot stake a claim upon which remedy can be granted. **You cannot harm a legal fiction**, a think that does not exist that lives as a construct of the imagination in the minds of the men that created it in the first place.

They are not taking anything from us as human beings they are taking it away from this trust that is creates, this legal fiction that is our name spelt in capital letters. When we can start learning to tell the difference we can act as a principle on our trust, instead of the trustee or administrator of our trust, and we can also say we are ultimately the beneficiary of our trust we can take control of our entire commercial affairs and it is all guaranteed in the statutes and the common law combined.

Precisely, yes. That is the simplicity of it but it is so simple it repels the mind.

In a practical sense there is a strong firewall within the banks and the corporation so when you try and use any method other than the one they describe, it is incredible difficult to get them to agree to it. How do we go about getting them to accept this? How do we make this change to say there is an alternative route and it applies to me?

When I deal with anybody in the commercial sphere I give them the benefit of the doubt. I didn't know any of this information myself. It was discovered in an awkward manner. I didn't look for it, it was a gradual process through necessity, because I was confronted by issues I didn't know how to deal with in the first place.

It is essential to understand that most people that operate for the banks are probably triple A personalities, they are driven they have a fear of loss but they are entrenched in a system where they don't know that they don't know that there is an alternative.

We need to educate them? What is the first step?

The first thing to recognise is that banks have two functions, one is financial service provision and the other one is credit provision. If you listen to any of the ads they make it clear, “they are an authorised financial service provider and a registered credit provider in terms of the national credit act.” You can access the documents that prove that they are a corporation.

Who gave the banks the rights to become a financial service provider?

When I ask them the question they go pale on me. I ask them the question because I know the answer. If you go back to the establishment of the South African Reserve Bank in 1920 it was created with the banking act of 1920, act 31, which made provision for the establishment of the system that we are dealing with today. Commercial banks then lost the ability to issue their own domestic notes. **That sole authority was basically handed over to the South African Reserve Bank.**

In 1920, there was an act that was established that gave them the first round of power?

There was a commission that basically sold the idea to the government. That commission was pre-emptive. It was a conspiracy. It was part of the cartel. And they sold the idea to the government.

Is this the same cartel that started operating in all the countries of the world? Effectively the IMF and the world bank are in every country of the world except for five.

They make it very easy for those who are in favour of this centralised institution to have a carte blanche. **That time is over now.**

The central bank still get their money from us at the end of the day? When they create that wealth they have to use the people as collateral surely?

They deal with the law merchant, the ancient system of pledging that goes back to 1066 when **William the conqueror** took over England with his Jewish tribes. They put in place the statutory staple we still use today, which is in essence a promise to pay something back and a pledge if you don't pay back they can take something of value, the physical substance, either land or your physical property.

That is what the game is about? The game is about security? The game is about our physical assets and our physical assets is not about our property, in terms of our houses and our cars that is just a part of it but it is also our bodies, in terms of the way we provide energy into the system through our work. That is what is creating the currency?

Yes, they want everyone enslaved to this same system with the same interest derived from you without you knowing it.

It is almost like they create a mirror of society and they just distort it slightly like the mirrors in old fair grounds. Some of them were concave, some of them were convex, and they distorted your image. They are controlling the mirror and what is being reflected is distorted and we are unable to see the difference between that and our reality. So I am sitting with a burden that is eating into me, what is the first step I take?

The first step is to recognise there is a remedy and it is guaranteed. It is embodied in a different set of legislations and they hide that. They don't want you to know about that.

If you look again at the South African Reserve Banks own information booklet, they talk about managing distress and having an exit policy for banks if they go into distress. They say very clearly.

These procedures differ significantly from those embodied in ordinary company and insolvency laws. When you look at a human being in so called distress under the National Credit Regulations Act or the National Credit act, they eventually end up challenging you through the companies legislation or the insolvency legislation, where people basically sequestrate.

The questions I ask is if a bank has an exit policy, why not a human being?

We are being channelled into things like debt review ?

This creates two questions why does a bank need an exit policy and does a human need an exit policy? It is my contention that a human does not need an exit policy. Because you have a remedy, the exit policy doesn't apply to you. It can only apply to a bank with limited liability.

I want to start using this now, I want to start the process. The first step is to stop paying. There is no debt to pay off. We are making payments for the sake of making payments.

Yes what you do is run a hamster wheel in the public venue. It is good time to distinguish between the private venue and the public venue. We need to stop fiddling around in the public venue, running this hamster wheel, and step back into the private venue and invite them to bring the claim from the public to you in the private in order to do the set-off.

When you keep on paying in the public venue, all you do is you are discharging a debt with another debt instrument, which is a benefit privilege but the account never closes.

Because we have a guaranteed remedy for anything, I should go to the bank who is in the public space and invite them to make me an offer in the public space. How much do I owe, make me an offer. And the bank says you currently owe R1 million rand on your house. If you can get that from the bank, we have a remedy in the private to balance the accounting.

We have a remedy in our private space to contract those implied agreements.

We can't pay off a debt with a debt because all money that is in circulation is evidence of debt. If we have a debt, we can't take someone else's debt and use that to pay off a debt. That just makes the bubble expand. We have another remedy in place to contract the agreement back to zero. How do you do that?

You issue an original issue that they need to discount to the value of the implied agreement.

They provide you with an offer. You provide them with an original issue and they balance each other out. How do you issue that?

You issue this through the doctrine of offer and acceptance and through applying the Bills of exchange act which is also part of the financial service provision.

As an example the National Credit Act is not functional unless it is founded on a foundation. The foundation for the National Credit Act is not just the constitution. The constitution plays a role, but the fundamental foundation of the National Credit Act is the Bills of Exchange act.

I can get this original issue by using the Bills of Exchange act and provide them with a set-off.

If you look at the original issue, you cannot put unlimited on a spread-sheet or into an accounting journal. You need to discount the unlimited value to a value that is created somehow.

In the private space we are unlimited, so when we move from the private into the public. The bank is in the public space. They provide us with an offer which we receive in the private space and because we have unlimited capacity in the private, I want to discount my unlimited liability, or ability to create anything, unlimited remedy, and I am discounting that to whatever it is they sent to me. It is an accounting transaction, balance your books.

They never address you in the private space. You get addressed to your name all in capitals (strawman), which is limited.

They want to know how limited you think you are. They take us at our limited perception of ourselves. How do I take that offer and bring it into the private so I can set it off?

You make use of the provisions they put in place with the amendment act 56 of 2000.

That is the Bills of exchange act, we need to apply the bills of exchange act ?

Yes, and you need to recognise that before 2000, before it was amended, we were running with act 34 of 1964.

There are basically three parties in a transaction. There is either a drawer, an acceptor or an endorser. That was until 2000 when they amended the act, they added a fourth party to the transaction, a signer of the la valle. The word la valle is a French word and it means surety. Now I can act as a surety on behalf of this legal fiction or strawman.

They created a new party to the leveraging or the relief that you are entitled to.

Why wasn't that there before 2000?

I believe the events of 911 triggered this.

What other provisions have been made ?

They also made provision for the protection of the users. So, whoever understands this legislation, your remedy comes to the forefront. They tell you upfront you are protected when you use it. The other is to make provision for the reduction of fraud. This puts you in a position that if you recognise fraud you can deal with it and should deal with it from an honourable perspective. If you are aware of a fraudulent system and you do not report it you become complicit to it.

We are perpetrators of this fraud. We are guilty from day one and treated as such.

The Bills of Exchange act was founded on the Bills of Exchange act that was enacted in 1882 in the UK by Justice Chalmers. It has now been recognised and people regard it as the best act that was ever written. It is like a manual. Sections 1 – 100 tell you exactly how to apply the bills of exchange act.

The system is a fraud, the system is collapsing and causing huge amounts of chaos. The financial system does not work.

The Canadians and other commonwealth countries, especially America, their Bills of exchange act is a little more complicated. The Americans codified the Bills of Exchange into the uniform commercial code.

When I came back to South Africa and mentioned the uniform commercial code, people looked at me with blank stares.

In 1988 there was an investigation into the payment system of South African law. In 1994 there was a report published by Professor Franz Malan of the Rand Afrikaans university. That report was given political connotation in 1994 and it was buried and no one knows what was written in that report. When you look at the essence of that report it talks about the unification of law and it talks about the

negotiable instrument of law worldwide. 'The Bill of exchange is the most cosmopolitan instrument in the world. It drives all commerce in the world'.

You mentioned we are still under the British Empire and the legacy they left is the Bills of Exchange Act. And it is always the crown getting their share.

When you look at another book Southern Cross edited by Zimmerman and Visser, Professor Charl Hugo who has done mercantile law at Stellenbosch, he maintained in chapter 15 in the book that there is no arm of South African law where English law had a more specific effect as in the **law of negotiable instruments**. That took me to late Professor Leonard Geerin and Professor Dennis Cohen, who are probably regarded as the utmost experts on the law of negotiable instruments. The law on

negotiable instruments by Professor Geerin is a fantastic book to help you to understand and to integrate the bills of exchange act into your common business affairs in order to stay honourable in terms of the public policy. There was also a public policy established in 1920 that very few people are aware of.

END OF TAPE THREE ... START OF TAPE FOUR

How are you finding the process ?

In the seminars I find audiences are broken up in to threes. You have got people that want all the fundamentals. And they want it slowly. And then you have got a middle group that are happy with that but they get impatient, and thirdly there is a very impatient group that wants everything yesterday. That is the challenge to put it out that there so that people don't lose interest, but we will discuss everything in details. I find some people engage with this almost like a silver bullet as an instant gratification, instant solution. It is not, it is going to blow back on people.

I looked at your commercial lien today and it is 300 points in your affidavit, it is meticulous process. From the community side we do have a lot of reference material available on the web. We talked about social insurance and public policy ?

If you look at **insurance** it takes you also into another jurisdiction. We talk about going into nature

and trying to rangle a rhino calf from his mother. There is no insurance. In fact you must be careful because you could be killed instantly. In Natural Law and true commercial law there is no insurance. **On the ancient merchant law there was no insurance.**

You have to look after your affairs ?

Correct and you need to provide substance. If you were a merchant and you were trading in dummy stuff or rotten stuff you committed financial suicide. There was no turn around on that. **It was**

substance for substance. I gave you spices, you gave me silk. **It wasn't paper for paper.** What we have today is people enter into the public venue under limited liability insurance. I find that today when you receive an email from someone who calls herself Denis O'Grady and you address what is in the letter they back off and say I am just a typist. But I say you signed your name on this document and you said we referring to a law firm.

In the previous interviews we looked at this process where you target an individual and bring them out of their shell. It is almost as if the lawyers themselves are designating their signatures to someone junior, where the juniors don't realise what they are signing and that they can be personally liable.

And because they are insured we can say that they have done something wrong here and need to make good.

They are protected by limited liability insurance.

We have social insurance which is effectively unemployment benefits, and then you have public policy. How do all the insurances link together ?

With **the public policy that was established in 1920**, because they took money of substance (backed by gold or silver) out of circulation, they had to give us something in exchange and that is what Mandell House refers to as the privileges and benefits of using a fiat currency. It is an **elastic currency** backed by nothing other than the faith put into the system, or the confidence into the system, that a bill carries the weight it is supposed to.

The government say the bad news is that the money is backed by nothing but the good news is that there are benefit privileges and we are going to slowly expand these benefit privileges which include social insurance.

Besides that, now you act as a limited liability vessel on the ocean of commerce.

Before that when money was backed by nothing, we could still act separately from the system? So if you were a trader you could do business normally, but when it came off the gold standard we have to work within the system.

And now you act in a limited capacity, so they had to top it up so to speak with public liability insurance. Because you had limited liability, if you now caused any injury, there was something that needed to back up in order to provide the remedy.

So the bad news was we were going to a fiat currency and the bad news was where we had unlimited rights, they were going to limit you but the good news is that everything you do will be ensured.

Yes, you have **commercial grace** or an exit policy, there is tolerance built into it. It has taken you away from the relentless almost unforgiving true, ancient law now to maritime admiralty jurisdiction.

in maritime, the law of the sea does insurance pay a role? If I was a captain of a ship and I was in Europe, and you wanted me to sail around the Cape. I would say are you going to insure my family if I run aground on skeleton coast in Namibia. Who is going to look after my children when I die. I am prepared to take the liability on the cargo but you are to insure my family in order to get there and back.

Insurance is from the sea, the domain of ship captains and merchants. In order to start doing business on the land it is almost like the law of the sea is encroaching onto the law of the land and that is why we have ports in the middle of the land. The law of the sea brought with it insurance and that is why with insurance you are dealing in a completely different jurisdiction. Money is the law of the sea, whenever we use money, we effectively are using the law of the sea.

If you look at this pamphlet of the National Credit Regulator, it shows a guy literally sinking into paper and it says, **‘sinking into debt.’** Your ship has gone astray and you are now being liquidated.

Why didn’ t everybody say well if everything is insured we have nothing to worry about?

I create the distinguishing factor that I don't want to deal with **limited capacity in the public** anymore. I would not entertain any insurances and I will not subrogate my rights and defences to an insurance company either.

We don't have to accept this fiat currency money. We can still operate in the private, which is unlimited. We have forgotten that, everyone went with the herd. And if you do take someone on the public you know they are insured.

What you do in the private is, you use your strawman, that limited capacity entity or corporation, it sounds like you. It has the same sound of your name but it is written in capital letters and is linked to a birth date on a certificate or a bond number on the certificate or your ID number. It becomes an account number and a **transmitting account between the unlimited capacity in the private into the public** where they expect the claim settled.

I get an SMS as an example from TV Licence and it says CUNDELL SC MR all in capitals, this is not me, this is a transmission utility.

When they do that, that is the reason I say we need to apply the amendment act of 2000, because that is one of the technological advancements they make provisions for - to send you an SMS. Before 2000 they couldn't. They had to send you a letter. Where we dealt with paper in the past we now deal with electronic circuits: literally currency running in electrical potential or in voltage, literally electricity. **An SMS can now be an invitation to contract.**

If they say you owe so much on your TV Licence that is effectively an offer? What are our options here?

You can either ignore the SMS which puts you in dishonour in terms of the public policy. You can accept it conditionally, you can accept it unconditionally or you can reject it with impunity which again puts you at dishonour in terms of the public policy.

How does ignoring something put me in dishonour in terms of the public policy?

They make the assumption that the fact that we have accepted the ID document, signed certain things and accepted certain privileges that there is an agreement between them, either expressed or implied.

What is the difference?

Expressed is when you went in and said I want to have a TV and yes I am prepared to accept a licence.

When they send me that SMS they are saying you owe me x amount of money. They are assuming we have an agreement. If they create a liability for me the x amount owed, that is money owed in the system and if I don't do anything about that liability I am being dishonourable. I have to counter that some way?

They can now prosecute you, instead of when they send you the offer, and you prosecute the case.

That is where your **power of attorney** comes from. If you ignore the offer they will prosecute

you because now the account is open. They created that liability but you did not contract that implied agreement. So don't ignore these offers.

Someone might come and say I am prepared to take over that liability on that title which is a law firm, now they come with litigation or the threat of litigation.

A law firm effectively buys the debt from TV Licences?

From the definition of a negotiable instrument, it is just transferred from one to the other.

The lawyers are debt collectors and are going to share the spoils. Effectively TV licences almost farms it out to a whole bunch of debt collectors who are lawyers who effectively put these offers out there hoping we are going to do something about it, or not do something about so they can take our assets. The worst thing we can possibly do with these things is ignore them. We have the option of inviting them into the private, doing an original issue and set-off the account. What do lawyers say about the Bills of Exchange Act?

If you look at how the **Bills of Exchange Act** is presented from the academic perspective: the subject Bills of Exchange is done in **commercial law** level 5. Very few lawyers have a working knowledge of the Bills of Exchange Act. In Veterinary Science we did not study commercial law at all.

As a professional in the UK, with a consultant, an accountant, a tax consultant and insurance agent and everybody who says Dr don't worry about your finance, we will take care of that, you worry about your practice and I walked myself into a brick wall. I literally ran into a brick wall, because I didn't care about my finances. Now that I do it is a different story all together, all my accounts are settled. Before I was an ignorant nitwit and totally ignorant of the principles of **staying honourable in the public**.

If we use money we should understand the principles of how it works? Commercial law is based on the principles within the Bills of Exchange Act.

In the year 2010 between the North and South High Court of Gauteng they had approximately 140 000 summonses in one year and the majority of those are financial institutions against people. There is a bottle neck. When I did my first summons against Standard Bank, the case number was 49730 and when I tried to file it the people at the registrar said they hadn't even processed 46 000. They were behind with 3000 summonses which makes it an **epidemic**. If the lawyers had a knowledge of the Bills of Exchange Act the loads on the courts would be a trickle as to what it is now. They would have given them the application of the Bills of Exchange act to contract the agreement within the 72 hour period allowed.

Lawyers have the judiciary responsibility to act as trustee. They have the ability to contract these agreements. They are trustees of the **National Trust**. The National Trust is the one where the debt was put in in 1920 to relieve the people from the debt and created the National Trust with the debt that has escalated to 1.6 trillion rand. We have never addressed that. We are strictly speaking under a reorganisation bankruptcy that roles over every 70 years.

What is the difference between the public policy and the national trust?

The National Trust was created to say the four colonies, the British Colony, the Kwa Zulu Natal colony, the Free State which was a republic and the Transvaal republic they all got together as the **Union of South Africa in 1910**. Four groups came together and created a trust relationship.

What was the property in that trust?

It must have been the escalated debt of all the wars before 1910.

Four regions came together and each of them was individually in debt. They said lets come together and create a new corporation to hide the debt of the previous four so we can reorganise this process and almost start a fresh. The National Trust has a huge amount of debt in it. And debt is money.

The debt keeps on circulating and the debt keeps on expanding.

A lawyer as a trustee of the national trust can dip into the national trust and remove the debt?

Settle the debt. Do a set-off. They are under obligation to maintain the bankruptcy, but I don't. My objective is to get to a point where we say that is enough. This year is the 90th year of the South African Reserve Bank so we are into the second phase of a seventy year bankruptcy. **It is time we rehabilitate this bankruptcy.**

It escalated exponentially. The lawyers could rectify the situation. We can instruct them from the private to go into that National Trust and set-off the account.

And you have the power of attorney to do that. And they can only follow your instructions after they have received instructions.

We are unlimited so we have the right to instruct them instead of taking advice.

It is changing now. There are a group of lawyers who have seen this. They were sceptical initially. It has been confirmed. One of the lawyers, who has a masters degree in commercial law when he was first exposed to this he said I don't know what you are talking about, half way through he said I think this is a new study field. I maintain it is not. Remember I have no economic background. I am speaking in terms of being a veterinary surgeon. I look at the tangible natural substance element of the system and distinguish between the fact and the fiction. That is all I did.

The fundamentals are to set off the accounts to such an extent that they eventually deflate without causing harm to anybody. Most people I talk to when we talk about this stuff there is a

deep seated driven fear that moves them. **How can you fear a fiction?**

We have an obligation as unlimited human beings to start teaching attorneys and lawyers, in doing the real job, setting off accounts.

It is starting to happen. There are lawyers that have a guilt conscience, I have spoken to many lawyers, especially ladies who said they stepped out of being a lawyer and downgraded themselves from being a lawyer to being law typists just to get release from this stress. I deal with insolvency lawyers who say to me they don't sleep at night. They don't understand that there is a remedy built into it. **It is called saving to suitors. It is an ancient principle.** They know the system is a fiction and they have to keep a backdoor open to save themselves from being found guilty of treason and hung from a lamppost somewhere. In a time of war treason is still punishable by death. This is very serious, people don't understand how deep it goes.

People ask me, when are you going to monetise these things? That is not the issue. **In true commercial law you have to offer tolerance, grace and a delayed period of reaction** and not just to storm in and execute, which is unfortunately what the banks do.

In the process of applying the fundamentals we also teach them a lesson, a real lesson. I don't want to destroy anybody but when you get to a point where you take on **moral high-ground** to then perform your duty in order to protect your rights and make sure other rights are also protected. When you take that high moral ground that is the unalienable position to be in and you say stop you are not going to

go further. We are now 2012 – 2016, in the watershed, where people will turn around. There are lawyers who are starving to death as well because they don't have enough work. You can only execute so many people and then it is finished. How many houses can you take to execution when people back off and say I can't afford to buy it in any case? Other than to see the real agenda of **asset stripping**, where they take their property away from them, because people do not know what the remedy is.

When you apply the remedy there is no reason for execution of immovable properties. People who have a vested interest in the national credit regulator and the fringe industries that spawned around it, they are blind to it and are deaf to it as well. They don't want to see that, it but it is inevitable, it is going to happen.

We as the people need to start using our remedies and the beauty of this is it is remedies for the individual. We don't need a mass group of change because we can provide benefit in our individual capacity. I have already gained financial benefit from this, but financial benefit as a shield. By doing good for yourself, you will help other people around you.

It is liberating because for the first time in my life I don't have to sell you the idea to utilise this technology. Whether you do it or not is immaterial. There is an urgency: where people ask me to share the information. This is not about finding a loophole. This is about using a system that was put in place decades ago to provide a system where as they said "was the only logical way to fund government." Because people are not prepared to take responsibility. My mentor, who got me to understand this, it was painful to initially listen to him when he said it is your fault. Yes. This is my fault. I must take responsibility. For the mess-up I made 1977 – 2002, no-one else is to blame but myself.

That is a key word, to take responsibility. How do you recognise what they are sending you? What is an offer?

Look at the terms. Going back to what Mandell House said initially. "Every American will be required." Requirement is not mandatory. It is optional. When someone says do this and they have the authority to do this it is a different story. They come with an offer that is concealed in the form of an order, that you misconstrued.

There is a requirement that you drive 120 km/h. If you drive more than 120 km/h you will get a fine. That is effectively an offer. They are offering to penalise you to teach you a lesson.

You asked them to do it, they are offering you a service. The issue is not whether you drive fast, the issue is if you hit someone above the speed regulation. Common law says if you harm someone you are going to carry the consequences thereof. If you strike someone within the speed limit, there is a chance you will get off, because it was an accident. But if you are speeding and you then strike someone there is no remedy for you. You are going to carry the consequences: it is an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.

But, if you are speeding and a peace officer jumps out and stops you, you need to establish jurisdiction. You ask whoever you are, are you a police officer or law enforcement officer? No matter what, that is not breaching the peace. If there is no-one else on that motor way. And he jumps out the bush and stops you and says I am a peace officer and you transgressed on the speed limit, now I am going to force the law upon you, I don't agree with that. Unless you can show me an injured party or show me the agreement where I consented to that I am on my way. Did I breach the peace?

This is like when you were at the border patrol and showed your law?

You can also have the contrary argument. A taxi filled with 28 people, where they are supposed to have 16, driving at 110km/h. Isn't that vehicle more dangerous than someone driving in a brand new Lexus at 140 km/h. One is a traveller, the other one is a driver.

The traffic officer when he fines you makes an offer and he is acting out an implied agreement.

When I came back from the UK, in 2008, I applied for my drivers licence. I had been driving since 1978 and have never had an accident. When I went to the UK my South African licence expired. I had to do my drivers licence again at the age of 51. Up and down with the courts and everything, I was stopped eight times, stopped to say 'hello sir can I have your drivers licence.' I said no you can't, here is my notice of understanding and intent and claim of right. There were two officials that couldn't distinguish between law and statutes all the others said sir we won't bother you further, have a safe journey. Two said they are doing their job and wrote a ticket, and didn't argue because they are armed, I took the violation tickets and addressed them to the prosecutors in the jurisdictions where the violations happened, in Potgieters Rus and Hiedelberg. Both the prosecutors settled my accounts. The process is understood especially at the magistrates court. The high court is a different story.

As people we need to get under the skin of how these administrative process work and how we start dealing with them on a step by step basis.

How many people know how powerful their power of attorney is and how easily they sign it off to someone else? **We need to start by understanding the power of your power of attorney** and how to apply that.

Power of attorney means how and who deals with you in the public space. We can act as unlimited people in an unlimited world.

Yes, as the signer of a la valle on behalf of this legal fiction that floats around the in the public.

TAPE FOUR ENDS ... TAPE FIVE BEGINS

Let us being by defining the term power of attorney?

You will find when you go into an agreement from a corporate perspective there is always a document slipped in where they expect you to give them power of attorney.

Power of attorney is giving the power to somebody to represent you on a particular issue.

When you give power of attorney, a good policy would be for whomever you give power of attorney to make it a **limited power of attorney**. If you go to a lawyer and accept them representing you, when you give them power of attorney they assume full power of attorney. You end up in a situation where they can literally sign your life away and they said well we acted on instruction.

When you look at the documents and the documents go into the public, they said they acted on instruction of the client.

Where is power of attorney most commonly used and most commonly abused?

Probably where you deal with transfer of title in property, immovable property or movable property like a vehicle, you have seen most men have fallen into the trap, where they get a nice deal on a vehicle but they give their power of attorney away because they make the offer, they did not accepted the offer.

So you have the doctrine of offer and acceptance, how does that apply to statutes? Every statute must be offered to us first and we give our consent.

Yes and that consent is a limited power of attorney. When they make you that offer and you regard it as an order, at some stage or another they are going to say sign here. You are going to sign to accept the services offered to you. But, they cannot do it without your consent and without your power of attorney.

We were taught that the law is the law and we are to obey it, but if it is a statute law, and it has the force of law, then they need to have your consent.

Either expressed or implied. When it is expressed you sit down with the documents and go through it and say yes I agree to this and I accept the terms and conditions. When it is implied, it is something that comes your way and it is concealed and they say you have to sign here. For instance when they want to offer you the service of being arrested, they will give you a document and say sign for your rights. Being arrested is a benefit privilege. They don't see it as jail, they see it as correctional services, they are going to do some correction on some behaviour and secondly they are going to put a roof over your head, although it is in the form of a cell with bars in front of it. They are going to clothe you although it is a jumpsuit with chicken footprints on it and they are going to feed you. They offer you a service.

Jail would be more of a common law crime, but this is correctional services. We think they are one and the same but they are actually different. When we are signing for our rights we are signing for that benefit privilege. In America in the movies they read you your rights and say do you understand your rights? By saying yes, we are accepting their offer.

You understand your rights, means you stand under something. I do not understand my rights. **I stand at common law and I express my rights.**

When someone says do you understand that you have to wear a seatbelt?

I say no, I don't stand under that regulation.

Saying yes means I choose to stand under the benefit rights that they are offering me.

Ask what they mean by understand, do you mean comprehend? These are two completely different meanings. Understand is a term used in legalese and not English.

There is a body of statutes with all these rules and regulations. We are effectively being offered those and we are accepting those, either directly by signing a document, or implied where they assume we have already agreed and carry on the process as if we have already agreed. We don't know how to stop that dead in its tracks. So when we give our power of attorney over to a lawyer, they effectively operate on our behalf within that realm of the statute.

You are a living man seated next to me. How on Earth can I represent you? You can only RE PRESENT something that is written on paper. You can walk in somewhere with a piece of paper and say I am representing this person.

What is power of attorney representing?

The power of attorney is representing that legal fiction. I can only present myself. Here I am. It is a presentation. It is not a representation.

We are effectively saying, I am playing monopoly and we can have all our different pieces and I need to run off to the bathroom so I say to my mate wont you play using my piece. When would you need an attorney?

You (can use) an attorney whenever you inject something from the private into the public or when you want to communicate with for instance, the court system. I would say to them I would like to communicate with your court but because I am in a different venue I am going to use an attorney. It becomes like a telephone.

You mean we want to communicate with the private venue from the public venue and we need a conduit to do that. And that is when we can use an attorney.

You have attorneys of record and attorneys in fact. Attorney of record is normally a lawyer. All lawyers are attorneys but not all attorneys are lawyers. I am acting in the public as an attorney but I am not a lawyer. Lawyer needs a licence to practice.

*Lawyers have to be registered with a BAR. I know that Americans have a BAR and we have a BAR in South Africa. BAR stands for **British Accredited Registry**.*

They are still esquires. Esquire is a shield bearer, that takes away attorns something from somebody to someone else. If you look at the old feudal system, those are the guys that came into the village that had been armed to the teeth and they would come to collect the taxes, that was attorning substance from the people back to the crown or the king. Their allegiance is with the crown.

And with the monetary system: Why do we run to lawyers for advice? Is it because we feel we are playing a game that we don't understand?

And we are led to believe that that is the way to do it. There are even adds on minibus taxis that say, don't speak to me, speak to my lawyer. People see it as almost sophisticated.

We looked at this from a vet perspective. You had the benefit privilege of plunder because you had knowledge that other people didn't have. Effectively the lawyers are the same thing, like in the old days where religious texts were written in Latin so specifically only a few people could actually read them.

These people get jealous and almost aggressive when you present yourself. In veterinary science if you have two dogs on your property and they fought and the one bit the other and it develops into an abscess, you have the ability to recognise that something is wrong. But, most people read legal documents and it reads like Chinese, it doesn't make sense at all. No one has the comprehension to decode those terms in such a way that you really understand what it means in terms of your own affairs.

We are like children running to our parents to help us with a situation we don't understand. I spoke to a lawyer and he said to me about the meaning of a certain term, "as a layman I can see why you don't understand it." So, what do we do with our power of attorney?

Firstly recognise your power of attorney is valuable and treat it with discretion and don't give it to anybody, use it yourself. **I act in the public as attorney in fact on behalf of my legal identity.** I walk in and present myself and in terms of the amendment act 56 of 2000, I can at any stage I wish act with the capacity of a signer of a la valle.

Attorney of record is acting in the capacity of a legal character whereas attorney in fact deals in a business capacity not of a legal character.

Lawyers are acting as a character and not as themselves?

Yes and it is adversarial, there is conflict involved. In business or commerce when there is no dispute there cannot be any adjudication. That is what I am trying to achieve. By acceptance of any claim you stay in honour of the public policy, you set off the account, therefore it cannot go into an adjudication process where you are going to get set down whether you like it or not.

It goes back to this notion of offer and acceptance. We now realise we are constantly getting offers we don't readily comprehend such as the SMS from TV Licences, what are my options?

Do you agree that when you receive a bill for instance, you have the right to do due diligence on that bill? Do you check to see if those are the services you received and if not so you can query it if necessary? You can call them and say there is a problem with the accounting service and we need to correct it.

When you receive that SMS and they say you need to pay us this amount. The first stipulation that I would make is 'stop sending me sms's. If you are so sure I owe you money put it in writing. We have allowed this amendment to creep in, tiptoeing towards total control from a corporate perspective and people allow it by acquiescence.

The systems are getting cleverer and cleverer in the corporate environment. If you accept an offer, the facilitation and administration of that will go on and you are on that roller coaster. If you ignore an offer it is immediately going to kick start. We have created a technological system that is judge, jury and executioner all in the blink of an eye.

It is not even a person, just a computer system, a data base running in the background like the big blue machine, what then? The short term solution is to use the system as a platform to go where you want it to go. I am not saying we should go back to the stone-age. I am saying if they make provision for certain technological advances and they make provision for protection of the users that by implication means that you have protection as well if you utilise that technology in such a way that you express your unlimited capacity to deal with it. **Just, don't ignore it.** If you ignore it they are going to regard that as acceptance. You can also accept it if you do an unconditional acceptance. I don't have a problem to deal with my local government if they want money to make provision for it. I have a problem with a bureaucrat sitting somewhere who is never in his office. And that is why I use the commercial lien process and that is to correct fraud or when you are aware of certain issues where fraud might be prevalent. You have to take responsibility, we have to put the checks and balances in place and you do that with your power of attorney.

I am going to use my power of attorney to operate within this commercial sphere, and if I get an offer or a bill from TV licence. I can say I do have a TV I am happy to accept that. How do I accept it from the private space and use my unlimited commercial liability in the private to set-off the TV licence account.

The ideal way is to get them to address your legal personality. i.e your name in capital letters, because they can't address you they can only speak to you, and provide you with a bill of exchange that conforms to the bill of exchange act in order for you to apply section 19 of the bill of exchange act on the bill and return it to them to set off the account.

Section 19 makes provision to accept it and return it to them?

Section 19 is delivery as requirement for a contract on a bill.

To bring it back to zero

People want to settle a bill with their gold card or master performance cheque from a bank. But that cannot settle the account. **That is a discharge on the account.**

That just keeps the wolf from the door but it doesn't get rid of the wolf.

It discharges the debt but there are remnants of the debt staying in the account and that is why it stays open. When you do a set off on the bill that disappears immediately. It is irrevocable and complete contract at the end of the month.

When I receive a bill I receive a piece of paper. That piece of paper is the Bill of Exchange. Do I have to ask them to send me something that complies with the Bills of Exchange?

Preferably because they don't sign it and they never make provision for a signature on that document, that under oath and under penalty of perjury says that you really owe us that money. In terms of section 18 of the bills of exchange act an inchoate instrument, they basically send you a blank. It is like a blank in terms of ammunition, when you put a blank into a hand gun, you can fire a shot and it makes a loud noise but there is nothing projecting out of it. There is nothing that can execute someone else.

When we receive a Telkom bill and it does not have a signature on it we are almost receiving something in the hope that you will pay it. It is not a legitimate bill at all?

Strictly speaking no, it is nothing more than waste paper.

In order for it to be genuine someone from Telkom should sign that Bill?

And what is the implication of that? If someone would sign the bill under penalty of perjury, they are making the assertion that first of all there was never a public policy established in 1920, that we do have money of substance and that you do owe them something because you took something of substance from them.

A corporation can therefore not sign a bill. They would be admitting that it is backed by something. They have the right to send you a piece of paper because that is all that money is, it is just a piece of paper. It is almost a bail payment. What can we do with this piece of paper?

This is the simplicity of it. **You sign the bill.** Now there is a signature on that document, like the South African Reserve Bank notes. How many signatures do you find on a South African Reserve Bank note? How many signatures do you find on a South African Reserve Bank Note?

One

So what is the difference between a promise to pay on a South African Reserve bank note and your promise to pay with your own signature on a piece of paper with a value allocated to it.

We were told that only the SA Reserve Bank can create currency. They are the sole issuing authority of domestic bank notes. Domestic is inside the borders of the corporation. It is an internal corporate currency.

If you have domestic in the public and non-domestic in the public can you see how you will offset that as well?

So we can off-set a charge in domestic currency with non-domestic currency.

Correct and you as a man can issue your own non domestic bank notes. That has never been defined. They said specifically domestic. That is a restrictive definition it is not an expansive definition.

*They are the sole authority to provide domestic bank notes, but they don't say they are the sole authority to issue non domestic bank notes. **Non domestic is the balancing of the books from the private side.** Because money does not exist, it is just pieces of paper. If they send us a piece of paper, we can endorse and say yes we agree that that amount is what it says it is, by signing it and it now becomes worth the same value as a domestic bank note.*

And you became the maker of something else. It came to you in one form and you then drew on that document and became the maker of something that is going to be returned to them in the form of a

promissory note.

You are the maker and the maker becomes the holder in due course and in terms of section 25 of the Bills of Exchange Act, if you do that in such a manner, you take that bill, or the value in that bill, under onerous title, you accept the value under onerous title and that is unlimited capacity and that can only be non-domestic, because domestic is limited and therefore you can contract the value on that bill back to zero when they return it and you receive it.

So, Telkom have opened an accounting record with my name on it that is R750. They then send me the bill, the piece of paper. Using my unlimited commercial liability, by applying the Bills of Exchange act, I accept this document for the value that is written on it, I effectively sign it and turn it into value. I created that as value.

I would like to make one correction. The acceptance for value really means you accept something for value but in return you need to receive something else, and that is the rights embodied in that bill. When you look at the definition of a negotiable instrument it says that a **negotiable instrument is a document of title, embodying the rights to a payment of money, or the security for money.** When you do an acceptance for value you take command or ownership of the rights embodied in that document to the value that is said there. Otherwise you could launder money. And with your signature, you are the originator, or maker of that document and the holder in due course and it is expressed in the value of that bill.

The public can only work in the limited. With negotiable instruments, negotiable means more like how a ship negotiates, traversing and going from one spot to another, it involves movement. With a negotiable instrument they have effectively created a liability that didn't exist before, or based on a fee schedule. When they send you a bill they effectively created a new liability. You have received that you take it under onerous title, and by signing that you own that document in its entirety and you also own the rights that are embodied in that document and the rights to the payment of money or the security for money.

They claim first of all that you owe them money, but I say okay but if you make a claim in public you must also provide the remedy and what is the remedy? The remedy is built into that document as the security for money, because now you interject from the private into the public the value of that bill, but you do that from an unlimited capacity and you contract that to that small amount which is really an **original issue discounted.** Economic people understand it as calling it **discounting commercial paper.** That is all you do. We can also provide an original issue that can be discounted to a certain value. Otherwise they would have provided you with a cheque that you could just sign in terms of the

public policy, which they should have done. **That is why I keep on maintaining that everything is pre-paid.** We are fiddling around chasing a wild goose, while our energy is

being sucked out of circulation to the IMF and world government of making us perpetual slaves.

What gives us unlimited rights ?

I see it as unlimited capacity. When I see you as a man, can anyway maintain that you do not have the capacity of a Bill Gates? Can you develop the same empire or the same business empire that he did? So how can I limit you in your capacity? We are unlimited. It is the opposite of limited.

When you walk into a place and say I want to apply for this, I want to take out a 24 month contract. They allow you to limit yourself by providing them with a copy of your ID , your FICA RICA QUICKER documentation and your financial statements and where you are employed, which is limited.

That is why I said earlier that the report into the investigation of the payment system of South African Law is buried because if we dig up that report , we can put pressure on them to utilise the system as it

was designed in the first place and we are going to make **inflation disappear. The system cannot collapse. The system at this point in time allows for inflation. We need to use the same system for the opposite which is deflation.** And when we deflate this inflation we will prevent the chaos that they want to erupt worldwide because people protest and when you protest they can use the force of law against you. **When you deflate an inflated value you end up with nought.**

This is what you did with your Nedbank scenario. They inflated this bubble which they sent to you. You contracted that liability back to zero. We have the unlimited ability to contract any agreement.

By using **contract as a verb** by looking at the value that comes out of it as **expansion or inflation** and by **contracting or deflating** it back to **zero** to the point where it originally started with nothing.

We are unlimited people in a limited system. How do we convince the system of this?

The people in managerial positions of that organisation have no comprehension of it whatsoever. Remember we sit with at least three generations that have been dumbed down. Those people don't have the vaguest idea of what you are referring to when you try to apply the Bills of Exchange Act. When you instruct them to provide you with a bill of exchange, conforming to the Bills of Exchange act and they do and you do an acceptance and return it, they say it wasn't a bill.

That did happen. I got a legal claim that was sent to me by a lawyer, it was a letter that he had signed it was addressed to my legal fiction. It was a document of title. It said I owed a particular amount of money. I instructed him to send me a letter that did comply to the Bills of Exchange act in the definition in Section 2. He did this. I accepted it for value and sent it back and he had no idea what I was talking about.

It shows you how poorly they understand the situation. Where they had the audacity to send you something saying you have to pay without delay this certain amount on behalf of somebody else and when you do an acceptance, they say it wasn't a bill. So what was it then, a friendly reminder?

There is no such thing as a friendly reminder from a lawyer. So, what was that letter? A Bill of Exchange or intimidation tactics. It is a threat and surely goes outside of the ambit of what a lawyer is supposed to do.

You will also notice that the letters are addressed to you in the form where they say 'we'. Why is it a 'we' against you. Who are we? 'We' is the law firm. That means the lawyers, their secretaries, their

typists whatever, it is almost a team effort. **It goes back to a democratic mob rule against an individual.**

That is also the difference between a public and a private venue. When we look at what happened since 1994 with the establishment of the so called democratic South Africa. For me this is an oxymoron. **You cannot have a democratic republic.** A republic should be a constitutional republic on a true constitution where the rights of the individual is entrenched and protected against any mob rule. People in South Africa are proud to say we live in a democracy. When the majority says we are going to do this against you and you don't have any say in it.

*We as individuals can now operate. Up until now, people in this country think they can only instigate change at a political and economic level, if they vote for a political party that will represent them. You are saying **we can make changes to our own lives** and we can make changes to these guys and take them on in our individual capacity, without the necessity for ridiculously expensive law fees.*

That is why the National Credit Regulator and Debt Council and all those fringe industries that developed, they are going to disappear as they started off, once people realise that **you have the individual power of attorney to settle your business affairs as a single human being, you don't need anybody else.**

It is an extraordinary power and the potential to make significant waves. If person A says that I owe him R10 000 and I am not paying and you go to lawyer and the lawyer sends me a letter. I accept it for value and send it back to him. How do you get paid?

The definition of a bank in the Bills of Exchange Act starts with right in the beginning, the first term that is defined is acceptance. **Acceptance means acceptance completed by delivery or notification.**

Bank means a body of persons whether incorporated or not. A law firm satisfies the original meaning of a bank. Law firms have the capacity to deal with negotiable instruments in such a way that they can settle the accounts as an intermediary. Because they can receive your liability and turn it into an asset, as-set, as set-off. Not as set-down or as set-up. Asset is two separate words joined together.

Lawyers are also trustees of the National trust. Lawyers have every capability in fact an obligation to take an accepted bill of exchange (especially when they are the ones who sent it in the first place), to take that acceptance and then deal with it and set-off the account.

Remember they have a trust account and a trust account does not belong to the lawyer. Lawyers do not make money on their trust accounts. The interest goes elsewhere. It eventually channels itself straight to the IMF and back to the allegiance to the crown. The lawyer has a fiduciary responsibility to deal with that negotiable instrument that they receive because when they act as intermediary between a seller and a buyer there is also an escrow account where the value goes into or the title of the property and they wait for the settlement of that account before the escrow is closed. That should happen within 72 hours. One day I was speaking about this and I said you needs to deal with this in T and 72 hours. And a lady asked me if I was referring to tea and coffee which is hilarious. It actually refers to trade day.

How would you get paid?

When the lawyers put it into their accounting system as a contingency asset received from the debtor, they need to write a guarantee against that asset to bring the books back to zero.

They created the liability of R10 000 in the form of a bill. I received that but I contracted that bill back to zero. This physical document has value it is like money.

It is liquid certain liability.

They need to dump it, like you dumped your birth certificate on the treasury, as valuable, they need to dump it into the trust account and they need to set it off by writing something in a ledger that brings that initial transaction back to zero. They must give somebody else a cheque or transfer.

That asset has to mantle up eventually to the discount window of the South African Reserve bank which then discount that paper rand for rand back into circulation.

It is almost like money has been created without being created. It is just transactions.

Look at the term transaction. It is action taken under trans. Trans is like being under hypnosis or sleep walking. You take that action but you don't really know what is going on.

Based on the story that you told me, if they don't do this this they are in dishonour and you can take a commercial claim against them. That commercial claim is not against the we that sent you the document. The particular lawyer that signed it, they are responsible for that document. Therefore when you take them on, you bring them out of their shell, and do a commercial claim against them and you keep mounting it and mounting it and eventually this guy has got to wake up. Will the bank accept this?

The bank have to accept this, they don't have a choice it is in their mandate. When you look at the deposit slip from any banks they refer to coins, notes and money orders. What is a money order?

If you look at a banks own documents when they take people to court, it says 'plaintiff will pay all Bills of Exchange, cheques, promissory notes and other negotiable instruments, deposited at the plaintiff, drawn, accepted or made by the defendant.' It is in their own words that they would honour that, if it is presented. **We don't present it.** We present credit cards, notes and coins and we say well that is our money. We don't consider anything else, other negotiable instruments and also Bills of exchange as a valuable commodity. Ignorance of the law is no excuse. This is what excites me. We are now at a point where there is a pivotal change where we are going to deal with them in their own game but they are behind the bar, we are not behind the bar. Like a monkey or a tiger in the zoo. They are the limited ones, not us.

And we need to start instructing them as such.

And they don't like it because they are not used to it. The ball is in the other court. We had been served an ace for many years but now we can return that serve. It is like a tennis game, they don't like to know that we can play the game according to their rules. And that puts you on moral high ground performing your duty to protect your own rights and those at this point in time who do not have the ability to protect your own rights. It makes it a responsibility.

TAPE SIX

Do you know what it means when you accept legal representation?

They call us a **WARD of the court**. Wards are normally there for mental institutions and hospitals for people who can't care for themselves or are incapable of caring for themselves. When you accept legal representation you are regarded as a word of the court. The technical definition of the WARD of the court is an ill minded person or an infant. They regard you as clue-less. And that is why they speak to you when they speak to you and otherwise ask you to shut up.

The one thing that really concerns me since I came back from the UK is to hear from the media, how they flaunt the aspect of **terms and conditions apply**.

Do you really understand what terms and conditions apply means? Let us say we had a pot of honey and a pot of superglue and I said you have a choice I am going to apply honey or superglue to your lips, which would you consider? You choose the honey. If you take the superglue you will be in trouble because it will attach your lips together and I will be a struggle to get it off. So the term 'apply' is also very important.

I am saying we should 'apply' the Bills of exchange act whenever we deal with a so called contract. The term '**apply**' refers to 'attachment:' immovable properties that attach to someone or an agreement that now attaches to you. Even an invisible contract they talk about sometime that attaches to you.

'**Term**' from a legal dictionary is 'a word or phrase particularly one that possesses a fixed or known meaning in some science art or profession.'

The first question that comes up, is a bank a science, an art or a profession?

"The word term in a legal sense means a fixed and definitive period of time. Example, term of lease, court session, sentence. In civil law a space of time granted to a debtor for discharging his obligation."

We are talking about a term, short-term, medium-term, long-term. We are very familiar with that. What does that imply? Someone is going to dishonour their term of lease, they will have a court

session and they will receive a **sentence**. What is missing there?

Who is making the agreement?

Yes, where is your agreement and what does that agreement entail. Who is the debtor when you go into an agreement?

I am

Are you really? You are the creditor, they have the obligation and you have the liability.

Conditions is "a future and uncertain event upon the happening of which is made to 1.) depend the existence of an obligation, or 2.) that which subordinates the existence of liability under a contract to a certain future event."

You see how these words point to an agreement where there is an offer and acceptance but they don't define who made the offer and who did the acceptance. Subordinates the existence of liability takes your unlimited liability and limits it.

So if there is a car for sale at R450 000 and they limit your liability to less than that and they say you will have to pay us on a monthly instalment basis for the next fifty months at R1700 per month, they have just taken your liability under the contract to a certain future event. They have limited you and they have depended the existence of their own obligation.

So they have handed the obligation that should have been theirs and put it back onto you.

It appears in that agreement as a clause in a contract or an agreement. They make a distinction between contract and agreement.

So in a contract is while you are contracting an agreement

“It is a clause in a contract or agreement which has for its object to suspend, rescind or modify the principle obligation or in the case of the world to suspend, modify or revoke the device or bequest.”

That is now when you deal with someone who has already passed away.

There is a clause in the agreement that you need to clearly consider and if you recognise that then you validate that, remove it and then you can go back and say hang on my friend I have unlimited ability and I am not going to grant you more time as a debtor of discharging your obligation than 72 hours. You don't have to go for the 50 month lease agreement. They don't even consider the agreement in that term definition. They start with term of lease, court session and sentence. What does that imply? Someone is going to dishonour their term of lease, they are going to go to court and have a court session and they are going to receive a sentence.

***These conditions have been set-up.** These conditions that we sign actually have no bearing on the agreement and are put in there specifically to put the obligation onto us to perform. And if we do not perform we will effectively go through the court system.*

How do they guarantee that you might default on your term of lease? A strategy to make you default on your term of lease is to **extend the term of lease as long as possible**, to stretch it out as far as you can because from a statistical perspective your chances of defaulting get bigger. They write these conditions in as a clause on the agreement and you accept it. You let them off the hook as far as the obligation is concerned and you let them off the hook in terms of your own liability. People don't want liability, they think it is a swear word.

If you look at **Robert Kusaki's** work where he said listen, liability is not a liability and asset is not an asset. Liability is not what you think it is. Liability does not pull you down. Liability puts you in a

position where you can contract any agreement within 72 hours and put the debtor on the spot for discharging his obligation as the offer they are supposed to make and let them deal with it.

What does it mean depend the existence of an obligation ?

When you consider that agreement, most people overlook the fact that two things happen in that agreement. The one is depending something and the other one is subordinating something. On one hand they are defining an exit policy for themselves but also turning the tables on you.

Let us look at the word dependant. It is defined as “deriving existence, support or direction from another, conditioned in respect to force or obligation upon an extraneous act or fact.”

They basically rely on your ignorance to write something into an agreement that will let you off the hook without saying hang on, you are the one with the obligation and not me.

Aren't they turning you into a dependent?

Yes, to a certain extent because you are limiting yourself. Now you are dependent on extraneous acts or facts, such as the economy booming, raise in your salary, or whatever it might be in order to accept that obligation.

There exit policy is they will take you to court and attach your assets.

Yes, you signed the agreement, you agreed to the terms and conditions and you put up the surety because you wanted the car.

What do we do when we sign contracts? Do they allow you to remove these clauses.

Initially they didn't but now it is starting to happen. If you only put in the almost non sensical all rights reserved, it stops them dead in their tracks.

So, all rights reserved removed the burden of these terms and conditions?

It gives you indemnity and immunity against that so called 'dependence of the existence of the obligation.' I am saying to the contractor, or the guy who has the obligation, that if you at any stage

show me that you are not giving **full disclosure**, I am going to revisit this agreement, I am going

to call you to attention. It puts them dead in their tracks, so they can't pursue it further without being jeopardised or without being prejudiced. Because you have **all your rights reserved**, by implication, you are unlimited. Inclusion of one is exclusion of the other. You cannot reserve all your rights and still have all the benefit privileges as well. It is either or. When you say I reserve my rights, you say I waive the benefit privileges. I don't need your benefit privileges. I am instructing you to a certain amount of time, a space of time granted now to the debtor for discharging their obligation. Their obligation is to perform their promise of offer. I put them in a position that they bring the first promise to the table.

When you walk into a car dealer they may give you a quotation. What is a quotation? Let us look at the definition of quotation.

"A statement of the market price, of one or more securities or commodities, or the price specified to a correspondent, the lowest offer to sell a commodity and the highest bid to buy in a given market in a given time."

Is this definition expansive or restrictive? It is extremely expansive. They cover the capital market, securities and commodities. It covers everything.

When you walk into a showroom and there is a coupon on the window that says R440 000, do you think that guy has put up the lowest offer to sell or the highest bid to buy?

And that is where the **BATON SWITCH** comes in. They put it as high as possible in the hope that you are going to come and say you are crazy, I will give you R420 000 and I want a CD player or whatever the case may be. So, they try and entice you to make the offer to purchase rather than giving you an offer to sell as the debtor should be for discharging his obligation, putting that vehicle out into the public and making that title available to the public.

They want you to bargain the price down, in which case their offer is switched on you so that the offer becomes your offer to purchase and that is why you are always forced to sign an offer to purchase.

And because you made the offer to purchase in a limited capacity, it is subject to finance.

So what is an offer to purchase?

They want you to bargain the price down, to make you make the offer. They give you paper that is titled 'offer to purchase' and if you do that you are basically making the offer and they are prepared to accept it. In order to do that, that volumes of paper are the terms and conditions to depend their

existence of the obligation and subordinate your existence of liability. **A contract is not where it is made. A contract is where it is paid.** You make the final payment and that only contracts the original agreement. These are the clauses that are added in the hope that you will find them unreadable and uncomprehendable and just put your signature on the paper.

Why would the offer to purchase have any bearing on the financing.

It is based on the value of the offer to purchase. When you go to the bank you say I want to borrow this amount of money based on the offer to purchase I made on this vehicle.

The bank want that offer to purchase and take what you have signed in that offer to purchase. What have you signed in that offer to purchase that makes it so lucrative to them?

Another bill of exchange, but now in the form of a promissory note. You put the first note on the table. You give them a negotiable instrument.

Where is the promise to pay in the offer to purchase ?

You say I offer to pay an amount of money.

Doesn't that come under the bank application?

You do it twice. You offer to purchase the vehicle subject to finance.

But that is a valuable document like we talked about your birth certificate. It is a liquid document. It is a bill of exchange that has been endorsed. But we didn't know it was valuable.

I have one word for that. You get **double crossed**. They basically draw you over a barrel with a **double entry book keeping system** from that moment onwards and they derive interest from your security.

And this is what Edward Mandell House said, "we will utilise this methodology to derive interest from their security forever because no-one will understand it. And if one or two find it out we will play plausible deniability."

I sign an offer to purchase and I combine that with a promise to pay to the bank, that document is now worth the value that I applied for. The bank then takes that and records it as an asset.

They do a double entry book keeping. They take what they have now recorded as an asset and they take it off ledger, and they create a liability against you in an account whereby you have to pay the principle back with interest.

*If we knew that that document was valuable and that we were the **creators of our own credit**, it would be immediately set off.*

We find set off unfamiliar and when you talk about set-off with a lawyer they go ballistic. They don't want you to set off anything because they want you to do the set down. **Their whole livelihood is based on setting you down some time in the future.**

The banks have been caught out doing this. When you look at the commercial banks and the investment banks with the repeal of the **glassdeegle act** back in the early nineties and Bill Clinton was instrumental in doing that. They basically created a revolving door between commercial banks and investment banks to take all the property backed securities to bundle them all in special purpose

vehicles, rap them up, give them a credit rating and sell them off to investors to trade on the capital market. And that is what created the bubble. And now that is backlashing and rebounding at a tremendous rate.

This is why it is so pertinent and timely to look at this and deal with it in the way we are supposed to. People say so where does the money come from? **There is no money moving. It is currency.** It is a credit that is facilitated through your security in an accounting system that one half of it is hidden in an off ledger balance account, which is essentially abandoned funds and they get away with it as they regard us as to ignorant to realise we have done that in the first place.

So what Bill Clinton did is he took these abandoned documents and allowed them to be traded.

Yes, almost like a casino, he put bets on it. So you end up with people bundling all these toxic assets because it is an adverse position in nature. They bundled it up and gave it a credit rating attractive to investors and all these derivatives and future derivatives and the pension funds where they leverage their clients premiums to a future event, so you essentially by giving them your first note you also invest later on in your own note in the hope that you are going to get a pension from it. It is ridiculous. I am looking at it from the natural perspective of a vet. **What goes in must come out sometime. What goes in can not necessarily come out better than as it came in.**

*Mandell House said they will employ the president of their dummy corporation, which is all the presidents and prime ministers. Because all these corporations are designed for one thing profit and money, we should not be surprised that they are situated on **Capital Hill**. They see an investment opportunity for themselves, their group and their cartel, so we should not be surprised. We should stop looking at these presidents, these ministers, these government officials as anything else than bankers.*

I cannot agree more. We are to take responsibility for it and stop whining, stop complaining, stop passing the buck to someone else and stop saying this is what they do. This is what we allow. It is time to change.

It seems to me that the real corporation and the government being a corporation they will do everything they can to avoid making the offer. They want us to make the offer.

Yes, when government obligations go out, they go out as **tenders**, they never make an offer. If you look at it in the context it is supposed to be in the doctrine of offer and acceptance does not discern what an offer is and what an acceptance is.

They should do their own research, find out what things cost and they should make the offer.

Yes and they can do it with one contractor. That would put the whole building industry on a different footing altogether because when you have the contractor do the acceptance in good faith, you basically create a currency up front. **That is why I again maintain that everything is prepaid.** You will never have the risk of a contractor with sub contractors eventually leading to all the sub-contractors having to sequestrate in order to fuse a contract.

The fact is we live in a prepaid economy because we are not paying people to do a job. We pay for something that is already there. If we buy a car the car is there. I am paying for something that already exists. That car must have been paid for already and settled already financially. How does that work with the tenders? Do they need to pre-pay the contractors?

Yes and you can only do it with an original issue and you can only do an original issue from the private and not the public. They create the debt, we have to contract the debt. We cannot create debt. With unlimited capacity to contract any agreement you cannot create debt. **There is abundance in nature.** It is criminal in nature even to consider that. You can't do it is not physically possible.

Because they expect you to make an offer they put you in a position whereby you limit yourself and therefore they look at you and basically grant you a space of time for discharging your obligation but it still stays a taxable event.

If a contractor gets a tender he has the obligation to make it work. If he can't, he is in trouble. But, if the reverse is done and the government had put out the offer in the first place, by accepting that offer they would have been accepted under the unlimited commercial liability, which means the money would have been created then and there to do that job.

And without an interest burden: And that is the other issue that people don't comprehend.

Normally with those tenders if you analyse it you will find that most of those contractors live very dangerously. Most of them live on over drafts that are not even falling under the National Credit Act. They are basically future derivative transactions in the first place.

They are running on less than empty, however what should be happening is their should be enough fuel in the tank in the beginning to get the job done.

Yes and we can do that. That should start at local government, then provincial and then national government and not the other way round. Everything is backside or upside down or forwards backwards.

*It is the mirror image that is distorted. The reflection comes back at you but it is a little bit distorted. As people we should not be signing offers to purchase. **We should be demanding offers to sell.** We should take that valuable negotiable instrument and the banks should consider that as money.*

Yes and we come back to the term '**apply**'. If you have that reasoning and you come and you say let's apply the bills of exchange act to this offer that is now being made by the corporation. You are basically in the driving seat.

The definition of 'apply' is "to make a formal request or petition usually in writing to a court officer, board or company for the granting of some favour or of some rule or order which is within his her power or discretion."

You are begging to a higher power. The moment you apply for something you become immediately subordinate.

Yes, what we should do is use or employ the amendment act 56 of 2000 or the Bills of Exchange Act by employing that legislation "for the particular purpose to appropriate and devote to a particular use, object demand or subject matter."

I am seeing a sword and a shield. From the shield perspective, there are lots of people who have got what they think are loans that they are paying off at the moment. We can now start applying the Bills of Exchange Act and start revisiting those agreements and start setting them off. That is the shield. We have already been damaged and now we are going to limit being damaged and unhook ourselves from what we have already been hooked in. What you are referring to with regard the tenders is almost more of a sword. It is more offensive we are now looking to create the currency. It is easier to

use the shield to protect my assets and my own body, but now I can actually go out and start creating currency that is needed to achieve my dreams.

Rather than defending yourself with the shield is that we look at it in a **creative perspective**, that we

get to a point **where you apply the truth, there is no need for a shield. Fact dispels fiction**

and there is no threat. You deal with something that is now not adversarial. There is no dispute and there is no need for adjudication whatsoever.

When you look at the sword, there is a remark that **the pen is mightier than the sword**. We prevent adversarial action in the public by accepting in the proper fashion with a pen and you basically put your signature on the agreement and you become the holder in due course. Therefore you contract the agreement without any adversarial confrontations or consideration. It is peaceful. They don't need a shield because it is a fiction that tried to haunt them in the first place.

"Like the song, it wasn't roaring it was weeping." We think it is a great beast, but actually it is a legal fiction. A great analogy is if you go work for a company and become the employee, one of the first things they do is they say here is your employee handbook. You are signing to be bound by those corporate rules. If the government is a company, the only way you are bound by their rules is if you sign for their handbook. We are saying we did not sign your handbook.

In fact we are the owners. We are the owners of you and the printers that printed your handbook in the first place. We are the principle. You are the principle and surety.

Because we elected you into office and the fact that whatever power the government has we must also have individually. We can't delegate the government to act in any particular way, if we couldn't act in that particular way ourselves. Anything that a government can do and anything that a corporation can do we can do as well. We are the ones that gave them that power.

It comes to the point that **the created can never be greater than the creator**. What you don't have you can't give away. Unless you had it in the first place you could not delegate it back to someone else to represent you. And that ties in with the final aspect of power of attorney. When you give someone power of attorney it needs to always be in a limited fashion. What you have granted with power of attorney you can also revoke because you can overwrite it in the first place. They have to follow instructions and not dictate to you.

*If you give someone the power you must always have more power than that. **If you had given all your power away you wouldn't be here.** If the reserve bank has got the power to print money, then so do we.*

Yes, but I would like to go a step further. They put into circulation currency that is based on a trade agreement where someone pledged and accepted a debt obligation. They can't just print it on nothing, they have to have guidelines and there are guidelines for either a trade agreement or a project.

An excuse to use the people's work?

Correct and that they discount and for and back into circulation.

If you look at what happened in Johannesburg for the world cup it was a brilliant excuse to get a whole lot of public works done. If you look at Shanghai it is one of the most extraordinary examples of capitalism in work. There are more cranes operational in Shanghai than in the whole of North America. It has to keep expanding in order to create the currency to keep it expanding. It is like a

perpetual nightmare. That puts us in a situation where more and more honest people have to work much harder to create this currency that keeps perpetuating. With the Bills of Exchange act when we apply a remedy that has been with us for centuries.

The act was enacted in **1882**. If you look at the original Bills of Exchange act the principles stay the same. Young lawyers have the audacity to say it is ancient it doesn't apply any longer. There are people working for First National Bank in their legal division saying the Bill of exchange act doesn't apply. **If the Bill of Exchange act didn't exist there wouldn't be any money circulating.** You cannot have a credit facility without first applying the Bills of Exchange act. Period. How do you bring credit into circulation unless you have a promissory note.

The reserve banks own words says: "Banks acquire certain liquid certain liabilities (deposits) and create illiquid uncertain as-sets (bank loans)." Jannie Rossouw wrote that under the exit policy and procedures for managing distress in banks.

*I am thinking of the concept of the census. They are saying 'stand up and be counted.' What is giving me the cold shivers is that we are already hearing rumours that there are 700 000 people in South Africa that have not been accounted for. Now that we know our government are nothing more than bankers, this is an investment opportunity for profit. These hundreds of thousands of South Africans that are now going to be accounted for are going to be used as **collateral** to be put back into the system to work to pay **taxes** and to be used as fodder for more **debt** that can be borrowed.*

I am qualified as a vet. The same analogy used now, I see it as a cattle farmer who has got cattle roaming the bush field and he knows that some of them are still out there, but they resist coming into the crushes. So he closes the water areas hoping that they will be thirsty enough to come into the

crushes, so he can count them and bargain. Tying up with what Mandell House said, 'we are regarded as chattle property or cattle property and they want to hoard us, count us and then execute us and gain their interest.'

They are not slaughtering us, they are slaughtering our strawman, our legal fiction because it is another way they can earn money.

Or making immovable property specially executable. Something that is immovable they take into the crush, take off its head, quarter it and gain the profits of it,

TAPE SEVEN

What was Edward Mandell House about, he seemed to have it in for the human race?

17 June 1923 **Mandell House** was on the cover of Time magazine. Some people maintain that

what we discussed is private memoires, it never happened. I think it is immaterial and it doesn't really matter, what does matter is some of the terms he uses : "by this methodology we can propel people to submit to our agenda."

He said, "It is truly an **administrative process**." When people understand that the processes

and instruments of commercial law is referred to collectively as the administrative process or the due process of law then it will make more sense. You need to look at it as a methodology. It is like writing a letter to you mailing it and following through to see if you received it and you reply back to me. That is a process and it is administrative. **Administrative also refers to bankruptcy.** If I had a liquid business why would I administer that business? You can only administer something that is insolvent.

What about invoices and accounts isn't that administration ?

Yes it is a reflection of bankruptcy.

Why is that? Is it because we are using debt money?

Yes, you need to account for everything. Everything needs to be accounted for in a registry or a register. If you look at native people who live off the land, such as aboriginal, what administration does that entail? **How much administration does a bushman have?** The only administration he has is to remember where he buried his ostrich eggs full of water.

The methodology that Mandell House refers to is the registration of a person, similar to a company or a corporation because it exists as a construct of the imagination only. The person by definition also resembles something that is artificial. That does not really exist specifically. It has no real body mind or soul but created for legal purposes only and defined as the legal subject and substance of which rights and duties are attribute. Similar rights or attributes to that of a man or of a woman which if you think about it and if the implication is considered carefully is criminal in nature.

I am taking you back to the pledge I did with the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons. With the benefits conferred onto me there were rights and duties conferred onto those privileges.

Mandell House is saying there is an administrative process that starts with the registration of biological property and in this case they redefined that legal property to fit into the **legal**

definition of a person.

So your legal person and your flesh and blood are two different things.

Accept that they combine it as the **'individual', or an 'indivisible duo.'** Let me give you the definition of an individual. They make a distinction, as a noun and not as a verb. They are very specific. People think legal definitions are arbitrary and not concise, but they are very specific.

It says, "as a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also very commonly a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation or association. This restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, INCLUDE ARTIFICIAL PERSONS.

By saying individual they may be referring to your strawman. And how are you going to know that, unless it is expressed?

*They are not going to express it as they only recognise us as a legal entity. **We have to express who we are otherwise it is not going to come from anybody else.***

Also they work on the assumption that if you stay quiet you accept that definition. That is why he says, "every American will be required to register their biological property." They knew by defining the words pre-emptively, people through ignorance would basically just accept it and think well that is what is supposed to happen. And in the meantime they were creating something on Mandell House's behalf.

If I get a judgement against my person they are they referring to my monopoly piece?

"you will be stripped of your rights and given a commercial value. These rights include ownership of property, lobbying the government, voting and other activities relating to money."

Well most people will say I own a house.

Well not really if you look at the agreement you are nothing more than a glorified tenant. If you look at the original conveyance deed of transfer it says right at the end, almost as an addendum that **‘the state reserves its right.’** What rights are they referring to and who is the state?

They are referring to **benefit privileges**. What Mandell House was referring to initially was that they would strip you of your unalienable rights and in return give you benefits and privileges.

That is the unlimited and limited. A bushman has unalienable rights. As a free human being you have all these rights.

That person allows us to function with limited liability in the public, in other words with less responsibility.

A person and a strawman legal fiction effectively mean the same thing, a transmission utility that is our name in capital letters?

Our primary legal person, our **ID document** comprises of your birth date and sometimes eye

colour, hair colour, height and weight, fingerprint and retina scans as they carry on and as they bring in these technological advancements and bring in more biometric data into your ID, as if that is what you are. It is a limited representation of who you really are. Nowhere on any ID document is there any evidence of your soul, your real personality, hopes, dreams or capacity to love ever mentioned.

A piece of paper cannot love anybody. It cannot have aspiration, it cannot have ambition. It cannot move, only you can move. It is peculiar that some people cannot make a distinction between the legal entity and the natural person. They say you are that person. I say no I am not. I am a man of flesh and blood and on that desk lies a piece of paper with a photograph image of a head, that is supposed to be mine but that is not mine. It is an image. Here is my head, right in front of you.

At birth the state creates the child's first legal person. With the parental application for birth certificate which is given commercial value and reflect the word revenue or inkomste on it. Why is there revenue written on my birth certificate? Why should there be the word revenue on a child's birth certificate? Revenue is not what people think it is. It is RE VENUE. **You have been re-venued from the private into the public. That is why we live in a RE PUBLIC.** You have been stripped of your private rights, put into a cubicle, now the public with civil rights which are limited. Sorry I don't participate in that. I live in my body. From a constitutional perspective my legal person resides in a constitutional republic. Thank you very much.

Looking at the sports stars as an example ?

When the captain of the Springboks trap onto the pitch, how is his name written on his back.

His name in capital letters?

Surname. What did we do in the military, what was reflected above your heart?

Even in private school, your surname.

So they don't refer to you, they refer to that corporation that was created by registration of that person with a commercial value. That is what your **security of person** means. When you go to the

constitution chapter 2, section 12.1 it says, “everyone has the right to freedom and security of the person.” It is something tangible. It is reflected on a piece of paper.

When there is protection, do you agree that there is protection for something valuable? Is a life valuable? **Yes a human life has unlimited value.** If someone gets lost in the Drakensburg, they will immediately send out a search party and they will not save any money in order to find that so called person. Are they really referring to the life or the artificial person with the commercial value?

And that is what I saw in the United Kingdom when you look at the health and safety issues. It is not about health and safety. They are not concerned about your health and safety, they are concerned about you acting like an idiot and harming yourself and they have to pay out an insurance claim.

Remember when you take out insurance, you subjugate your rights and defence now to a legal entity with limited capacity and limited liability.

Insurance doesn't happen in nature.

All insurance must be in the revenue or the republic, this jurisdiction of money.

You subrogated your rights to this company in exchange for paying a premium in the hope for a benefit privilege in the hope that something happened to you. If it does happen they want to repudiate that claim in the first place and secondly they don't want to let it happen from the start. So, they basically warn you to behave and to obey the rules in order for them not to get into a position of paying out insurance claims.

*And that will increase their profits. **The fewer claims there are then the more money the insurance company will make.** And now I am understanding what security means.*

Yes, and it is also an oxymoron because if you have unlimited capacity to underwrite any agreement in any case, whatever they charge you as a **premium** is a bonus to them.

That is why they call it a premium. Why would you pay premium on anything, you have already got it.

Yes, that is why they can say get a better claim and we can beat that. You will always beat it down to zero. It doesn't matter. I don't need insurance as I can underwrite all agreements myself.

As you are unlimited you are able to set off any accounts. We talked about how you created an indemnity bond by taking your birth certificate and dumping it into the UK treasury. Do you need to do that in order to set off accounts ?

No you don't need to. I just created the example almost like the pied piper, to show that this is the way it can be done, to express it on paper and create a structure for others to see but there is an alternative. **The mere fact that you live that you breath that you are a man, you have that innate ability to do it.**

When I drive I protect you against me by being responsible and by adhering to the rules and regulations of the road, being conscious, being aware.

The concept of insurance has been expanding and expanding and then you had a company like AIG in America that was insuring on insurance of people insured which was a ridiculous concept that had to crash. And even they were insured.

Yes, it shows you we have abundance and **abundance can never be depleted down to a point of scarcity**. It is a natural impossibility.

When people refer to the system that is broke, the system is not broke. **The system is generic. It was put in place for a specific purpose.** We need to investigate the research that was done into the payment system of South African law. **The payment system is corrupt at this point of time.**

This book was buried because the political connotation made people very resistant to address it or even speak about it. I am not concerned about political correctness. I want the payment system in South African law treated and applied the way it was designed in the first place. If it does it will

eradicate inflation and everyone, even the ones in the bank who defend the National Credit act as though their lives depend on it, they will realise also they have immunity against reprisal and they

have the assured benefit of using the remedy and recourse that is built in the Bills of Exchange Act.

They could change tomorrow ?

Yes that is what is happening. The pastor I had a meeting with this morning before I came to you said he did an acceptance on a Vodacom bill by registered mail. And the lawyer made it very clear that he would take it to the bank and they would clear it. I am not trying to create a loophole it is there for everyone's benefit.

Take Standard Bank, 2500 people were retrenched, why were they retrenched, why are they not in their position? Any bank official at this point in time, unless they wake up now, are not going to have immunity. They run the risk of being retrenched and sitting in the same position. I hope the penny will drop before they get retrenched and for the lawyers who are now struggling to make a living.

It is unprecedented that so many summonses have been issued. This is literally a harvesting of assets. It is like a culling.

In America the banks got bailed out, but there you are dealing with 400 million people. We are 40 million. The game and the nuances of the game are slightly different but essentially people are fleeced at this point in time.

The Republic of South Africa was registered in 1994 with the security and exchange commission in New York.

*The Republic of South Africa is a bankrupt organisation. **In a bankrupt company, the company is run and controlled by the creditors.***

That is an extremely good point. Taking my own position as a vet, when I ran into trouble in the early nineties with my own practice because of lack of finance or my lack of the understanding of the financial system, they came with a sophisticated offer. It was almost as if they were saying a dentist, a doctor or a vet doesn't have to liquidate, they are placed under administration.

What happens today is most people are invited to go for debt review. Which is also you are placed under administration.

Which means your strawman is bankrupt?

Yes, but not you as a man or a woman. **No man or woman can be bankrupt unless you die.**

*So, no matter how bad things are we have always got this **unlimited financial capacity** to set off all these accounts. If we are in the house and we have possession of the things around us, it is protected and it is guaranteed?*

And it is written into the system. In the Bills of Exchange there are 102 sections. Sections 1 – 100 give the full working mechanism of that legislation. Why do they ignore it, why do they pretend it doesn't exist. That is the prime question we need to start asking?

The National Credit Regulator with all its fringe benefits and bureaucratic slump, people who are employed like welfare people will disappear. **That whole branch of the National Credit Act should disappear and the financial services side should expand.**

An Act is something that plays off on a stage. I operate in the public. I operate still

when I go into an operating theatre. I operate, I don't act, I don't pretend that I operate on an animal. These people are acting out a role. **It is a fiction.** They are fooling themselves, they should go look themselves in the mirror and ask themselves when am I going to wake up out of this illusion and stop playing out this role.

When someone tells me I am only doing my job. I tell them straight, it is not good enough. You are not just doing a job, you have a responsibility as a human being. It is a different story when I talk to a

computer with a synthesized voice speaking to me in gibberish. That thing has an obligation to be there.

If you write a letter on behalf of me and you sign your name. The last name on that letter I will regard as personally liable. They don't like it and they think it is not possible but it is if you look at it closely you don't have an excuse. **If you harm someone from a natural perspective it is an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.** And that is what makes commercial law so powerful. When we do apply our principles we do it with discernment and responsibility, with tolerance and with grace and offering them an **exit policy** then things start to happen in the way they are supposed to happen.

What are the difference between the National Credit Act and the Bills of Exchange act ?

As far as I am concerned the one follows the other. The one is founded on the other. The National Credit Act cannot exist on its own without being founded on the Constitution and secondly on the Bills of exchange Act. **It is a Russian Doll syndrome**, the one needs the other to maintain itself. The National Credit Act cannot float in thin air it is founded on something else. **The Constitution is founded on Natural Law and that is the Law of the Land.** That is a solid foundation, not water, not a ship. It is rock, physical land.

You cannot protect your unalienable rights with an act. The Constitution protects civil rights which is the benefits and privileges. **The Republic of South Africa Constitution is a document of no authority.**

When you consider the constitution, Act 108 of 1996, it is an Act and it has a preamble. Very few people have read the preamble. When you do you realise that the constitution does not apply to people, it applies to persons, or corporations or officials working for the government. **It is a reference with a framework in which government officials can operate and stay within the framework.** If they don't, then we as the people of this country have the right to claim against them and take them out of office. That is the issue. Go read the preamble and read the Constitution and see for yourself. It does not apply to people. It applies to persons.

Is there more precedent for this concept of a person.

Person is the legal substance to which rights and duties are attributed. When you add an adjective like juristic or natural or artificial it just expands it. The fundamental definition of that person is something that was created by man.

The **ID document** is an insurance policy that you accepted and subjugated your rights and defences to the state in exchange for the benefit privileges of having an army, the fire department, roadworks and whatever the case may be. **The ID document is to make the strawman whole**, because it is a body of persons floating around as a **bearer bond** when you go from place to place they ask you can I see a copy of your ID. Why? If it was so essential to identify you wouldn't your whole body be on that document. Why is just your head there? Where is your body? If you look at the bank and they have a branch office and they have a head office. Why is the head and the branch not the same place? And what is a Chief Executive Officer. Hopefully people will become more receptive of looking into the terminology in such a way and understanding the meaning of those terms and what the effect is going to be in your agreement.

When I walk into a bank to open a bank account and they say can I have your ID document please? They are effectively attaching the head to the real body so that can become whole, what you call an individual.

Now that it is whole, it can contract and they can use the full transmitting utility. It is almost like a vault: you can have four numbers in a vault code but you need another two and someone else carries that. They come in and slot in and next to you and zip the vault opens.

The banks in order to contract want to put the head with the body. The body being the strawman, legal fiction, and the head being you? And now you become one? What does the ID number represent?

Your ID is a unique account number that links you through this trust eventually into the IMF because it is a unique account number. As far as SARS is concerned I express whenever I use my ID number now, I use it as an **exemption ID**, because my status has changed. You can either use it as your slave or you can use it as your master. I have expressed the fact that I am in control. I am the beneficiary, the only beneficiary in fact of this trust and therefore I can use that account number as a transmitting account number to settle my business affairs.

Where is the concept of trust ?

I have a personal understanding. The fact that you and I met created a **trust** and if I violate the trust then you are either going to never speak to me again or it will give you the conduit to claim something from me. The moment two people meet there is immediately a resulting trust established.

There must be a trust between each of us and our strawman.

Yes, but we didn't create that trust, it was created by our parents. But since we came of age we started contributing to that trust, with our labour, the product of our labour and whatever we put into that and therefore we are the beneficiaries and the contributing beneficiaries.

The corpus of a trust is the product of your labour ?

More than your labour, your physical body... **They regard your body as their property.** That is the priority stock of this corporation.

The government assets are all these strawmen.

You can also refer to it as a title. The title can be split. **You can have equitable title (so called ownership) and beneficial title (so called possession).** We have equitable title but someone else owns it. It lies in a register and we didn't create it.

My name is not my name. My name actually belongs to the state. If there is a house or car in my name, it is not mine because my name is actually owned by the state. I have the ability to administer my name, I can buy and sell on it. It is my monopoly piece. But actually my monopoly piece is owned by the bank.

Yes and what is even more ironic is that you always limit yourself. You do not make a distinguishing contribution in the sense that you back off on it and say hang on I am the principle and surety for this entity. I have unlimited liability. I am not limited.

If our name is not owned by us then all transactions that are used, using our name as title and that is why it is a taxable event, lawyers take their fees, transfer duties and additional costs. It is not ours and they can charge whatever fees they want to, because they own the property and we are just playing musical chairs.

The system was designed to keep track of you and that was the objective. They wanted to get us into a totally paperless cashless society where all your actions are tracked through electronic means and probably a micro-chip put in their bodies. I don't have **altzaaymis** and I don't want a microchip thank you very much. **I will manage my own affairs with my own power of attorney and I will track my own business affairs and preferable not part of this reorganisation of bankruptcy.** We don't have to be part of this reorganisation of bankruptcy. It is time that we rehabilitate this organisational bankruptcy. **All South Africans collectively should do a rehabilitation on this corporation bankruptcy and get them to adhere to their own rules.**

Our monopoly pieces are moving around the board. Our monopoly pieces are not owned by us. If the players want to do private business amongst themselves they are entitled to and if the monopoly board wants to do business with us, we should wait for the monopoly board to provide the offer and then we can do an original issue and set it off and we can effectively create money that can then be used on that monopoly board and we can still stay in the private.

Very good analogy. This is to help people realise that they can take a break, relax nothing is going to happen, the banks have already shown a monotorium on six months they are not going to take homes back. When people realise this they are going to take back their own power of attorney and exercise it in such a way that it is going to **create heaven on earth.**

TAPE EIGHT

Applications of the Bills of Exchange Act :

When you want to apply a certain body of legislation you first of all have to establish jurisdiction. The jurisdiction we deal with is **maritime admiralty jurisdiction:** the law of the sea and also

banking law. **It involves Bills of exchange.** The sae farers did not take all the cargo and go up and down. They sometimes took paper that was locked up in the captains cabin, and **they signed and exchanged the consideration through bills of exchange.**

There were two gentlemen in South Africa, Professor Leonard Geerin and Professor Dennis Cohen. Sadly they are both late. According to Charl Hugo, chapter 15 of Southern Cross, there is **a workable**

and complete definition of a negotiable instrument. I use this as the reference or definition I need to satisfy in order to get the **remedy** that is built into the bills of exchange act.

Let me read it to you: “a negotiable instrument, is a document of title, embodying rights to the payment of money or the security for money.”

Can you see it is plural? There are two sets of rights.

*The only security for money that exists today is people's **promises to pay** which is their energy. Therefore the security for money must be the human being and the effort a human being puts into the system.*

Correct, but if they then transfer that into a **document of title** then you have got something that is negotiable without trading your body.

A document of title meaning something with our name on it?

Yes, or a deed of transfer with a title transfer regarding a property or a vehicle. All vehicles have titles. It is expressed on the offer to purchase or the offer to sell. The title of the vehicle is unique to that one piece of property.

There is a title deed of a house which we don't see. Is it the accrual title on that transfer, the original document you had in your hand?

It is the document you never see, but the transfer took place. When you accepted the agreement, the meetings of the mind, caused the title to transfer. Title is also a pledge, or allegiance to the crown, or it could be a mortgage on land.

A promise to pay?

Yes, or a **pledge**. Or, to accept the title of nobility and you say well thank you my lord, for giving me this piece of land, now I am pledging allegiance to the crown and in times of war I will either go and if I am too old my son will go.

When you receive a claim against you, against your legal entity addressed to you, do you agree that that is a document of title?

Yes, a document of title is a document with my name on it, but it is my legal fictions name.

Yes, and that is negotiable. **A negotiable instrument must be a document of title** or if you have a document of title that by implication means it is negotiable.

Negotiable means it can move, it can transfer from one person to the other.

Yes, and **it embodies rights to the payment of money**, or the security for money. Those rights can also be negotiated, from one person to another.

It is a piece of a paper with your name on it that has rights to money.

Because this is so simple, that is where the frustration lies. When you look at the negotiable instrument law handbook it says when the document is transferred or it is a negotiable instrument, if it is frustrated by extraneous efforts from whatever it defies the object.

In other words stop window dressing it, at the end of the day it is an extremely simple thing.

If it is a piece of paper with a title description on it, it is a document of title and that piece of paper now becomes negotiable.

If a negotiable instrument is that simple then the application of it must be too?

Exactly, it says: "Which by custom or legislation is A.) transferrable by delivery." **I can give it to you, literally just give it to you.**

"Or by endorsement and delivery": So, I can receive something that is not complete, endorse it and then deliver it in such a way that the holder PRO TEMPORAI."

If they don't want you to understand the definition they put it in Latin. What is PRO TEMPORAI? It is a temporary holder. "The temporary holder may sue on it in his own name and in his own right."

Why would that be the case? Because now you have the **security for money embodied in that document and also the right for payment.** You have received it and now you have the privileges embedded in it.

*I have got the piece of paper and therefore I own the rights embodied in it. **The Bills of Exchange Act is the foundation of commerce and negotiable instruments is the foundation of the Bills of Exchange Act.** What is custom and legislation?*

The definition of negotiable instruments is one of the most expansive definitions in the world. When you look at the unification of law, and when you look at that report on the payment system in South African Law, they refer to the negotiable instrument as **the most cosmopolitan instrument in the world.** It has to be, they cannot limit it. **Whoever walks in with unlimited capacity and endorses that instrument, is immediately unlimited.**

Legislation is obviously a statue and custom could be the customs of any country and could be of anything and as far back as you want to.

Before legislation came into place there was **custom.** There are certain customs that are still today recognised in common law. They call up common law and they call up statutory law, and it says it is transferrable by delivery, or by endorsement and delivery, in such a way that the holder pro temporai may sue on it in his own name and his own right. And it is regarded as money.

You couldn't sue on it if it wasn't valuable.

"B.) a bona fide transferee ex calza onerosa may require a good and complete title to the document and the rights embodied therein, notwithstanding that his predecessor had a defective title or no title at all." Bona fide means on the face value of it and transferee is also the holder. The genuine holder, on face value, bona fide. Transferee ex calza onerosa, there is the reason for using the Bills of exchange act section 25 : **a holder takes a bill for value when he takes it under onerous title.** May acquire a good and complete title to the document and the rights embodied therein, notwithstanding that his predecessor had a defective title, or no title at all.

When Telkom sends you a bill that hasn't been signed, a piece of paper with a value on it, that is a defective title but you can now endorse it and become the bona fide transferee ex calza onerosa and

you can take it under onerous title which means you own it and the rights embodied in it. A document sent from a corporation with your name on it and a value on it has value and you can work and use that value to your benefit using your unlimited commercial liability in the private space.

A negotiable instrument is what the bank would send to you and you then turn it into a bill of exchange?

Yes and a negotiable instrument by definition is also a Bill of Exchange.

So if someone sends you a bill and you promise to pay it, that is money, it is a promise to pay.

When you look at a South African Reserve Bank Note, what is that? We refer to it as a note and a note is defined as a promissory note. It is a promise to pay. Before 1994 it said 'I promise to pay the bearer on demand.' And now the Euro has fallen to look like **monopoly paper**. South African Reserve Bank notes now resemble monopoly paper. It has got a head on, but it is an animal head and doesn't say I promise to pay anybody. So why do we still give our confidence to such a system?

The only thing keeping it afloat is the confidence of the people. We are duped into thinking those notes are valuable. So if you go to a restaurant and pay R200 for a meal, the only reason they accept is because you are willing to give it.

And then they are going to pass it on to someone else, they are going to pass it onto the supplier to get their eggs and milk and cheese and that guy is going to pass it onto the farmer who gives them the eggs and cheese, but what do you do with that piece of paper? He puts it into his bank account and because there are too many of those in circulation, and because people don't contract their bills, they now come to the end of the fiscal year and the accountants come in with two sets of books that they cook to such an extent that some of these bills end up in a cake tin under a bed and it doesn't go out of circulation. **We end up with inflation.** We have too many promises to pay in circulation that people accept it in good faith but they don't do it with their own bills that come which they could contract to zero and close the accounts and get these worthless papers out of circulation.

If you look at section 18 of the bills of exchange act it makes provision for a bill that you receive that does not have a signature on it. You can then fill it up to whatever you want to and make sure that it is complete.

Section 19 says "delivery as a requirement for contract on a bill", which proves that a contract is not necessarily an agreement and vice versa. "When you receive a bill with an expanded value, you can contract that bill on the face of it by endorsing it and returning it to wherever it came from. And that is irrevocable and complete."

Section 25 the flimsiest section says, "**a holder takes a bill for value when he takes it under onerous title.**" That means a holder takes a bill for value when he takes it under unlimited commercial value and contracts it to zero.

Once you apply this legislation and you then use the commercial lien process, in combination with some of the court rules, you are going to have a devastating **remedy and recourse based on**

the truth, the real truth and all the shenanigans are going to disappear. **We are going to turn our country around.**

There is a concern that one will do the acceptance and then get a backlash that they will not know how to deal with.

That is a good point. People do say that. I am sitting here to instil confidence in other people to do likewise, as we have done already. Once you start asking questions, it diffuses the situation altogether, and is settled. **When it is settled it is not adversarial.** There is nothing that can be adjudicated. **There is no conflict.** It is an acceptance, it is basically **cleared out.** I find now that lawyers come and they say we acknowledge your acceptance but it doesn't comply with the plea in the court system. They are so used to dragging you to court that they cannot recognise that you have done something non judicial.

The doctrine of offer and acceptance governs the entire commercial and court system. If a lawyer says they 'acknowledge your acceptance,' those words themselves have already diffused everything.

And if they then pursue further, they make themselves liable. **How can you justify foreclosing on somebody's property, physically taking them out of their house or taking their car, you are going to better the economy?** Explain that to me? It becomes a cul-de-sac, a dead end where you sit and say, what are these people thinking about? What are they really busy with? There is only one answer and that is control to strip assets away to such an extent that you are controlled forever and dumbed down that you end up with generation after generation that are so clueless that they cannot even read.

I now see the court in a different perspective, I now see it as an administrative agency, or as an administrative head office, where we can register certain things in such a way that it reflects into the public that we dealt with unlimited commercial liability and settled the accounts. You are going to have an adversarial party that stands there miserable and with limited liability that can't do anything about it.

If someone wants to put a judgement against you for not paying your Edgars account. If you do the acceptance, before they put a judgement on you, you put a judgement on them?

Yes, you can concurrently do a **counter claim**, which they refer to as **joining the files**. You end up with two files running on separate tracks and you say join the two files and that becomes **the set-off**. You take the set-up and the inability to set-off and you prevent the set-down by throwing it together into one file and you do the set-off. **The court will rule towards that set-off.**

When I was a vet and you saw me at 6 in the evening when I had dealt with 110 clients that day you would probably think that I don't have a sense of humour. The load on the judges at this point in time to adjudicate on a case load of 150 000 (in the two North and South Gauteng high courts) don't expect to see a judge with a sense of humour. When I was there I looked at how they use certain ploys to get the documents presented in such a way in front of that judge that they write the numbers 1 – 10 the summons and the particulars of the claim with a marker pen in order for him not to miss the number. It is about timing. Those court documents get dressed up like a Christmas tree, otherwise they don't get through the role.

Remember those people also have a conscience. Some of them don't tolerate that or don't appreciate having to do that.

When you go into court with a notice to defend and your defence is based on a previous acceptance, you are going to have someone embarrassed, as I had the advocate embarrassed against Nedbank. He

said to the judge, "this man proclaims that the South African Reserve Bank and Nedbank create money out of thin air." That retired judge moved forward and he pointed his finger at this advocate and he said to him, "if that is true you are going to be in serious trouble".

We need to settle this as adults. Stop the adversarial action and procedures and ask who is the real guilty party here? The real guilty party is the **banking industry**, which is a fiction. We can settle it tomorrow. This is what I have done. Up to now this has worked every single time and everything I have wanted to achieve, happened because of **following the truth**. My experience from the court system is that these judges are also fed up dealing with I don't know how many cases per week.

What is the role of debt counselling in all of this ? Debt Counselling is slowing down a little bit so that the bottle neck in the courts can be slightly alleviated.

That is why they call it a **National Credit Regulator**. A regulator regulates pressure that is **built up on one side and it releases something else at a constant level on the other side**. Again it is a misnomer. It should be a National Debt Regulator. There is more credit we could deal with as there is 1,6 trillion rand of credit that has gone into circulation. That is not the issue. It is regulating that bottle neck but it doesn't manage it anymore.

It is extraordinary that a lawyer can say 'I acknowledge your acceptance but I am carrying on.'

They said it doesn't comply with a plea in terms of the court rule. They basically invited me out of the business arena and said well you need to come and play tennis with us, but you are not following the rules, you are not dressed appropriately. That is how ludicrous that statement was. And we give you five days to dress up properly and come play us. I said okay I will do that. And I filed a notice to defend and that notice to defend is going to be based on 1.) the acceptance and 2.) that this lawyer is trying to commit **tax fraud** by adjudicating something in front of a judge that should be settled in a bank foyer, not in a court room.

There are judges that have a conscience and are also concerned about the state of this situation who would rule that they need to get the right stuff in front of them in order to rule it.

It is comforting to know that someone has been down that road and seen it for what it is and is now ready to come back and report on it in truth and fairness. Why are we putting our vehicles, properties

and businesses into CC's, PTY LTD's and TRUSTS when our own names are a trust in itself and has unlimited capacity. Why are we limiting everything we do?

It is ignorance and the fear of loss. **The fear of loss is always greater than the desire to gain**. When you get bombarded by the media with fear mongering to tell you that this is what is going to happen and because it is an economic crisis you need to take precautionary measures. Lawyers and accountants and financial advisors come in and they basically offer you advice that makes their life easier, not yours. And therefore we fell into this quagmire. It is foolishness. I did the same. I registered my first hospital in a CC but I take responsibility for it I wouldn't do it again. You will never deal with me outside of an **ALTRUSITIC NON CHARTERED SOLE PROPRIETERSHIP**.

I have stopped paying my mortgage because I do not want to perpetuate the fraud.

A lot of people have a guilty feeling about that because they say I have taken out the loan and now I must pay it. But what if that original meaning was void or voidable? How would you remedy that then, if you were trying to reason with them. **It is a disclosure issue**.

*Firstly I don't have a debt I am paying a **monthly bail payment**.*

Correct. And now we talk about **common law rules** and the true merchant rules of what constitutes a binding agreement. **That is full disclosure, equal consideration, lawful terms and conditions and**

signatures or meeting of the minds, good faith and clean hands. The first maxim that we use is every man and woman knows that the foundation of law and commerce is in telling the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

If I provide you with a document that is a promise to pay and it has value and you do not disclose that to me, immediately that agreement is voidable.

And they fully know that and that is why they never come to you as the bank to do litigation, they pass that negotiable instrument to a **temporary holder or pro temporai lawyer**, that in essence **fortifies the instrument** because they are indemnified and they are qualified to do what they do and they try and pull you over a barrel. **That is where it is going to stop, at that fulcrum.** They with their limited liability are going to come across someone that stands up against them with unlimited liability and prevents them using their own court system to fleece people unknowingly or unwittingly.

That is why the predictions that Mandell House made in 1923 are doomed. **It is doomed because of a few things such as the internet and for them to make provision for technological advancements that they used for a while. And now it has caught up.** People said well if they can use technological advancements so can we. This might **spin across the globe in 24 hours** depending on who decides to do it. It is that simple. It is liberating and it makes one feel at ease and it makes one think on their feet. **When you are liberated you can become creative and that is my objective, to utilise this system not in a destructive way but in a creative way and assist people to enjoy and live the lives they deserve.**

TAPE NINE : *Scott presents a document of intention during this tapes, he reads from the document, explains what he has read and Johan makes comments. They give the day as Christmas*

Day 2010 !

*We talked about how we can use affidavits and notary publics to create our own **bubble of law around us.** What documents are these ?*

It boils down to a notice of understanding, a notice of intent and a notice that you put out a claim of right.

The notice of intent is to communicate. If you look at the rule of law it clearly states that the rule of law needs **communication, negotiation, and arbitration before anything can be adjudicated.** This

puts you in a position from the offset that you make sure that you communicate and negotiate if necessary. Any dispute that would arise you make sure that you deal with that dispute in such a way that it is amicable and peaceful and if it cannot be resolved perhaps you find someone to arbitrate in an amicable manner.

It puts my thought and my intent expressly on words on paper. It is recommended that these documents are done as it is going to assist you to get a working knowledge of the principles that we deal with and it will also put you in a position that if you do; **that becomes your law.** That is your agreement. And you put your signature or autograph to it which makes it very powerful.

*I have the document here in front of me and it begins with the coat of arms. I found **my coat of arms** on the internet and put it at the top. Your coat of arms is your flag of your jurisdiction and you are showing any foreigner that you do have a law and a jurisdiction.*

From my perspective, because I am a sovereign I want to be recognised as a sovereign that we don't end up with confusion in the mist where cannonballs are flying all over the place and you get in the

cross fire because of mistaken identity. It takes us back to the family. It takes us back to our **ancestry**. It takes us to a position where we can stand our lawful right in commerce, even a **moral standing that identifies you as a member of a family rather than a registered ship in a book**.

The coat of arms is there to protect. The truth is it is really a shield and not a sword. It is a question of providing them with the truth that becomes a shield to protect you from fiction and to identify me with my family.

There are people without a coat of arms and then the idea is to set up something for yourself or for that matter don't do it. I did it from a preference perspective.

Next we have our details : Scott Colin of the Cundel family. We do that to distinguish ourselves from ourselves and the strawman. This document is written by a flesh and blood human being it is separate from the juristic person.

And it is tricky, how do you distinguish on paper the difference between a juristic artificial human and a natural human being of flesh and blood. We were taught to spell our names grammatically correctly yet today we receive mail and it is all in capitals.

And then is written Real Land South Africa, so you are showing that you don't live inside a corporation you live on real land. You are doing everything in your power to show that you are outside of the maritime jurisdiction.

I make a distinction between the corporation that was created and duly registered as a corporation with a name similar to what we refer to as Southern Africa, the Southern tip of the landmass or the continent of Southern Africa.

Also to warn them that they must not take any implied agreements or make the assumption that some of these implied agreements are going to attach to me, the man. **You also indicate to them that you are the captain of your own ship and the cargo on your ship is under your control.** It doesn't belong to someone else.

And then there is the postcode where you put (circa) in brackets and then the post code.

My understanding is that it refers to the **last outpost** which is a military connotation and I am not a soldier for the crown any longer. **The soldier that they refer to is not at his post anymore.** Do you really think using a postcode will enhance the delivery of mail? You can mail someone a letter with or without a post code and as far as my experience goes it normally arrives at the same time.

*You then have the concept that this is a **private** and not a **public** communication.*

The queen is also the defender of all faiths. You find that lawyers write yours faithfully. She is the queen bee of the corporate entities and the beehive mentality we have in a state of unconsciousness.

And we are all the serving ants, the servants that run around as public servants in the hope that we can serve the queen. Her officials and her offices are any legal fiction existing on the planet. The system is a hierarchical based corporate structure.

I am coming to her in a state of consciousness and I am coming to her as an ally saying that you do not have jurisdiction over me. **In essence if we are allies then your officials and your offices should respect that and the rights embodied in the status of a sovereign.**

When I came back from the UK I was stopped eight times as a man of then almost fifty years old to enquire about my licence. I got to a point where I decided I was not going to tolerate that any longer. And that is why I decided to draft a notice of understanding and an intent and claim of right to tell them that if I travel from point A to B and they jump out behind a bush, and stop me at C, that is basically a seizure; especially if I did not breach the peace. **It is to make them understand that it is time for them to change their modus operandi to follow the law and stop enforcing statutes when there is not a breach of the so called law or statute.**

They are peace officers, they are supposed to honour the peace and respect the peace. If you do not breach the peace and they stop you, they then masquerade as a law

enforcement officer. That is when I established the jurisdiction in the first place. I asked them straight are you a peace officer or are you a law enforcement officer. Inevitably they say I am a peace officer and I say did I breach the peace and if not I am free to go. And it is time that they recognise that and unless the public as a whole enforce that principle and right we are going to have trouble as time goes on. It becomes more and more encroaching. They force people to switch their car off, get out of the car, open your boot. They use orders. **Unless there is a reasonable cause to search a vehicle they have no right to infringe on your privacy in that manner.**

*We should realise that the government needs revenue urgently but it needs revenue not for schools and roads and all the things they claim but for ***paying off the interest on their debt.****

A friend of my daughter went to Buffelspoort dam the other day, and he was apprehended by two cops, and they made him stop the car, switch it off and get out and open his boot and the one took out his service pistol and buried it in this young mans luggage and the other one came and searched through the luggage and pulled out the pistol. This was a young man in his twenties and he was in an anxious position afterwards. I find that despicable that two peace officers can act that way. It is because we don't stand on our rights and put them in their own jurisdiction.

*The purpose of the claim of right is to show them that you mean no harm and that you do act with honour. **We call this a notice of understanding, intent and claim of right.***

I am Scott Colin Cundel a non fiction being an infinite consciousness soul carnated in the living flesh and blood body of a man created in natural universal law with unalienable rights and freedoms as the owner and priority claimant. The holder in due course is a blessed living soul serving a true creator alone. I hereby make oath and state the following as my truth and my law.

It is a mouthful but the purpose of this is to make it absolutely clear, without any shred of doubt that you are not your strawman and that you are coming across as a flesh and blood human being with unalienable rights.

And you reserve those rights. It also means that when you reserve those rights and express them there is no room for benefit privileges. Inclusion of one is exclusion of the other.

And that goes back to this cross between common law and statute law as evidenced in Southern Cross. Statute law has to be consensual. All statutory law, all acts that are passed by parliament and by government have to have your consent before they are enforced and that is why they are so desperate to contract with you.

Without your consent it does not apply to you.

“Truth as a valid statement of reality is sovereign in commerce. An un rebutted affidavit is acted upon in the judgement in commerce.” The foundation of all our law and our legal system is truth. It is how you express that truth that becomes important.

Your un rebutted affidavit is also your remedy. If it is un rebutted that becomes your foundation that you can utilise. **It is sovereign.** Nothing else is necessary. Once that affidavit is expressed and it has gone un rebutted in the time frame that it is allocated. That is it, it is sovereign.

“To breach the peace one must without others permission greatly threaten the safety of others. Impede the rights of others or act in a disturbing manner in the presence of others.” To breach the peace you have to breach common law. This is when you hurt someone, steal from someone or do something dangerous. You are stating in this document that you are not above that law.

No, **we are at the law.** Some people have said that they have felt threatened with their

encounters with peace officers. And that is why when I am stopped, I always make sure that my hands are visible, I make direct contact, I establish the jurisdiction straight up immediately because that ensures that the peace officers firearm stays in its holster and there is never ever reason for hostility whatsoever.

“If I have the power to elect a representative and empower them to appoint peace officers, then I also have the power to appoint peace officers directly.”

Correct, that is a very strong statement. What you can do by proxy you can do directly. **The created can never be greater than the creator.** The power that you delegate to a representative is always a fraction of the power you possess yourself.

That is also the foundation of a civil arrest. I try to avoid it all cost and where possible avoid third party interference and whenever I deal with people who decide to go this route, I make sure they fully understand the principles of acting peacefully in the public.

“The law provides remedy at all times even against rogue or negligent peace officers and de facto governments apparently hijacked by soulless corporate interests.”

It also says the reasoning power must not fall into the hands of the one who apply the force of law. Only we can reason. They don't reason. They need to receive orders and it needs to be in such a way that those orders are congruent to their frame of reference.

When I did research into the creation of a corporation it was in the early 1900's where there was a court case and in this court case the court recorder said that the judges made a decision that a corporate or a corporation has exactly the same rights as a human being. A corporation created this concept of the legal fiction and what is amazing about this case was that it was actually not true. The judge never said that. The concept of a corporation given the same rights was extraordinary that something like that could have been passed.

If you put it into perspective : how long does it take to establish a PTY in SA ? A few days. Take on the other hand a human that gets conceived and then there is a pregnancy period of nine months and then they get born, a live birth and then the child needs to get to the age of 18 (historically) to become legally competent. It is very clear that you cannot give the same rights to a natural person or an artificial person in the form of a corporation. It is not possible. It is criminal in nature.

Also if you sit down at a table full of food, you will eat until you have had enough and then stop eating. That is nature. A corporation will keep eating and eating until there is absolutely nothing left

at that table in which time it has grown so big it will have to usurp another table of food and another table. A corporation will never stop growing. And the second thing is a corporation doesn't die or even reach a maturity. What I believe is the corporation should start decentralising. When it reaches a maturity stage, it should then spawn other smaller businesses and smaller businesses will start to take over. That could never happen in the current status of a corporation.

Their main objective is to gain profit, with limited liability. They sit with limited liability and yet they want to accrue as much profit as possible.

"Unless I consent to exist in association with a person, I cannot be lawfully governed by people acting on the role for and on behalf of the government who in turn is a legal fiction of its own."

Yes, you climb off the board and are not part of the board game anymore.

This knowledge will help you look at the world with completely different eyes. Looking at the letter of the law in absolute black and white and putting your feet firmly on the earth allows you to step back, and look at the world with completely different eyes.

It is on the one hand liberating and on the other hand gives one a tremendous advantage to be able to assert yourself with a specific knowledge of who you really are and what your role is in relation to whatever the case may be at that point of time, whether it is a claim, or a bill or an insult or whatever. It will assist you to make the right choices to discern and exercise your rights the way you could.

*How many people have sat down and decided that if they can make up their own laws, what would their own laws be ? **What is your truth in your law, it is an extraordinary process.***

"A statute is defined as a legislated rule of society, which has been given the force of law over members of that society and those who consent to have those rules applied to them. Only with consent can any of these laws be applied."

When they refer to a society, which society are they really referring to? As far as I can gather they are referring to the law society. **The law society writes up the statutes.** If you go up to the 5th floor of the high court in Pretoria and you go up to the library. It says no access for anyone unless you are a judge an advocate or a lawyer. So, for someone to present themselves in a court case, how do you defend yourself if you don't have access to the library that these people utilise?

Redemption lies in the fact that you draw them back with gravity and you ground them. You say come down from the 5th floor to ground.

And that is why we should stop worrying about the high court, the supreme court and realise that the highness or supremeness of the court is more up in the clouds and that is the downstairs courts that make all the difference we can start to have less fear of the highcourts because they are as much of a legal fiction as the others.

In my experience I understand that the **magistrates court** understands this process much better than the high court. In a magistrates court you can still recognise and ask for the accuser to present

himself but it is very difficult to do that in high courts.

Having the accuser there is important because that is really what common law is about. If you have got a human being that accuses you of doing something. What if you have a bank. It can't stand up and speak for itself can it?

I have first-hand experience where I stood in a court room with a judge and a clerk and a person who deals with the record and someone in a black mantle or as some people refer to it as a batman suit, where he specifically said Nedbank is in the court room today. And I was there. I must be blind because I couldn't see a bank in there!

A government is a corporation because it has to be incorporated in order to appear in court.

I wish there were a few more people to break through the façade of this ridiculous fiction and get to the real essence of it and confront them and call a spade a spade.

“Any contracts, agreements, charges, bills and so on are now void, discharged and by all other means required if one of the members of the affected party was not a member of the Law Society and was ill informed due to lack of legalese comprehension.”

If you look at Blacks Law Dictionary you see how they redefine certain words. For instance to redefine the word child. Doesn't everyone know what a child is? Why did it have to be redefined in terms of commerce as a person under the age of 18? A person! So there you start again and as you look at the construction and deconstruction of these definitions and then you need to conspire and extrapolate and it becomes a quagmire of just legal terms that most people don't have a comprehension of.

I have heard that the word 'government' broken up means 'govern' coming from the word control and 'ment' originally from the word mind. It is a control of the mind. And the most effective way to control the mind is to control the language. If you are using two sets of languages, one that the other person doesn't understand, that is powerful. But, if you really want power, use a language that people think they understand.

‘All corporate government is based on commercial affidavits, commercial contracts, commercial liens, or distress, hence government cannot exercise the power to expunge commercial processes.’

It is a statement that calls them to attention and it is also a warning to take heed of the fact that their foundation, the energy that they utilise and are reliant upon cannot be expunged otherwise they will commit governmental suicide.

We are looking to calling individuals in these places to attention. The fact that you are taking on an individual, you are bringing out an individual within the system and you can't use plausible deniability. You can't stand up and go I am doing my job.

What you bring in there is the **doctrine of equality before the law** which is paramount and mandatory. You dismantle the mob in such a way that you as an individual are facing another individual that gives you the equality and balance to settle your business affairs in such a way that you are not ruled by the mob.

They always refer to a we and it is always addressed to you in your individual capacity. That is just not fair. The signature at the bottom, George de Bruin for example, is who can be held accountable.

And you get them to escalate. You will find very quickly George de Bruin will become apprehensive and try to escalate it upstairs. That is the objective. It is the stepping stone into the corporation, up to the chief executive officer and chief financial officer. Slowly by working our way up we will reach that level.

So if a soldier arrives at your door and starts causing trouble, what you are doing is getting him to call is sergeant. The sergeant calls the general. And the message eventually gets to whomever is at the top.

Once we pass the general we get to specific.

If one has lawful excuse, one is not obliged to obey a court, tribunal, statute act or order. What is a lawful excuse?

The only way to have a lawful excuse is to have a claim of right.

You have expressed your truth, someone breaks it and you now have remedy against them.

I also reserve the right so I waive the benefit privileges to make a distinction between the true right and the benefit privilege that they refer to as civil rights. I waive benefit privileges.

“Any government contracts certificates or licences such as certificate of marriage, birth certificate of children unknowingly agreed upon are accordingly required to be null and void.”

There is a lot written about licence, my favourite way of looking at it, is can you licence something that is illegal and after licencing it make it legal?

“Any action that one can apply for and receive a licence must be in itself a fundamentally lawful action.”

So why apply for a licence in the first place ?

So if you can do it and it is already lawful then why bother applying for a licence?

It shows up again the state of unconsciousness when you perceive it to be lawful, rather than legal to apply for a licence and then afterwards complain. About the rules and regulations you basically submit yourself to.

Looking at the drivers licence, how many youth of today fail three or four times and fail for

the most dismal reasons you can imagine. It has now become an industry. The system has corrupted itself again. I don't have a problem with someone going through a training period.

There is no insurance in common law. When I go out, I take the risk that I will run into somebody who is unfamiliar with what they are doing. But how many people with licences drive like lunatics in any event?

In this claim of rights you have a clause in it : “I am fully competent, experienced and have the ability to drive a vehicle that is mechanically sound.” That is your truth and if you break that you are in trouble. It is rather like everybody should swear an oath on the road that they are competent and that would be much more powerful than getting a licence?

People don't just go fly a plane. They make sure they can fly that thing before they go up and come down again.

If you look at the statistics regarding insurance, or actuary studies, which drivers are the most dangerous on the road today?

Taxi drivers

Besides taxi drivers it is people between the age of 18 and 25. They have stepped out of the boundaries between junior school and high school and now they let loose and they have got the licence and they have got insurance but they are not grounded in terms of common law.

Insurance gives us a licence to act over and above the way we would act naturally.

“Liberty is a priceless good. Liberty is intestimable. Truth need not shy away from scrutiny or rebuttle. Failure to rebut after full notice grace and mercy have been granted constitutes acceptance of the truth.”

*Truth by whoever pronounced is natural universal law. **Truth is the mother of justice.** The foundation in this entire process is truth.*

The other issue is that if you speak the truth you don't need to remember anything. When you go into an agreement with the truth you don't need to remember anything. It is not going to catch you out.

“A man on the land is senior to any capacity of judge or officer.”

They derive their very essence of their existence from a man on land.

*“A **notary public** is senior to any judge, and considered a gate keeper between the lawful common law world and the legal world which is a law society.”*

I went to the deeds office in Pretoria to try and register the transfer on title between an individual and the close corporation, the shares. I spoke to the registrar at the deeds office and he maintained that the deeds office was a creature of statute and he could not register that transfer of title. Because it is a cc he insisted that it go through CIPRO, however when I gave him the deed of sale and he saw it was notarised he said he recognised it was a negotiable instrument and said that it was very powerful because it was under **notary seal**.

It is our generation that will have to pull this wagon through the drift. This information won't be lost there are too many people with an urgency to understand this technology and also the yearning to find out what has happened in the last four decades.

*In my experiences of working with **small businesses** there are two things that people really want.*

They want to discover and know the truth and they want remedy. The vast majority of small businesses are operating on the verge. To be able to put those two things together and express your truth in such a way that also gives you remedy, is required.

Small business is on the forefront of the battlefield between collectivism and individualism. Those are the last bastions of individualism. When they go down we are going to be entrenched in collectivism for the next thousand years, so it is essential that those people are acknowledged, honoured, supported and people recognise them for what an incredible position they play in society.

Small businesses operate on the cusp. They are just in the private space because a small business owner or person is humanly responsible for their actions. The moment it gets passed the maturity date, it starts growing and it starts reproducing. With small businesses they are still in that stage where they are still personally responsible and that means they still have the ability to act in the private space. Which means their remedy is unlimited. We are in a situation now where small businesses are being limited more and more.

When small business realise that they are actually the creditor of this economic system and not their suppliers creditors then this whole thing is going to change. It is going to be the fulcrum around which this whole thing is going to swivel itself around. It's going to be like a polar shift around that interface. The small business owner will take control of their business affairs in such a manner that it is going to have an effect that you have never seen on this planet before.

"It is a lawful right to travel through the use of a non commercial private travel conveyance which is an unregistered private automobile held under a claim of right."

When you look at vehicles, specifically motor driven vehicles or machine driven vehicles, the government with their legal title, still have carte blanche in a sense when the vehicle comes off the conveyor belt that legal title gets registered to the state immediately. You end up at best equitable or beneficial title on that vehicle: nothing more than a glorified carer of the vehicle. We still need to dig deep into that especially when it comes to new vehicles where an order is in place for a new vehicle when there is already a transfer on title and you do an acceptance on that new title.

Register comes from the word regis which means to the crown. When we are registering something we are immediately associating it with the crown.

Yes and it goes in as a stock item, and it ends up in a receipt book. It goes onto paper. It goes onto a registry. It is not yours any longer. Or it was never yours in the first place. When you realise your name is not yours, it doesn't belong to you and you register something in that name then whatever is registered doesn't belong to you either.

Does this claim of right allow you to take peaceful possession of this property ?

Yes. If you can get by the regulations they put into that paperwork. Now people do it by expressing **'all rights reserved'** even on an offer to purchase. **Suddenly banks are reeling backwards.**

"If the peace officer is not providing a service they have no reason to stop anyone and if proof of registration insurance and licence details are not valuable they have no need to ask for it."

They assume they have an agreement with you.

Yes, it is not justified and it is not confirmed. And that is why I decided to unregister my vehicle and change the registration on my vehicle in such a way that unless I breach the peace, best you stay clear. I have unlimited capacity so I will take care of any claim if I was responsible for damage to anybody or anything.

"The minister of transport must on demand create and post insurance bonds to aid any free man in exercising their common law right to travel by any means while keeping the public safe. Failure or refusal to do so is to accept that insurance is not needed for a functional sovereign to lawfully travel."

If you don't subrogate your rights and defences to the state, they have the ability and responsibility to ensure that that channel is open enough that when it does come to play you can say I accept that claim and I will settle it.

"Policy enforcement officers or law enforcement officers or those that attempt to enforce statutes against a functional sovereign or free man are in fact breaking the law."

Look at the term policy, or police. **Police also reads policy.**

When we are talking about government policy? Insurance policy is linked to everything else.

Different branches of the same policy that was established is the public policy of 1920. That one is workable and it is congruent with my whole understanding of the system. I can call it up and we can deal with it. Most people ignore it and pretend that it is not there.

“I am not obliged to obey the orders of anyone claiming to be a king, queen, officer, government official or those acting on behalf of such an entity.”

The lady who occupies Windsor, where does she get the claim of right from to be the queen? It is based on genetics.

“Traverse freely over the land as I see fit without being hindered by law enforcement officers, to lawfully exercise my common law right to travel unencumbered. To keep my mark land, my land details, free of any financial liabilities, exempt from taxes and levies, and no government entity, corporation or person may under any circumstances over-rule any decision I make pertaining to it.”

When you look at it from the flipside they say we cannot own land, because **the pope took custodianship of the whole planet back in 1305 or whenever the case may be**. I look at it like the **Native American Indians**. I did not create the land, therefore I cannot own it.

What you build on that land is a different story. When you try and sell land to me that is a misnomer. It is transfer of land and that goes back to 1657 when the first transfer of land deeds were done. **People lost the concept of not having to pay for land.**

Property became an investment. We have sectional title. In sectional title, you have a section of a title.

You are a tenant in a beehive. You don't own it. You have liability on the title. There is a difference between ownership and possession of property.

“All rights to my offspring are complete and irrevocable and as such my own judgement or decision regarding them supersedes any other person or statute.”

In the top draw they have **indemnity forms**. So all you have to do is reach into the top draw and you can sign the indemnity form that that is not going to happen. They cannot force you to have

children vaccinated. It is a requirement it is not mandatory.

*When we refuse to do something that is being enforced upon us by an official, we should put ourselves in their shoes. **Is it not worth carrying our own indemnity forms?***

You can do that. And **you can swap the indemnity form around** so if something happens to my child you are going to be held personally liable.

Judge Joffe was on radio probably three months ago where he made it very clear that the rule of law is still paramount in South Africa and that is despite the fact that we are the fourth lowest on the world rank of adhering to the rule of law.

The point that I am trying to bring across when we look at all this technology is if you are fed up with being bullied in the system, **teach yourself to recognise and apply these rules** then things will change for you. People in the system get bullied to a point of no return and they complain and whine because they do not know the rules. I am talking from first-hand experience. I didn't know the rules. Now I am getting to know the rule and it has changed my whole life.

“To have in the event of my death, all of my property and inheritances that I pass on, protected by this claim, and that; my will is my final word. These inheritances may be bequeathed to anyone I choose without being subject to taxes or fees.”

Consider the fact that we are dealing with **benefit privilege of discharging a debt into the next fiscal year** what you do now is you are trying to discharge your debt in your estate when you die over into another living trust. **It is a taxable event**, don't complain about it unless you create the structure in your living trust in order to set off all your accounts, there cannot be tax on that when it is bequeathed into the next living estate of your progeny.

My estate is going to be worth nothing when I go. **The estate is gone.** The energy state of my physical body transpires. I don't own any property, I just control property. The books are balanced, the balance state ends up at zero the moment I expire, because all my accounts have been contracted.

I am doing this to bring across a fundamental aspect for humanity to recognise. This is to bring across this quantum leap into the next consciousness level. This we are facing now.

On a standing level **it is taking the position of higher moral ground.** It is untouchable. When you internalise it yourself you can look yourself in the mirror. You don't need to lie to yourself.

It is about your understanding of the system that we deal with which is maritime admiralty jurisdiction, commerce, your intent, how you intend to deal with it and interact with it and finally a claim of right that is put out responsibly and that basically waives the benefit privilege, and puts you in a position where you can express very clearly where you operate from and that is: **from the private venue interjecting into limitedly into the public venue.**

TAPE NINE : *Scott presents a document of intention during this tapes, he reads from the document, explains what he has read and Johan makes comments. They give the day as Christmas*

Day 2010 !

*We talked about how we can use affidavits and notary publics to create our own **bubble of law around us.** What documents are these ?*

It boils down to a notice of understanding, a notice of intent and a notice that you put out a claim of right.

The notice of intent is to communicate. If you look at the rule of law it clearly states that the rule of law needs **communication, negotiation, and arbitration before anything can be adjudicated.** This puts you in a position from the offset that you make sure that you communicate and negotiate if necessary. Any dispute that would arise you make sure that you deal with that dispute in such a way that it is amicable and peaceful and if it cannot be resolved perhaps you find someone to arbitrate in an amicable manner.

It puts my thought and my intent expressly on words on paper. It is recommended that these documents are done as it is going to assist you to get a working knowledge of the principles that we deal with and it will also put you in a position that if you do; **that becomes your law.** That is your agreement. And you put your signature or autograph to it which makes it very powerful.

*I have the document here in front of me and it begins with the coat of arms. I found **my coat of arms** on the internet and put it at the top. Your coat of arms is your flag of your jurisdiction and you are showing any foreigner that you do have a law and a jurisdiction.*

From my perspective, because I am a sovereign I want to be recognised as a sovereign that we don't end up with confusion in the mist where cannonballs are flying all over the place and you get in the cross fire because of mistaken identity. It takes us back to the family. It takes us back to our **ancestry**. It takes us to a position where we can stand our lawful right in commerce, even a **moral standing that identifies you as a member of a family rather than a registered ship in a book**.

The coat of arms is there to protect. The truth is it is really a shield and not a sword. It is a question of providing them with the truth that becomes a shield to protect you from fiction and to identify me with my family.

There are people without a coat of arms and then the idea is to set up something for yourself or for that matter don't do it. I did it from a preference perspective.

Next we have our details : Scott Colin of the Cundel family. We do that to distinguish ourselves from ourselves and the strawman. This document is written by a flesh and blood human being it is separate from the juristic person.

And it is tricky, how do you distinguish on paper the difference between a juristic artificial human and a natural human being of flesh and blood. We were taught to spell our names grammatically correctly yet today we receive mail and it is all in capitals.

And then is written Real Land South Africa, so you are showing that you don't live inside a corporation you live on real land. You are doing everything in your power to show that you are outside of the maritime jurisdiction.

I make a distinction between the corporation that was created and duly registered as a corporation with a name similar to what we refer to as Southern Africa, the Southern tip of the landmass or the continent of Southern Africa.

Also to warn them that they must not take any implied agreements or make the assumption that some of these implied agreements are going to attach to me, the man. **You also indicate to them that you are the captain of your own ship and the cargo on your ship is under your control**. It doesn't belong to someone else.

And then there is the postcode where you put (circa) in brackets and then the post code.

My understanding is that it refers to the **last outpost** which is a military connotation and I am not a soldier for the crown any longer. **The soldier that they refer to is not at his post anymore**. Do you really think using a postcode will enhance the delivery of mail? You can mail someone a letter with or without a post code and as far as my experience goes it normally arrives at the same time.

*You then have the concept that this is a **private** and not a **public** communication.*

The queen is also the defender of all faiths. You find that lawyers write yours faithfully. She is the queen bee of the corporate entities and the beehive mentality we have in a state of unconsciousness.

And we are all the serving ants, the servants that run around as public servants in the hope that we can serve the queen. Her officials and her offices are any legal fiction existing on the planet. The system is a hierarchical based corporate structure.

I am coming to her in a state of consciousness and I am coming to her as an ally saying that you do not have jurisdiction over me. **In essence if we are allies then your officials and your offices should respect that and the rights embodied in the status of a sovereign.**

When I came back from the UK I was stopped eight times as a man of then almost fifty years old to enquire about my licence. I got to a point where I decided I was not going to tolerate that any longer. And that is why I decided to draft a notice of understanding and an intent and claim of right to tell them that if I travel from point A to B and they jump out behind a bush, and stop me at C, that is basically a seizure; especially if I did not breach the peace. **It is to make them understand that it is time for them to change their modus operandi to follow the law and stop enforcing statutes when there is not a breach of the so called law or statute.**

They are peace officers, they are supposed to honour the peace and respect the peace. If you do not breach the peace and they stop you, they then masquerade as a law

enforcement officer. That is when I established the jurisdiction in the first place. I asked them straight are you a peace officer or are you a law enforcement officer. Inevitably they say I am a peace officer and I say did I breach the peace and if not I am free to go. And it is time that they recognise that and unless the public as a whole enforce that principle and right we are going to have trouble as time goes on. It becomes more and more encroaching. They force people to switch their car off, get out of the car, open your boot. They use orders. **Unless there is a reasonable cause to search a vehicle they have no right to infringe on your privacy in that manner.**

*We should realise that the government needs revenue urgently but it needs revenue not for schools and roads and all the things they claim but for ***paying off the interest on their debt.****

A friend of my daughter went to Buffelspoort dam the other day, and he was apprehended by two cops, and they made him stop the car, switch it off and get out and open his boot and the one took out his service pistol and buried it in this young mans luggage and the other one came and searched through the luggage and pulled out the pistol. This was a young man in his twenties and he was in an anxious position afterwards. I find that despicable that two peace officers can act that way. It is because we don't stand on our rights and put them in their own jurisdiction.

*The purpose of the claim of right is to show them that you mean no harm and that you do act with honour. **We call this a notice of understanding, intent and claim of right.***

I am Scott Colin Cundel a non fiction being an infinite consciousness soul carnated in the living flesh and blood body of a man created in natural universal law with unalienable rights and freedoms as the owner and priority claimant. The holder in due course is a blessed living soul serving a true creator alone. I hereby make oath and state the following as my truth and my law.

It is a mouthful but the purpose of this is to make it absolutely clear, without any shred of doubt that you are not your strawman and that you are coming across as a flesh and blood human being with unalienable rights.

And you reserve those rights. It also means that when you reserve those rights and express them there is no room for benefit privileges. Inclusion of one is exclusion of the other.

And that goes back to this cross between common law and statute law as evidenced in Southern Cross. Statute law has to be consensual. All statutory law, all acts that are passed by parliament and by government have to have your consent before they are enforced and that is why they are so desperate to contract with you.

Without your consent it does not apply to you.

“Truth as a valid statement of reality is sovereign in commerce. An un rebutted affidavit is acted upon in the judgement in commerce.” The foundation of all our law and our legal system is truth. It is how you express that truth that becomes important.

Your un rebutted affidavit is also your remedy. If it is un rebutted that becomes your foundation that you can utilise. **It is sovereign.** Nothing else is necessary. Once that affidavit is expressed and it has gone un rebutted in the time frame that it is allocated. That is it, it is sovereign.

“To breach the peace one must without others permission greatly threaten the safety of others. Impede the rights of others or act in a disturbing manner in the presence of others.” To breach the peace you have to breach common law. This is when you hurt someone, steal from someone or do something dangerous. You are stating in this document that you are not above that law.

No, **we are at the law.** Some people have said that they have felt threatened with their encounters with peace officers. And that is why when I am stopped, I always make sure that my hands

are visible, I make direct contact, I establish the jurisdiction straight up immediately because that ensures that the peace officers firearm stays in its holster and there is never ever reason for hostility whatsoever.

“If I have the power to elect a representative and empower them to appoint peace officers, then I also have the power to appoint peace officers directly.”

Correct, that is a very strong statement. What you can do by proxy you can do directly. **The created can never be greater than the creator.** The power that you delegate to a representative is always a fraction of the power you possess yourself.

That is also the foundation of a civil arrest. I try to avoid it all cost and where possible avoid third party interference and whenever I deal with people who decide to go this route, I make sure they fully understand the principles of acting peacefully in the public.

“The law provides remedy at all times even against rogue or negligent peace officers and de facto governments apparently hijacked by soulless corporate interests.”

It also says the reasoning power must not fall into the hands of the one who apply the force of law. Only we can reason. They don't reason. They need to receive orders and it needs to be in such a way that those orders are congruent to their frame of reference.

When I did research into the creation of a corporation it was in the early 1900's where there was a court case and in this court case the court recorder said that the judges made a decision that a corporate or a corporation has exactly the same rights as a human being. A corporation created this concept of the legal fiction and what is amazing about this case was that it was actually not true. The judge never said that. The concept of a corporation given the same rights was extraordinary that something like that could have been passed.

If you put it into perspective : how long does it take to establish a PTY in SA ? A few days. Take on the other hand a human that gets conceived and then there is a pregnancy period of nine months and

then they get born, a live birth and then the child needs to get to the age of 18 (historically) to become legally competent. It is very clear that you cannot give the same rights to a natural person or an artificial person in the form of a corporation. It is not possible. It is criminal in nature.

Also if you sit down at a table full of food, you will eat until you have had enough and then stop eating. That is nature. A corporation will keep eating and eating until there is absolutely nothing left at that table in which time it has grown so big it will have to usurp another table of food and another table. A corporation will never stop growing. And the second thing is a corporation doesn't die or even reach a maturity. What I believe is the corporation should start decentralising. When it reaches a maturity stage, it should then spawn other smaller businesses and smaller businesses will start to take over. That could never happen in the current status of a corporation.

Their main objective is to gain profit, with limited liability. They sit with limited liability and yet they want to accrue as much profit as possible.

"Unless I consent to exist in association with a person, I cannot be lawfully governed by people acting on the role for and on behalf of the government who in turn is a legal fiction of its own."

Yes, you climb off the board and are not part of the board game anymore.

This knowledge will help you look at the world with completely different eyes. Looking at the letter of the law in absolute black and white and putting your feet firmly on the earth allows you to step back, and look at the world with completely different eyes.

It is on the one hand liberating and on the other hand gives one a tremendous advantage to be able to assert yourself with a specific knowledge of who you really are and what your role is in relation to whatever the case may be at that point of time, whether it is a claim, or a bill or an insult or whatever. It will assist you to make the right choices to discern and exercise your rights the way you could.

*How many people have sat down and decided that if they can make up their own laws, what would their own laws be ? **What is your truth in your law, it is an extraordinary process.***

"A statute is defined as a legislated rule of society, which has been given the force of law over members of that society and those who consent to have those rules applied to them. Only with consent can any of these laws be applied."

When they refer to a society, which society are they really referring to? As far as I can gather they are referring to the law society. **The law society writes up the statutes.** If you go up to the 5th floor of the high court in Pretoria and you go up to the library. It says no access for anyone unless you are a judge an advocate or a lawyer. So, for someone to present themselves in a court case, how do you defend yourself if you don't have access to the library that these people utilise?

Redemption lies in the fact that you draw them back with gravity and you ground them. You say come down from the 5th floor to ground.

And that is why we should stop worrying about the high court, the supreme court and realise that the highness or supremeness of the court is more up in the clouds and that is the downstairs courts that make all the difference we can start to have less fear of the highcourts because they are as much of a legal fiction as the others.

In my experience I understand that the **magistrates court** understands this process much better than the high court. In a magistrates court you can still recognise and ask for the accuser to present himself but it is very difficult to do that in high courts.

Having the accuser there is important because that is really what common law is about. If you have got a human being that accuses you of doing something. What if you have a bank. It can't stand up and speak for itself can it?

I have first-hand experience where I stood in a court room with a judge and a clerk and a person who deals with the record and someone in a black mantle or as some people refer to it as a batman suit, where he specifically said Nedbank is in the court room today. And I was there. I must be blind because I couldn't see a bank in there!

A government is a corporation because it has to be incorporated in order to appear in court.

I wish there were a few more people to break through the façade of this ridiculous fiction and get to the real essence of it and confront them and call a spade a spade.

"Any contracts, agreements, charges, bills and so on are now void, discharged and by all other means required if one of the members of the affected party was not a member of the Law Society and was ill informed due to lack of legalese comprehension."

If you look at Blacks Law Dictionary you see how they redefine certain words. For instance to redefine the word child. Doesn't everyone know what a child is? Why did it have to be redefined in terms of commerce as a person under the age of 18? A person! So there you start again and as you look at the construction and deconstruction of these definitions and then you need to conspire and extrapolate and it becomes a quagmire of just legal terms that most people don't have a comprehension of.

I have heard that the word 'government' broken up means 'govern' coming from the word control and 'ment' originally from the word mind. It is a control of the mind. And the most effective way to control the mind is to control the language. If you are using two sets of languages, one that the other person doesn't understand, that is powerful. But, if you really want power, use a language that people think they understand.

'All corporate government is based on commercial affidavits, commercial contracts, commercial liens, or distress, hence government cannot exercise the power to expunge commercial processes.'

It is a statement that calls them to attention and it is also a warning to take heed of the fact that their foundation, the energy that they utilise and are reliant upon cannot be expunged otherwise they will commit governmental suicide.

We are looking to calling individuals in these places to attention. The fact that you are taking on an individual, you are bringing out an individual within the system and you can't use plausible deniability. You can't stand up and go I am doing my job.

What you bring in there is the **doctrine of equality before the law** which is paramount and mandatory. You dismantle the mob in such a way that you as an individual are facing another individual that gives you the equality and balance to settle your business affairs in such a way that you are not ruled by the mob.

They always refer to a we and it is always addressed to you in your individual capacity. That is just not fair. The signature at the bottom, George de Bruin for example, is who can be held accountable.

And you get them to escalate. You will find very quickly George de Bruin will become apprehensive and try to escalate it upstairs. That is the objective. It is the stepping stone into the corporation, up to

the chief executive officer and chief financial officer. Slowly by working our way up we will reach that level.

So if a soldier arrives at your door and starts causing trouble, what you are doing is getting him to call is sergeant. The sergeant calls the general. And the message eventually gets to whomever is at the top.

Once we pass the general we get to specific.

If one has lawful excuse, one is not obliged to obey a court, tribunal, statute act or order. What is a lawful excuse?

The only way to have a lawful excuse is to have a claim of right.

You have expressed your truth, someone breaks it and you now have remedy against them.

I also reserve the right so I waive the benefit privileges to make a distinction between the true right and the benefit privilege that they refer to as civil rights. I waive benefit privileges.

“Any government contracts certificates or licences such as certificate of marriage, birth certificate of children unknowingly agreed upon are accordingly required to be null and void.”

There is a lot written about licence, my favourite way of looking at it, is can you licence something that is illegal and after licencing it make it legal?

“Any action that one can apply for and receive a licence must be in itself a fundamentally lawful action.”

So why apply for a licence in the first place ?

So if you can do it and it is already lawful then why bother applying for a licence?

It shows up again the state of unconsciousness when you perceive it to be lawful, rather than legal to apply for a licence and then afterwards complain. About the rules and regulations you basically submit yourself to.

Looking at the drivers licence, how many youth of today fail three or four times and fail for

the most dismal reasons you can imagine. It has now become an industry. The system has corrupted itself again. I don't have a problem with someone going through a training period.

There is no insurance in common law. When I go out, I take the risk that I will run into somebody who is unfamiliar with what they are doing. But how many people with licences drive like lunatics in any event?

In this claim of rights you have a clause in it : “I am fully competent, experienced and have the ability to drive a vehicle that is mechanically sound.” That is your truth and if you break that you are in trouble. It is rather like everybody should swear an oath on the road that they are competent and that would be much more powerful than getting a licence?

People don't just go fly a plane. They make sure they can fly that thing before they go up and come down again.

If you look at the statistics regarding insurance, or actuary studies, which drivers are the most dangerous on the road today?

Taxi drivers

Besides taxi drivers it is people between the age of 18 and 25. They have stepped out of the boundaries between junior school and high school and now they let loose and they have got the licence and they have got insurance but they are not grounded in terms of common law.

Insurance gives us a licence to act over and above the way we would act naturally.

“Liberty is a priceless good. Liberty is intestimable. Truth need not shy away from scrutiny or rebuttle. Failure to rebut after full notice grace and mercy have been granted constitutes acceptance of the truth.”

*Truth by whoever pronounced is natural universal law. **Truth is the mother of justice.** The foundation in this entire process is truth.*

The other issue is that if you speak the truth you don't need to remember anything. When you go into an agreement with the truth you don't need to remember anything. It is not going to catch you out.

“A man on the land is senior to any capacity of judge or officer.”

They derive their very essence of their existence from a man on land.

*“A **notary public** is senior to any judge, and considered a gate keeper between the lawful common law world and the legal world which is a law society.”*

I went to the deeds office in Pretoria to try and register the transfer on title between an individual and the close corporation, the shares. I spoke to the registrar at the deeds office and he maintained that the deeds office was a creature of statute and he could not register that transfer of title. Because it is a cc he insisted that it go through CIPRO, however when I gave him the deed of sale and he saw it was notarised he said he recognised it was a negotiable instrument and said that it was very powerful because it was under **notary seal**.

It is our generation that will have to pull this wagon through the drift. This information won't be lost there are too many people with an urgency to understand this technology and also the yearning to find out what has happened in the last four decades.

*In my experiences of working with **small businesses** there are two things that people really want.*

They want to discover and know the truth and they want remedy. The vast majority of small businesses are operating on the verge. To be able to put those two things together and express your truth in such a way that also gives you remedy, is required.

Small business is on the forefront of the battlefield between collectivism and individualism. Those are the last bastions of individualism. When they go down we are going to be entrenched in collectivism for the next thousand years, so it is essential that those people are acknowledged, honoured, supported and people recognise them for what an incredible position they play in society.

Small businesses operate on the cusp. They are just in the private space because a small business owner or person is humanly responsible for their actions. The moment it gets passed the maturity date, it starts growing and it starts reproducing. With small businesses they are still in that stage

where they are still personally responsible and that means they still have the ability to act in the private space. Which means their remedy is unlimited. We are in a situation now where small businesses are being limited more and more.

When small business realise that they are actually the creditor of this economic system and not their suppliers creditors then this whole thing is going to change. It is going to be the fulcrum around which this whole thing is going to swivel itself around. It's going to be like a polar shift around that interface. The small business owner will take control of their business affairs in such a manner that it is going to have an effect that you have never seen on this planet before.

"It is a lawful right to travel through the use of a non commercial private travel conveyance which is an unregistered private automobile held under a claim of right."

When you look at vehicles, specifically motor driven vehicles or machine driven vehicles, the government with their legal title, still have carte blanche in a sense when the vehicle comes off the conveyor belt that legal title gets registered to the state immediately. You end up at best equitable or beneficial title on that vehicle: nothing more than a glorified carer of the vehicle. We still need to dig deep into that especially when it comes to new vehicles where an order is in place for a new vehicle when there is already a transfer on title and you do an acceptance on that new title.

Register comes from the word regis which means to the crown. When we are registering something we are immediately associating it with the crown.

Yes and it goes in as a stock item, and it ends up in a receipt book. It goes onto paper. It goes onto a registry. It is not yours any longer. Or it was never yours in the first place. When you realise your name is not yours, it doesn't belong to you and you register something in that name then whatever is registered doesn't belong to you either.

Does this claim of right allow you to take peaceful possession of this property ?

Yes. If you can get by the regulations they put into that paperwork. Now people do it by expressing **'all rights reserved'** even on an offer to purchase. **Suddenly banks are reeling backwards.**

"If the peace officer is not providing a service they have no reason to stop anyone and if proof of registration insurance and licence details are not valuable they have no need to ask for it."

They assume they have an agreement with you.

Yes, it is not justified and it is not confirmed. And that is why I decided to unregister my vehicle and change the registration on my vehicle in such a way that unless I breach the peace, best you stay clear. I have unlimited capacity so I will take care of any claim if I was responsible for damage to anybody or anything.

"The minister of transport must on demand create and post insurance bonds to aid any free man in exercising their common law right to travel by any means while keeping the public safe. Failure or refusal to do so is to accept that insurance is not needed for a functional sovereign to lawfully travel."

If you don't subrogate your rights and defences to the state, they have the ability and responsibility to ensure that that channel is open enough that when it does come to play you can say I accept that claim and I will settle it.

“Policy enforcement officers or law enforcement officers or those that attempt to enforce statutes against a functional sovereign or free man are in fact breaking the law.”

Look at the term policy, or police. **Police also reads policy.**

When we are talking about government policy? Insurance policy is linked to everything else.

Different branches of the same policy that was established is the public policy of 1920. That one is workable and it is congruent with my whole understanding of the system. I can call it up and we can deal with it. Most people ignore it and pretend that it is not there.

“I am not obliged to obey the orders of anyone claiming to be a king, queen, officer, government official or those acting on behalf of such an entity.”

The lady who occupies Windsor, where does she get the claim of right from to be the queen? It is based on genetics.

“Traverse freely over the land as I see fit without being hindered by law enforcement officers, to lawfully exercise my common law right to travel unencumbered. To keep my mark land, my land details, free of any financial liabilities, exempt from taxes and levies, and no government entity, corporation or person may under any circumstances over-rule any decision I make pertaining to it.”

When you look at it from the flipside they say we cannot own land, because **the pope took custodianship of the whole planet back in 1305 or whenever the case may be**. I look at it like the **Native American Indians**. I did not create the land, therefore I cannot own it.

What you build on that land is a different story. When you try and sell land to me that is a misnomer. It is transfer of land and that goes back to 1657 when the first transfer of land deeds were done. **People lost the concept of not having to pay for land.**

Property became an investment. We have sectional title. In sectional title, you have a section of a title.

You are a tenant in a beehive. You don't own it. You have liability on the title. There is a difference between ownership and possession of property.

“All rights to my offspring are complete and irrevocable and as such my own judgement or decision regarding them supersedes any other person or statute.”

In the top draw they have **indemnity forms**. So all you have to do is reach into the top draw and you can sign the indemnity form that that is not going to happen. They cannot force you to have

children vaccinated. It is a requirement it is not mandatory.

*When we refuse to do something that is being enforced upon us by an official, we should put ourselves in their shoes. **Is it not worth carrying our own indemnity forms?***

You can do that. And **you can swap the indemnity form around** so if something happens to my child you are going to be held personally liable.

Judge Joffe was on radio probably three months ago where he made it very clear that the rule of law is still paramount in South Africa and that is despite the fact that we are the fourth lowest on the world rank of adhering to the rule of law.

The point that I am trying to bring across when we look at all this technology is if you are fed up with being bullied in the system, **teach yourself to recognise and apply these rules** then things will change for you. People in the system get bullied to a point of no return and they complain and whine because they do not know the rules. I am talking from first-hand experience. I didn't know the rules. Now I am getting to know the rule and it has changed my whole life.

"To have in the event of my death, all of my property and inheritances that I pass on, protected by this claim, and that; my will is my final word. These inheritances may be bequeathed to anyone I choose without being subject to taxes or fees."

Consider the fact that we are dealing with **benefit privilege of discharging a debt into the next fiscal year** what you do now is you are trying to discharge your debt in your estate when you die over into another living trust. **It is a taxable event**, don't complain about it unless you create the structure in your living trust in order to set off all your accounts, there cannot be tax on that when it is bequeathed into the next living estate of your progeny.

My estate is going to be worth nothing when I go. **The estate is gone.** The energy state of my physical body transpires. I don't own any property, I just control property. The books are balanced, the balance state ends up at zero the moment I expire, because all my accounts have been contracted.

I am doing this to bring across a fundamental aspect for humanity to recognise. This is to bring across this quantum leap into the next consciousness level. This we are facing now.

On a standing level **it is taking the position of higher moral ground.** It is untouchable. When you internalise it yourself you can look yourself in the mirror. You don't need to lie to yourself.

It is about your understanding of the system that we deal with which is maritime admiralty jurisdiction, commerce, your intent, how you intend to deal with it and interact with it and finally a claim of right that is put out responsibly and that basically waives the benefit privilege, and puts you in a position where you can express very clearly where you operate from and that is: **from the private venue interjecting into limitedly into the public venue.**