

Definitions list >>

Definitions, "in this state" "in the state"

The rules and codes of the The fifty STATE OF
----- CORPORATE overlay State de facto
statutes apply ONLY to "in this state" "in the state" - and
that does not mean what you think it means... UNLEARN...
re-educate! Everything you have been told by government,
Crown plantation teachers; enter-training, edu-
tainment is a lie! I do mean everything!

8 ▼

First some un-learning:

"If you find from your own experience that something is a fact and it contradicts what some authority has written down, then you must abandon the authority and base your reasoning on your own findings." ~ Leonardo da Vinci

Government Tricks:

This is one of the most important things that you may unlearn.

First Trick:

The first 'trick' of the Government is the re-definition of certain critical words in each Statute (Act). They (the Government) want you to presume the ordinary meaning of the word so as to trick you into reading and interpreting the Statute in their favor. Here is a summary of some of the Trick Words.

Two key words that are re-defined in almost every Statute are the words "person" and "individual". There are only two "persons" in law, a human being, and everything else:

A **natural-person** is a legal entity for the human-being.

An **artificial-person** is a legal entity that is not a human being.

Comment from DetaxCanada: Both types of "person" are legal fictions. A natural person is a human in the false or fictional status of slave crewmember on a make-believe ship called a "body politic".

An "artificial person" is a make-believe ship called a body corporate or politic.

The definition found in dictionaries states that a natural person is a human being. In legal terms, a human being refers to a human body without considering the mind – it being the captain of the vessel called the human body. A vessel at sea (equivalent to an 'adult human') is impervious to outside command, as the captain is the supreme commander.

A human who is of "natural person status", is as a captain of a vessel in 'dry dock' – he and his vessel being subservient to the vessel owner, the Crown..

The natural status of an (adult) human is "free will", and thus sovereign over his own human body.

Outside control is equivalent to some form of "piracy" – call it what you may.

Here are the exact definitions from Barron's Canadian Law Dictionary, fourth edition (ISBN 0-7641-0616-3):

- **natural person.** A natural person is a human being that has the capacity for rights and duties.
- **artificial person.** A legal entity, not a human being, recognized as a person in law to whom certain legal rights and duties may attached – e.g. a body corporate.

You will observe that the natural-person has the "capacity" (i.e. ability) for rights and duties, but not necessarily the obligation. The artificial-person has rights and duties that may be attached (i.e. assigned) by laws.

Comment from DetaxCanada:

"Capacity for" is not the same as "Having" rights and duties. The only 'duties' a free-will human has are those found in the negative and positive form of the Golden Rule – Do (or, do not) unto others as you would have (not have) others do unto you. Thus, for the free-will human, rights and duties come from the Creator Father, not from government. The "created" cannot dictate to the "creator" – and as the Declaration of Independence says: "That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, ..."

Alternative expressions for a "natural-person" are "real-person", "human-person", or "human-being". Since governments have recently become paranoid about the use of the term "natural-person" perhaps it is better to use the terms "human-person" or "human-being" instead. Other terms like "private-person" could be misleading because a "private legal entity" (such as a private corporation versus a public corporation) may be called a private-person, which should not be mistaken with a natural-person, human-person, or human-being. The trick is to get you to believe that "private" means "human", which is not necessarily true.

Second Trick:

The second 'trick' of the Government is to use the Interpretation Act to define words that apply to all Statutes, unless re-defined within a particular Statute. Without this knowledge, you could presume the ordinary meaning for the words you are reading, not realizing that they may have been defined by the Interpretation Act. Unless these words have been re-defined in another Statute, the underlying definitions for the two most important words still apply, either from the Interpretation Act, or the Canadian Law Dictionary. Basically, they are defined as follows:

from the *Canadian Law Dictionary* we find that:

individual means a natural person, from the *Income Tax Act* we find the re-definition:

individual means an artificial person.

From the *Canadian Law Dictionary* we find that:

person means an individual (natural person) or incorporated group (artificial person),

from the *Interpretation Act* we find the re-definition:

person means a corporation (an artificial- person),

from the *Income Tax Act* we find the re-definition again:

person means an artificial person (amongst other things).

In the Canadian Human Rights Act (<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/H-6/FullText.html>) you will see how **individual** and **person** are used and how they apply to natural and artificial persons.

Comment from DetaxCanada: The definition of "individual" in the Income Tax Act says:

" "individual" means a person other than a corporation; "

The only other "person" besides the corporate person (artificial person) is the "natural person".

Third Trick: [A better example for includes can be found below]

The third 'trick' of the Government is to use both the word "means" and the word "includes" in the definition (interpretation) section of the act. They do this in some critical definitions that they want you to misinterpret. It is important to understand the difference between "means" and "includes" when used in definitions. Previously we believed that "means" and "includes" were interchangeable, however after much study of many statutes, we now have a revised belief, as contained herein.

Here is the interpretation of "means" within statutes:

Basic Form: subject means objects;

Effect:

1. means implies a **substitution** of words.
2. means creates a new definition for the subject.
3. the subject does not need to be pre-defined.
4. the objects need to be pre-defined.
5. any pre-existing definition of the subject is replaced by the objects.

Example from the *Bank Act*:

"**person**" means a natural person, an entity or a personal representative;

Interpretation of the above Example from the *Bank Act*:

Any pre-existing definition for "**person**" is substituted with the given objects, so when **person** is stated in the *Bank Act*, any or all of the objects are used in place of the word **person**.

Here is the interpretation of "includes" within statutes:

Basic Form: subject includes players;

Effect:

1. includes implies a one-way **attachment** of the players to the subject.
2. includes does not create a new definition for the subject.
3. the subject needs to be pre-defined.
4. the players need to be pre-defined.
5. any pre-existing definition of subject is still effective.
6. any player can play the role of, or act as a replacement for, the subject.
7. a subject may not play the role of, or act as a replacement for, any player.
8. includes implies **attachment** for role-playing – the players may play the subject's role in the *Act* but not *vice versa*.

Example from the *Income Tax Act*:

"**employee**" includes officer;

"**corporation**" includes an incorporated company;

"**insurance policy**" includes a life insurance policy;

"**taxpayer**" includes any person whether or not liable to pay tax;

"**person**", or any word or expression descriptive of a **person**, includes any **corporation**, and any entity exempt, because of subsection 149(1), from tax under Part I on all or part of the entity's taxable income and the heirs, executors, liquidators of a succession, administrators or other legal representatives of such a person, according to the law of that part of Canada to which the context extends;

Interpretation of the above Examples from the *Income Tax Act*:

An officer may play the role of an **employee**, but not *vice versa*. For example, any **employee** (pre-defined – may be a waitress) may not play the role of a Judicial Officer (an officer). Within the *Income Tax Act*, both **employee** and officer are pre-defined by the use of the verb means.

An incorporated company may act as a **corporation** but not *vice versa*. For example, any **corporation** (pre-defined – may be unincorporated) may not act as an incorporated company.

A life insurance policy may play the role of an **insurance policy** but not *vice versa*. For example, any **insurance policy** (pre-defined – may be house insurance policy) may not play the role of a life insurance policy.

A **person** (including a natural person) may act in the capacity of a **taxpayer** but not *vice versa*. For example, any **taxpayer** (pre-defined – may be a corporation) may not act in the capacity of any **person** (especially a natural person).

A **corporation** (including an incorporated company) may act as a **person**, but not *vice versa*. For example, any **person** (e.g. an individual, or a natural person) may not act as a **corporation**.

Here is the interpretation of "means and includes" within statutes:

Basic Form: subject means objects, and includes players;

Effect:

1. means creates a new definition for the subject from the objects.
2. the subject does not need to be pre-defined.
3. the objects need to be pre-defined.
4. the players need to be pre-defined.
5. any pre-existing definition of the subject is replaced by the objects.
6. and includes implies a one-way **attachment** of the players to the new subject.
7. any player can play the role of, or act as a replacement for, the new subject.
8. a new subject may not play the role of, or act as a replacement for, any player.
9. means and includes implies a new subject definition with an **attachment** for role-playing – the players may play the new subject's role in the *Act* but not *vice versa*.

Example from the *Interpretation Act*:

"**province**" means a province of Canada, and includes the Yukon Territory, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut;

Interpretation of the above Example from the *Interpretation Act*:

Any pre-existing definition for "**province**" is substituted with "a province of Canada", and any of the players (Yukon Territory, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut) may play the role of a **province**, but not *vice versa*. For example, any **province** may not play the role of Nunavut.

The use of the word **includes** is key to understanding your potential loss of natural-person. This is the major trick used by the Government in an attempt to take away your natural-person rights. Unless you know this, you will voluntarily forfeit your rights. Now that includes is no longer believed to be restrictive, you have to look elsewhere in the statutes to find out where your rights, as a natural person, are preserved. Your rights will be upheld somewhere, you just have to find out where.

Fourth Trick:

The fourth 'trick' is directly attributable to a defect in the English language in respect of the verb '**to be**'. In the English language there are many different meanings of the verb '**to be**' and the reader/listener may misinterpret the intended (or 'trick') meaning and thereby draw the wrong conclusion from its use.

The two different and distinct meanings of the verb '**to be**' which concern us are: the one meaning which relates to the essence of the subject (such as the table is made of wood; he is strong) and the other meaning which relates to a temporary location or position (such as the table is over there; he is a swimmer).

To be succinct, the two relevant meanings of interest, in this 'trick', may be summarized by the following simple definition:

to be, means 'to have the essence of, to exist or live' (in the sense of essence), or 'to occupy a place or position' (in the sense of location or position).

By the way, the noun 'essence' requires the helper verb 'to have'. Be careful with 'exist' because an artificial person can 'exist' on a piece of paper somewhere in a file, but an artificial person cannot exist as 'living'.

Now to utilize the Fourth Trick associated with '**to be**', a judge may make a ruling as follows:

"a natural person is a taxpayer", or "a natural person is a driver"

which immediately translates into the valid conclusion, with regard to occupying a position (because someone has to do the paperwork), that:

"a natural person occupies the position of a taxpayer"

However, a judge cannot make a ruling that:

'a natural person has the essence of a taxpayer'

'a natural person lives as a taxpayer'

because human rights are immediately violated and slavery would be condoned by the judge.

The conclusion, in respect of the Fourth Trick, is to be careful when reading the word "is" and check for 'essence' or 'location'. What you think you read may not be in fact what you really read.

You can very quickly get clarification by asking: "When you say is, do you mean occupies a position, or do you mean has the essence of (lives as)?" With this question you will immediately expose any 'trick' which is being utilized.

Spanish is one of the few languages which has maintained a distinction by having two separate verbs; the verb '**ser**', derived from the Latin 'esse' (English 'essence'), is used 'to have essence'; and the verb '**estar**', derived from the Latin 'stare' (English 'state'), is used for a 'temporary location or position'.

Fifth Trick:

The fifth 'trick' is the use of the word '**you**' to create joinder between the one who speaks, and the artificial-person. See the PDF document [Who Is You? \(http://www.natural-person.ca/pdf/Who_Is_You.pdf\)](http://www.natural-person.ca/pdf/Who_Is_You.pdf) for additional insight.

Sixth Trick:

The sixth 'trick' is the use of the Birth Certificate to create a bunch of legal entities with NAMES derived from the Birth Certificate, and to get you to agree that you are the same as the NAME on the Birth Certificate. For a starter, [here is a document which discusses this topic \(http://www.natural-person.ca/pdf/A_Little_TRUTH_shall_set_free.pdf\)](http://www.natural-person.ca/pdf/A_Little_TRUTH_shall_set_free.pdf).

Seventh Trick:

The seventh 'trick' is to have you affix your "signature" to documents, thereby creating joinder with Artificial Person represented by the "signature" in some official capacity. Human beings use an "[autograph \(http://www.natural-person.ca/pdf/autographs.pdf\)](http://www.natural-person.ca/pdf/autographs.pdf)" not a "signature".

Lets look specifically at the Term "Includes"

-
Expressio Unius Est Exclusio Alterius Definition (Negative exclusion canon):

Latin: the expression of one thing is the exclusion of the other.

expressio unius est exclusio alterius

-
- **Legal Definition of expressio unius est exclusio alterius**

Origin and Etymology of expressio unius est exclusio alterius

New Latin, the explicit mention of one (thing) is the exclusion of another

Sometimes referred to in short form as *expressio unius*.

In *Rodaro*, Justice, at ¶856, defined the Latin maxim *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* as follows:

"... a maxim of interpretation meaning that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of the other. When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred. In this case, the reference to the assignment to a financial institution excludes assignment to any other entity."

In **Dorval**

(<http://www.canlii.org/en/sk/skca/doc/2006/2006skca21/2006skca21.html>), Justice Cameron expressed it as:

"... to express one thing is to exclude another."

In **Transpacific**

(<http://www.canlii.org/en/bc/bcsc/doc/1985/1985canlii107/1985canlii107.html>),

Justice Lysyk described it as follows:

"The principle ... *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*: the express mention of one or more things of a particular class may be regarded as impliedly excluding others."

Although the doctrine is useful in determining the extents of **contracts**

(<http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/C/Contract.aspx>), it

is also an important principle in the **construction**

(<http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/C/Construction.aspx>)

of **statutes**

(<http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/S/Statutes.aspx>). In

her book on the topic, jurist Ruth Sullivan wrote:

"One of the so-called maxims of statutory interpretation is *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*: to express one thing is to exclude another.

"The maxim reflects a form of reasoning that is widespread and important in interpretation the a contrario argument ... negative implication ..implied exclusion ...

"An implied exclusion argument lies whenever there is reason to believe that if the legislature had meant to include a particular thing within the ambit of its legislation, it would have referred to that thing expressly. Because of this expectation, the legislature's failure to mention the thing becomes grounds for inferring that it was deliberately excluded. Although there is no express exclusion, exclusion is implied."

"Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law," (Preamble – Universal Declaration of Human Rights (<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>))

'In this State' – 'In the State' – is found in all de facto STATE codes examples for which follow:

Definitions by corporate Federal "State" for "in the state", "in this state", "in the state", "within this state" and "this state"

NOTE State today means a sub-corporation of the UNITED STATES Federal Corporation (Title 28 Section 3002). STATE are operating as

CALIFORNIA (CCA) located in:

"In this state",

Aircraft assessment and taxation, Revenue and
Taxation Code §5304

Beverage containers, Health and Safety Code §113200

Cigarette tax, Revenue and Taxation Code §30013

Corporate Securities Law of 1968, Corporations Code
§25008

Diesel fuel tax, Revenue and Taxation Code §60017

Emergency Telephone Users Surcharge Law, Revenue
and Taxation Code §41005

Energy resources surcharge, Revenue and Taxation
Code §40006

Fractional interests, local agency obligations,
Government Code §5950(b)

Hazardous Substances Tax Law, Revenue and Taxation
Code §43009

Integrated waste management fees, Revenue and
Taxation Code §45008

Motor vehicle fuel license tax, Revenue and Taxation
Code §7309

Private railroad car tax, Revenue and Taxation Code
§11205

Residential mortgage lenders, Finance Code §50003

Sales and use tax, Revenue and Taxation Code §6017

Taxation, Revenue and Taxation Code §130(f)

Use fuel tax, Revenue and Taxation Code §8609

Revenue and Taxation §130(f) "In this state" means within the exterior limits of the State of California, and includes all territory within these limits owned by, or ceded to, the United States of America.

Revenue and Taxation §6017. "In this State" or "in the State" means within the exterior limits of the State of California and includes all territory within these limits owned by or ceded to the United States of America.

MARYLAND (Md. Ann. Code) (2012) located in:

Article 2B, Alcoholic Beverages, Title 1. General Provisions.
Subtitle 1. Generally.

- 1-102. Definitions [Md. Ann. Code art. 2B, § 1-102 (2012)]
- 1-102(a)(14) "In this State" or "within this State" means in or within the territorial limits of this State.

- 11-102. Definitions [Md. COMMERCIAL LAW Code Ann. § 11-102 (2012)]
- 11-102 (k) State of Maryland. -- "State of Maryland" means the State and its political subdivisions and each of the instrumentalities of the State and the political subdivision.

MICHIGAN (MCL) located in:

BEVERAGE CONTAINERS (EXCERPT) Initiated Law of 1976 (Popular Name: Bottle Bill)

445.571 Definitions. [M.S.A. 18.1206(11)]

Sec. 1(k) "Within this state" means within the exterior limits of the state of Michigan, and includes the territory within these limits owned by or ceded to the United States of America.

Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) located in:

CHAPTER 372 - SALES AND USE TAXES

NRS 372.030 "In this State" and "in the State" defined. "In this State" or "in the State" means within the exterior limits of the State of Nevada and includes all territory within these limits owned by or ceded to the United States of America.

OREGON (ORS) located in:

This state, PROCEDURE IN CRIMINAL MATTERS GENERALLY - Jurisdiction

131.205 Definition for ORS 131.205 to 131.235. As used in ORS 131.205 to 131.235, "this state" means the land and the air and water space above the land and water with respect to which

the State of Oregon has legislative jurisdiction. [1973 c.836 s.13]

Chapter 323 – Cigarette Tax Act and Chapter 459A – BEVERAGE CONTAINERS

323.010(8) "In this state" means within the exterior limits of the State of Oregon and includes all territory within these limits owned by or ceded to the United States of America.

459A.700(7) "In this state" means within the exterior limits of the State of Oregon and includes all territory within these limits owned by or ceded to the United States of America.

TEXAS located in:

Texas TAX CODE: TITLE 2; SUBTITLE E; CHAPTER 151; SUBCHAPTER A. GENERAL PROVISIONS;

Sec. 151.004. "IN THIS STATE". "In this state" means within the exterior limits of Texas and includes all territory within these limits ceded to or owned by the United States.

Acts 1981, 67th Leg., p. 1545, ch. 389, Sec. 1, eff. Jan. 1, 1982.

WASHINGTON (RCW) located in:

RCW 82.04.200 "In this state," "within this state."

"In this state" or "within this state" includes all federal areas lying within the exterior boundaries of the state.

[1961 c 15 § 82.04.200 . Prior: 1955 c 389 § 21; prior: 1949 c 228 § 2, part; 1945 c 249 § 1, part; 1943 c 156 § 2, part; 1941 c 178 § 2, part; 1939 c 225 § 2, part; 1937 c 227 § 2, part; 1935 c 180 § 5, part; Rem. Supp. 1949 § 8370-5, part.]

Clarification on the word 'include' is necessary to realize the true jurisdiction. When includes is used it EXCLUDES things not listed that are of a different definition. It "includes" "territories" within the state boundaries and therefore Excludes all else. If it included the entire state, it would have said so in plane English!

EXAMPLE: Revenue and Taxation §130(f) "In this State" means within the exterior limits of the State of California, and includes all territory within these limits owned by, or ceded to, the United States of America.

-

Definitions by corporate Federal "State" for "in the state", "in this state", "in the state", "within this state" and "this state" therefore mean:

"In this State" means within the exterior limits of the State of California, and EXCLUDES everything other than what is owned by, or ceded to, the United States of America.

In plain words "In this State" means exterior the District of Columbia (68.3 Sq Miles) and includes all territory owned by, or ceded to, the United States of America.

-

In my opinion, US Inc. has no lawful claim over anything on the land outside of DC! The Corporate US Inc. created in 1871 was created to rule over the 68.3 Sq Miles of DC ONLY and can not reach back in time to claim the land held by the sovereign states.

1953 - Kitchens v. Steele, 112 F.Supp 383 "A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government..." (10)

1967 - Also Congressional Record , June 13, 1967, pp. 15641-15646): A "citizen of the United States" is a civilly dead entity operating as a co-trustee and co-beneficiary of the PCT, the private constructive, cestui que trust of US Inc. under the 14th Amendment, which upholds the debt of the USA and US Inc. in Section 4.

-
If you are not in DC or subject to a Federal Zone then you are not "in this state" - "in the state".

The fifty Free and Independent Nation states (independent Countries) are not "in this state" "in the state"!

All De facto STATE Actors including law enforcement want you to agree that you are in this state... i.e. in their FOREIGN jurisdiction!

You are the only one that can put yourself in their FOREIGN jurisdiction by your agreement!

Remember – everything you have been told is a lie to manipulate and use your labor for benefit of foreign parasite entities all organized under the Corp of London (CROWN) – Vatican system!

Clarification on the word 'include' is necessary to realize the true jurisdiction. When includes is used it excludes things not listed that are of a different definition. It "includes" "territories" within the state boundaries. If it included the entire state, why would they even need the distinction?

EXAMPLE: Revenue and Taxation §130(f) "In this state" means within the exterior limits of the State of California, and includes all territory within these limits owned by, or ceded to, the United States of America.

10. Negative-Implication Canon

The expression of one thing implies the exclusion of others (*expressio unius est exclusio alterius*).

Expressio unius, also known as *inclusio unius*, is a Latin name for the communicative device known as negative implication. In English, it is known as the negative-implication canon. We encounter the device—and recognize it—frequently in our daily lives. When a car dealer promises a low financing rate to “purchasers with good credit,” it is entirely clear that the rate is *not* available to purchasers with spotty credit.

Virtually all the authorities who discuss the negative-implication canon emphasize that it must be applied with great caution, since its application depends so much on context.¹ Indeed, one commentator suggests that it is not a proper canon at all but merely a description of the result gleaned from context.² That goes too far. Context establishes the conditions for applying the canon, but where those conditions exist, the principle that specification of the one implies exclusion of the other validly describes how people express themselves and understand verbal expression.

The doctrine properly applies only when the *unius* (or technically, *unum*, the thing specified) can reasonably be thought to be an expression of *all* that shares in the grant or prohibition involved. Common sense often suggests when this is or is not so. The sign outside a restaurant “No dogs allowed” cannot be thought to mean that no other creatures are excluded—as if pet monkeys, potbellied pigs, and baby elephants might be quite welcome. Dogs are specifically addressed because they are the animals that customers are most likely to bring in; nothing is implied about other animals. On the other hand, the sign outside a veterinary clinic saying “Open for treatment of dogs, cats, horses, and all other farm and domestic animals” does suggest (by its detail) that the circus lion



READ
READ
READ
READ

REPORT ON
THE
NATIONAL LAWYERS GUILD
Legal Bulwark of the Communist Party



SEPTEMBER 17, 1950
(Original release date)

September 21, 1950.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Prepared and Released by the
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U. S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Prev

[\[/joomla30/index.php/unlearn/definitions/137-
capitis-diminutio-meet-your-strawman\]](http://joomla30/index.php/unlearn/definitions/137-capitis-diminutio-meet-your-strawman)

Next

[\[/joomla30/index.php/unlearn/definitions/103-
definition-lex-fori\]](http://joomla30/index.php/unlearn/definitions/103-definition-lex-fori)



_1776RELOADED.ORG

[\[http://www.1776Reloaded.org\]](http://www.1776Reloaded.org)

GANTRY ([HTTP://WWW.GANTRY.ORG/](http://www.gantry.org/))
**FEATURES ([HTTP://DOCS.GANTRY.ORG/GANTRY5/BASICS/KEY-
FEATURES](http://docs.gantry.org/gantry5/basics/key-features))**
PARTICLES ([HTTP://DOCS.GANTRY.ORG/GANTRY5/PARTICLES](http://docs.gantry.org/gantry5/particles))

POWERED BY **GANTRY FRAMEWORK ([HTTP://WWW.GANTRY.ORG/](http://www.gantry.org/))**

COPYRIGHT © 2017 - 2021 **1776RELOADED.ORG ([/Joomla30/](http://Joomla30/))**

