

## " Sovereign Citizen "

Oxymorons, legalese, and the illusion of government authority  
By Mika of the Rasila Family

Everything called "legal" is unlawful when the enforcement of it causes loss or harm.

Contained within this book is a radical view of life, something that will come as a shock to many.

This book will explain what it is to live without the rule of government.

This book will explain what governments truly are and why it is so difficult once you have a greater comprehension of it to accept the things that are expected from it.

Written in this collection of thoroughly researched and proven concepts are remedies to living within a government social construct without participating in it if someone is entirely willing.

Whether you choose to try any of these ideas and concepts rests solely on your desire to become free of government but as every good thing in life, it does have risks attached.

You must come to this with a complete intolerance and moral objection to government but in order to comprehend this statement you will first have to know why someone would have this world view.

I will explain why in this book how you have been cheated, I will explain how your life and freedom have been stolen from you through the use of social contracts and I will also explain how it was possible for them , the government and it's various elements including but not limited to , it's medical branch, it's agricultural branch, It's Judicial branch, It's educational branch and it's media have been used to create the legally compliant persons that most people live their lives as.

To open this book is to come into a world that is not only foreign to the average reader but to create considerations and open pathways to a different life that only few have ever dared to travel.

My choices have been very clearly made through lucid discovery and the abandonment of all social fallacies taught to the masses throughout the ages.

I am purely and truly sovereign. I have no legal identity.

The writings within this work are all of my findings, considerations, research, and finally my actions based on them.

If you are content with paying taxes, fees, fines and exorbitantly exaggerated and inflated costs of everything and you love and trust your government to do what is good and just and right for it's citizens then you may as well put this book down and go join your friends as they watch the news on TV.

or.....

Welcome to a new understanding of your life, and the very carefully constructed deviant social structure you live in.

I have lived without government ID or any of it's permissive tyrannical controls, rules and legal statute for almost 20 years.

When I sign a contract I qualify that contract with a very important lawful statement and you will want to learn why, and you will learn the purpose of it within this book, "In propria persona sui juris without prejudice" is how I qualify a signature as a sovereign individual who is competent to act as an adult under the common law and how you waive the benefits of anyone who would otherwise defraud you of your inherent freedoms through contract,

So let me explain...

In the beginning there were lies, big lies and many of them. It all became impossible for me to continue as a citizen of any government.

It was the morning of September 11th 2001 that determined the course of the rest of my adult life, which is explained here in this book. Since that day I had now become so thoroughly disgusted by the entire system, the media and it's government, police and courts, that I had only one choice left and that choice was to quit participating in any of it forever....and I have and roughly 17 years later I am writing this book in order to explain some things and perhaps enlighten others who would also like to find their way to a life of individual sovereignty. Sovereignty basically means "without rulers".

That morning of 911 I made a call to the law firm that my wife worked in at the time to tell her to get home, She worked in Detroit and we lived in Windsor Ontario Canada. She seemed a bit concerned why I would be calling her at work since I had never done so before. " What's happened Mika ? Is everything okay ? " I replied frantically " you need to get home before they shut down the border , there is something happening in New York and it looks

like someone is starting a war with the states " She had no idea what I was talking about so I urged her to turn on the radio or a TV. Later that afternoon the border between the US and Canada was put on red alert and no traffic was being allowed in or out. My wife had made it home in time but little did I realize that, that day would change my life and the world in ways that could have been unimaginable at the time.

Years later after much thought and reflection I would realize that a monumentally insulting lie had been perpetrated against the people of the world. This was the last time I would participate in anything that the government had to offer in any way. I could not imagine that even the government that lied to create the war in vietnam using the false flag gulf of tonkin incident and or the lies of pearl harbor as justification to drop nuclear bombs on hiroshima and nagasaki, would create such a bold and insulting lie as what they told the world that had happened on september 11th 2001. Joseph gobbels would have been proud. "Make the lie big and repeat it often" he would say "...and the people will believe it."

So I decided from that day that I would stand against all things government under a moral objection to it. I would no longer voluntarily fund it, contract with it or comply to it's illegitimate legal jurisdiction.

If they felt that they could insult me in that way I would show them that with a bit of legal knowledge and a firm stance against all things corrupt that, I would and, I could then live my life as it was intended. Deliberately without fear and free of any government permissions, restrictions, or it's fraudulent legal contracts.

## CLOSING THE PERSONAL ACCOUNT

The first thing that must be known before anything is allowed to be thrust upon us as a legal, or what is considered a social contract, is that when you are born you are issued a birth certificate which is a bond, set upon the earnings of your lifetime. It and you as a person become a commodity to be used and traded as an account created as a registered person under legal obligation to perform.

They will not tell you about this bond nor will they admit that it exists but the number on the back of your birth certificate is a CUSIP number used by the banking industry as a salvaged stock receipt from which they can then monetized and traded on the stock exchange. This number can be looked up on the online database, If you look at the card your birth certificate was printed on you will notice around the edge it is written on bank bond paper, the birth certificate is a contract, a registration and in this book you will learn how all things registered with the government give legal title of that thing registered to the issuer, meaning you as a person.

You have a strawman account bearing your title as a name written in all capitol letters on your identification contracts, and that is your legal personality.

When I was a kid I wanted to change the world and I protested the government, The government beat me up for it. So now I was not only oppressed but, oppressed and beat up by it to once again comply to it.

As an adult I decided that I couldn't change the government, It was far to well protected and designed, but that I could change myself so I quit allowing it to tell me what to do but didn't tell them what I was gonna do and sent back all their papers and said Mika Rasila will no longer be needing these documents as he is now deceased. It was addressed from the agent, meaning me, for the now deceased legal person. This was done in court for the court of record while attending court on a summons for no insurance, no license.

It was the last time I attended one of their courts. They finally asked me who I was and I told them I was the agent for the now

deceased person known as MIKA RASILA and told them the account is no longer necessary and they accepted. they told me I was free to leave that day and I never walked onto their ship of admiralty jurisdiction again.

It was quite "liberating"

I see people complaining about government oppression and they don't know what to do so I tell them and they say that it is too hard to live without government.

I feel badly for those people however I also feel badly for myself since I am one of very few who know the quick answer to government tyranny.

You can be an activist within their system of lies and fake laws and keep getting assaulted by it or you can be an activist to the core and live it everyday by just living and working within it lawfully. It is amazing how nice they seem to be when they realize you really do not need their services, but most people are made to be afraid of them. They call it having "respect for authority". I have no respect for costumed men and women who claim to be better than I am without ever proving any of it apart from having guns and tazers and a mean disposition towards anyone who simply challenges that perceived authority.

People think that just because a police officer tells you to produce papers, perform an action, or to answer questions you must immediately comply or suffer the consequences but if you live on Canada, as I currently do, the Canada Evidence Act clearly states in section 50 and 50.2 That you can refuse to comply and do it legally. All legal statute contains the remedy within it if you take a moment to find it.

Canada Evidence Act section 50

Right of refusal to answer or produce document

50 (1) Any person examined under any order made under this Part has the like right to refuse to answer questions tending to criminate himself, or other questions, as a party or witness, as the case may

be, would have in any cause pending in the court by which, or by a judge whereof, the order is made.

Nature of right

50 (2) No person shall be compelled to produce, under any order referred to in subsection (1), any writing or other document that he could not be compelled to produce at a trial of such a cause.

The purpose of this book is to detail and illustrate how I live as a sovereign, how I can avoid most taxes, how I can travel in my car without permissive government contracts such as licenses and permits, insurance and valid plates

I have studied contract law and sociology ( Deviant Group Dynamics ) since high-school and the simplest rule of contract is that there has to be a balance within any contract made between parties, It has to be a fair exchange.

If the liabilities of any contract are equal to the benefits provided by it then it is fair to accept, but as so often happen in government banking or the courts these contracts are altered or amended without the knowledge or lawful consideration of both parties, and always to favor themselves.

The government always profits and the people suffer for it. This becomes a form of soft tyranny that should always be contested. You will notice I did not say "protested" as that is another thing altogether that the government uses in their favor.

Within this book I will be referring to many words, particularly words that the government has altered to deceive the public with use of prefix's that negate words or alter their meaning, or completely bastardized "legalese" that is used constantly within the world of legal statute. The most common words they use to deceive you are : Person, Vehicle, driver, employ, and the word legal itself.

Up until the time that I was still accepting of the balance of the governments contracts and I had faithfully renewed my drivers

license, permit stickers and various other things that were required of a good law abiding citizen of Canada.

I had not up until that time however contracted with any of the social insurance or other insurances that the government offered simply from not wanting the government to profit from my work.

Most of my life I have refused to be employed but to rather work for a living. There is a substantial difference to those two things. I had previously stopped paying income tax on my work or buying automobile insurance for many years. I had also stopped cashing what they call GST cheques here on Canada as that is just a bribe to monitor people and to ensure that you are satisfied with the current taxation programs in place. Every time someone cashes that measly pittance of a government check they accept that you have agreed to their tactics. Everything they do is to covertly gain your consent and compliance with benefits, small tokens, and bribes.

From several other sources of interest in law I had learned that not only was paying an income tax voluntary but it was a war measure that was used to fund the second world war and was supposed to be discontinued after the war but they then made it a permanent thing. No law can be made mandatory since any mandatory encumbrance in law comes without consent and no law can be enforced without the consent of the governed. They gain your consent when you contract with them. If you have a social insurance number or in the United states a social security number they now have your consent to tax you in many ways that would otherwise require written or oral.



Are you Traveling or are you driving?

A Traveler simply uses a car to go from one place to another whereas a driver is using a registered car which can now be classified as a vehicle used in commerce since registration gives legal title of a thing to the issuer of the registration thus making you a commercial operator of government property. If in fact you are merely traveling yet admit to the police that you are driving, which does require a license, or your car is a vehicle you have just been fraudulently coerced into admitting a crime. A license is a licentious instrument.

Definition of licentious  
li·cen·tious

1.  
promiscuous and unprincipled in sexual matters.  
"the ruler's tyrannical and licentious behavior"
2.  
disregarding accepted rules or conventions, especially in grammar or literary style.

When I first started using a car at the age of sixteen automobile insurance was not yet compulsory and many people simply did not want it and were not required to have it. I chose not to get any then and, I still choose not to have any now, even though they have made it " compulsory" .

Nothing can also be made compulsory. When they made automobile insurance compulsory on Canada they also made it "no-fault" and that was intentional.

At various points in my life for business reasons I had felt the need to have insurance on various cars and trucks but at that time the

rates were so low that it was worth having in the event of an accident. Today you have pay a huge premium with little or no assurance of anything to have a policy.

Once again the benefits do not balance the liabilities of the contract so in good standing with any contract you have the freedom to choose not to contract.

One of my first cases brought into their admiralty jurisdiction court was for no insurance and I proved my case that day to the court that anything made compulsory is in effect an un-bondable statute in their legal world and can not be enforced by a sitting judge since it is gambling and or racketeering and a judge who enforces it while under judicial oath can be disbarred for it. I learned this from reading the uniform bonding code on compulsory insurance schemes

## 2.4 – BONDING INSURANCE STATUTES

### Compulsory Insurance

The bonding of statutes which require natural persons (non-incorporated persons) to purchase insurance, must be very carefully analyzed, and be regarded with the utmost caution. As a general rule, it is against the law for any entity to compel any citizen to pay any wager or premium for the privilege of not being injured or for the privilege of not being threatened with injury (Protection Insurance Racketeering).

Since that day I have never been accused of noncompliance to insurance or summoned to court for it.

Furthermore if you look into the word structure of basic english, and I will do this alot through this book, you will find that the prefix "IN" always negates the word in the common english language.

The reason that you want to always look at the words being used is simple. If you live by a set of established rules such as a common

language then everyone and everything has to be bound by the same language or it gives whoever would pervert that language to meet their own ends an unfair advantage over those of us who have not been informed of the new definitions. Legal language or legalese or " lawyer speak " is a deceptive attempt by a legal system to deviously alter the definitions of many words to sway justice or as I like to call it " the Just us System of law " in their favor.

By effectively creating a language all their own that sounds like english yet has multiple definitions to allow them to speak to each other in the open deceptively while the people in their court rooms stand oblivious to their true intent.

## WORDS AND SPELLS

The first word I would like to have you consider is the word "IN"

Once again thinking about words and today's word is "in". Such a simple word, seemingly "in" significant correct but the definition is quite significant? Is it incorrect or is it correct? You'll notice the prefix "in" negates the word.

Are you sane or insane.  
Is it sufficient or insufficient ?  
Is it credible or incredible ?  
Is it consistent or inconsistent ?  
Are you solvent or insolvent ?

I think you get the idea right ?  
When they pre-fix something in a devious way you have to wonder if they are pre-fixing your perception ?  
So now that IN as a prefix negates a word, did you buy an assurance policy of something or did you buy insurance meaning you have no assurance of anything.

So again you'll notice they made it compulsory which by any act of compulsion they must then allow a safeguard for it thus making it no fault on Canada. Why make it a no fault insurance policy ?  
Because under the rules laid out in the bonding code they have to. Nothing can be made compulsory or mandatory without your consent. An act or statute made compulsory is un-bondable and unenforceable in a court of law that stands under its judicial oath. The judge who enforces a racketeering scheme can be disbarred if it is brought to the record by the accused.

Do you tolerate these word games or are you intolerant of them ? I am very intolerant and point them out every chance that I can.

Now ask yourself do you live "on" Canada or "on" the United states of America or do you live in Canada or In the United states of america?

Where and when did you learn to use this improper grammar to define your status ?

The same holds true with the prefix "ab" such as, normal or abnormal, which falls sadly in line with one of the greatest deceptions against native peoples calling them aboriginal meaning not original

## THE INDOCTRINATION OF A NATION

"Who do you think you are ? Meaning what have you been told ?

What if your entire individual character had been erased by a twelve step indoctrination system as reinforcement and indoctrination for an event that originated at " birth " when your parents signed your birth certificate ? I can explain in very simple terms that it has, when, how, and why.

One of the most important questions that someone should ask themselves is just that, "who do you think you are?" What have you been told all your life? Are you a citizen of something? Are you an obedient and compliant ward of the state? Do you accept things as they are without contest simply because all of your life you have been told to do so?

I was never a believer in things. I questioned everything including my school studies which always just seemed wrong to me. I wound up missing a lot of school and getting into a lot of trouble as a child.

I spent many years in group homes and juvenile detention centers and it always centered around my unwillingness to assimilate into the collective insanity that I saw in basically everything that regular people seemed to accept as normal. I did not fit and still do not fit into their social norm but at least now I can reasonably explain why it never was the way any of us should be living.

Would it be frightening to realize that you were sold into a slavery of your body and mind when you were born only to be programmed to accept that slavery all through your formative years ?

Well in short, you were, let me explain in more detail the deception of the "person".

It's not as complicated or controversial as it seems that a government who's business is to control people and keep a log of all of it's citizenry would require it's members to inform on any new arrivals would it ?

Parents of new born children are always required to registered their offspring at birth. Keeping in mind that all things registered give legal title to the issuer of the registration, you may have wanted to reconsider contracting until you were given full disclosure of what that meant for the child to have them registered.

In the case of applying for a birth certificate you essentially gave your children to the care of the state or as they like to call it to become " wards of the state " and in doing so you now have to abide by the legal framework of parenting created by the government. You will now be forced to have your children attend schools whether you think that is the best thing for your child or not, You will be forced to follow an inoculation and vaccine program whether you want to or not, Your child will then be monitored till the age of 18 for any signs that he or she might have deviated from what I like to call the 12 step indoctrination program, which I first heard used by Jordan Maxwell in one of his lectures. Once they reach the age of consent and are considered adult. The state can now apply different forms of punishment for legal infractions that they were unable to apply while they were still attempting to train the child.

Everything you learn in school was carefully created to make you a servile and complacent "person" within the confines of a government indoctrination 12 step program called school.

You spend your lives in a school system till you finally graduate which is to say that you were gradually created into a social robot that would never question the behavior or intent of your masters. You were taught or should I say " trained " to... remember and repeat, remember and repeat, remember and repeat, until all you knew was what was told to you and to never question the training you were given or suffer the consequences of poor grades, punishment, social ridicule, or even repeat certain grades until you finally accept your programming that was created by the ruling classes of more than a century ago once outright slavery had been abolished in the new world. It still exists in many other countries but we are considered civilized. Newer and more clever tactics would have to be enacted to ensure compliance.

The ruling class designed the curriculum and such families as the rockefellers who run the rockefeller foundation who approved most school text books, The carnegies who ran the carnegie institute which wrote or approved most science and medical literature where the main sources of these tactics, these are the people who live in the metaphorical plantation houses. They designed the society we live in and also meticulously created the scarcity of it to control you easier.

"Give me the child for the first seven years and I will give you the man." Jesuit maxim

They created it very carefully so that their citizens work for meager wages, work longer hours, pay more taxes, yet never question it. a lifetime of programming and repetitive reinforcement is how they create free-range slaves who never question the world they live in.

Why else would people gladly hand over their hard earned money in taxes to keep those who merely claim to be authority and languish in their lavish lifestyles while they barely get by. They have been programmed from childhood to be compliant and servile.

In the last 60 years under a United nations agenda called agenda 21 the masses have been further dumbed down by many things

People are fluoridated and radiated , Poisoned with bad food called GMO's ( genetically modified organisms ), Unnecessary vaccinations full of toxic heavy metals and various other mind altering and restructuring chemicals by which they have created a utopian society for themselves of non thinking drone like humans, Aldus Huxley spoke of this chemical reinforcement in his novel a brave new world.



The people who created the text books, and school curriculums as mentioned, and their lineage are the same people today who keep the many secrets from you I will attempt to explain in this book.

They have formed secret societies that go back hundreds of years, religion being one of the most pervasive and persuasive control mechanisms they use, controlled by various churches.

Banking and Money as well is a very useful tool to contain people. Bankers have always profited the most from war and to convince a nation to give up its sons to go fight in these bankers wars was a very important part of this indoctrination. You are consistently told that your country is the best country and subliminally all other peoples are expendable and worthless. It's a mass geopolitical branding of sorts.

So in short Religion and war or for god and country is the motto isn't it? If you choose not to allow your child to go fight for his or her country you are shamed and the greatest sacrifice one can give is their only begotten son? Every time you hear the expression "support the troops" you are being brainwashed in the same exact way.

"If my sons did not want wars, there would be none." ~ Gutle Schnaper, Mayer Amschel Rothschild's wife

These days many more people are aware of the Free-masonic societies as well as the trilateral commission, council on foreign relations, the Bilderberg group, among others.

Yet The Freemasons, the Club of Rome, the Jesuit Order, and the Council of 13, and that many of these groups among others have been around for centuries.

Very few people are given the opportunity to join unless you are born into it, and are very carefully selected to do so through further indoctrinations of law schools and medical institutions that rely on the greed of those involved to become possible candidates for lower level control. Yes doctors and lawyers although well compensated are merely given just enough information to do as they are told

regardless of the damage they do to people. It is a very carefully planned out hierarchy of intent.

Your average TV watching sports or soap opera fan which comprises the vast majority would not have a clue as to who these people are or the control they have over their lives let alone be able to comprehend the context of this book. They would be inclined to call it conspiracy theory as was the case for anyone who questioned the assassination of John F Kennedy in the Warren report. They needed a quick catch phrase to defend against anyone who would or could still critically think to question their intent, false flag events, and various other actions they would need to perpetrate to carry out their devious agenda.

Murder was an easy one for these people since they have no conscience when it comes to destroying human life, they rather enjoy it. It is a criminal mafia disguised as a deep state government apparatus of authority.

They use the police in the same way, incrementally rewarding their slave control tactics with bonuses and wage increases. Police are also given a level of impunity from prosecution which is a very tempting incentive for those who seek positions of power over their fellow human beings.

The incentive for sociopaths and narcissists to become police is very enticing to those types of people. The police are told very little about how things truly are, they are merely told what to look for and how to react to it. All legal enforcement is unlawful since under the common law it is a crime to cause loss or harm to another human being so they use their police forces to break the law and assault people for them.

It should be easy enough to see the class divisions and who these people and families are if you are compelled to seek this out which 80 to 90 percent of people probably would not, still many people do, yet for most people their indoctrinations are so deeply embedded or perhaps they just don't care, or they can't be

bothered, that they would never think to stand up to their overlords.

Sadly however in most cases people just do not have a clue what is happening or what is being done to them.

The matrix is indeed real.

## EMPLOYMENT IS A SCAM

Have you ever wondered why in order to be employed it is required to have a social insurance number or in the United state a social security number prior to employment. You should never have to provide anyone with anything else than your title or qualifications and how you want to be paid prior to working for someone. It is non of the governments business how, where, or what you do for a living.

The employment system is also set up to keep you enslaved and very well planned out.

Break it down and you get "Em" "Ploy" "Ment"  
"Em" is "to" followed by "Ploy" which means "a scam or deception"  
followed by "Ment" which means "of the mind"  
Employment is a scam of the mind.

It gets equally disturbing when you apply this to the people who join the military for " deployment " into foreign countries or government itself which by the same logic means to control the mind.

Employment is a deception of the mind and a very lucrative way to steal your money through taxation and all forms of taxation are theft since you are not given the option of not paying it and if you choose to not pay you can be assaulted and caged for not paying it. Once again you are required to have a special number.

(Social security or Social insurance number and ironically to work on Canada you are required to have a "SIN" number)

These numbers or contracts are required to be able to gain " employment ",or otherwise they can not keep track of how much they need to tax you.

You can always work for a living and choose not to pay taxes on your own merit by simply advertising yourself and plying a trade as

I have for most of my life, I have not paid an income tax since I was a very young man.

Legal persons are required to have many things: A SIN number, bank account, Work license ( ticket ), valid license, and a " vehicle ". and in the trades is worksafe insurance, a hard hat, steel toe boots and a high viz vest costume. None of which actually qualify's you to do a particular job it only qualifies you to work within their controlled system so they can monitor and tax you.

I as a sovereign human being do not accept any of those rules to ply my trade. I simply accept money in exchange for work, I am a highly skilled and qualified renovator, carpenter, plumber, electrician, concept designer, crew leader, painter, artist, musician of many instruments which I have played professionally in several bands since my teenage years and I teach various things such as law to people who wish to learn the system they live in. Many would call me a transient, vagrant, a bum in some instances until they realize the scope of what I provide but that is the essence of freedom isn't it? To be without showing yourself to the world and causing anyone to question you or worse inform on you.

The first rule of sovereignty is to never inform on yourself.

I realize that in this book I am doing exactly that but for the sake of allowing others to know their slavery it is mine to accept the ramifications of this book. I have also been on the front page of the national post newspaper and have made several movies about sovereignty most notable "the sovereign movie by Mika of the Rasila family" that can be found on you tube.

I have never accepted these people in government positions as anything less than parasites and thieves yet as mentioned I was still up to a point fairly accepting of it all but I can no longer do that since the scales have tipped so far into the favor of the ruling

classes that the once soft tyranny has become an outright police state tyranny now.

Let me ask you .....

SO YOU THINK YOU ARE FREE ?

I watch people who say that they are free who drive around in their cars thinking that the only reason they can is because they were granted permission from the government to use a car to travel, they take that car to a job where they had to use a Social security or Social insurance number to be able to get permission from government to work. That card and number also allows the state to inform the tax collectors that you have made a certain amount of money for your labor that they now can take from you, those taxes that they take from you are now used to buy surveillance cameras and fund police departments that are in place to make sure that you follow the rules set up by the government that issued you those permissions to work in the first place.

You need a license to fish or to hunt, to get married or to run a business, to sell things or to use your car, to work in certain trades or to run a farm. You basically need a license to do anything that otherwise would be perfectly lawful without one.

You need a permit to use your car, to own a pet, to build onto your house, to own a gun, to use a gun, to help the needy and most disturbing of all to hold a protest or to congregate among your peers in public.

You are told to declare your earnings and file a tax return and you are told that you must fill out a census to inform on your family and friends. They say this is " the law " .

You need to go through an indoctrination program called school which gives you a diploma so that you can get a higher level of indoctrination in college or university and without this certificate you are considered unemployable to those people who take your money in the form of taxation.

When you are born you are given a certificate to become a citizen and that certificate identifies you as a "person" who is "subject" to the laws and rules of that society .

If you choose to revoke these contracts with the government or question the motives of these contracts for any reason you will have police sent out to either assault you , fine you , steal from you , or worst case they will kill you .

If for any reason you decide to travel abroad and do not have a government issued passport or birth certificate or citizenship card with you as a good and obedient card carrying slave you will be denied your right to travel the world. If you do happen to have these things you will be insulted , interrogated, searched and scanned with radiation until those with perceived authority deem you worthy of travel. A perfect slave is allowed these concessions.

You are not allowed access to your own body in the way of health . If you wish to remain healthy on your own terms that is considered anti social behaviour, The state requires that you inject poisons into your body , drink fluoride , and if you choose to use natural healing products to rid yourself of pesky diseases created by the governments own health agencies and policy like chemical aerosol spraying and GMO's. you will be arrested for using alternative natural methods such as cannabis, hemp, or if you promote raw foods or alternative treatments such as apricot kernels, DCA, or

other things that the government does not want you to know about you will be put on a list of suspected terrorism and or raided in the middle of the night by mercenaries.

If you choose to oppose the war , If you speak out against government policy, the obvious lies of 911, or Israel, or Islam, you will be arrested for hate crimes or called anti-semitic or a racist and persecuted to the point of exile .

Do you think you are free? Think again.



To become SOVEREIGN OR are a FREEMAN ON THE LAND

There is a very big difference and I will explain,

I have up to the point of writing this book, being what I call purely sovereign, for almost 17 years since 911, have had no paper permissions from government to do anything and I have traveled in various cars, trucks, and camper vans all across Canada several times and have been pulled over by the police 14 times to date without incident, save for the one time the officer chose to steal my van in st catherines ontario for which I had to wait almost a year for the opportunity to confront them in court for the violation.

They then sold my van and all my tools that were in the van that I had collected over many years to ply my trade as a carpenter, renovator, contractor. They made my life very difficult for that following year.

I was told in court that they had already sold off my property I was forced to write many letters and for a year I was given a meager sum of 3000 dollars for damages, however the officer was demoted to a desk job in a small town for confiscating a car that was not registered. A registered car can legally be confiscated whereas an unregistered car held in allodium otherwise known as "allodial title" can not be legally confiscated.

In the beginning I spent a lot of time being summoned to court for various " driving offenses " as they had as yet not tried me enough times to realize the futility of it. To charge me without a legal personality is the first thing they always need in court " a legal person " which I am not. To have a legal personality you must have contracts with the government. I have none.

Those who claim to be sovereign yet still hold ID are for better use of a term "Sovereign Citizens" or "Freeman on the land" types. We tend to use the same tactics and truths when it comes to court room procedure although they do it without standing which in the eyes of the court is everything.

Slaves do not have voices in plantation houses. In order to have standing you must first show them that they can not access your bond account. Without that account they can make no money from prosecution or "charges" so will not want to waste any time with you. Did you ever wonder why they use the word "charges". Did you ever wonder why there always seems to be a monetary penalty to a legal infraction ? It's all about making money.

When going to court, if you choose to....

Lets say that you are brought into a court room for questioning or for outright defying their government structure and you have been deemed to have done something that is " illegal " under their creation of statutory laws which change every year or month to accommodate whatever new revenue stream they decide to implement.

New laws are created every year, almost as though they read a yearly report or spreadsheet that requires more revenue doesn't it? The mission statement of a corporation is to make more money and the government is a corporation.

How should you approach these people in their own house? It is a public venue or is it not? Are there rules in that court room that you are unaware of? Have you read the court procedures acts and police services acts before entering into their arena? Have you looked into any of the rules that you have allegedly broken? Are you even required to follow those rules? Do you have free will or are you simply at the mercy of those who call themselves authority figures?

Before entering any court room you must first download, read, and learn the procedures act for that jurisdiction. They need more ways to make money so they create new rules to enforce and happens

every year so every year you are encouraged to seek out their new provisions and learn them.

Lets start with entering the court remembering that this is " your time " they are wasting and it was you who was summoned to perform and not the other way around so use your time there wisely and carefully and if you need to, ask as many questions as possible to get the information you need. They are still your servants even though they claim to be otherwise. Do not let them rush you or make you react out of fear to any of their questions, stay very calm and respond carefully and think about your answers, Never react. You should always respond as honestly and eloquently as you can. Do not get angry if you do not like a question simply respond with an objection, I must refuse to answer that question as it is not relevant or I will have to take time to consider my answer to that question. Something of that nature can not be used by them as contempt of court. Contempt of court is their favourite go to threat to induce fear into you. I have had police try to assault me in a court room for which I simply asked the judge to tell them to back off and the judge did just that. If the police in the court room take it upon themselves to act it is the job of the judge " impartial arbitrator " to restore peace in the court room but you have to tell him.

When and if I go to court, which I have not had to do since I can no longer be charged at all anymore, I first set the jurisdiction in my own case by standing at the bar and clearly for the court of record I state

"I claim common law jurisdiction and waive the benefits of the court ". Is always the first statement I make if I choose to approach the bar. ( the gate installed between the gallery and the court area )

This immediately lets the court know many things about me. They know that I am standing in honor as a sovereign who chooses only to be tried under the common law, which requires, that in order to be charged I must have caused loss or harm to another individual or I must have defrauded someone in some way. The second part means that I waive the opportunity for any legal representation and

choose to settle this manner "sui juris" as an adult capable of handling my own affairs.

The purpose of a lawyer is to facilitate the court by favoring the process and not for your benefit. A Lawyer will take your money and facilitate the court to be able to take more of your money, advise you badly and always favor the needs of the court over your needs.

They are hired to make as much money for the court system as they can or until you have nothing left in which case the judge will then have a fast determination based on your inability to further pay them for their time.

It is all a scam once you see how it really works.

Now if the first things you do are to waive the benefits they suddenly see that you are not going to be paying them anything and they will want you gone as soon as possible.

Forget that pesky common law thing since 90+ percent of the people that attend court are there for statutory infractions or otherwise "rule breaking" which only comes with a monetary punishment that they want to extort from you quickly and easily as most people will.

A statutory law is a quasi-law and not a law at all. It is, by definition, a rule of a society given the force of law. Once again it is merely an arbitrary construct created to collect more revenue for a defacto (illegitimate) court system based on a commercial admiralty court system. There are very few common laws that would have you arrested or caged immediately once you are found guilty of them. The irony of it all, as mentioned earlier in this book, is that every statute causes loss or harm almost every time it is enforced, which means that, every legal statute is then an unlawful act against you or your person.

A quick note on actionable statute, If the police pull you over and you are being reasonable but have no Identification or "papers" to show them then they will likely not act on you since before they can act they will first need to obtain your permission to do so.

In other words a license or "licentious instrument" is a charging instrument attached to the account they created for your person that all acts and statutes require a person to be charged under.

If they can not see a person they can not act and the same applies in a court room, If the judge asks if the person is in the court room you can simply reply when you stand that, "You are agent for the person and the person will not be appearing today". I in fact made it very clear for the court record that the person was in fact "deceased" and would no longer be available for questioning at any time.

In the 14 times I have been pulled over since I made my "deceased person" proclamation for the court of record I have not been assaulted or detained for more than just a matter of minutes before they would return and tell me I was free to go. This is a fact of my time on the road without papers as I sit here today in my camper writing this book and not sitting in a jail cell somewhere writing it with a small golf pencil.

It is also necessary to know the judges judicial oath in the event that he does not want to play fair that day and to test you on your resolve in the court room, You do not want to ask the judge , as many do, if he is on his oath because he has several. Which one are you asking for ? You want to be able to recite his judicial oath for the record in the form of a question. I always have this ready in my mind for just such an occasion.

"Is it not true sir that you and this court are bound by a sworn oath to do right by all manner of people under the laws of canada and for the usages of the province, without fear of favor affection, or ill will ?

The judge or administrator must then either answer yes or no for the record. If he chooses not to you can then motion to dismiss as he has just admitted to the court that he is an impostor.

so with that I would suggest some logical court question prior to commencement as follows:

Get clarification first . likely they will not want to waste their time with you

Before we proceed in any type of court, admiralty, provincial, supreme, civil, family or whatever type of label they decide to claim authority over you first need to establish two things, Jurisdiction and supremacy. What language (jurisdiction) will be used and who has supremacy (authority) and where does it come from?

When the man or woman who enters the room “acting” as the “judge” the crown prosecutor refers to him or her as “your honor” or in Canada now it is “Your worship“. There is a presumption on the part of the people that this man or woman has been somehow elevated to a position where he/she can unilaterally impose judgment on another human being but from where could any one human being gain such power? Only from two places could a man/ woman get this type of power. From contracted acceptance or from an accepted perception of authority. If you are aware of both options you will need to clarify in court which option is valid and what measures if none exist are used to enforce such a perceived authority .

You need clarification or the cause must be refused. Every ticket, fine or summons must then be refused for cause and for clarification . For the last 10 years I have written this in bold letters on any attempt to extort monies from me and have never received clarification of their demands so I have never paid a ticket fine or charge. This has always been the most important question in law. Who has authority, where do they get it, and why do we accept it ?

In any case brought before a court that is not de jure (juried) in nature you are playing a game , it is all theater and you are being asked to accept this theater as reality when in fact it is nothing more than Actors with elaborate props playing a role.

Sample arguments to establish supremacy are simple.

You have been charged with 4 counts of possession of a controlled substance how do you plead ? Asks the judge.

Lets look at this question and the charge and the word “charge” which is a “demand of a price for a service or goods supplied” and they use the phrase “counts of” which is accounting for total charges which means you have somehow sold them something or provided a service to correct ? First you need to ask to whom did I provide a service to be charged for, who determines its worth, and when did we enter into this transaction ?

Second part of this original common phrase based on “charges” says it is a controlled substance. So the obvious question is who can claim authority over a natural substance to control it and for what purpose? These are all valid and important questions if any entity wants to claim supremacy over nature.

How do you plead is the final step here right? To plead is to “beg for forgiveness” or simply “to beg” first of all you never beg for anything so the simple and logical question to this demand is,

“Who is asking and where do you get the authority to do so over a man who has no contracts with this court?”

First before we even get to court if in fact you are summoned you have to also ask a question . Why am I being summoned and why should I consider this invitation ? On most summons it shows your all capitol name which most of us now know is not really you but merely a corporate legal fiction and it has your address and some address of a court or corporation of the city of that it was issued from. It may even have a stamped signature from a judge or justice of the peace. This also can simply be refused for cause and for clarification , Who makes the claim against you? why have you been invited to appear? And as before who can claim the authority to enforce this order if in fact it is an order from the state should it not as an order be answered with a bill ?

You can write on this summons, ticket, or order ,

“Refused for cause and clarification“ then if you wish, state your questions or objections, as you are not obligated to take any time out of your day or worse spend an entire day of valuable time entertaining some unsubstantiated request based on nothing more than a perception that these people have assumed an authority to demand your attendance

The obvious concern of most people is “if I don't go they will send the police or render a judgment in my absence“ but the thing of this is by asking for clarification you have actually address the issuer of this summons and they can not say that you are not attending. The question needs to be answered first before they can claim that you did not attend. They have offered you a contract to appear and you have asked for a valid reason why you should, the ball is in their court and you are simply waiting for them to either hit the ball back or quit the game.

If you decide to go to court which I tell people daily is a bad idea since once you do enter that place you are being intimidated by physical violence since they have men there with guns and a limited liability of impunity to use force against you.

This brings me to another subject if you do decide to go to court , How do they enforce this perceived authority and hold up the illusion of theater that they call court? More questions need to be asked before you can proceed. If you have already tried to determine supremacy and have not received an adequate response, one very important question that must be asked is “since we have not been able to come to acceptable terms of supremacy how do you intend to enforce your demands ? Do you intend to answer my concerns or are you going to instruct your enforcement officers to unlawfully assault me?“



The only way the state can enforce their illusion is just by that “enforce” so you need to clarify whether or not you are there by consent, deception, or are you being coerced to attend and if so you are being tried under a forced consideration. I could get into the whole “under contract” argument which is more obvious and defend-able but this is for logical purposes, I find it is important to bring these people into their own deception and ask questions that make them realize their own corruption under law, the perversions they defend and the due process they now see as an affront to their extortion scheme.

You have a right and a duty to ask these questions and asking pertinent questions that otherwise would allow a violation of your body and dignity are absolutely relevant and acceptable terms . What is your dignity worth ? Would you allow yourself to be violated without first making your oppressor aware of the violations that they threaten you with ? Make it known to everyone or they will surely violate you . Make it very clear in their house in front of any witnesses that will listen, your life, dignity, and freedom are at stake.

So what do we know based on all of this? All claims need to be substantiated prior to acceptance, that is “refused for cause and clarification” of all offers from the state, tickets, fines, summons, charges and orders. Asking questions prior to allowing someone to pass judgment against you is an absolute necessity and if they do not or cannot answer your questions appropriately or validate their claim that they have an authority over you tells you that they simple do not, You already know that they do not but making them realize that they do not is important. Obviously they can not proceed until they have shown you how they have this authority and if not by getting them to admit to the gallery and to the world that the only authority they have is by using a force of guns and coercion. Once you have ascertained that confession from someone who illegitimately claims to have supremacy over you you can then ask them ..... Is that not slavery ?

## THE ADMIRALTY SHIP OF FOOLS

In the last section I mentioned admiralty jurisdiction as opposed to the Common law. There has been much written on this subject and can be found easily by simply googling it but I will touch on it here.

The common law or " the law of the land " also known as case law was usurped over the last hundred or so years by the "law of the sea" to accommodate many perversions of justice and created the legal world we now live in. But as it was enacted the laws of the sea on land were used to steal for the people on land like the pirates that they became. Police or policy enforcers work for the admiralty courts as well as for the people as peace officers depending on which jurisdiction they are enforcing. One of my favourite lecturers on this topic is Jordan Maxwell who explains it very well in detail. The court rooms themselves are sectioned into parts of a ship. the captain of the pirate ship sits in judgment over the citizenship as you pass through the gate onto their vessel, you Have just crossed the bar if you proceed to the docket or dock of the ship to be then commanded if you choose to enter. You should always remain outside of the bar (gate) of the ship or you will be abducted and sentenced. Once you have entered the court you have stepped off of dry land and you have entered the sea of commerce. commercial admiralty law and if you notice everything in that courtroom comes with a monetary penalty. If you do not pay the fines or attempt to avoid them they will then send their mercenary officers to collect or with a warrant (war rant) take you to a cage until you comply. If you do not have any of their contracted numbers they can not charge you since you have no charging instruments under commercial law.

When you think about the police most people these days see them as the guys you never want to have to deal with when that should not be the case but the police have gotten so corrupted and greedy over the last 20 years or so that rogue elements, hiring practices, and incentive's have created a very bad element in the police forces

of today. The police forces were originally created for small communities of work force towns to monitor the activities of those areas. Pinkerton police were there to keep order. small industrial towns were popping up all over and they needed to make sure that the people there had some form of control. This concept was replaced once the people were made to start using licenses for various activities that otherwise would not have required such things. Mostly after 1913 and the signing of the American Federal Reserve Act and Social Security Acts.

It was those two things that created the paper slavery that we are controlled by today.

A bit of history, bankers and politicians of the time merged their forces to think up ways to collect money from people with various new laws. They took those two acts in secret and had a meeting on Jekyll Island off the coast of New York to hash it out and sign it. They could then sell it to the public as a sort of insurance policy and use it to incrementally take more and more of your freedoms and convert them into rights and privileges for which they could then grant you the things you could already do without permission. That is the job of a tyrant. The Warburgs, the Harrimans, The Rothschilds, The Rockefellers, The Carnegies, the Rhodes, The Morgans, The Strongs, The Bromsfields, among others, large banking and industrial families that came together to draft the most totalitarian legal deception ever.

These people were the original slaver families. They among themselves were the richest most devious people of the time and they planned the biggest fraud of the century and carried it out.

Quote from Edward Mandell House

"Very soon, every American will be required to register their biological property [that's you and your children] in a national system designed to keep track of the people and that will operate under the ancient system of pledging. By such methodology, we can compel people to submit to our agenda, which will affect our

security as a charge back for our fiat paper currency. Every American will be forced to register or suffer NOT being able to work and earn a living. They will be our chattels [property] and we will hold the security interest over them forever, by operation of the law-merchant under the scheme of secured transactions.

Americans, by unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of lading [Birth Certificate] to us will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent, 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, for not one man in a million could ever figure our plans and, if by accident one or two should figure it out, we have in our arsenal plausible deniability. After all, this is the only logical way to fund government, by floating liens 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." [Social Security] Without realizing it, every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly. The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and we will employ the high office [presidency] of our dummy corporation [US] to foment this plot against America." -- Colonel Edward Mandell House

The Police were their favourite tool to carry it out, To become a police officer meant you would have a job in a time when very few were available and you would be given the pleasure of having authority over large groups of people. It wasn't so bad then as it is now since the technologies had not yet advanced to the place that they are today but at the time they needed a force of control to enforce the myriad of new statutes that were to be implemented over the course of the next many years. Every year a list of new rules would be developed heard and tried in their defacto courts of law until they could hash out the things that they did not think would work on the collective, Back then people were a lot less willing to give up their freedoms and would act violently against their oppressors with lynching parties and various other forms of violence. The controllers and creators of these new acts would

gauge the level of compliance and conceive of new ways to gain that compliance over time. They realized that they had to get the people's minds while they were young if they were going to create the types of compliant slaves that they needed to continue usurping more and more of their freedoms. They had to be very careful, meticulous and mostly they had to do things slowly so as not to disturb the herd.

It was a very incremental sort of slavery that took many decades to achieve, first they would introduce license plates on the automobiles that were rattling around as a safety measure in case someone stole one or used one in a theft. It was a monitoring device that the people agreed with.

If a cop will not show you three pieces of ID when asked for he is fully liable to any damage he may cause to you, Know the bonding code.

#### 7.4 – Bonding of Specific Performance

Modern scientific bonding is based on a number of factors which mathematically determine the price of the wager (premium) charged by the bonding company. Some

5. the types of unbonded statutes he will enforce,
6. the types of bonded statutes he will enforce,
7. the types of paper enforcement processes he will use, and,
8. the types of enforcement acts he will engage in (especially the violent ones).

An officer is acting without the protection of a municipal bond, is acting on the municipal corporate assets, or is acting “out of uniform” and on his own personal liability if he:

1. behaves in a clearly antisocial manner,
2. does not have an education in law adequate for his specific performance as a law enforcement officer,
3. is not adequately bonded for law enforcement, i.e., to enforce the law,

4. does not have an adequate identification card or does not show his identification card when necessary,
5. acts on an unbonded statute, and/or
6. violates a citizen's U.S. or state constitutional rights or equal protection of the laws.

The identification card of a law enforcement officer declares the authority of the officer to act by:

1. stating the specific performance of his job for which he is bonded, such as the class of statutes he is bonded to enforce.
2. stating that he is licensed and bonded,
3. stating the name of the bonding company which is bonding the executive acts of the officer, and
4. stating the bond (policy) number of the officer's bond (insurance).

An officer who cannot or does not display his official identification card is deemed out of uniform and acting as an ordinary citizen on his own personal liability. His personal property is then the true pledge underwriting his authority.

## CHARLATANS AND FOOLS

In this world of corrupt politicians and unjust legal courts, crooked judges and cops, and the desperations caused by thousands upon thousands of new rules and invasive statutes it was really just a matter of time before people started to seek out remedy and with the internet it was a hot bed for all the scammers to try to milk it for their benefit and draw people into various groups or Ideals that albeit were based on good information lacked the full disclosure to make them actually do any good such as the "Freeman on the land" type gurus for which I will not mention any names.

I was once considered one of them until I found that I had to constantly correct the assumption. stating that Freeman on the land types retain their contracts and benefits and a sovereign does not accept nor have any.

Over the years I have been invited to many homes of these people and listened to many of their seminars only to find that barely any of them are truly sovereign. Perhaps 1 percent of the thousands I have spoken to in real world or online.

These freeman on the land types or what the authorities and media call "sovereign citizens" simply pretend to be free while accepting the benefits whenever they choose to, yet wish to not have to face the consequences whenever they are charged for breaking the rules that come with the acceptance of those contracts.

You just can't do that, Their logic states that you "have a person" that resides with you as a strawman and you can use it when you chose or deny it when you don't but that thinking is patently false as seen by the multitude of arrests and imprisonment of many of these guru types themselves.

The fact is that they created the legal person without your knowledge, your expressed permission or consent or they

somehow tricked you into agreeing with it. The legal person, The all capitol corporate fiction, is theirs and they will do whatever they want to do with it since it is solely controlled by them. That is the admiralty court , That is the tickets and fines, and rules, and confiscations, and incarcerations and every other unlawful enforcement tactic that they enjoy and make money from.

The guru's would never want to tell you this even if they knew, which frankly most do not, because if they did that would be the end of their 70 dollar a head per night seminar over in about five minutes if they told people it was that simple, yet that difficult to live within their society after you had returned all of your contracts and no longer could receive any of the benefits.

The majority of the people that gravitate to join the thinking of the freeman on the land societies are those who have become desperate or distraught by financial difficulties or court summons or charges for various things seeking remedy by using their system against them. Some people have been lucky in court using various tactics as I have but simply put, the law society sees everything that happens within their society and quickly sends instruction to their judges and clerks on how to counter any of these defense tactics the freeman on the land guys attempt to use.

They do not work more than a few times whether the tactics and their legal basis is correct or not remember the law society creates it's own rules daily based on hearings and trials. Once they have tried something and it failed they tilt the board in their favor so it can never be lost again.

The one thing they will never tell you in their seminars is that the only way to be truly free of government is to send them all of your contracts back with whatever reasons you may have and declare them void ab initio ( void from the beginning ). Keep in mind that once a contract is no longer fair or has been altered without your approval it can be canceled at any time. This must be done in writing and sent back with your contracts ( ID cards and papers ) to the proper perceived authorities who issued them. You can not



simply get pulled over by the police and say "I do not consent" as so many of these gurus tell people.

The day you applied for any of these benefits you did in fact consent to the terms of the contracts and you did so in writing so no amount of talking at that point is going to remove that consent. The police are going to simply laugh at you and arrest you. You are using their person and they have every right to assault you if you try to deny them that right. You can not say "I do not consent" when you already have and you have done so in writing and carry the permission slips and contracts in your own pocket. The first thing they always ask is to see official government identification and that is the reason they need to see it.

"The game is rigged folks" as George Carlin so eloquently stated in his final onstage performance.

In my travels and from my individual experience the freeman on the land types have been broke, down on their luck, wake and bake pot heads, drunks, and basically beggars and bums. Some of these people had radically tried to take advantage of my generosity and help, and then when I would get fed up and leave, they would slander me to everyone they knew to try to discredit me within their circles.

I however never much worried about the tactics of these people. I mostly just felt bad for how lost they were, but the gurus that run these societies will prey on the gullibility and desperation of these people and sell them dreams that eventually lead them into jail cells or worse.

My mission is to dispel the myths and to explain the simple reality of it. You do not have a person they do and you can never use it in any way that they will not allow.

The only way to true freedom and sovereignty from the government is to quit entirely and send the person and all personal contracts you have with them back completely to the people who created them.

Some people do it with a religious reasoning , and some do it simply because they no longer want the obligations of it, for myself however it has always been that I have a moral objection to it. I am a conscientious moral objector to tyranny essentially, and with that, unless things were to change back to a reasonable and just government I may consider going back in to contract but it is unlikely that that that will ever happen.

I managed various groups of free men groups online for years and watched as they attempted these tactics and one by one watched them get assaulted, arrested, abused and even a few have been killed by the police in the last 15 years alone. I could not in good faith continue to sit back without calling out the fools and con men who thought up the concepts that got those people in so much trouble by attempting things that those con men would not try first themselves, Untested theories against men with guns and cages who work for the same people who created the legal statute in the first place. You are never going to win for very long playing games with those people.

So how does someone live as a sovereign outside of their legal society, while still being inside of their physical society ?

I have done so for 17 years as of this writing.

I chose to live the nomadic life but one could as easily build a cabin somewhere in a remote area and homestead, But the first rule of sovereignty is never inform on your self to government, You have to lose that thing in you that tends to think that you can not do anything without the governments permission.

There are many places and abandoned spaces and crown land all over this land mass known by the natives as turtle Island that is free to be taken as a caretaker of it.

You do not own anything since the earth is free to use but you can claim a small portion of it and use it for your needs as a sovereign.

I have yet to find that place for myself.

For the last 17 years I have lived nomadic since my work requires me to be in populated areas to gain money and resources for my living. I build things and fix things, I am a renovator, carpenter, contractor, and an accomplished musician. I always have ways to make money and survive which needs to be a big consideration for anyone who chooses to stop using government benefits.

I travel in various forms of conveyances such as trucks and vans and campers which I outfit for living quarters and travel.

This also explains why I get pulled over so frequently, I live on the road in an illegal way that the police are paid to question me and interrogate me for doing so. It is their job and to do this and to date It has been without incident, save for the two instances in St. Catherines and another in Castlegar British Columbia but both were done by police mistake as they were not allowed to confiscate property that was not registered.

I simply in both cases bought another car and went on about my life. The St. Catherines case was read by a judge and their ruling in the media and newspapers was that I was charged and ordered to pay a certain amount and that my van and property was auctioned off. That was a lie apart from the auctioning, every consecutive incident of road side pullover and to this day still show no warrants or warrants from any jurisdiction.

The last incident in Castlegar has yet to be resolved as of this writing.

It is an annoyance that I choose to accept but over the years the police have gotten to know me and now the pull overs usually take mere minutes before they return to tell me I am free to go.

I work wherever I go and advertise my business through online ads and word of mouth. I provide a quality service for a good wage that is agreed upon prior to commencement of any job. It is fair and it is lawful. I of course do not inform on myself or pay taxes to anything since I do not have a social insurance number. Also with this type of living you do take risks of getting hurt or for whatever

reason you become incapable of working which is partially the reason I am writing this book. I am not entitled by contract or benefits to any form of welfare or employment insurance or any health care within the governments contracted citizen health card contracts.

With sovereignty you are solely responsible for your own living and health care although if you are injured to can always pay for services if necessary.

I have paid to have the bones in my hand adjusted after I'd fractured it once and for various stitches I've needed due to mishaps at work.

In the beginning of this book I had written much about courts and police and various other things that I've had to learn to be able to deal with them in their courts but, interestingly enough once you have explained your position in a few court appearances and or special appearance letters eventually they will stop summoning you since they come to realize the futility of summoning a non legal person into their legal courts.

When you no longer have any licenses or permits or other contracts you do not have any numbers or charging instruments they have nothing to charge or act on so they will leave you alone once they realize that you are without any consent to their legal world. You never have to say " I do not consent " They just know at that point that you do not and they have to act accordingly. So when they ask you a question, be polite since they have a job to do, be cordial and answer their questions and do it honestly without hesitation and soon enough you will be on your way again.

They have a job to do and so do you, You are sovereign so once you have learned enough and know enough to be able to live as one and without any benefits, the police and the courts will then realize you are not trying to pull any sort of trickery or get away with anything.

The only way they can then arrest you is if they in some way see you disturbing the public peace or hurting people, or stealing from people, or doing anything that would cause harm or loss and, in the

event of that they certainly would not need to ask you for any ID would they ?

No, they would simply arrest you and detain you as peace officers doing their job to protect the people and their property from you, if they needed to.

Do you see how that works in a real life scenario ? Lawful is not legal meaning that in the legal world they first have to see your ID to act on you but if you are actually acting unlawfully they do not need to see ID before they can act on you.

As a sovereign they can ask you for ID but since none exists for you you simply tell them just that, You have not contracted for any ID. If they ask your name and birth date you may as well tell them what those are since the legal fiction is deceased and it does not matter anyway if you in fact have stated for the record in court that you are legally deceased and you have in fact sent back all of your former defacto contracts.

## HOW GOVERNMENTS CREATE CRIME

Have you ever asked yourself how governments create laws? Are those laws really necessary or is there another reason for them? Think about how many new laws you have seen enacted just in your lifetime. 100's? 1000's? Would it surprise you to know that at the beginning of almost every year maybe 10,000 new laws or amendments to old laws take place? This is true for most years but lately it has been much more common place .

These new rules called statutory laws, are very cleverly inserted into the collective thinking using many tactics, mostly based on fear, security, or fairness. That is how they are sold to the public. At the base of law there are only three requirements for something to be deemed a crime and those are the only three things as mentioned before in this book, we need to look at before we can allow the state to tell us we have done something wrong. In order to have committed a crime you must have caused loss or harm to another human being or you have acted fraudulently in your contracts with someone . The simplest way to look at what true laws are is to read the ten commandments in any of the original bibles. I am not a religious man but those ten laws cover it pretty well.

Lets look at how the governments create the scenario that they then enforce. First they create the scarcity by supplying the money, they create the inflation and the economic bubbles. They set interest rates, devise new tax and insurance schemes, they impose fines and fees and other things to keep you insolvent so you become desperate. They know that desperation leads to crime, Drug and alcohol abuse, theft, fraud, The sale of what they call contraband, and it facilitates the breaking of other rules people will break to survive so they can then arrest people for those things as well. This is very clever and has been happening for over a hundred years.

Lets look at Cannabis as a prime example of this idea of laws created for the sole purpose of creating an intentional crime to

make money for the state, Why is pot criminalized in the first place? It is the most versatile and beneficial plant on the planet. Hemp is used to make everything from clothing to building blocks and as a food. Hemp is almost the perfect super food for the body. The other side of the coin is the part that is considered a drug, or a controlled substance, the cannabinoids in this plant are known to do many things from curing diseases such as cancer and alleviating pain to easing depression and many others. So why is it controlled? The simple answer is that anyone can grow it and the government can't tax it unless they themselves sell it which they do now.

The government is very aware of its benefits but if they don't have a unlawful control of this plant they lose billions in revenue every year, It's all about the money and always has been. It's all about you being afraid to live your life the way you choose and they can never allow you to have that sort of freedom. They also do the same thing with alcohol but in a different way, they know that alcohol creates social problems like bar fights, domestic abuse, car accidents, and the like so this also creates a lot of revenue for the state. It works very well for them.

Heroin and cocaine are the governments best ploy, These drugs destroy lives and causes lots of crime so typically if they catch someone with these substances they get a slap on the wrist and get sent back into society quickly to continue the profits they get from them.

In the last few years the governments have now allowed people to grow pot but only under once again a controlled and licensed arrangement. Once you commit yourself to any sort of application to do anything or get a permit to do something or register anything you no longer have the free will to do what you are already doing lawfully but now you are essentially growing for the state.

What does that mean to you? Do you see this as a good thing? Hey great the government says I can grow pot! isn't that great? Now ask yourself why? It is not yours, it is there's and if for any reason something goes wrong or you get caught growing a plant or two more than they allow they will wait for harvest and take it all, This

is happening everywhere across Canada now and they are raiding the non-government dispensaries that they themselves allowed. It is just another clever way to make money for themselves. They can then take all your work and sell it or use it in whatever way they want to .

Lets look more into this "drug war" and how deep it reaches to show more of how the state manipulates its own society to create the crime it can then enforce. Most of us know that the war on terror is a huge lie. The obvious lie of 911 should be a testament to that.

Why did the US and Canada have to go to Afghanistan? Why was it so important to happen when it did. Most people thought if they were to create a false flag attack and lie about justifications to go to war there it would be for oil. But they forget that the majority of the opium, hashish and heroin comes from there and drugs are big business for government. This is why the government is there , they are protecting poppy fields which in the year 2000 were being burned by the taliban who are a human rights organization and not the bad guys the governments tell you they are.

One mans terrorist is another mans freedom fighter.

So now if you can get your head around the idea that the military is killing babies in the middle east to protect poppy fields, take your thinking to the next level, what happens to the drugs once they are harvested ? Obviously they are being used. The CIA has been caught many times bring plane loads of drugs back the Americas. This has been happening for 50+ years already, perhaps longer. Now who gets these drugs? Large pharmaceutical companies certainly get all that they need to create their psychotropics which they feed to your children for made up conditions like ADD and ADHD.

Oxycontin and other opioids make doctors a fortune selling these to just about anyone who wants them. This creates more crime that the state can then legislate against and then make more money from in the way of prison labor, fines and confiscations of property. They bring it in then legislate against it then enforce that legislation to make money. That is, as stated earlier, that the mission statement



of any corporation to make money and Canada is a corporation and it is in fact traded as a commodity on the new york stock exchange.

With all this said can you see how the rules of statute are being used to create the scenario that they can then legislate against and enforced for a profit ?

They handle the slaves very well, that is the business they are in. Once again the common law means do not cause loss or harm or defraud your contracts, How does any use of a drug and plant or even if you decide to use a chemical poison offered by a doctor create a crime? It doesn't.

You learned long ago never to question authority by government run school systems and government controlled media. Everything is in place for a reason to create that environment of ignorance to the reality that we all inherently feel within us. We all know that these things are happening but what can we do right ? The answer is to leave it. Tell the government you no longer accept their criminal manipulations, theft, extortion, racketeering, and coercion and you leave it as I have.

The courts in this country are not legitimate and the government is a cleverly crafted mafia on a crime spree.

They run non-juried courts so you are not being tried for crimes of any kind by a group of our peers so the courts are merely administrative offices that have assumed the illusion of a court room. They are only there to take your money for legal infractions and the entire legal structure is another thing created by these corporations that control the governments who then in turn control you .

Everything you do is now permitted,or controlled by your own ignorance of contract law .

Another simple way that the state creates criminal behavior that they can then enforce is by way of scarcity in social welfare programs . I'm sure that many of you have made a claim at some point to collect social assistance and found that they need to know

everything about you almost down to the color of your underwear. This is their way of telling you if you want anything you will have to remove your dignity at the door so we can emotionally assault you until your will is completely broken. They want to completely own you. This is also evident when traveling these days if you wish to cross borders or fly on planes, take across country bus or train, You are interrogated, searched, and violated.

Once again to test your will and see if you will sacrifice your dignity to them for a freedom that they have turned into a privilege. Every inherent freedom that you have if you are a contracted citizen is turned into a right or a privilege that can then be monitored, legislated against and removed at the will of the state.

Looking back to the welfare game , Have you noticed that they only just give you barely enough to pay a rent and buy food ? This is intentional because they have other plans for you and your desperation and they will recruit you for whatever they want once they need you. Military to go kill babies or to steal resources, security jobs, perhaps if you were to display certain psychotic qualities of control they will recruit you into police or intelligence positions with the government. They are always looking for a good quality sociopath to help them with slave control .

Once you are on welfare you are also monitored very carefully, your living space, your purchases, your job searches, everything is now under scrutiny, But by accepting their money you are hired on for this position. They now completely own you and they know it. People must stop informing on themselves. Tax and consensus forms, licenses, permits are all ways that people inform on themselves to government.

A word about possession, Once you register something it is no longer yours. You probably already know that registration gives legal title to the issuer of the registration right ? Possession is 9/10's of the law did you know this ? The government needs your registration to relinquish that title or entitlement to all of the possessions that you have, that they want to

be able to restrict or legislate against, and once you register they can legally do this.

If you do not register, as I do not, everything I have is mine and held in allodium or "held under allodial title" meaning it is mine free and clear of any government encumbrances or rules as long as I do not cause harm or loss with my property they can not lawfully "confiscate" my property. But hey do sometimes still steal it.

The only other way that someone can take possession of my property is to lay claim to it if I am unable to refute the claim, but of course as long as I live and breathe and am competent to attend to my affairs that can never happen.

The courts and police know that they need my consent to take my stuff unless it is registered but they will try every time to "impound" my car but they also know that if it is not registered I can say no I will move it over to this parking lot or gravel area and they have to allow it but they will always try because once you relinquish your consent they have it in their possession and everyone knows how hard it is to get something out of impound without government ID. This is their extortion racket to get you do what they want but if you do not allow them to take it they have no recourse of tactics to make you do anything. Never register and never allow them consent to take your property.

Every court hearing or trial is an empty slate, The judge and everyone in there is not aware of you or what you know until you tell them what you know, You need to provide evidence in your case and that is all the court can or will have to determine your position.

They do not do your work for you nor will they make presumptions against you unless you allow them to by doing nothing to better your position or worse by getting a lawyer. **YOU HAVE TO MAKE YOUR CASE.**

You have to provide all relevant case law and peer reviewed fact based evidence to support it.

It is your job to prove that you are not only a fit parent, in the case of anything child related, or a competent enough adult to stand up in court and impress them with your ability to make a case against any of their claims

The judge and all those people do not care about you. Why should they? They don't.

If I call you unfit and you can not provide evidence to counter that claim the claim will stand as truth. You have to defend it.

Once you have set precedent for yourself they will never again revisit it against you that is called double jeopardy. It's like me with no insurance or any other papers , I made my case and they do not bug me anymore because of it. Why can't everyone use my case to not have licenses ? because you did not make the case for yourself did you ? You did not prove yourself worthy of it in court. You have to make the case for yourself and if you win it will quickly be discarded from case law so that no one else will be able to use your precedent. They are lawfully required to publicly post every court case into a public database but when they lose they typically do not. It would make it too easy for other citizens to realize their power over them. There is a user friendly online database called canlii.org that keeps these records but as for myself none of my winning cases are listed there for obvious reasons they won't allow that to happen.

However to reiterate a point of law,

A judge after being made to accept his judicial oath for the record a judge can not render a verdict if there is an unanswered question on that "same" record.

So to repeat an important aspect of how to address the court.....

So you want to know the judges oath and state it clearly for the record as an answerable question. (yes or no) and then you are entitled to ask factual questions of the court.

Otherwise no facts are admissible to the record in court.

The reason this is important because until you have done this nothing in that court room is valid and the judge can and will do anything it wants to do at that moment because the court is not obligated to "do right" by you.

You first have to set the jurisdiction by claiming it by saying ( I claim common law jurisdiction ), You have to state that for the record or it is presumed that you accept their admiralty statutory jurisdiction.

I always also " waive the benefits of the court " and then I recite the judges oath as a question. ( judicial oath )

Typically at this point I will be told I am free to leave and I can then state for the " court of record " that the judge has dismissed all charges.

He won't say it, you have to say it.

If he leaves the court room and returns you have to do this all over again because when he returns the court has re-adjourned under a new jurisdiction.

first time is an exchequer, commercial revenue court , then second time he is reconvening an admiralty court then finally he comes in as a priest in Canon court. You must reassert YOUR Common law jurisdiction all three times.

Its a game and they respect you when you know how to play it.

When you hear the phrase "ignorance of the law is no excuse" It does not necessarily mean non-comprehension of their statutory rules or the rule of law which is not the true law. What it means is the literal of ignorance, " to ignore ". Acquiescence is tacit or silent agreement.

When you acquiesce you are telling them that you agree with their terms and willfully comply. You must always "refuse for cause" any charges levied against you and demand clarification otherwise you stand under their fictional authority without contest.

You must then stand under that refusal, you can even ask them if they understand your refusal and if they say yes you win right there.

You are always entitled to face your accuser with a valid claim against you. You are always entitled to see cause and in the event that they have a valid claim and cause you are then entitled to a jury of your peers. Every fraudulent statutory charge they levy against you will ruin your life to a degree, It will cost you money, It could cost you days of torture and suffering in a cage with bad food and surround you with dangerous people with bad attitudes and the stigma you carry once you finally get back to society will stay with you forever.

These people don't care about you or how their lies effect peoples lives as long as everyone gets paid, so the first step is to make them know that you are not going to pay, they will not want to bother you if they can't get paid. that is what it is all for.

No ID = No charging instruments  
No registration = No legal confiscation  
No birth record = No jurisdiction

You are a foreign national sovereign individual living on the land mass of your choice under the jurisdiction you choose, Common, Natural, ecclesiastical, universal, or spiritual. No one can refute your claims unless they see evidence of contract to the statutory legal fiction name.

That is why they need to see ID and once they do they will proceed in ruining your life for money.

A charge of contempt in court is nothing more than a legal judge who knows that you know the game of their bullshit society and knows that if he ever allowed it to be known he would be out of a job.

You sir want to charge me with contempt for questioning the validity of this court? I am not a member of your criminal society. I live lawfully. I am a foreign national on this country you have created for yourselves, Read my letter rogatory and you will be apprised of my seclusion. I morally object to your form of government.

What is a certificate of pending litigation ? If someone has a offensive motion or charge filed against (this include cops, judges, banks, collection agencies, landlords, or anyone) you for any reason you always have to counter that claim. Once you have countered with any form of proof that the original motion was invalid or vexatious you file a counter and once you have filed a counter with a "notice to admit" and an affidavit of service you put in a requisition for a certificate of pending litigation and those original charges will be either dismissed outright or set off until the complainant can prove his original motion or charge.

It is something I have always done and so far no one has ever carried through on their offensive.

Once you have filed they will send you one within 10 business days and it's not an application, it is their duty to provide you that certificate but like anything else you have to know to ask for it, or a better term is "You require it for your records".

You never have to acquiesce to the will of tyrants and judges .You must always contest, you want a valid WRITTEN claim from and injured party, cops can not make a claim, that is a conflict of interest, they work for the same people the judge (administrator) does.

They expect you to as they require in their court but everything comes as a contest of your willingness and indoctrination. Never acquiesce, silence is a tacit agreement, saying nothing means you accept.

I always object and ask for clarification and they will not give it, but once they sit quietly to your question they have given you the court.

It is a court like tennis, they called it that for a reason. If your balls are bigger you win. always answer and if you cannot answer in a way that requires an answer you have lost. I have always won based on this simple logic.

Tell the court its judicial oath, as mentioned and written out before, and know it without thinking before you go there. KNOW IT. It's not hard to remember so know it.

The clerk of the court is the only one you are addressing, the rest is coercion theater.

Once you learn to only address the 'court of record' you will always get the same result.



## WHAT IS A LETTER ROGATORY ?

This is very important point of law as a sovereign since as a sovereign you reside on a land mass as a foreign national and you must always use the rogatory which is an introduction letter stating your purpose within a foreign jurisdiction and if you do not, the assumption will always be that you are acting as a citizen of the " country " you are addressing with your demands or actions.

When you send a notice into their system of "just us" without first removing presumptions you will be considered a citizen and as a citizen you have a very limited set of " rights " not inherent freedoms as a sovereign does. You will never be treated with any respect in their court rooms or in their society if you can not learn to remove those presumptions.

Justice delayed is justice denied, It's important to remember that anytime you are expecting favor from the courts and you have done your due diligence and filed your claims and grievances in the proper format for the courts to "accept you" as a valid claimant.....

( freeman on the land don't know the proper format) they learned to deal with courts from silly places.

You then go to court and you watch and you record the transaction then what you are looking for is their acceptance. Once you have it you wait again. Never try to pressure these people into a corner or they will as expected come at you with violence, that is what they do and are trained to do. Never poke the hornets nest, You will always lose.

Learn to become a diplomat.

If someone makes a verbal claim against you in this demonstration I will say it is something that has happened to your child, and it gets the attention of child protective services or social services or

whatever alphabet agency that wants to benefit from it, remembering that these people know how it works and pray on your ignorance if you don't.

They can only act on it if you do not tell them that they need a valid court order and if they tell you that they don't you file a petition to the affect that they are acting against their mandate to get one . It is very common practice for these people to do this because people don't know they can't.

You file a claim against them for slander and racketeering if they consider a claim against you based solely on hearsay. They need a valid claim and a court ordered verdict or injunction before they can tell you that you can not see your kid or whatever they choose to tell you and you then have the recourse of a response.

It is always best when someone tells you they have a claim against you to deny the allegations and then file a petition in the supreme court or claim in civil court for slander, libel, racketeering or fraud. whatever the case may be you have to file your own claim to refute the allegations.

"Ignorance of the law is no excuse" means you can not ignore an accusation.

Create an affidavit outlining your position and enter it into the court record as an application and when anyone tries to tell you they have a claim against you you can then refer them to the court file and they have to first refute your claim before they can impose their own. That is how it works in court.

In the light of an accusation you acquiesce when you remain silent.

If someone makes a claim against you for whatever reason you need to immediately file your own claims against them, think of any charges that might be valid and get them filed. the reasoning for this is not so simple .

When a judge gets a claim he has one "person" to try to make as much money from for the state, it's obviously not about justice as we should all know by now. Is the claim against you valid? is it

going to matter if the state can milk it? no they don't care about that they want you in their jails and in their courts to make money. Once they have a counter claim now the judge has choices, you give him as many choices as possible, make it meaty so he has to bite at it, say someone came onto your lawn in a threatening manner and you assaulted him and ended up in jail. You counter with everything you can think of; trespassing, threatening, damage to property for walking on your lawn without your consent, anything you can think of. then the judge gets to determine who he can make the most money from and if you make your charges more "interesting" to the court.

File your counter claims and motions immediately, do not wait, the longer you wait the less credibility you have. go through the trespass act and the real property acts and find every possible violation you can write down and file motions to all of them.

The best position in court is not a defensive one but a clearly offensive one, see you are helping the state make money and they will like you for it.

Its not about justice, it's about money.

A point of law in Canada, known as "the doctrine stare decisis" if the court will not allow precedent or remedy or follow the statutes in their own code that were created from this precedent.

All Canadian courts are bound to follow a precedent of the Supreme Court of Canada and any pre-1949 decision of the Privy Council which has not been overruled by the Supreme Court of Canada. A minority opinion of the Supreme Court of Canada is, however, not binding.

The Ontario Court of Appeal is not bound to follow a decision of the appellate court of another province.

The Ontario Court of Appeal will generally be bound by its own prior decisions unless the liberty of the subject is involved or unless the prior decision was given per incuriam, that is, inadvertently without consideration of an applicable authority or statutory

provision. It should be noted by comparison that appellate courts in certain other provinces have allowed themselves greater freedom in overruling their own prior decisions.

All Ontario provincial courts lower than the Court of Appeal are bound to follow a decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal. A Divisional Court decision as a decision of an intermediate court of appeal would bind lower courts. (It should be noted that the Divisional Court also sits as a court of first instance.)

All Ontario provincial courts are not bound by the decisions of the appellate courts of other provinces or by decisions of the Federal Court of Appeal.

A decision of a court of co-ordinate jurisdiction is not binding<sup>24</sup> although where there is conflict it may be appropriate to refer the case to the Court of Appeal. It should be noted that in certain circumstances, the District Court may have co-ordinate jurisdiction with the High Court and not be obliged to follow the decision of the otherwise higher court. Similarly, it seems that with respect to procedural matters, the Master's Office and the District Court may be considered to be co-ordinate courts.

another point about court and the language of legalese . Legalese is the language found in their statutory world ( Blacks Law Dictionary ) ( Duhaime.org is a good online dictionary ) , it has it's own language that only they learn while everyone else is watching TV and playing video games.

Its how they can control their court room without you knowing how to do anything unless you have spent the time to learn what they are saying.

Then it gets worse because not only did they create a language unknown to the average guy on the street that sounds like English but it is also open to interpretation by those people in the funny costumes.

It is their party, their world, their language, and to them you are just a foreign invader who has no idea what they are really saying and they can talk freely without you having a clue as to their intentions. So just knowing the definitions is not enough, you also have to know their game pretty well to play in it.

This is why I always "claim common law jurisdiction and waive the benefits of the court" before I say anything. Then they must use literal English. I just walked onto their ship and told them I do not speak their language so I require an interpreter. They must either speak my language or get me one.

Then not only do they have words but also terms and expressions that you would never come across in regular conversations, motions for this and for that or you won't be heard, disclosures, actions, applications for this and for that and they must be filed perfectly or you are not entitled, various things that they know will make you lose your mind before just throwing up your hands and pleading to the mercy of your masters so they will take pity on you. Learn procedure, learn the language and learn the game.

The real world is not Judge Judy and Judge Wapner or even the O.J Simpson trial, that is TV entertainment to make you think you know what is happening in their world.

"It's a big club and you ain't in it" George Carlin

These are all from the police procedures acts, court administrations acts, and my own findings and interpretations of their wording.

1~ Police have no lawful right to impose a summary conviction during a road stop and seize your property without first obtaining a warrant from a proper due process court judgement.

2~ Police have no lawful right to expect identification from you unless you are wanted for a valid crime that is ordered by a proper due process court conviction and this judgement needs to have a valid claim from an injured party.

3~ Police have no lawful right to assault you at any time and arbitrary arrest is considered assault without your consent.

4~ Police have no lawful right to make presumptions of guilt.

5~ Police have no lawful right to follow unlawful orders.

6~ Police are out of uniform if they are not wearing badge, name tag and have a business card with a bonding number. If the police

are out of uniform they are acting under full commercial and criminal liability for their actions against you.

7~ Police do not have the lawful right to enter or otherwise violate your privacy or property without your consent. This includes pockets, automobiles, private housing and luggage.

8~ Police do not have the lawful right to violate your privacy at any time.

9~ Police do not have the right to stop you from video taping or audio recording their conduct as they are public servants and must be scrutinized for public safety.

10~ Judges must at all times be held to their oath in a court of law or there is no law. 11~ Judges must at all times be impartial in a court of law and practicing law from the bench is a violation of their oath.

12~ Judges can never pass sentence in a criminal court, only an impartial jury can make that determination.

13~ Judges must first establish a crime with a claim from an injured party prior to commencement.

14~ Judges who will not allow their oath into the court record are imposters.

15~ Government cannot own property since they cannot make a claim to it.

16~ Government cannot create laws without the consent of the governed.

17~ All statutory legislation is enforced by consent, fraud, coercion or extortion.

18~ All statutory acts are invalid due to lack of consideration of contract

19~ All licenses, permits and registrations are voidable if consideration and full disclosure was not offered.

20~ All loans and mortgages are invalid and the liability is upon the issuer if the contract has only one signature

WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE ?

There is a reason that the word belief can not be written without the word lie right in the middle of it

You Believe ? really ? did you know that a belief is the acceptance of hearsay and hearsay is inadmissible in a court of law ? If you hear a lawyer or a judge say "I believe" you must immediately object on those grounds. I will not accept a belief in a court of law that determines my fate. Only facts .

And if the court can not provide me with solid indisputable facts there is no case .....Period .

All you have in life, as in court, is allegations and facts .

Allegations become facts only with proof, a preponderance of evidence that removes any "shadow of doubt" . .

The police question a man on the street and feel he is a threat to them and unlawfully engage in a summary execution and draw their weapons and fire based on no supporting evidence of fact or an opinion, the only fact that remains is that, that man is laying on the street dead without an opportunity for due process of law or procedural justice.

## OBJECTION

Never accept the words 'believe' or 'think' in a court room , you have to object to any speculations, Your life and dignity are at stake and nothing but clear and evident fact is acceptable. People have been conditioned to accept belief as an argument. It is slave training 101.

Your life is more important than hearsay and conjecture. Object to their fantasies, It all starts with swearing on the bible which is all stories of belief. Never accept their imaginary friends when your freedom comes from reality.

The following is from research done by myself an many others and includes the legal and lawful case law.

the cases presented all come with accreditations to the source and are not relevant to the subject, they are only added for reference such as if you happen to be a sovereign individual and you have standing, it leads us to the " notwithstanding" clause again whereby if you have standing you can simply negate everything after the clause such as

You have freedom notwithstanding this provision and that provision as written and they will list a hundred things that you must adhere to before you can have that freedom but as a sovereign foreign national on Canada I can simply accept that I have freedom and in fact I did not even need to read this I just knew it but the notwithstanding parts are simply for those who have no standing in their court rooms meaning those with ID and contracts.



## A Natural Person vs Artificial Person (A Legal Fiction)

Government Manipulation of Language, In this final section I will show how they pervert the language in a way that makes a comprehension of statute so tedious to read that anyone who tries would quickly give up and they count on it. It is very cleverly crafted to be that way. The following is case law that explains the unlawful creation of statutory law. It is well documented that the law has been subverted to become what it is today and that is the beginning of how we are in the mess we are today with the current admiralty court structure that basically everyone ( except sovereign people ) understand. Remember Understand means to stand under something whether it is a law or a concept of something or simply and idea. You should be very careful of the things you claim to understand.

When the police officer asks you "Do you understand the charges I have read to you?" I always respond "Of course I will not understand you". This leads me to the next section.

## GOVERNMENT TRICKS

### 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 assume the ordinary meaning of the word so as to trick you into reading and interpreting the Statute in their favour. 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 at least two "person" in law:

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

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

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 be 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.

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 assume 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 you will see how individual and person are used and how they apply to natural and artificial persons.

Third Trick:

The third “trick” of the Government is to use the word “includes” in definitions instead of using the word “means”. They do this in some critical definitions that they want you to misinterpret. If they used “means” instead of “includes” then their deception would be exposed, but by using “includes” they rely upon the reader to assume that “includes” expands the definition, whereas in reality it restricts the definition in the same manner that “means” restricts the definition,

Here is a means definition of the word “person” from the Bank Act:  
person means a natural person, an entity or a personal representative;

Here is an includes definition of the word “person” from the Interpretation Act:

person, or any word or expression descriptive of a person, includes a corporation

To expose their deception, substitute the word means and you have  
person , or any word or expression descriptive of a person, means a corporation (viz. – artificial-person)

Both “means” and “includes” are restrictive in scope because they only encompass part of the whole. Typically they are used in the following form:

person means A or B or C (and nothing else).

person includes A and B and C (and nothing else).

From the above example, you will see the logical difference. The list that follows means is constructed using “or”, whereas the list that follows includes is constructed using “and”.

There is a Legal Maxim that supports the restriction of “includes”:

*Inclusio unius est exclusio alterius.*

The inclusion of one is the exclusion of another.

The definition of the word include 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.

Forth Trick:

The fourth “trick” of the Government is to modify how the word “includes” is used in order to make an expansion in the definition when such expansion is required. This “trick” helps add confusion to the use of “includes” convincing most readers that “includes” should always be expansive rather than limiting. Here are some legitimate ways in which “includes” is modified to become expansive rather than restrictive:

also includes  
and includes  
includes, without limitation,  
including  
including but not limited to

The expansive definitions usually take the following form:

person means A or B or C and includes D. (A,B, C and D)

However, there is also a possibility that “and includes” is restrictive in some constructions. There are some people investigating this possibility right now. Their logic is demonstrated by the following example of a definition that states:

province means a province of Canada and includes Ontario and Quebec.

So, if we presume that “and includes” does provide expansion then we must ask why Ontario and Quebec had to be specifically mentioned when they are already part of a so-called province.

The above construction clearly defines the scope of what is meant by province, that is a province of Canada (it does not say which one), and includes only Ontario and Quebec (compiled from a list of two from the original scope of all provinces). In this construction means provides the scope of the definition and includes provides the list of what is actually included in the definition.

The foregoing analysis is one interpretation, but is not the only interpretation. The use of “includes” in statutory definitions can be argued both ways and is the backbone of understanding interpretations.

With the presumption that “and includes” is restrictive, then we must take a very close look at the following definition, taken from the Interpretation Act:

province means a province of Canada and includes the Yukon Territory, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut .

With this presumption what is stated is: unless another statute re-defines province, the default definition of province only includes the Yukon Territory, the Northwest Territories and Nunavut.

So in order to not become absurd, we must allow for “and includes” to be expansive, however more work needs to be done on this subject before placing the last nail in the coffin, so to speak.

Definitions:

Barron’s Canadian Law Dictionary does not provide definitions for “include” or “means” therefore we have to look in the next Source for the definitions.

From Black's Law Dictionary, fourth edition, here is the definition for the word "include":

\* include. To confine within, hold as in an inclosure, take in, attain, shut up, contain, inclose, comprise, comprehend, embrace, involve. Including may, according to context, express an enlargement and have the meaning of and or in addition to, or merely specify a particular thing already included within general words theretofore used.

\* inclose. To surround; to encompass; to bound; fence, or hem in, on all sides.

It is stated in the above definition that the verb include is clearly restrictive and only has limited scope. On the other hand the participle, including (but not limited to) enlarges the scope.

Therefore the conclusion is that when used in a definition, include does not expand the existing definition of the word it is attempting to define. It is easy to be confused because we naturally assume the existing definition of the word, then assume include means to add this new interpretation to the existing assumed definition of the word. Our assumptions fail us in this case.

From now on, when you see the word includes, mentally substitute the word means and you will not be "tricked" by this definition any more.

If you look into any statute, you will be able to find a definition that uses the word includes and when you attempt to broaden the scope of that word to include the ordinary meaning, you will find that the statute will break down because it will not be able to support the inclusion of the ordinary meaning of the word. The breakdown usually occurs when slavery is invoked.

"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)

## LANGUAGE AND DICTIONARIES

“How’s the dictionary getting on?” Winston asked his comrade Syme, who worked with him in the Research Department.

“We’re getting the language into its final shape,” Syme answered.  
“By the year 2050 at the very latest not a single human being will be alive who could understand the conversation we are having now.”  
1984, George Orwell.

In America we speak three languages: Slang, Formal English, and Legal English, Though similar, if one tries to communicate using one language while the listener is listening using another language, there is great opportunity for miscommunication. This article is written in Legal English.

### Slang

It’s the language of the street. It is a dynamic, loosely defined language, and it can vary considerably from one geographical area to the next. It abounds with special and paradoxical interpretations. Once must “grow up” with the language to fully appreciate its peculiarities.

Foreigners always have great difficulty dealing with the various idioms. For example, if you think something is genuinely wonderful, you could say either, “That’s really cool!” or “That’s really hot!” Another way to express great approval is to exclaim, “That’s B-A-D!” or “That’s G-O-O-D!”

### Formal English

Precise communications require a more formal structure. Formal English is taught in the schools, and it is the language of choice when strangers meet to execute common transactions. It is a stable language that typically requires multi-decades or centuries to evolve its meanings.

Unless otherwise specified, English dictionaries cast all words in Formal English, with the more common usage placed at the beginning of the definition. Dictionaries often will show slang or legal meanings as well. They are placed after the more popular usages.

This author favors Webster's 1828 Dictionary because it is useful in understanding words used in the U.S. Constitution. G. & C. Merriam Webster's unabridged dictionary published in 1953 and earlier is great for modern meanings.

### Legal English

When you want accuracy in communication, Legal English is the preferred language. Also known as King's English, or the Language of the Court Room, Legal English is extremely stable, requiring thousands of years for changes in meaning.

Because accuracy is required for good legal communication, legal definitions tend to be rather verbose. The extended explanations are necessary to achieve that accuracy. Legal dictionaries are not all called dictionaries. The more thorough dictionaries are entitled "Corpus Juris" and "Words and Phrases." A given word could require fifty or more pages to arrive at its exact meaning. Other dictionaries (in descending order of this author's preference) include Bouvier's Law Dictionary (1872 Edition), Ballentine's Law Dictionary, and Black's Law Dictionary (4th edition or earlier).

Later editions of Bouvier's Law Dictionary are more like legal encyclopedias



Black's Law Dictionary, 5th through 7th Editions are not as accurate because references to common law are progressively removed, and Roman Civil Law concepts are augmented in order to conform to the law enforcement needs of political power centers such as the Federal Government and the United Nations.

The rule of thumb is that older dictionaries are useful for understanding natural rights, common law, personal sovereignty, and the people's point of view. Newer dictionaries are useful for understanding civil rights, Roman civil law, centralized authority, and the government's point of view. All attorneys are trained in the latter. Judges may go to special seminars to learn the former.

For an excellent research paper on the use of dictionaries in the Supreme Court of the United States, see Kevin Werbach's *LOOKING IT UP: The Supreme Court's Use of Dictionaries in Statutory and Constitutional Interpretation* (1994).

Constructions and legal basis of, in this following compilation are from actual case law.

An absolute, unqualified sentence (or proposition) needs no expositor {*Absoluta sententia expositore non indiget*; 2 Coke, Inst. 533}; From the words of the law there should be no departure {*A verbis legis non est recedendum*; Broom's Max. 268; 5 Rep. 119; Wing. Max. 25}; Constructions should be liberal, on account of the ignorance of the laity, or non-professional persons, so that the subject-matter may avail rather than perish; and the words must be subject to the intention, and not the intention to the words {*Benigne faciendæ sunt interpretationes propter simplicitatem liacorum, ut res magis valeat quam pereat; et verba intentione, non e contra, debent inservire*}; Laws are to be more favorably interpreted, that their intent may be preserved {*Benignius leges interpretandæ sunt quo voluntas earum conservetur*}; The construction of law works not an injury {*Construction legis non facit injuriam*; Coke, Litt. 183; Broom's Max. 259}; The voice of the legislators themselves is like the living voice; the language of a

statute is to be understood and interpreted like ordinary spoken language {Est ipsorum legislatorum tanquam viva vox}; It concerns the commonwealth that things adjudged be not rescinded {Interest reipublicæ res judicatas non rescindi}; There should be no departure from common observance {Non est recedendum a communi observantia; 2 Co. 74}; The best mode of interpreting laws is to make them accord {Optimus interpretandi modus est sic legis interpretare ut leges legibus accordant; 8 Coke, 169}; The thing speaks for itself {Res ipsa loquitur}; A statute is to be so interpreted that the words may be taken with effect {Sic interpretandum est ut verba accipiantur cum effectu}; Statutes

made for the public good ought to be liberally construed {Statuta pro publico commodo late interpretantur}; When anything is granted, that also is granted without which the thing granted cannot exist {Ubi aliquid conceditur, conceditur et id sine quo res ipsa esse non potest}; and that class of authority, *infra*:

It is the duty of the court to give a construction to all written instruments; 3 Binn. R. 337; 7 S. & R. 372; 15 S. & R. 100; 4 S. & R. 279; 8 S. & R. 381; 1 Watts. R. 425; 10 Mass. R. 384; 3 Cranch, R. 180 3 Rand. R. 586; to written evidence: 2 Watts, R. 347 and to foreign laws, 1 Penna. R. 388. For general rules respecting the construction of contracts, see 2 Bl. Com. 379; 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 658, 669; 2 Com. on Cont. 23 to 28; 3 Chit. Com. Law, 106 to 118 Poth. Oblig. P. 1, c. 1, art. 7; 2 Evans' Poth. Ob. 35; Long on Sales, 106; 1 Fonb. Eq. 145, n. b Id. 440, n. 1; Whart. Dig. Contract, F; 1 Powell on Contr. 370 Shepp. Touchst. c. 5; Louis. Code, art. 1940 to 1957; Corn. Dig. Merchant, (E 2,) n. j.; 8 Com. Dig. tit. Contract, iv.; Lilly's Reg. 794; 18 Vin. Abr. 272, tit. Reference to Words; 16 Vin. Abr. 199, tit. Parols; Hall's Dig. 33, 339; 1 Ves. Jun. 210, n.; Vattel, B. 2, c. 17; Chit. Contr. 19 to 22; 4 Kent. Com. 419; Story's Const. § 397-456; Ayl. Pa d. B. 1, t. 4; Rutherf. Inst. B. 2, c. 7, § 4-11; 20 Pick. 150; 1 Bell's Com. 5th ed. 431; and the articles, Communings; Evidence; Interpretation; Parol; Pourparler;

28 U.S.C. § 1366 (Construction of references to laws of the United States or Acts of Congress) (For the purposes of this chapter, references to laws of the United States or Acts of Congress do not include laws applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia.);

ORS 42.230(Office of judge in construing instruments) (In the construction of an instrument, the office of the judge is simply to ascertain and declare what is, in terms or in substance, contained therein, not to insert what has been omitted, or to omit what has been inserted; and where there are several provisions or particulars, such construction is, if possible, to be adopted as will give effect to all.); Cf. *Hunnel v. Roseburg Resources*, 00 CV 0693 CC; A114411 (Or. 08/07/2002); *Olson v. Van Horn*, 182 Or App 264, 48 P3d 860, rev den, 334 Or 631 (2002);

ORS 174.010 (General rule for construction of statutes) (In the construction of a statute, the office of the judge is simply to ascertain and declare what is, in terms or in substance, contained therein, not to insert what has been omitted, or to omit what has been inserted; and where there are several provisions or particulars such construction is, if possible, to be adopted as will give effect to all.);

ORS 174.020 [Amended by 2001 c.438 §1] (Legislative intent; general and particular provisions; consideration of legislative history) (1)(a) In the construction of a statute, a court shall pursue the intention of the legislature if possible. (b) To assist a court in its construction of a statute, a party may offer the legislative history of the statute. (2) When a general and particular provision are inconsistent, the latter is paramount to the former so that a particular intent controls a general intent that is inconsistent with the particular intent. (3) A court may limit its consideration of legislative history to the information that the parties provide to the court. A court shall give the weight to the legislative history that the court considers to be appropriate.);

ORS 174.030(Construction favoring natural right to prevail) (Where a statute is equally susceptible of two interpretations, one

in favor of natural right and the other against it, the former is to prevail.);

*Carcieri v. Salazar*, No. 07-526 (USSC 02/24/2009) ((a) When a statute's text is plain and unambiguous, *United States v. Gonzales*, 520 U.S. 1, 4, the statute must be applied according to its terms, see, e.g., *Dodd v. United States*, 545 U.S. 353, 359. ... There is also no need to consider the parties' competing views on whether Congress had a policy justification for limiting the Secretary's trust authority to tribes under federal jurisdiction in 1934, since Congress' use of "now" in §479 speaks for itself and "courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there." *Connecticut Nat'l Bank v. Germain*, 503 U.S. 249, 253-254. Pp. 7-13.);

*Ali v. Federal Bureau of Prisons*, No. 06-9130 (USSC 01/22/2008) (This Court must give effect to the text Congress enacted. Pp. 3-13.);

*Clark v. Capital Credit Collection Services*, No. 04-35563, 04-35795, 04-35842 (9th Cir. 08/24/2006) (Well-established canons of statutory construction provide that any inquiry into the scope and meaning of a statute must begin with the text of the statute itself. E.g., *Int'l Ass'n of Machinists & Aerospace Workers v. BF Goodrich Aerospace Aerostructure Group*, 387 F.3d 1046, 1051 (9th Cir. 2004). They further caution that, "where the statute's language is plain, the sole function of the courts is to enforce it according to its terms . . . for courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says there." *Id.* (citing *United States v. Ron Pair Enterprises*, 489 U.S. 235, 241 (1989) and *Conn. Nat'l Bank v. Germain*, 503 U.S. 249, 253-54 (1992)) (internal quotation marks omitted).

*Clark v. Capital Credit Collection Services*, No. 04-35563, 04-35795, 04-35842 (9th Cir. 08/24/2006) (Because the statute affirmatively designates certain manners of operation, we are counseled that, under the doctrine of *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*, these omissions are the equivalent of exclusions. See *ARC Ecology v. U.S.*

Dept. of Air Force, 411 F.3d 1092, 1099-1100 (9th Cir. 2005); *In re Gerwer*, 898 F.2d 730, 732 (9th Cir. 1990) (“The express enumeration [of an exception] indicates that other exceptions should not be implied.”). Nevertheless, we have long held that however helpful . . . rules of construction may be, the courts will . . . “construe the details of an act in conformity with its dominating general purpose, will read text in the light of context and will interpret the text so far as the meaning of the words fairly permits so as to carry out in particular cases the generally expressed legislative policy.” *Matheson v. Armbrust*, 284 F.2d 670, 674 (9th Cir. 1960) (quoting *S.E.C. v. Joiner Leasing Corp.*, 320 U.S. 344, 350-51 (1943)); see also *Longview Fibre Co. v. Rasmussen*, 980 F.2d 1307, 1313 (9th Cir. 1992) (holding that *expressio unius* “is a rule of interpretation, not a rule of law. The maxim is ‘a product of logic and common sense,’ properly applied only when it makes sense as a matter of legislative purpose.”) (citation omitted). Moreover, we are not bound by the plain meaning of a statute where its literal application will produce a result “demonstrably at odds with the intention of its drafters.” *In re Been*, 153 F.3d 1034, 1036 (9th Cir. 1998) (citing *United States v. Ron Pair Enterprises*, 489 U.S. 235, 242 (1989)); see also *United States v. Combs*, 379 F.3d 564, 569 (9th Cir. 2004) (“[W]e are not required to interpret a statute in a formalistic manner when such an interpretation would produce a result contrary to the statute’s purpose or lead to unreasonable results.”) (citing *Commissioner IRS v. Brown*, 380 U.S. 563, 571 (1965)). In the present context, strictly abiding by the plain language of § 1692c(c) would do just that. Cf. *Lewis v. ACB Business Services, Inc.*, 135 F.3d 389, 398 (6th Cir. 1998) (“While Congress appears to have intended the [FDCPA] to eliminate abusive collection practices, the language of § 1692c(c) is broader. . .”).

*Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Servs., Inc.*, No. 04-35563, 04-35795, 04-35842 (9th Cir. 08/24/2006) (However, “[i]n analyzing a statutory text, we do not look at its words in isolation. Textual exegesis necessarily is a holistic endeavor. . . . Thus, we look not only to the language itself, but also to . . . the broader context of the statute as a whole.” *BF Goodrich*, 387 F.3d at 1051 (internal quotations and citations omitted). Indeed, elsewhere we have

explained that “[t]he words of a statute are, of course, dead weights unless animated by the purpose of the statute.” *Favish v. Office of Indep. Counsel*, 217 F.3d 1168, 1171 (9th Cir. 2000). To that end, we are “obliged to give effect, if possible, to every word Congress used,” *Baker*, 677 F.2d at 778 (citing *Reiter v. Sonotone Corp.*, 442 U.S. 330, 339 (1979)), and “[w]e have consistently . . . reject[ed] interpretations that would render a statutory provision surplusage or a nullity,” *In re Cervantes*, 219 F.3d 955, 961 (9th Cir. 2000). See also *id.* (noting that “statutes should not be construed in a manner which robs specific provisions of independent effect”) (citations omitted). This requirement demands that we pursue consistency not only within a particular provision but also among the provisions of the FDCPA. See *Am. Bankers Ass’n v. Gould*, 412 F.3d 1081, 1086 (9th Cir. 2005) (“Our goal in interpreting a statute is to understand the statute as a symmetrical and coherent regulatory scheme and to fit, if possible, all parts into a harmonious whole”) (internal quotation and citation omitted).

*Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Servs., Inc.*, No. 04-35563, 04-35795, 04-35842 (9th Cir. 08/24/2006) (See, e.g., *Security Pac. Nat’l Bank v. Resolution Tr. Corp.*, 63 F.3d 900, 904 (9th Cir. 1995) (“We must avoid a construction which renders any language of the enactment superfluous.”); *Hearn v. W. Conference of Teamsters Pension Tr. Fund*, 68 F.3d 301, 304 (9th Cir. 1995) (“Only where a sensible result isn’t reachable may we resort to the drastic step of ignoring . . . statutory language. . . .”) (citation omitted). Instead, intent is only relevant to the determination of damages. *Taylor*, 103 F.3d at 1238, 1239 (“the fact that violations were innocuous and not abusive may be considered only in mitigating liability, and not as defenses”); *Bentley v. Great Lakes Collection Bureau*, 6 F.3d 60, 63 (2d Cir. 1993) (“the degree of a [debt collector’s] culpability may only be considered in computing damages”). We are convinced that this reading of the FDCPA is more in harmony with the remedial nature of the statute, which requires us to interpret it liberally. Cf., e.g., *Eby v. Reb Realty, Inc.*, 495 F.2d 646, 650 (9th Cir. 1974) (concluding the remedial purpose of the Truth in Lending Act, 15

U.S.C. § 1601 et seq., required liberal construction); accord *Johnson v. Riddle*, 305 F.3d 1107, 1117 (10th Cir. 2002) (“Because the FDCPA . . . is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer.”).

*Hamdan v. Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense*, No. 05-184 (U.S.S.C. 06/29/2006) (The Government’s argument that §§1005(e)(1) and (h) repeal this Court’s jurisdiction to review the decision below is rebutted by ordinary principles of statutory construction. A negative inference may be drawn from Congress’ failure to include §1005(e)(1) within the scope of §1005(h)(2). Cf., e.g., *Lindh v. Murphy*, 521 U.S. 320, 330. “If ... Congress was reasonably concerned to ensure that [§§1005(e)(2) and (3)] be applied to pending cases, it should have been just as concerned about [§1005(e)(1)], unless it had the different intent that the latter [section] not be applied to the general run of pending cases.” *Id.*, at 329. If anything, the evidence of deliberate omission is stronger here than it was in *Lindh.*);

*Scheidler v. National Organization for Women Inc.*, No. 04-1244 (U.S.S.C. 02/28/2006) (Respondents’ contrary claim rests primarily upon a canon of statutory construction that favors interpretations that give a function to each word in a statute, thereby avoiding linguistic superfluity. See *United States v. Menasche*, 348 U.S. 528, 538-539 (1955) (“It is our duty ‘to give effect, if possible, to every clause and word of a statute’ ” (quoting *Montclair v. Ramsdell*, 107 U.S. 147, 152 (1883))). ... The canons of interpretation cannot lead us to a contrary conclusion. Those canons are tools designed to help courts better determine what Congress intended, not to lead courts to interpret the law contrary to that intent. *Chickasaw Nation v. United States*, 534 U.S. 84, 94 (2001) (noting that “canons are not mandatory rules” but guides “designed to help judges determine the Legislature’s intent,” and that “other circumstances evidencing congressional intent can overcome their force”).

Gathright v. City of Portland, No. 04-35402 (9th Cir. 02/24/2006)  
(Gathright challenged his evictions from the city park on First Amendment grounds. The City defended its ordinance as a legitimate “time, place, or manner” regulation of protected speech. The Ninth Circuit’s opinion rejects the City’s argument and invalidates the ordinance on its face, distinguishing the Supreme Court’s seminal case for such regulation in city parks ( Ward v. Rock

Against Racism, 491 US 781) and the Supreme Court case most closely on point ( Hurley v. Irish-American Gay Group of Boston, 515 US 557), and then concluding without much more discussion that the City’s ordinance is not “narrowly tailored” enough to protect the permittees’ interest in exercising their right to gather peaceably in city parks.);

City of Nyssa v. Dufloth, 339 Or. 330 (2005) (Under the Priest paradigm the court searches for the intent of the people who drafted and adopted the original provision of the constitution. In so doing, the court examines the wording of the constitutional provision, the case law surrounding it, and the historical circumstances leading to its adoption. 314 Or at 415-16.)

Lambert v. Blodgett, No. 03-35081 (9th Cir. 12/28/2004)  
(Reinforcing our textual analysis is the usual presumption that when Congress employs a commonly used phrase like “adjudicated on the merits,” it intends that term to retain its ordinary meaning. See Miles v. Apex Marine Corp., 498 U.S. 19, 32 (1990) (“We assume that Congress is aware of existing law when it passes legislation.”); RANDY HERTZ & JAMES S. LIEBMAN, 1 FEDERAL HABEAS CORPUS PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE 1422 & n.4 (4th ed. 2001) (“[I]f a word is obviously transplanted from another legal source, whether the common law or other legislation, it brings the old soil with it.”) (quoting Felix Frankfurter, Some Reflections on the Reading of Statutes, 47 COLUM. L. REV. 527, 537 (1947)).

United States v. Vagas Amaya, No. 03-50577 (9th Cir. 11/22/2004)  
 (“In construing a statute as a matter of first impression, we first



must look to the statutory language: ‘The starting point in interpreting a statute is its language, for if the intent of Congress is clear, that is the end of the matter.’ ” *Morales-Alejo*, 193 F.3d at 1105 (quoting *Good Samaritan Hosp. v. Shalala*, 508 U.S. 402, 409 (1993)). It is a well-established canon of statutory construction that when Congress uses a term of art, such as “warrant,” unless Congress affirmatively indicates otherwise, we presume Congress intended to incorporate the common definition of that term: [W]here Congress borrows terms of art in which are accumulated the legal tradition and meaning of centuries of practice, it presumably knows and adopts the cluster of ideas that were attached to each borrowed word in the body of learning from which it was taken and the meaning its use will convey to the judicial mind unless otherwise instructed. In such case, absence of contrary direction may be taken as satisfaction with widely accepted definitions, not as a departure from them. *Carter v. United States*, 530 U.S. 255, 264 (2000) (quoting *Morrisette v. United States*, 342 U.S. 246, 263 (1952)).

*Norfolk Southern Railway co. v. Kirby Engineering*, 543 U.S. 14, 125 S. Ct. 385 (2004) (“Read naturally, the word ‘any’ has an expansive meaning, that is, ‘one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind.’ ” *United States v. Gonzales*, 520 U.S. 1, 5 (1997) (quoting *Webster’s Third New International Dictionary* 97 (1976)). There is no reason to contravene the clause’s obvious meaning. See *Green v. Biddle*, 21 U.S. (8 Wheat.) 1 89-90 (1823) (“[W]here the words of a law, treaty, or contract, have a plain and obvious meaning, all construction, in hostility with such meaning, is excluded”).

*McMellon v. United States*, No. 02-1494 (4th Cir. 10/14/2004) (The Supreme Court has repeatedly explained that the plain language of a statute is the best evidence of Congressional intent. See, e.g., *Holloway v. United States*, 526 U.S. 1, 6 (1999). As noted above, the SIAA includes no list of exceptions to its waiver of sovereign immunity, but instead provides only that the government is entitled to the limitations of liability that are available in admiralty to

private defendants. Thus, the plain language of the SIAA seems to reflect a Congressional intent that discretionary acts should not be excluded from the waiver of sovereign immunity. See *Barnhart Comm. of Social Security v. Sigmon Coal Co.*, 534 U.S. 438, 450 (2002) (explaining that when construing a statute, “[t]he first step is to determine whether the language at issue has a plain and unambiguous meaning with regard to the particular dispute in the case. The inquiry ceases if the statutory language is unambiguous and the statutory scheme is coherent and consistent.” (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)).

*Miller v. C.C. Meisel Co.*, 183 Or App 148, 51 P3d 650 (2002) (In *Van v. Fox*, 278 Or 439, 445-46, 564 P2d 695 (1977), the court explained: “‘The law does not favor, but leans against, the destruction of contracts because of uncertainty; and it will, if feasible, so construe agreements as to carry into effect the reasonable intentions of the parties if that can be ascertained.’ (Quoting 11 *Williston on Contracts* 813, § 1424 (3d ed 1968);

*Hunnel v. Roseburg Resources*, 00 CV 0693 CC; A114411 (Or. 08/07/2002) (We review the interpretation of an express easement for errors of law. *State Highway Com’n v. Deal et al.*, 191 Or 661, 681, 233 P2d 242 (1951); *Kell v. Oppenlander*, 154 Or App 422, 426, 961 P2d 861 (1998). To interpret an easement, we follow the guidelines that the Supreme Court established in *Tipperman v. Tsiatsos*, 327 Or 539, 544-45, 964 P2d 1015 (1998). See also *Olson v. Van Horn*, 182 Or App 264, 270 n 4, 48 P3d 860 (2002) (adhering to *Tipperman* method). We begin with the text of the instrument itself and look beyond it if it is ambiguous, in which case we look to the intent of the original parties as revealed by the relevant surrounding circumstances such as the nature of the easement and how it was used. If ambiguity still remains, we look to rules of construction such as the one announcing that an easement is to be construed against the grantor who reserves it. *Tipperman*, 327 Or at 545. Applying those guidelines here, we conclude that the trial

court erred. Thus, the actual words themselves are unambiguous, and neither the punctuation, the handwritten numeral, nor the context of the disputed phrase alters that fact. And if they did, the ambiguity would attach not to the meaning of the instrument but to whether that meaning reflected the intention of the parties. As the trial court recognized, these factors do not affect the language in such a way as to produce more than one meaning. Rather, they indicate (if anything) an inadvertent scrivener's omission. Reinserting inadvertent omissions is not the office of the judge in interpreting instruments; that office is "to ascertain and declare what is, in terms or in substance, contained therein, not to insert what has been omitted[.]" ORS 42.230. An unambiguous contract that mistakenly fails to reflect the intent of the parties through inadvertent omission is remedied through a claim for reformation—a claim that defendant did not raise and that would have required defendant to prove, by clear and convincing evidence, an antecedent agreement to which the contract could be reformed, a mutual mistake (or unilateral mistake on the part of the defendant and inequitable conduct on the part of plaintiffs), and the absence of gross negligence by defendant. See *Jensen v. Miller*, 280 Or 225, 228-29, 570 P2d 375 (1977).

*Olson v. Van Horn*, 182 Or App 264, 48 P3d 860, rev den, 334 Or 631 (2002) (ORS 42.230, which provides: "In the construction of an instrument, the office of the judge is simply to ascertain and declare what is, in terms or in substance, contained therein, not to insert what has been omitted, or to omit what has been inserted; and where there are several provisions or particulars, such construction is, if possible, to be adopted as will give effect to all." (Emphasis added.);

*AT&T Communications of the Pacific Northwest, Inc. v. City of Eugene*, 16-98-12672; A105861 (Or. 10/31/2001) (The only possible justification for reading subsections (b) and (c) as substantive prohibitions is the textual maxim *expressio unius est exclusio alterius*. That maxim, however, may operate only to

explain a text, not to contradict it. *Neuberger v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 311 US 83, 88, 61 S Ct 97, 85 L Ed 58 (1940) (“The maxim *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* is an aid to construction, not a rule of law. It can never override clear and contrary evidence of Congressional intent.”).

*United States v. Oakland Cannabis Buyers Coop.*, 532 U.S. 483, 496 (2001) (As an initial matter, the Cooperative is correct that, when district courts are properly acting as courts of equity, they have discretion unless a statute clearly provides otherwise. For “several hundred years,” courts of equity have enjoyed “sound discretion” to consider the “necessities of the public interest” when fashioning injunctive relief. *Hecht Co. v. Bowles*, 321 U.S. 321, 329-330 (1944). See also *id.*, at 329 (“The essence of equity jurisdiction has been the power of the Chancellor to do equity and to mould each decree to the necessities of the particular case. Flexibility rather than rigidity has distinguished it”); *Weinberger v. Romero-Barcelo*, 456 U.S. 305, 312 (1982) (“In exercising their sound discretion, courts of equity should pay particular regard for the public consequences in employing the extraordinary remedy of injunction”). Such discretion is displaced only by a “clear and valid legislative command.” *Porter v. Warner Holding Co.*, 328 U.S. 395, 398 (1946). See also *Romero-Barcelo*, *supra*, at 313 (“Of course, Congress may intervene and guide or control the exercise of the courts’ discretion, but we do not lightly assume that Congress has intended to depart from established principles”).

*United States v. One 1997 Toyota Land Cruiser*, No 99-55661 (9th Cir. 04/26/2001) (In construing a statute, we first consider its text. “[W]hen the statute’s language is plain, the sole function of the courts—at least where the disposition required by the text is not absurd—is to enforce it according to its terms.” *Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Union Planters Bank*, 120 S.Ct. 1942, 1947 (2000) (citations and quotation marks omitted). If the statute’s meaning is clear, we will not consider legislative history. “When the words of a statute are unambiguous, ... the first canon is also the

last: judicial inquiry is complete.” Connecticut Nat’l. Bank v. Germain, 503 U.S. 249, 254 (1992) (citations and quotation marks omitted).

State of Oregon v. Cach, 9903-61470; CA A105887 (02/29/2001) (ORS 426.100 is like any other statute, in that its interpretation depends on ascertaining the legislature’s intent. We should interpret it as it is written and not add to, or delete language from, its text. ORS 174.010. There has been a tendency by this court to read this particular statute’s requirements as if the failure to comply with them constitutes “structural” error. See, e.g., State v. Montgomery, 147 Or App 69, 934 P2d 640 (1997); State v. May, 131 Or App 570, 888 P2d 14 (1994). Although that term has a somewhat ambiguous meaning in the law, I understand it to refer to situations where the denial of a fundamental right is so pervasive that it necessarily infects the entire proceeding. An example would be the denial of the assistance of counsel in a criminal proceeding where there has been no effective waiver of that right. See, e.g., State v. Barone, 329 Or 210, 986 P2d 5 (1998).<sup>(5)</sup> In those instances, the concept of “harmless error” can play no role because it is impossible to ascertain whether the proceeding was fundamentally fair. Nothing in the language of ORS 426.100 suggests that the legislature intended that a failure to comply with its requirements would constitute structural error. Consequently, this court has erred in the past to the extent that it has refused to consider arguments about waiver and harmless error, because those doctrines are applicable under this statute.)

Trus Joist Macmillan v. John Deere Insurance Co., 171 Or. App. 476, 15 P.3d 995 (12/20/2000) (The focus of statutory construction is the intentions of the legislature, not the intentions of the parties to a private insurance policy. There is a presumption that the legislature intended the ordinary meaning of terms to apply, as generally reflected in common dictionary definitions. See, e.g., Marcilionis, 318 Or at 644-45);

Trus Joist Macmillan v. John Deere Insurance Co., 171 Or. App. 476, 15 P.3d 995 (12/20/2000) (This is not a case in which the Oregon legislature enacted a uniform law. See, e.g., Security Bank v. Chiapuzio, 304 Or 438, 445 n 6, 747 P2d 335 (1987) (“the legislative intent to make the UCC a uniform code makes relevant the decisions of other courts”). Nor is it a case in which the Oregon statute is based on the wording of a statute from another jurisdiction, in which case pre-existing decisions from that jurisdiction may become relevant. See, e.g., Pamplin v. Victoria, 319 Or 429, 433, 877 P2d 1196 (1994) (pre-existing federal court decisions construing federal rule of civil procedure relevant to interpretation of identical Oregon rule based on the federal counterpart). In the absence of any such evidence that the Oregon legislature intended to follow decisions of other jurisdictions, the fact that some of those decisions construe similar language differently provides little, if any, assistance to us in determining what the Oregon legislature intended.);

State of Oregon v. Barnes, 329 OR 327, 986 P2D 1160 (1999) (“In the construction of a statute, the office of the judge is simply to ascertain and declare what is, in terms or in substance, contained therein, not to insert what has been omitted \* \* \*.”);

United States v. Harris, No. 97-10270 (9th Cir. 07/30/1999) (The presumption is that a statute is constitutional. United States v. National Dairy Corp., 372 U.S. 29, 32-33 (1963). Statutes are construed to avoid defects which would render them unconstitutional. U.S. Civil Service Comm. v. Letter Carriers, 413 U.S. 548, 571 (1973)); Cf. Rose v. Clark, 478 U.S. 570, 577-78, 106 S Ct 3101, 92 L Ed 2d 460 (1986);

Fales v. Multnomah Co. et al., 119 Or 127, 133, 248 P 151 (1926) aff'd. City of Eugene v. Nalven, 152 Or App 720, rev den, 327 Or 431 (1998) (When a power is given by statute everything necessary to make it effectual is given by implication.); Ubi aliquid conceditur, conceditur et id sine quo res ipsa esse non potest.

Salinas v. United States, 522 U.S. 52 (1997) (As we held in *Albertini*, supra, at 680: “Statutes should be construed to avoid constitutional questions, but this interpretative canon is not a license for the judiciary to rewrite language enacted by the legislature. *Heckler v. Mathews*, 465 U.S. 728, 741-742 (1984). Any other conclusion, while purporting to be an exercise in judicial restraint, would trench upon the legislative powers vested in Congress by Art. I, §1, of the Constitution. *United States v. Locke*, 471 U.S. 84, 95-96 (1985).” These principles apply to the rules of statutory construction we have followed to give proper respect to the federal-state balance. As we observed in applying an analogous maxim in *Seminole Tribe of Florida v. Florida*, 517 U.S. 44 (1996), “[w]e cannot press statutory construction to the point of disingenuous evasion even to avoid a constitutional question.” *Id.*, at 57, n. 9

(internal quotation marks omitted). *Gregory* itself held as much when it noted the principle it articulated did not apply when a statute was unambiguous. See *Gregory*, 501 U.S., at 467. A statute can be unambiguous without addressing every interpretive theory offered by a party. It need only be “plain to anyone reading the Act” that the statute encompasses the conduct at issue. *Ibid.*);

*Jones v. General Motors Corp.*, 325 Or 404, 939 P.2d 608 (1997) (In the construction of a statute the office of the judge is simply to ascertain and declare what is, in terms or in substance, contained therein, not to insert what has been omitted, or to omit what has been inserted; and where there are several provisions or particulars such construction is, if possible, to be adopted as will give effect to all.);

*Stull v. Hoke*, 326 Or 72, 78, 948 P2d 722 (1997) (We consider other statutes in *pari materia*, if not strictly speaking as “context” of the statute—because the other statutes were later enacted);

Holcomb v. Sunderland, 321 Or 99, 105, 894 P2d 457 (1995) aff'd.  
State of Oregon v. Lyons, 94-10-37308; CA A89277 (Or.  
07/07/1999) (When the court interprets a statute, that  
interpretation becomes part of the statute as if it were written into  
the law at the time of its enactment.);

So in closing I hope this book has opened your mind to what  
government is and does and the crime spree that it carries out  
against the peaceful people who try to navigate the waters of it's  
maritime admiralty legal insanity.

I wish you all peace and hope that one day we can all become  
purely sovereign then we can finally and collectively rif ourselves of  
the plantation houses of slavery owned and run by government,  
royalty and all of those many families that continue to control and  
manipulate it with money and the power that it's perceived value  
holds over the masses.

I am Mike of the Family Rasila and I wish you peace.