

# PRESENTMENTS

This is private expression of personal perspective and is neither public disclosure nor a public offering. The material set forth herewith is for educational purposes only. Nothing stated herein is intended as constituting legal advice and is not provided with any warranties, express or implied. The content set forth herein constitute the opinions and understanding of the author. Accountability for the actions of anyone who utilizes any material set forth herein, in part or in whole, resides entirely with the user and are neither the actions nor responsibility of the author.

Acknowledgment. This work is the product of the dedication, intelligence, and above all courage/risk, of many people. Some have paid, are paying, and are threatened with paying, with their property, freedom, and their very lives. It now appears that the numbers of such casualties in the cause of truth, freedom, justice, and peace are rapidly increasing. This work is dedicated to all those who share these values, in whatever way they perceive and think of them. Note: This article, such as every treatise of this type, must be regarded as "work in progress" that is subject to change without notice at any instant based upon the acquisition of new knowledge, information, insights, and experience.

## Dealing With Presentments

### Part I—Background, Context, and Underpinnings

Whenever you receive a presentment of any kind, from a traffic ticket to a bill to a summons or indictment, there are two basic and diametrically opposite ways to think about the matter. I.e., you can think of receiving a presentment as an event that:

1. Will cost you, be a loss to you;
2. Is a gift that can enrich you.

Everything in life is a matter of perception. Our challenges are usually the result of ignoring what we are confronted with rather than endeavoring to discern how best to act with more adequate knowledge and understanding. We **assume** rather than **know**. Consequently, if we would have any chance of succeeding vis-à-vis a presentment, we must first have some basic understanding of the system within which the issuance, interpretation, and enforcement of presentments occur. The following mini-analysis of the legal system may be helpful in this regard.

In *The I Ching* is a remarkable statement: "The Superior Man goes only into his own domain." As Frederic Bastiat said in a similar vein, "Minding one's own business is the only moral law." The conundrum, of course, is how to live in peace and freedom in a world in which we are besieged by exercises of the interminable, relentless, longstanding, and incredibly brilliant schemes of rulership, slavery, and exploitation that have plagued mankind throughout history and that aggressively intrude themselves unilaterally into all areas of our lives—spiritual, emotional, mental, social, and economic. This renders living in a "live-and-let-live" manner on this planet difficult, and impossible without sufficient knowledge.

The fact that law consists of rules revolving around the use of deadly force is a powerful incentive to become as clear as possible concerning the nature of the legal/commercial system governing the world. We must remember that "To 'assume' makes an 'ass' out of 'u' and 'me.'" In the case of law, acting on false knowledge, i.e., in ignorance, can be fatal. This is enormously complicated by the fact that the legal system is "colorable," i.e., "phony." It may **appear** real, but nothing is as it appears, just as in *Alice in Wonderland*.<sup>1</sup> To assume that the appearance is genuine and dependable is to act on illusion instead of truth.

One cannot have peace with those who hold aggression in their hearts and are not interested in love, freedom, harmony, truth, or any of the other higher values of man that most people revere and would cherish seeing established in the community of man.

<sup>1</sup> Alice in Wonderland was written as a satire on the legal system, where things are an ever-changing mirage and nothing is as it appears.

The state of the heart is what counts in this equation. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." Good people are disarmed in advance by an inability to comprehend the mentality of deliberate

predators, usually regarding problems in dealing with such aggressors as misunderstandings that can be cleared up through sufficient communication. It is often not easy for good people to understand that there are those who know the difference between "good" and "evil" and deliberately choose the latter.

The significance of this in law is profound. If your adversary is sincere, truthful, fair, and honorable about what he is doing, i.e. interested in uncovering and dealing justly with the truth, then you are probably operating on parallel tracks. In such case the discord or conflict is the result of misunderstanding or lack of communication, and disappears when both sides realize what is happening. If, however, your adversary is operating from a covert stance with deliberate deceit, concealment, misrepresentation, bad faith, and aggression in his heart, the dispute is real, will not be resolved amicably, and requires exposure of the facts to the light of day by providing sufficient evidence. Further significance of the importance of subjective condition and intent of the heart is that all law is contract, and the essence and core of any contract is agreement. Without a genuine agreement, consisting of a true meeting of the minds and mutual understanding by all parties of all terms and conditions to which the parties are agreeing, there is no contract.

### Derivatives and the Nature of the Legal System

The Powers-That-Be turn everything into a tool and a weapon to be used in their unceasing attempt to triumph by playing win/lose games against their fellow man. One of the most powerful, magical, and difficult to detect tools and weapons used against mankind by aggressors and exploiters is language. Allegedly the word "phonetics" derives from "phoenetics," purportedly stemming from the Phoenicians, who gave us "lan-goo-ag," a word referencing a substance that, when fired from the canon of a ship, tore the sails and mast and left the opponent "dead in the water." Obviously words are extremely powerful weapons, and using them for conquest and rulership purposes is what the legal system is about. Ideas concerning the nature and use of language in law are set forth, inter alia, in a discourse entitled *Legal Fictions*, by Lon L. Fuller, 1967, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California:

#### **The Fiction as a Linguistic Phenomenon – page 9-10**

Ihering once said that the History of the Law could write as a motto over her first chapter the sentence, "In the beginning was the Word."<sup>26</sup> Students of the legal fiction might also take this motto to heart. For certainly it is a truth commonly overlooked that the fiction is "a disease or affection of language."

26 Ihering expresses in this fashion the exaggerated respect shown by early law for the written and spoken word. "Among all primitive peoples the word appears as something mysterious; a naive faith ascribes to the word a supernatural Power" (112,441).

Anyone who has thought about the legal fiction must be aware that it presents an illustration of the all-pervading power of the word. That a statement which is disbelieved by both its author and his audience can have any significance at all is evidence enough that **we are here in contact with the mysterious influence exercised by names and symbols**. In that sense the fiction is a linguistic phenomenon.

#### **What Is a Legal Fiction? - Pages 4-5**

The influence of the fiction extends to every department of the jurist's activities.

Yet it cannot be said that this circumstance has ever caused the legal profession much embarrassment. **Laymen frequently complain of the law: they very seldom complain that it is founded upon fictions.** They are more apt to express discontent when the law has refused to adopt what they regard as an expedient and desirable fiction. Perhaps, too, the fiction has played its part in making the law "uncognizable" to the layman. The very strangeness and boldness of the legal fiction has tended to stifle his criticisms, and has no doubt often led him to agree modestly with the writer of *Sheppard's Touchstone*, that "the subject matter of law is somewhat transcendent, and too high for ordinary capacities."<sup>2</sup>

At another place the only defense he can find is the doubtful one of recrimination, when he points out that the common-law fictions were no worse than the numerous fictions of the Roman law.<sup>13</sup>

13 Ibid., III, \*107.

### **A Fiction Distinguished from a Lie - Page 7**

Maine's classical definition of the historical fiction as "any assumption which conceals, or affects to conceal, the fact that a rule of law has undergone alteration...remains unchanged, its operation being modified,"<sup>19</sup> seems to leave room for the intent to deceive. The English courts were in the habit of pretending that a chattel, which might in fact have been taken from the plaintiff by force, had been found by the defendant.<sup>20</sup> Why? In order to allow an action which otherwise would not have lain. If this fiction does not deceive, of what purpose is it?

19 Maine, *Ancient Law* (1861; Beacon Press ed., 1963), p.25. Cf. "the authorities... distinctly admit that fiction is frequently resorted to in the attempt to conceal the fact that the law is undergoing alteration in the hands of the judges." J. Smith, "Surviving Fictions," 27 *Yale L. Jour.* (1917), 147, 150.

20 Blackstone, III, \* 152.

It is easy to conclude uncharitably that the judge who enlarges his jurisdiction or who changes a rule of law under cover of a fiction is very coolly and calculatingly choosing to hide from the public the fact that he is legislating.

### **A Fiction Distinguished from an Erroneous Conclusion – page 8**

A fiction is generally distinguished from an erroneous conclusion (or in scientific fields, from a false hypothesis) by the fact that it is adopted by its author with knowledge of its falsity. A fiction is an "expedient, but consciously false, assumption."<sup>21</sup>

21 Vaihinger, *Die Philosophie des Als Ob*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed., 1920, p.130.

As living, physical, biological, sentient beings we are real—we exist as aspects of existence. The system, on the other hand, is an abstract creation of the mind. It is in the realm of words, symbols, ideas, laws, contracts, etc., where the circuit exists through which the current (currency) flows in accordance with the rules of law and commerce.

Manifest existence emerges into form and substance out of the nothingness of the unmanifest. All creation, therefore, is derivative; the created is derived from the creator. Creator and created are different "meta-levels," or "logical types," from each other. The eternal absolute has no finite properties. From any relative perspective, the absolute is neither cognizable nor perceivable, and must be described in accordance with what it is not, such as "the void," "unbounded," "changeless," etc.

While the unmanifest is changeless, manifest existence is endless, non-repeating, unique, and non-repeatable change. It is not possible that any configuration of anything in creation is ever exactly the same as it ever was, or ever will be, or will be a split fraction of a second later, or ever could be. As Heraclites noted, "No man can walk twice into the same river." Everything is process in pattern, energy in motion in particular forms, orbits, paths, and circuitries that are at every infinitesimal instant unique. Furthermore, the further removed manifest creation is from the source, the more derivative and impotent it is. That which the mind, through sensory experience and all other relative processes, regards as "physical reality" that is solid, real, and substantive, is in actuality the most illusory. The more subtle, insubstantial, and elusive the level of manifestation one accesses, the more real and potent it is, since it is less derivative and closer to the Source. This can be illustrated by observing the history of science, perhaps most dramatically exemplified by the development of weapons. As man has gone from weaponry involving the gross physical (clubs, spears, catapults, etc.), to more subtle strata (such as the

chemical level where gunpowder operates), towards the atomic and sub-atomic domains (atomic bomb and hydrogen bomb), toward the unmanifest field, the more energy is liberated.

Although neither the Absolute nor the Relative is actually cognizable by the mind, that does not stop just about everyone from engaging in the popular game of thinking otherwise. The mind forms concepts about the Source—none of which is either remotely a faithful map nor the territory that it is purportedly mapping—as well as aspects of the Relative. To satisfy the mind's "need to know," man lives by the foolish idea that his conceptions of existence (whether of the Absolute or Relative) are true and that the fixed pictures, patterns, or conclusions derived from some finite vantage point (largely through acquired experience and sensory perceptions) have captured the thing itself. This is as silly as taking progressive snapshots of the ocean and its waves and thereby thinking that one has cognized and captured the ocean, or speculating from outside the door what is inside a room in which one is not present and living on the basis of one's speculations as if they were absolute. This state of man's development we call an "ego-conscious" state (as opposed to "unconscious" in which life is simply lived, or "Self-conscious," in which man lives in conscious awareness of the Absolute and Relative as they actually are rather than as his mind thinks about or cognizes them).

The ego-conscious state, or mistaking abstract constructions of the mind for reality, and thereafter building careers, institutions, "security," and governments thereon is idolatry. It is idol worship, i.e., Baal worship. By giving credence and superiority to concepts about something (such as God), rather than the reality of the thing itself, one worships (pays homage to, reveres, and depends upon) graven images. Graven images of the mind are as much idols as, and indeed necessarily precede the construction of, any idols of wood or stone. Man's penchant to think that he has cognized the un-cognizable, and, worse yet, mistake his own cognitions for that which he thinks he has cognized but has not, is not only idolatry but may be responsible for more discord, carnage, suffering, and wars than any other single aspect of human life. It might well be said that "God (eternal Source) created man in His own image (as a conscious, spiritual being with power to create), and man returned the complement." As Pascal quipped, "To die for an ideal is a pretty high price to place on conjecture."

The goal of any Zen master, for instance, is to bring people to a conscious state where they no longer, in the words of Gregory Bateson, "eat the menu and leave the dinner." Until one sees and lives reality as it actually is, he is mistaking what he regards as "reality," i.e., what his mind (through the senses) perceives and thinks about existence, for reality itself. He mistakes the map for the territory.<sup>2</sup> Since the senses are enormously limited, conclusions about reality reached by the mind are fantasy. The senses are liars and deceivers. We would perceive reality in a vastly different manner, for instance, if we could view existence throughout the entire electromagnetic spectrum instead of the extremely narrow range in which what we see as colors exist.

<sup>2</sup> The central axiom of semantics is that "The map is not the territory; the name is not the thing named."

The practical consequences of all this is that in man's ego-conscious state he lives a fraudulent and fictitious life. It is one of illusions and delusions by living in accordance with the preposterous belief that his conceptualizations are both accurate and real, when they are neither. Man's not only lives, but relates with others (often dogmatically and violently), on the basis of believing that the imposter is genuine. Inasmuch as law itself is a subset of the workings of man's mind, what else can law be other than that of which it is an expression, i.e., fictions and frauds? Moreover, since all of this occurs within and as derivative expressions of the ever-changing Relative, law cannot be other than ever-changing.

A summary of the points and consequences of the above include the following:

1. Language has power and magic because of man's ego-conscious state.
2. The Powers-That-Be deliberately utilize language and man's ego-conscious condition for administering power and exploitation. The entire legal system is a word game, played by the designers and operators of the system for purposes of power, plunder,

exploitation, and enslavement, with unending exercises of destructive physical force applied against living beings on the basis of meanings artificially imparted to the words used.

3. Mistaking the different meta-levels of existence itself, i.e., mistaking the map for the territory, is not only delusion, but when it comes to law, it is disaster. "Authority" for using deadly legalized violence against one's person is attached to the results of the error.

4. Our difficulties often arise from our acting in a manner that results in people enforcing the fictions and frauds by systematic and ruthless application of legalized violence, damaging the real us. Then whatever is happening in the system becomes substantive in our physical lives.

5. Everything in existence can be viewed, perceived, and thought about in an infinite number of ways, by an infinite number of beings, for an infinite number of possible reasons. Not only are no two of any of those things the same, but could not be identical even if anyone so wished. Concepts (maps) can be fixed; creation (the territory) cannot.

6. It is impossible in the ever-changing realm of creation for any subset thereof, such as a man, even remotely to fathom, comprehend, and know (let alone verbalize) "the truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth." We might define "Truth" (capital "T") as the actual way things are, i.e., the "thing in itself," to use Kant's term, or in their "suchness," to use a Buddhist characterization. This totality and actuality is not finitely knowable, both because of its unimaginable vastness and because no two split instants are ever the same. The same word designated as "truth" (lower-case "t") might be defined as an accurate abstract mapping of some thing or event, such as if one is given a map that allegedly shows where a treasure is buried and digs at the spot indicated, he will either find, or not find, the treasure. If it is found, we say the map is "accurate" and the author thereof told the "truth." If the treasure is not found, we say that the map was false or inaccurate and the author was either in error or lied (or someone removed the treasure subsequent to the making of the map).

7. Man's capacity for mapping reality through creation of abstract symbols, such as numbers and words, is likewise derivative. Anyone can observe or think about anything and create/concoct whatever designation of letters, symbols, and sounds he may wish for classifying, categorizing, or identifying the particular thing and referencing it in his own mind and/or communicating it to others by speech, writing, or some other means.

8. The legal system, like reality, likewise consists of the flow of energy in accordance with the patterns of its design. In the case of the legal system, both the designer of the circuitries and the current that flows therein are different than that of given existence. With respect to the universe, the designer is the Creator (however anyone may think of the ineffable Source of all that exists) and the current that flows is universal energy that is ultimately unknowable and indefinable by any relative means. Concerning the legal system, the designer is man and the current that flows in the circuits of the system is called "currency," i.e., "money." There are very few types of legal entities existing today. They are fundamentally corporations, trusts, partnerships, and sole proprietorships. The IRS Code at 26 USC 7701.01(a) lists seven classes of legal persons, the additional three to the four fundamental ones being an association, estate, and company. What defines each of these and distinguishes each from the other as well as determines how the system deals with them, is the schematic defining how the currency flows in the circuitry. Money embodies more laws and commercial principles than any other single thing, whereby insofar as the world is concerned it may reasonably be characterized as the measure of all things.

9. Legal terms and phrases are artificially imbued with the particular meaning and significance of those who define them. Legal terms have considerably different meanings than the same words do in ordinary parlance. The system, in short, is a word game. Words in law are artificially assigned meanings that are completely different than the

meanings attributed to the same words in normal speech. Examples of this are legion, one of the most prominent of which is the word "person," which in law refers to a legal fiction and does not, and cannot, pertain to a real being. This is why we need law dictionaries in addition to regular ones. The result is the legal system is its own language, concerning which we allegedly need translators and mouthpieces, called "attorneys," for using the esoteric language that is not spoken by laymen when in a forum (such as a court) wherein legal language is spoken.

10. When language, symbols, and ideas are usurped by those who would play win/lose games they are wielded as weapons. This phenomenon has grown to such gargantuan proportions that it is a scourge on mankind and a blight on the planet that is destroying civilization and wrecking havoc on the Earth. Some of the reason things have gotten so far out of hand is that the capacity to create and use new derivatives is unending. There are derivatives of derivatives of derivatives, all freely utilized for exploitation, legal plunder, and power. Use of creating endless new derivatives at will is ever-increasing. The situation is akin to an Internet site within which clicking to delete a current window causes several new pop-ups to occur until one's open file is overburdened with open windows.

11. A few concrete examples of derivatives with respect to the legal system are as follows:

a. The system invents and uses contrived (derived) names, such as a host of variations of one's all-caps name, all of which are legal fictions and each of which is a different entity, instead of one's full appellation consisting of all lower-case, or upper- and lower-case, letters (symbolizing the real being). Therefore, whenever one receives a presentment, such as a summons or complaint, the document is not addressed, and does not pertain, to you, but to a legal entity, ens legis, that is some bastardization of your name in all-capital letters. In this manner the system is freed from the requirement to deal with actual facts and real beings and can operate on presumptions, unsupported allegations, non-existent debts, stipulations in contractual interactions between legal fictions, and endless concoctions of the mind.

b. New case numbers are often created from the same case, such as by changing numbers or letters in the case, thereby enabling matters that you might submit in the original case, as well as any prior derivatives thereof, from needing to be addressed since they do not pertain to what you thought they did. It is also likely that the system uses each newly derived case to make yet more money.

c. Laws and administrative agencies multiply endlessly, with each new derivative used to make more money for those in the system while increasing the scope and severity of their power, and increasingly difficult to comprehend or counter.

12. In the 2002 Berkshire Hathaway (the company of Warren E. Buffet) annual report, on pages 13-15, appear the following words: "We view them [derivatives] as time bombs both for the parties that deal in them and the economic system....In our view...derivatives are financial weapons of mass destruction, carrying dangers that, while now latent, are potentially lethal."<sup>3</sup> If those in the system can create endless new derivatives out of all most anything, at any time, and use them for exploitation, enslavement, and moneymaking at the expense of those who are victimized by the monopolistic use of power under color or law, Warren Buffet's statement is self-evident. Further, those who act in this way may be regarded as terrorists using weapons of mass destruction. They are raping and pillaging with ever-increasing profligacy and blatancy.

One can download the entire Berkshire Hathaway annual report in an Adobe Acrobat pdf format by going to <http://www.berkshirehathaway.com/2002ar/impnote02.html>. 3.

In addition to inventing, using, profiting from, and destroying lives wholesale by the unchecked use of derivatives, the system rules without revealing the rules of the game. By means of undisclosed presumptions the Elite have structured a scheme that is full of catch-22's so that if we do not act we lose and if we do act we lose. It is in the presumptions — not the "law" and the "facts"—where the power lies. The designers and owners of the system concocted it for the purpose of bettering themselves vis-à-vis others. The result is a monstrous beast of cosmic proportions, a ravenous and insatiable Moloch, that is an expression of a single—and simple—ethical choice, which is whether one chooses to play win/win games or win/lose games when interacting with others. The features of these two kinds of games are summarized as follows:

1. A win/win interaction is an expression of peace, dignity, love, unity-harmony, mutual good faith, absence of malice, deceit, and presence of all of the other elements of contract law required to formulate a genuine contract. Free consent of all parties is essential.
2. A win/lose interaction is an expression of separation, conflict, and disharmony, and never results in the contract the "winner" claims exists. In actuality, a "win/lose" interaction is non-existent, since even the "winner" loses. Such an apparent victor causes harm to others, creation, and himself. He may think he wins, but in accordance with the inexorable laws of existence he "reaps what he sows," incurs the corresponding karma (action/reaction or cause/effect act and their exact consequences) by harmful acts. The "Golden Rule" in existential terms might be expressed: "One who harms others harms himself," or "That which one does unto others else shall be done unto him." "He who lives by the sword dies by the sword." A win/lose interaction in terms of nature is called the food chain—"law of the jungle," "dog eat dog." This characterizes law and governments today, in which is called the "law of necessity." The law of necessity is actually no law (law is suspended to deal with the "emergency," which the government itself causes to use as an excuse to abolish rights and increase its own discretionary power—witness the host of laws being passed these days, such as the "Patriot Acts"). In win/lose games there is no morality, nor ethics, and only one rule: just eat, baby. Anything goes, since "the end (increased power and commercial enrichment of the perpetrators) justifies the means." As a result, no win/lose interaction results in a valid contract enforceable at law. The involvement does not contain even one of the essential ingredients (all of which must exist in the interaction) of contract law to form a genuine contract.

It is because the inner intent of the heart of those who have designed and masterminded this system over the ages is malevolent in some manner that the resulting Moloch is loosed to run amuck on the planet, devouring living beings, the rights, freedom, and ability to live in peace and harmony between people, and the Earth's resources and ecological integrity. Indeed, the same gang has, throughout the ages, built up and destroyed at least seven (7) civilizations, or "Zions," and is now in the midst of destroying the eighth, i.e., our civilization today. This is transpiring in the United States, for instance, at an accelerated rate. Among many other aspects of this are that through the use of zip codes the world's nations with postal codes are divided up into quarter-acre lots (inventory) for liquidation. The world belongs to the ruthless, i.e., those who deliberately play win/lose power/exploitation games through interminable uses of legalized violence. The cardinal nature of the system today is that "everything skates unless you bust it." I.e., the undisclosed presumptions on the basis of which power is exercised are free to operate against you unchecked unless you neutralize them. As the maxim of law says, "When the law presumes the affirmative (existence and supremacy of the undisclosed presumptions), the negative (absence of any operational undisclosed presumptions) is to be proved." 1 Roll. R. 83; 3 Bouv. Inst. n. 3063, 3090. Some examples of undisclosed presumptions of the system are:

1. (Foundational presumption) Everyone is a free-will, sovereign being responsible for his or her own acts, thereby enabling law to exist at all. Without this presumption, no one could be held accountable for anything and no basis would exist for any rules or rectitude.
2. The system always wins and the people always lose.

3. The system can change the law, invent new laws, and alter interpretations of law and words at will (since it is all presumed to be their property).

4. Those in the system are not under any compulsion to reveal the presumptions on the basis of which they function.

It is impossible to play a game when one does not know the rules. If playing a game with those who not only know the rules thoroughly, but have carte blanche to change them at will, when one does not know what is going on, the result is a slaughter. It belies the quotation found in a law review:

We hear of tyrants, and the cruel ones: But whatever we may have felt, we have never heard of any tyrant in such sort cruel, as to punish men for disobedience to laws or order which he had kept them from the knowledge. Harvard Law Review, Volume 48 1934-1935, p. 198.

### Synopsis of the Problem

Our challenges when dealing with the system include the following:

1. The law is unlimited and no one can know it all. <sup>4</sup>
2. Law is always changing, so that at any point, something that previously was legal, recognized, and upheld might no longer be so.
3. The system does not belong to us, and changes perpetually without notice by those who own it.
4. There are an infinite number of ways to interpret any event and essentially any law (as those with experience in court can attest).
5. It is impossible to be assured that we know all the undisclosed presumptions on the basis of which law functions.
6. The Powers-That-Be study and exploit every aspect of man's nature, good and bad, with malevolent intent. Perhaps what they do, and the way they subjectively feel about what they are doing, is regarded by them as legitimate—or even worthy—or, even more, divinely mandated. In any case, when governed by this win/lose mentality the world becomes a nightmare. The dominating climate is not one of “live and let live,” peaceful and honorable intent, and harmony between people, but a perpetual war zone involving the need to live under a legalized-violence system that acts in accordance with the mentality that “the end (their self-aggrandizement and power) justifies the means (nothing is not permitted).”
  4. This foundational presumption may be the only presumption underlying the entire legal system that is existentially and ethically valid. The rest are fictions and frauds used for nefarious purposes.

### [Part II—Attitudes and Actions](#)

### [Presentments Index](#)



## Part II

### Attitudes and Actions

Now that we have some idea of the challenge we face just by living in the world today, we can use the understanding to help formulate solutions. Ideally, success involves four (4) elements, which are, in largely chronological sequence:

1. Knowing and living who you are—your true self, convictions, and creed.
2. Articulating properly in documents that define who and what you are, with a witness (notary).
3. Noticing and securing confirmation from those who you would like to acknowledge your true self and standing.
4. Defending your position in adversarial encounters with the system—both in the field and in court.

The following are some practical ideas concerning actualizing effective strategy:

1. The most important thing is knowledge and understanding of what is happening. Therefore, the first priority is: Get Educated. There is no substitute for this, especially in the climate in which we now live. In the celebrated words of Thomas Jefferson, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never can be." First and foremost getting educated requires knowing yourself, who and what you are, and becoming clear, confident, and established in yourself, your real being.
2. The nature of the times is escalating the timeless imperative to make one's spiritual life paramount. Increasingly the state of the world is communicating the message that the only way "out" is "in." Living in accordance with the understanding that cultivating and realizing our inner being, i.e., spiritual awakening and realization, is more important, enduring, and conducive to providing us with the happiness, peace, and fulfillment that alone will satisfy the heart and soul than anything we can see, do, experience, or have in the outside world. We all have two wars to win and opponents with which to deal: 1) ourselves (i.e., obtaining self-mastery) and 2) a hostile, deceitful, and treacherous world. If we do not win the internal battle and become clear about what we are and how/why we want to live, relate to others, and deal with the system, we have no hope of winning in encounters with the ruthless aggression to which we are relentlessly subjected.
3. In the absence of self-realization, we live at the expense of life. We expend time, effort, and energy attempting to acquire things in the outside world the essence and origin of which we do not possess in our own being and consciousness. In such case we "lose the roots and cling to the tree-tops," where our platform of operation is ungrounded and ephemeral.
4. Live to be free of blame, where blame is defined as blocking someone's way without just ethical cause. As it is said, "For blocking no one's way, no one blames him." If you do not interfere in people's lives you will not incur the repercussions for doing so, thereby immunizing yourself from having to deal with the entangling and undesirable consequences of your actions.
5. Stay in your own domain. If you do not traverse into your adversary's turf you do not create a nexus between you and them that allows the system to engulf you. Accomplishing this includes becoming clear about the nature of private and public and when/how you are acting in which domain. If you leave your ground of substance, reality, and sovereignty and go into their domain of illusion, treachery, and deceit, your

situation is hopeless. By so doing you abandon a position where you have clout and they have none, in favor of going into a realm where they have all the power and you have none. The public side is their game and property, not yours, so you have no standing, rights, and power there. Your body is real and came first into the world before any fictitious version of your given, private name, or any birth certificate or other document, could be derived by the system to use for its betterment and your detriment.

6. Be careful never to reach a point where you think you know enough or you "have it all figured out." As soon as you think you have it, you've had it.

7. Understand as much of the law and the practice thereof as possible in terms of universal principles that transcend and are more fundamental than the system's concoctions. Man's law is a subset of and derives from principles that are more fundamental than, and endure beyond, all human imaginings. The further removed from universal principles we are, the more unstable and unreliable is our position. The observation of Emerson is apt:

As to methods there may be a million and then some.  
But the principles are few.

The man who grasps principles can successfully select his own methods. The man who tries methods, ignoring principles, is sure to have trouble.

8. Change your thinking. If the thinking/perceiving ruts in which you have been confined and alter/revise/expand them. "Cast your nets on the other side of the boat" if you're not catching any fish on the side where you have heretofore been fishing. (See below.)

9. Never assume. Don't take anything they say or do at face value. Dig for the facts and substantiation in law for what you do. In the words of Gilbert and Sullivan, "Things aren't always what they seem. Skim milk masquerades as cream."

10. Create a paper trail and public record concerning as many aspects of your position as possible. This includes executing documents that articulate and declare your rights, identity, and standing, thereby shifting the burden of proof onto those who would deprive you of them. Establish and notice the proper parties of your position, sending color copies of your documents, preferably dispatched by a notary with a notarial certificate of service.

11. Whenever you are out and about, carry correctly colored pens with you, as well as postage stamps, rubber stamps, texts of various things to say in emergency contexts, and notarized, color copies of crucial rights-asserting documents. Be prepared.

12. Collect dictionaries, perhaps all you can, both regular and law. Words are the weapons of this game. By understanding the meaning and legal significance of words you not only have revealed to you what your strategy and tactics can be to win when writing your documents (all legal documents are "paper soldiers" for fighting win/lose battles in a legal setting), but communicate in their language. The official dictionary in the US is Bouvier's (they won't tell you this because of so many options available to you revealed in that law dictionary). Also, get the Oxford unabridged dictionary (available in diamond print with magnifying glass) for the extensive etymology of words.

13. Understand as much about the nature of the system as possible so you can use it to your advantage. This should include spending time in court observing diverse proceedings, paying attention to the interaction between attorneys and judges so you can perceive more clearly how the system functions to baffle the people.

14. Capitalize on the mentality of bureaucrats and what they understand, feel comfortable with, and offer you in the way of procedural options. If you relate to them in this manner you do not act outside the bounds of their job description and do not put them in the wrong. At the same time you secure their cooperation and let them do what

they are familiar with, such as sending you documents or clarification to which you are statutorily entitled (which they often tell you in their correspondence, such as under this or that act you are entitled to such and so). Don't confront them with anything hostile or outside of their niche and mentality,<sup>5</sup> and certainly don't require them to think.<sup>6</sup>

15. Since to bureaucrats reality is what exists on their computers, don't fill out any more forms than you have to, and don't answer and return questionnaires. Your answers get cross-referenced in innumerable computers, can be used to assemble a profile on you and everything about you, are often sold to marketing agencies so that you are flooded with unwanted offers, and fed into the system's data base as more food for the Beast to consume and use against you. What is advisable to do is live your life as privately and off the radar as possible, and put out information you want bureaucrats to believe (and hence act on) as the truth about you and your activities (including information on your computers that leads them on rabbit trails away from you and your freedom).<sup>7</sup>

16. Play different agencies and aspects of the system against each other. The system is not homogeneous. Most agencies and departments are very territorial, desiring to have as much exclusivity of power as possible to themselves without having to share power with other aspects of the system so as to compromise their ability to function as autonomous as possible.

17. Accept and return for value all presentments. When you can, use autographed postage stamps on your documents and have them sent to their destination by your notary.

5 As Dorothy Parker quipped, "You can lead a whore to culture but you can't make her think."

6 Bureaucrats write memoranda both because they appear to be busy when they are writing and because the memos, once written, immediately become proof they were busy. —Charles Peters, *How Washington Really Works*, 1980.

7 The nature of bureaucratic mentality was humorously exemplified in the May 3, 2003 edition of *Bizarre News* (an e-mail newsletter): "SACRAMENTO, Calif. — The Sacramento jury commissioner's office warned that if Lucille Marie Gordon did not show up to her allotted jury duty date, there would be a bench warrant out for her arrest. Caryn Gordon thought this was hilarious. Why? Because Lucile, or Lucy, is her dog. Last year, the chocolate Labrador retriever received a summons for jury duty in Sacramento Superior Court. Caryn read the summons and sent the form back in, writing where it reads, 'affidavit for disqualification,' she put, 'Lucy is a dog,' and sent it in. Earlier this month, Lucy got another summons. When Caryn called the office, the employee claimed they had heard every excuse imaginable. Caryn ended up having to show proof that Lucy might not serve too well on the jury, especially if a cat was the defendant."

18. Every time you ever mail anything, including having a notary mail things on your behalf, put postage stamps on the envelope. DO NOT MAIL BY USE OF THE RED METER POSTAGE. Whenever you take an item into a post office that needs postage, and ask the teller to put the postage on, they run it through their meter stamp. Do not allow this. You need the cancelled stamp for the clout it has (as a binding obligation on the US Government), and not the red-ink meter, the use of which means the item is not cancelled and mail fraud is involved.

19. In addition to use of a notary, such things as embassy seals can work wonders. Perception is reality. Many bureaucrats and officials, upon seeing embassy seals, apostilles, etc., back off immediately (possibly because they think that they might be tampering with matters beyond their knowledge and jurisdiction and thereby risking some kind of problem for themselves).

20. Place all documents you execute, as well as all paperwork from adverse parties in the system that you receive and accept and return for value, and/or file in court, directly under the Universal Postal Union, i.e., "UPU," by the proper use of postage stamps. This matter is discussed below under "Postal Power."

21. Whenever you have serious subpoenas to serve, such as on the mayor of a municipality or some high government official, have them served by the sheriff—or,

better yet, the Provost Marshal. Call the US Marshal's office and see what is involved in having it done.

22. If you are in prison, either ask, or have someone on the outside ask on your behalf, for the prison form for reporting irregularities. A prison is a federal project. Inmates can report irregularities and call in county, state, and federal auditors. This form is used for reporting irregularities in accounting of federal projects to the Army Corp of Engineers under the military accounting manual, ER37210. Almost all prisons keep false books. When they are audited, upon the first irregularity (which usually does not take long for auditors to find), things hit the fan. One might ask the prison administrator for the form, or the prison case officer.

23. Ask for your SID number and file from every state in which you have ever been for any period of time. While the SS No. is federal, the SID No. is state. Through this tracking number the states keep track of everything about you (i.e., your strawman), such as licenses, liens, arrests, etc. SID numbers are either seven (7) digits followed by a letter suffix, or eight (8) digits without the letter. All, however, are preceded by the two-character US Postal identification of the State (CA, NY, TX, etc.). One probably must make a Freedom of Information Act, "FOIA," request, or the State equivalent (in California, for instance, one might use the Information Practices Act, "IPA") for procuring your SID file.

24. Send off a FOIA to the FBI for your FBI rap sheet, which not only contains the record of every arrest or "detention" (alienation) to which your strawman has ever been subjected, but allegedly can be used legally to provide conclusive and indisputable proof that the strawman is a separate and distinct legal entity in the nature of a corporation, and created by the state. It references an organizational ID No. just like the corporate police agencies have, etc. This is prima facie evidence for diversity of citizenship. In addition, the FBI rap sheet is invaluable if you are trying to clear your record or restore your rights or attack an agency legally. In addition to obtaining it by making a FOIA request to the FBI, if you are a guest of the Bureau of Prisons, "BOP," you can get it by written request to your Case Manager, since it is in your file. BOP guests take note: The FBI rap sheet does not contain info on the dispositions of cases, so it does not come under the recent "snitch protection" ban on paperwork. That means they cannot refuse to give it to you.

25. Emulate success. As people who fundamentally simply wish to live in peace and be left alone study, interact, and engage in using approaches that their best research and judgment indicates might succeed, their experiences and the understanding that often ensue are not only invaluable, but add to the knowledge and tools available to the rest of us. Therefore, networking is invaluable.

26. Those of us involved in this quest for truth, freedom, and peace would be well-advised to abandon the petty bickering, fault-finding, and snap out of our stupor. There is no room left for indulging in such counter-productive luxuries. The good ship US long ago hit the iceberg. It is not the time to be arguing about who gets what space for a deck chair or who can play the next round of shuffleboard.

### Change your thinking

As we have discussed, if we would be enriched instead of diminished when dealing with presentments (or anything else in the system), we must replace false and inadequate ideas with true and effective ones. We must be more conscious of our thinking and why we think as we do. A humorous quote by Sidgwick punctuates the matter:

We think so because other people all think so;  
Or because—or because—after all, we do think so;  
Or because we were told so, and think we must think so;  
Or because we once thought so, and think we still think so;  
Or because having thought so, we think we will think so.<sup>8</sup>

Consequently, if our dealings with the legal system have not been successful in accordance with our priorities, it may be in large measure because we have not thought adequately about (and therefore not acted properly concerning) that with which we are interacting. We must re-evaluate our thinking and change it, and therefore the way we act, accordingly. In the words of a fellow named Dayle Mahoney:

If you continue to think as you always thought,  
Then you'll continue to get what you always got.

Is it enough?

On its face, a presentment is a demand either to pay something, engage in specific performance (such as coming to court and answering a summons and complaint), or both. It is important to understand that all presentments issued by/within the colorable legal/commercial system today are expressions of the Wizard's light show. That show appears dazzling, and is often terrifying, but is in actuality an insubstantial chimera. It becomes concrete only when we treat it in a manner that, by the rules of the game, authorizes its being enforced against us in physical reality. Someone provides you with a presentment because he expects to make money off of you by doing so. The point of this discourse is to elucidate how we can act concerning what has heretofore been damaging to us because of our ignorance and proceed in a manner that can turn the tables to enable us to use the same system and its rules for our betterment.

To begin with, we must realize that adopting the ostrich approach of hiding our head in the sand does not eliminate what we might wish we did not have to deal with. Emulating the ostrich merely exposes our rear end blindly; it does not stop our butt from being kicked (or worse).

The second thing to realize is that everything that happens to us is the result of our own creating, either by having caused it expressly or because we placed ourselves in the context where the event we have to deal with is allowed to be in our space. In either case, what we have control over is our free-will choice as to how to deal with a particular event. In the case of receiving a presentment, we can basically pursue one of the following courses of action:

1. We can comply with the demands stated on the face of the presentment;
2. We can deny, fight, try to run from it, etc., or,
3. We can accept it, and thereby neutralize and offset it by allowing the current to flow in a way that discharges the obligation without trying to block or resist the force directed against us.

Acting in accordance with either of the first two ways results in automatic loss. The first way consists of meek compliance, which is a dead loss to us. We just simply pay or perform as they have instructed us to do, like good little slaves. The second way constitutes a dishonor, enjoining the issues offered to our strawman that can then be enforced by the courts and imposed on us. We give substance and credibility to the Wizard's light show. This is also a dead loss, because our dishonor ensures that we lose. The third approach involves staying in honor and retaining a posture where we are free to act in a way that redounds to our benefit.

If what we experience is the result of our direct creation in the past, acceptance must occur to close the circle on the process involved in our creating by thought and then, sooner or later, experiencing back upon ourselves the results of our own thought/creation. We must complete the cause/effect cycle and discharge the imbalanced build-up of charge that remains until the action/reaction account is balanced and the imbalance, i.e., the charge, is discharged. If what we experience is the result of the actions of others, we need to do a kind of legal/commercial jujitsu that returns the

force of their actions back to them without injuring us. All injury we experience in legal/commercial matters is the result of essentially two (2) things:

1. Failure to establish on the record and correctly notice the proper parties of our position as the living principal, creditor, and authorized representative for, our strawman (all-caps name). All law functions on the basis of presumptions. A major presumption on the basis of which mankind is enslaved is the presumption that our failure to clarify and establish on the record who we regard ourselves as being and in what capacity we are functioning signifies the system's right to act against us as it wishes. As per the maxim of law, "He who fails to assert his rights has none." The 7th Commercial Maxim is apt: "A matter must be expressed to be resolved." If we do not provide notice of our position, no one else can, nor does anyone in the system have any motivation to try to assert our position for us (especially vis-à-vis them). If we want our position noticed, we and we alone must do it.

If we fail to notify appropriate officials and agencies of our position there is no basis upon which anyone in the system can relate to us other than in accordance with the system's rules and presumptions, which operate with impunity unless properly controverted by us. Their position is the only one on the table because we have not introduced our own into the equation. A gold prospector must drive a stake in each corner of a plot he is staking his claim on if he wants to have others recognize his claim. Without doing so, nothing exists to communicate his intent or be treated as if the plot of ground is his as opposed to anyone else's. He has not acted in accordance with the rules of the game that must be followed for him to achieve his objective.

2. Acting in dishonor, and thereby engaging in resistance that disallows pass-through of the current that enables us to retain our freedom and autonomy without being damaged. Resistance in a circuit creates heat. By resisting we bear the burden in our own biological circuitry, which remains until discharged. This absence of discharge can weaken, exhaust, burn up, or in some way debilitate us.

It is a cardinal spiritual maxim that victory is achieved through surrender. To understand this statement we must define the meaning of the operative words: "victory" and "surrender." By "victory" we do not mean physical conquest and domination, which is futility borne of acting on, attempting to render durable in some manner, the illusion of separation and superiority of one aspect of the One over another. In this situation an ego imagines not only that it is separate from others, all, and everything, but is superior to other expressions of the same Oneness. This delusion is a major source of sorrow and suffering that has plagued mankind throughout history. Using force and artifice is an attempt to get reality to conform to a flawed and vain abstraction of it is foregone futility that leaves carnage and suffering in its wake.

The term "surrender" is intended to convey the concept of expanded receptivity rather than outward-directed action without first obtaining the benefit of more thought, insight, and information than one has at the time. Receptivity involves opening one's mind, letting go of the attitude that one already knows the truth, releasing pre-conceived ideas about what one is experiencing, and inwardly expanding the vessel of one's being not only for the purpose of perceiving matters more fully, clearly, and wholly (free of distorting, deluded, and pre-conceived biases), but providing the conscious mind with more comprehension than had previously been the limits of one's thinking and consciousness. Depth always absorbs. And as a Zen master once said, "It is impossible to discover when preoccupied with the familiar." There are no limits or bounds to the size, scope, and depth of our vessel, nor to the nature of the content we can consciously contain. This is akin to a take-off on an old rhyme:

Little forms have bigger forms  
On their backs to bite 'em;

And bigger forms have bigger forms,  
And so on ad infinitum.

Further significance of surrender inheres in realizing that we see things far more as we ourselves are than what something is in itself. A moment's reflection reveals that anything can be viewed, perceived, thought about, and acted upon in an infinite number of possible ways by an infinite number of possible beings. Everyone observes and experiences life from his/her unique nature and position in space-time. No two perspectives are the same, nor can be. As someone once quipped, "When you hear two accounts of the same automobile accident it makes you wonder about history." The Bible is full of admonitions against acting in violation of this truth vis-à-vis others, such as "Thou shalt not bear false witness," and "Judge not, that ye be not judged." What certainty, after all, does anyone possess about the "truth, whole truth, and nothing but the truth" that might justify slandering or judging someone?

Therefore, "surrender" really means giving up one's entrenched position in favor of allowing clearer and more holistic understandings to emerge. The ultimate end of this approach is to perceive existence as it is, rather than how we might think or believe it is. Two further quotes of Zen masters come to mind: "Do not seek the truth; merely cease to cherish opinions"; and, "If you understand, things are such as they are. If you don't understand, things are such as they are." The actual truth of anything is the "such-as-it-is" nature of its existence. The more we live in this manner the more grounded in happiness and integrity our life can become.

### In court

Why do we lose in court? It is not because it is a military or maritime court (which it is), often evidenced by the gold fringe on the flag. It is not that we are under implied or adhesion contracts to some municipal corporation (if so we could raise the issues of contract law). It is not a plethora of other reasons advocated by innumerable "patriots," all of which "reasons" are rabbit trails. So, the short answer to why we lose in court is that we lose if:

1. We dishonor any of the people and processes that impinge on us, thereby enjoining the issues described in the presentment so that we become bound by the matter. We have no right to deny or speak to anyone else's utterances, and doing so lands us in the middle of their novel.
2. We traverse and therefore contractually amalgamate ourselves and our strawman into the court's jurisdiction so that we endure in the flesh the results of whatever trial or hearing might occur dealing with our strawman. It is the strawman that appears, is tried, and sentenced, not us. By traversing, however, the real us gets to go along for the ride and experience in reality the judgment against the strawman.
3. We fail to discharge the charges, thereby authorizing the system to enforce commensurate consequences on us.
4. We have no facts in evidence substantiating our position placed by a competent witness on the court record of the case. This crucial matter is discussed below in greater detail.
5. We have not bonded the case.

Let us briefly discuss these issues:

1. We avoid acting in dishonor by accepting and returning for value whatever presentment or charging instrument we are provided with and by not arguing, fighting, denying, or ignoring.

2. We do not join the dispute by traversing, by which we leave our own ground and tacitly give reality and credibility to the opponent's claims and allegations that are not facts but only presumptions and assumptions until we stipulate (expressly or by dishonor). Enjoining the issues in a presentment, such as denying allegations or charges, or saying that we don't owe an alleged debt, is a dishonor that enjoins us with the court's jurisdiction and our own strawman and creates a dispute that grants a court subject matter jurisdiction. It sucks us up into the made-up game of imaginary disputes between fictitious entities. The definition of "traverser" in Black's Law Dictionary confirms the point succinctly:

*Traverser. In pleading, one who traverses or denies. A prisoner or party indicted; so called from his traversing the indictment. Black's Law Dictionary, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, page 1345.*

3. Whenever we (i.e., our strawman) are "charged" with something, that charge is a bookkeeping entry of liability on the ledger and must be "discharged" by entering a balancing, offsetting asset. Filling in the asset side usually occurs by the loser parting with public funds of some kind, such as a check or FRNs, or doing "community service," or being bonded and incarcerated as the surety. When we discharge the charges by acceptance for value, which is a Banker's Acceptance, we end the controversy and become the owner of the contract. Each of us is a private banker. Under banking our acceptance and return for value establishes the facts and makes us owner of the transaction. We then own both sides of the deal, i.e., both the creditor and debtor side. By accepting from the private side and providing the value from the private, i.e., substance, side we end the dispute and remove from the equation any controversy for a court to resolve.

4. It is imperative to understand that the admiralty/equity courts of the system do not deal with reality, substance, and facts in evidence. They deal in assumptions (such as unsupported claims and charges), and presumptions (unexpressed rules by which the system operates), and stipulations (agreements that create the "facts"). Because they are strawmen and cannot be competent witnesses through sworn testimony, neither attorneys nor officials can place actual facts in evidence on the record that a judge can judicially notice, such as claims supported by sworn testimony, either through an affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, or testimony under oath on the witness stand in open court, or deposition.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> In the celebrated "voter punch cards" incident in Florida in the Al Gore dispute with George Bush in the last election, Gore's attorneys introduced a batch of "voter punch cards" as evidence for the purpose of proving that the election was flawed. The judge never even looked at the evidence and threw Gore's attorneys out of court. Although the press and public were not aware of the rationale for the action, the judge's basis for doing what he did was that the cards were never presented to the court by a competent witness. There had to be a witness to state that the cards came from such and such a precinct and that the one testifying witnessed the cards being gathered up, boxed, and transported and was stating such matters under oath. Without such competent witness, there was nothing on which the judge could rely to substantiate any claim that there had been tampering with the cards during the gathering and transporting thereof. Attorneys can neither be competent witnesses nor can any statements they make be considered testimony. They deal in assumptions, hearsay, and dishonor. So much for high-priced lawyers!

5. Recently some people in Nebraska allegedly avoided having to go to prison for some time by posting—at the last minute—a single-page bond. The text of this bond, along with some explanation and comments, accompany this article.

A presumption is defined as follows:

"A presumption is a deduction which the law expressly directs to be made from particular facts." (Evidence Code, § 600.) And "a presumption (unless declared



by law to be conclusive) may be controverted by other evidence, direct or indirect: but unless controverted, the jury is bound to find according to the presumption." (Evidence Code, § 602 et seq. *In re Bauer* (1889), 79 Cal. 304, 307.

The bottom line is that whenever we receive any kind of presentment, from a tax bill to a summons/complaint, indictment, etc., our proper course of action is to accept and return the offer for value, served by a notary on our behalf. Discharge of the obligation occurs at the moment the offerror receives our communication. Contractual ratification has occurred through offer and acceptance. The circuitry closes on itself, the + and – polarities discharge, and nothing remains upon which anyone can act.

A charging instrument (presentment) is an offer, an obligation created on the public side by inventing a new borrowing against the creditor (source of the credit) on the private side. Your strawman is offered the opportunity to assume the obligation. What we must understand is that:

1. Any presentment is a concocted debt on the public side created by the party responsible for issuing the presentment;
2. Whenever you (i.e., your strawman) receive a presentment, through your acceptance and return for value of the presentment, you can perform a legal/commercial jujitsu by diverting the force of the presentment back on the issuer;
3. The fabricated obligation constitutes a new borrowing, i.e., creation of more public debt, which they wish your strawman to assume, and which you—at the expense of your body/labor—must discharge;
4. Any presentment can be discharged by providing the offerror with the charging instrument accepted and returned for value and utilizing your exemption as the source of credit for discharging the obligation;
5. A presentment is not an obligation that attaches to you unless you dishonor and do not discharge it;
6. When you proceed correctly the charging instrument constitutes funds that can be used to make you money;
7. If the offerror does not honor your acceptance and return for value, then he is the one in dishonor and can be made the party obligated to pay you for costs, fees, and damages on the basis of his dishonor.

Understanding the above scenario serves greatly to remove fear<sup>10</sup> ("False Evidence Appearing Real") from the equation, especially when we realize not only that the presentment can be neutralized but that it can be turned to our advantage. The advantages can occur not only by what might ensue from the offerror's dishonor of our acceptance and return for value, but by other means also.

10 So long as one is ungrounded in his own existential/spiritual position, and ignorant of what the system is and how to deal with it effectively, fear is inevitable. This is because the system is one of endless applications of legalized violence on the basis of fictions and frauds promulgated by other beings. None of these paper assaults (presentments) is our creation or our property/province concerning which we have authority to speak. They are all the "truth" and actions of the originator, and therefore the originator's property and domain. Unless we understand what is happening we are in the dark having to deal with things that can destroy us without possessing any ability to fathom and disarm them.

The catch-22 of the system is that both traversing (enjoining the issues in any manner) and ignoring (doing nothing) constitute a dishonor guaranteeing our loss. The way out of this "damned-if-you-do, damned-if-you don't" double bind is to comment on the paradox. Problems

are not solved on the level of problems; they are solved by operating from another domain, or "meta level," which in this case is our ground and truth for which we have exclusive knowledge and authority to speak and concerning which they have none. Now they must deal with our world (which they cannot address and cannot enter) and from that position we require them to "put up or shut up." Since they cannot substantiate the truth and validity in our domain, which is more powerful and fundamental than where they are operating, we can by so doing turn the tables on them.

Officials, attorneys, and banks do not want to honor this process for a number of reasons, largely because they have been making money by usurping and using our exemption and do not wish either to be estopped from doing so or seeing us regain our sovereignty and autonomy by asserting our standing as creditor and using our exemption for our benefit and not theirs.

### Standing and status

Whenever you receive a bill, citation, summons, complaint, indictment, etc., what you receive is an original issue presentment. It is also an assumption—a concoction contrived in the mind of the living being who dreamt it up—since there is no bona fide assessment<sup>11</sup> for the obligation. There is no commercial paperwork to support the contractual basis upon which the alleged obligation is based.<sup>12</sup> Remember that the entire (colorable) system functions by fictions and frauds. There is only presumption of assessment, i.e., color of assessment. Since the presenter of the presentment did not attach anything of value to substantiate and support his position (hence the phrase in some accepted-for-value documents "I did not find your check enclosed"), the document is grounded in the imaginary. Nevertheless, it can be traced to the author of the document and whatever strawman on behalf of which he acted to create the new debt currency. The presenter is giving you something created by inventing a debt, and can be transformed into something of advantage to you if you treat it correctly.

11 Any genuine assessment involves a valid contract, bearing the authorized signatures of all involved parties, plus proof of breach of the contract by the one who is then rendered a "debtor," plus an accounting of the sum-certain amount owed based on a true bill that itemizes the particular dollar amounts owed for what specific things (such as goods and services received and not paid for, or specific performance promised and not performed), plus proof of the authority for those trying to collect from the debtor to operate as third-party debt collectors, plus a statement of commercial liability staked by every alleging party (anyone who makes any bookkeeping entry or acts in the matter) to back up his claims by indemnifying those harmed in case he is in error. Those acting in the system, such as attorneys and government officials, have none of these prerequisites. They have only assumptions, which become actualized in our lives by making the assumptions real through our traversing or dishonoring.

12 The foundation of every record is the commercial paperwork, consisting of two (2) essential elements:

1. A ledger of accounting, consisting of an itemized list of goods and services provided by whom to whom, with corresponding monetary values indicated for each entry backed by the contracts and records that substantiate the validity of each ledger entry;
2. Record of accountability identifying the party who takes commercial liability and responsibility for the accuracy, relevance, and verifiability of each bookkeeping entry.

Although technically every document in commerce must be executed by/under affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, the commerce of the world consists of billions of people engaging in countless commercial transactions a day. Obviously, it is impractical for the trillions of documents involved in actual commerce to be done by taking each one to a notary to be certified and sworn as being true, correct, and complete. Commerce, to be practical, must be efficient, streamlined, and minimalist. The force and effect of every document, however, is ultimately its accuracy, relevance, and verifiability combined with the sworn statement of some living, sentient being that he takes responsibility for the validity of the document and whatever information it contains. This must be so because every legal and commercial document involves someone paying and someone receiving gain. Since every such document involves a potential loss to somebody, accuracy and responsibility/accountability/liability must be inherent in all legal/commercial instruments. Therefore, although not in actuality sworn true, correct, and complete, all commercial documents may be enforced as if they were. Reality cannot be

cheated. No matter how fantastic and removed from reality and sanity matters become in the phantasmagorical public domain of assumptions, derivatives, fictions, and fraud, ultimately everything must be grounded in, and be able to be traced back to, the ground level, which is the combination of accuracy (truth) and individual responsibility/accountability. Documents do not write themselves—some living being writes them.

When you accept and return an offer for value, it must be remembered that the “value” is that which you, as the real being, give to the transaction. Only the private side, such as you, your labor, and your private accrual account—Private Treasury UCC Contract Trust Account—which is your “exemption” as the creditor from which the credit that creates the “currency” on the public side is derived, can have and give value. The public side is imaginary, created in the mind, and possesses neither value, nor substance, nor sovereignty, nor life. Public entities, such as corporations, trusts, partnerships, businesses, estates, and everyone’s all-caps name, etc., are persons, which are legal entities, *ens legis*. They are not real beings. By being creatures of the state, persons have status, which is fictitious and legal, not standing, which pertains to real beings and what is lawful. You, as the reality, are the substance and the source of all the public side reflects and from which it is derived.<sup>13</sup>

Any presentment you receive from the public side is a notice of the creation of a “charge” (open account), which remains un-neutralized unless you “discharge” it. You discharge the charge by performing a banker’s acceptance that provides the asset/credit that balances the liability/debit cross on the accounting ledger. You want to use your exemption (which is inexhaustible) for this purpose. In such case you can discharge any obligation. Anything that can be charged by creating debt against credit can be discharged by performing an accounting offset by using the same credit.

When you accept an offer and return it for value in your real, sovereign capacity, as creditor, you have accord and satisfaction. **The fact is your autograph.** You, as the real being, are a “lawful man,” capable of bearing a bond. You possess “*rectus in curiae*,” meaning “right in court,” or “*standi in judicio*,” meaning “standing in law.” That means that you are capable of bearing a note. Only a lawful man can do that. So the lawful man puts his autograph on the line, establishing the fact. Private men and women use autographs (self-generated marks), public side employees use signatures (signs of their juristic persona).

To understand more of the “money system” operating in the world today, we must make a short digression into history. The Legislative Act of February 21, 1871, Forty-first Congress, Session III, Chapter 62, page 419, chartered a Federal corporation entitled “United States,” a/k/a “US Inc.,” a “Commercial Agency” of what was originally designated as “Washington, D.C.” US Inc. is a corporation of the international bankers, *et al.*, and outside the Constitution.<sup>14</sup> The jurisdiction of the US incorporation is private, commercial, international, and military admiralty/maritime. Every “citizen of the United States” is a “citizen” of US Inc. (which is a corporation, not a country), and bereft of standing in law as well as access to genuine law (meaning “common law”) that was accessible to Americans under their contract with the parent corporation, USA. Every “citizen of the United States” is also an enemy of the state, i.e., the United States Government, as codified in the Amendatory Act of 1933 to the original 1917 Trading With the Enemy Act. This is codified, *inter alia*, at 12 USC 95.

<sup>13</sup> A reflection may appear as real as that which it reflects, just as the reflection of a candle gives light. We cannot, however, feel any heat from, nor burn out, the reflected flame, nor can we grasp the reflection of the candle and walk away with it.

<sup>14</sup> The 1871 “Constitution of the United States” of the private corporation, US Inc., is identical to that of the 1787 “Constitution for the United States of America” except for the difference in the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment. In the USA Constitution the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment is one forbidding attorneys from holding public office. In the US Constitution the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment is a prohibition against slavery and indentured servitude.

In 1933 US Inc. declared bankruptcy, as publicly noticed, *inter alia*, by House Joint Resolution 192 of June 5, 1933; Public Law 73-10; *Perry v. U.S.* (1935), 294 U.S. 330-

381, 79 L Ed 912; and 31 USC 5112, 5119. The result is that there is no money, i.e., real money, which is substance, such as gold and silver coin, that pays debts and is the coin of sovereigns. There is now only the representation or symbol of money consisting of debt created against credit (appropriate for bankrupt citizens devoid of capacity). The credit used to create and back the debt currency is provided by us through having given our gold in the 1930's, and our labor ever since, to back the failed corporation. Among many significant consequences of this are that there are now only bills of exchange, notes, and other evidences of debt to circulate as money. All currency today is created by signature.

When we accept and return a presentment for value, we discharge an obligation and render the offerror devoid of claim. This Banker's Acceptance ("BA") utilizes our standing in law as the creditor—the source of the credit—to discharge the obligation by using our exemption for offset and adjustment. We become established as creditor and owner of both sides of the transaction.

In the past we have usually sent the presentment back to the issuer ourselves. Now we realize that it is far superior to use a notary to send it to them. The notary does not care what is on a presentment or our paperwork, or the amount involved, i.e., whether a document says \$1.00 or \$10 Billion. The only thing the notary cares about is whether the document has a place for endorsement and a jurat, thereby justifying taking your fee, putting your document in an envelope, and serving it on the other party, saying, "Respond in ten (10) days." This time period is in accord with Regulation Z, Federal Truth in Lending, 15 USC 1601 *et seq.*, consisting of three (3) days for mailing, three (3) days for the issuer of the presentment to decide what he's going to do about your acceptance and return for value, three (3) days for return mail, plus one (1) for the day of service, which does not count on the time clock. The total time is therefore ten (10) days.

When we have the notary serve our acceptance and return of the presentment to the offerror, the notary's address is given for the respondent to send the check, remedy, or reply to. When a respondent does not respond to the notary within the required ten (10) days with a notice of discharge of the obligation he is in dishonor on our acceptance for value. He has not adjusted the account and is keeping the account open and the charge in place, continuing to cause trouble for us and make money by stealing our exemption. When no response from the original presenter is received by the notary within the required ten (10) days, we have the notary issue a certificate of non-response, which is a certificate of dishonor. At this point the dishonor of the issuer of the presentment is established on the commercial record. A notary's logbook is an irrefutable substantiation of the facts and admissible as evidence in any court.

The key to the notarial process is that a certificate of non-response issued by a notary is a judgment in estoppel. The first certificate of non-response is a judgment in estoppel on the law. The second judgment in estoppel is on the facts/money. Ideally we should do both when dealing with a presentment, since we wish not only to discharge the obligation but use the process to better us commercially.

We must remember who and what a notary is. Historically, the notary wrote the king's papers. He issued the writs. A public notary is higher than a judge. In addition, notaries have had from inception two (2) primary functions: 1) to protest international bills of exchange, and 2) be a bonded, neutral party who holds the commercial record and can place evidence into a court of any jurisdiction. Thus, the notary—as the ultimate holder of the commercial record—is higher than any judge inasmuch as no judge can act without the record. The great value to us is that through the notary we can place unimpeachable evidence into a court case for the record.

It is crucial to understand the following:

1. The commercial tribunals (courts) of the US and the States are in the private equity/admiralty jurisdiction of the alleged creditors in bankruptcy, the IMF, *et al.*

2. As admiralty courts the tribunals deal in matters of contract in which the defendant is presumed to have contracted (on land) to be "on the ship" where "the captain's word is law," one is "presumed guilty unless proven innocent," and the burden of proof is on the defendant to prove that he is not guilty (i.e., prove a negative).
3. As equity courts, the ultimate arbiter of a matter is the "conscience of the court," which is how the judge happens to feel that day, and is not anything accessible by a defendant. There is no "conclusions of law and findings of fact" issued (since it is in equity, not law), nor are there any facts, nor does any documentary material evidence exist established on the record of a case (an attorney, as we have discussed, cannot be a competent witness).
4. Since these commercial tribunals function in a private admiralty/equity jurisdiction that does not have any capacity to access law. It cannot deal in facts (reality). It must deal on color of those things, i.e., assumptions (color of facts). The assumptions become "facts" when both parties agree—stipulate—that they are true.
5. You cannot invalidate one assumption with another assumption; you can invalidate an assumption only by placing facts in evidence on the record.
6. Anyone in dishonor in any legal proceeding has forfeited his capacity to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and must legally/commercially lose if the other side remains in honor and proceeds correctly.
7. If both sides of a dispute are in dishonor (which is normally the case, since all attorneys argue and dispute, as do most *pro se* litigants), whoever is ruled as the winner is a function of the judge's discretion, concerning which he has *carte blanche* to proceed as he wishes.
8. If we can enter documentary material evidence as facts on the record and require the judge to take judicial notice of that evidence, we have a platform from which we can win, because without stipulations the other side has no evidence (facts) to support their claims.
9. As a result of the above, it is logical to conclude that not only must we place our evidence into court in any case in which we are involved, have the judge judicially notice it, and act on it in a way that provides us with a win, but placing evidence on the record and causing its existence to ensure that we prevail is the only reason we should ever go to court or even deal with a court.
10. We must act from the beginning, and ever and always, for the purpose of setting our evidence on the record in any case in which we might have to be involved so that we can not only win, but—if we act correctly—make money (perhaps a considerable amount) from the situation.

The next logical question is: How can we place evidence on the record in a case? The following means may be deployed for entering evidence on the record:

1. Deposition;
2. Testimony in open court;
3. Affidavit (not as good as the first two unless one can cross-examine the affiant on the witness stand);
4. Entry of evidence into the record by a notary.

Of all of the above-cited methods for entering evidence into a case, the fourth method, the notarial process, may be the most desirable. By so doing one may enter the evidence one chooses by a means that must be admitted as evidence on the record, which no court can refuse to enter, and do so preferably without having to endure the time, effort, and expense of depositions and attending court proceedings.

We must always remember the following:

1. Stay in honor and never dishonor anything or anyone (including policemen, officials, judges, and even attorneys). Your opponents must go into dishonor on their own, of their own volition.
2. Put the issuer of a presentment in a position of having to "put up or shut up." I.e., place the burden of proof on him.
3. Establish all documents substantiating our claims on the record of the notary and the evidentiary record of any court case involved with the transaction.
4. Relate properly with everyone involved, especially the court and judge, so that you can make the best use of your situation, i.e., prevail and also make money.
5. Do not talk for any reason that does not serve your interests, and be prepared as much as possible to know what you wish to accomplish, what not to allow to happen, and the proper way to say what can succeed in achieving the results you desire. They must have your words, your admissions, and even your legal determinations, to hang you.
6. Never make an offer (a supplicant, dependent position). Be an acceptor instead. The power is in acceptance, and without acceptance we cannot win.

So the tangible steps/processes/documents involved in dealing with any presentment consist of several phases:

1. Execution, filing, and notice of foundational documents stating rights, standing, and capacity;
2. Administrative actions concerning a presentment, both pre-court and non-court;
3. Documents and dialogue in court;
4. (If the issue is a mortgage, securing both legal and equitable title to the property as well as right of possession must all be done);
5. Collecting on the money.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Collecting from dishonoring persons can and has been done, but a discussion of the process is beyond the scope of this article. It is enough at this point to master the essentials, execute necessary paperwork, and remain free of debt and incarceration.

In the event they ignore everything we do, we can proceed to collect from them by a number of possible means, including "non-judicial strict foreclosure," as outlined in Chapter 9 of the UCC. We can also instigate a bankruptcy proceeding in which we are "debtor in possession" (and thereby able to accept or reject all offers), they are delinquent creditors, and we can request that an offset be performed that results in our collecting against their bonds, equity, or risk management department.

## Part III Civil and Criminal Charges

Whenever you receive a traffic ticket (citation), summons, complaint, indictment, etc., what you receive is a public offer. It is an offer of indebtedness to your strawman. It is conclusive presumption, i.e., "fact," that your strawman is obligated to provide the funds if you act in dishonor. In commerce the penalty for being in dishonor is losing one's equity. Remember that no court in the system—since they are all in the public realm—can see, address, or deal with the real you. Public courts can deal only with assumptions and fictions in their colorable (phony) system. As such, there are no facts other than what is stipulated (agreed) to by the parties. If an adversary says the sky is green and you agree, that agreement constitutes a "fact." The commercial tribunals of the system are all contract courts, and your stipulation is contractual ratification, which is the law of the matter. People lose in the courts because they try to counter or neutralize one assumption with another.

If you are in dishonor you will be forced to provide, through your [strawman](#), public funds (FRNs or equivalent), one way or the other, to satisfy the obligation. This can be by simply parting with FRNs, doing "community service," or by being incarcerated as the surety for the obligations of your strawman. In the latter case they create the bond by further borrowing against your strawman. This generates funds that are used to balance the books and also make considerable additional money for the courts, judges, attorneys, etc. Given the immensity of the money made (per CAFR and LAFR), which is several times the total amount of the entire economy of the private sector, the mania in the United States for charging, prosecuting, and incarcerating is understandable.

The following are important considerations in the equation:

1. As investors in the bankrupt corporation called the United States, as well as the USA, the parent corporation, we, as real people, are the true creditors of the country and source of the wealth, as discussed above. As such, we are exempt from taxation from the public side. The creditor and sovereign cannot be taxed by a system that functions by using the credit of the creditor. The public side is debt, operating by borrowing against us. Being derivative and dependent, the tail cannot wag the dog; the reflection cannot dominate the reality it reflects. The system does not deal with us as real beings; it deals with a fiction—a symbol—which is not us and therefore does not require the system to deal with us as the creditor and sovereign. Moreover, the public domain can tax and regulate only what is created in and belongs to the system, which can be only strawmen and never real beings.
2. As creditors, sovereigns, and true owners (preferred stockholders) of the country, we have authority to offset any obligation imposed on our strawman by the public side by making our exemption (which is unlimited) available to discharge the charges. The source from which the obligation was derived is our own credit, which can therefore be used as the asset to offset the obligation created by borrowing against that credit.
3. The size of the purported obligation, as well as its severity, is technically irrelevant.<sup>16</sup> That which can be invented in the form of an alleged obligation can be offset, i.e., discharged, with the same ease as the obligation was created. All public debt is nothing but numbers—digits in the matrix. Promissory notes (creating currency by signature) got us into this mess, promissory notes can get us out.

16 It is often considerably more difficult using the acceptance-for-value process for dealing with matters involving a mala in se crime than a mala prohibita offense, although all "crimes" in the system today are "commercial crimes," see 27 USC 72.11.

4. The only way we can discharge and offset such charges completely—neutralize and eliminate them totally and close the accounting—is through an acceptance and return for value through the use of our exemption, which we make available to be used for exchange as the funds for discharging the obligations/charges. Per the maxim of law, "As a thing is bound, so it is unbound."

5. When we, as the creditor and sovereign, proceed as above, we are functioning as the king. The colorable public side is rendered dependent upon and subservient to our acts. By law, public officers are fiduciaries, and have no discretion. Compliance is mandatory. It is unrealistic, of course, to think that those who structure and operate the system for commercial enrichment and power will "go gently into that goodnight" when we use the system for our protection and betterment. In addition, and of crucial importance, is to neutralize the unrevealed presumption on which the system operates that we, the real us, have agreed to be united with and treated the same as our strawman. We remove that presumption by noticing the proper parties of the foundational documents referenced below. Many times when these documents are placed on the record in a court case, the case disappears. If they cannot access the real you (and your body, labor, and property), they are left hanging out to dry in their cloud-cuckoo-land.

Upon receiving a presentment

Receipt of an offer (presentment) will occur in one (1) of the following ways:

1) by mail; 2) in person; or 3) after arrest and being placed in custody. Herewith below we will concern ourselves with the first two (2) modes of receiving a presentment.

1) As soon as you receive an offer (such as a bill or statement you wish to discharge), make a copy (preferably color copy, certified as a true and exact copy by a notary) of the offer and keep that copy in a safe place. If you are already in court, go to the court and obtain at least two (2) copies certified by the court clerk of the documents filed in a case by the other party. Then use these as you would an ordinary presentment, following the procedure set forth hereunder.

1. After making a copy of the essential documents issued by the other side, imprint over the first page of the original of each document the following text (there are numerous versions of this and opinions as to which is best):

**This presentment is accepted for assessed value and returned in exchange for settlement and closure of this accounting, certified and sworn on the commercial liability of the authorized representative as true, correct, and complete, with all related endorsements front and back. Pre-paid; exempt from levy. Adjust the account and release the orders to the authorized representative immediately.**

[Autographed Postage Stamp  
(Two-cents US is OK)]

**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

2. If you have had your **bullet stamp** made, which includes your full name in upper- and lower-case (some people use all lower-case letters in their documents for ancient linguistic reasons<sup>17</sup>), as well as your EIN# and the terms stating that you are operating in capacity of being the "living principal" and "authorized representative," stamp your bullet stamp in gold ink so that it is over part of your **Accepted and Returned for Value, i.e., "ARFV," stamp (above)** and also across the upper left hand portion of the postage stamp.



3. Autograph your name at a diagonal across the postage stamp so that your autograph is done over a part of the **ARFV** text, across the postage stamp, and on the presentment itself. Use blue or purple ink.<sup>18</sup> Put in the date by hand.

17 There appear to be four alphabets in English: print including upper-case letters (in whole or part), print in all lower-case letters, upper-case cursive, and lower-case cursive. Allegedly cursive (handwriting) joins phonetic symbols in a way that removes their individuality and therefore does not verify/certify the pronunciation of your name, voiding capacity for your autograph to state a claim. This is why one should always also print his name, thereby having a double witness and removing ambiguity (which may be construed as fraud in law that may require a third party, i.e., judge, to adjudicate). Also, language (multiple languages, i.e., babal—as in the “Tower of Babal”) came from the ancient Phoenicians and was, among other things, developed as a weapon. Writing in all lower-case letters was allegedly the mode of writing used by the elite, whereas use of all capital letters was reserved for ships, dead fictions, and slaves. One may review the term, “*capitas diminutia maxima*” in *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 6<sup>th</sup> edition, concerning this matter.

18 A long-standing concern about what color ink is best to use for such things as signing a document with an accepted-for-value stamp has been recently resolved for this author, who has now concluded that red is not good; blue or purple is optimum. Rather than indicating blood and the living being as we had thought, the significance in the color scheme of the system indicates that red expresses deficiency, such as “being in the red.”

4. If you do not have your bullet stamp, use the postage stamp as above, autographing on a diagonal across the stamp, filling in the date, and also printing your EIN#, as per the following:

**This presentment is accepted for assessed value and returned in exchange for settlement and closure of this accounting, certified and sworn on the commercial liability of the authorized party as true, correct, and complete, with all related endorsements front and back. Pre-paid; exempt from levy. Adjust the account and release the orders to the authorized representative immediately.**

[Autographed  
Postage Stamp  
(Two-cents US is OK)] **Account No.[EIN#]**

\_\_\_\_\_

**Date:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**[Name], authorized representative**

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Your package to the offerror will consist of:

a. **Verified notice** (by affidavit, notarized) that informs the presenter of what the documents are that are attached/enclosed, what is required of the presenter, notice that the notary retaining a copy of the documents being sent and is acting as a disinterested third party, and that if the presenter does not respond to the notary within the required time (ten (10) days in most cases) with notice that he has adjusted the account and the obligation is discharged, a Certificate of Non-Response will be forthcoming from the notary that constitutes a notice of dishonor and judgment in estoppel on the law;

b. **Your accepted-and-returned-for-value presentment**, signed and dated by you in blue or purple ink and bearing your Private Treasury UCC Contract Trust Account number [SS# w/o dashes];

6. If the notary does not hear from the offerror within ten (10) days that the discharge has occurred and the accounting is closed, have the notary send the offerror a Certificate of Non-Response. This constitutes a certificate of dishonor and a judgment in estoppel on the law, which bars the offerror, and everyone else, from ever coming after you again concerning the issues in the offer.

If a court case is involved, have your notary also notarize such things as the following:

1. **Certified copy of the Oath of Office** of whatever judge is involved (if the identity of the judge is known at that point), as obtained from the secretary of state of the State, or the county recorder, or whatever office is holding it.

2. **Notice of Waiver of Protest.** This documents requests the court to waive any fee, fine, cost, or charge the court is looking for. A default position by the court is automatic record of INVOLUNTARY BANKRUPTCY if the court dishonors your request (as the living principal and authorized representative for your strawman). Your notice informs them that their dishonor constitutes a waiver of right to protest the matter (or anything connected therewith) henceforth.

3. **Notice of Acceptance, Standing, and Status; Request for Remedy.** This pleading-format document instructs the court to discharge all charges and dismiss the case (based upon your acceptance and return for value of the charging instruments and all court documents, along with filing the bond) or, in the alternative, produce the assessment for the charges (whether the charging instrument is a citation, complaint, information, statement, or indictment). (See "Instructions for Executing and Using Employer ID," B) 3), *supra*.)

It is an automatic dishonor/forfeit position if the court does not provide the assessment for the charges if you require it. Substantiation of the bona fide nature of the assessment consists of providing the commercial paperwork that reveals the origin, nature, particulars, and legitimacy of the assessment which, to be genuine, must be executed by the responsible party under affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, with stated commercial liability risked by the responsible party in case he is found to be in error, and swearing to the accuracy, relevance, contractual validity, and verifiability of all allegations made and the exactitude of the sum-certain amount of the assessment. Failure to "put up or shut up" in this regard signifies the court's stipulation that it is continuing to entertain prosecution of non-existent charges.

4. **Bond (2 options):**

a. **Single-page bond (on court pleading format).** This bond is filed in the court on court-pleading format. Such format renders the document more familiar in appearance (and therefore more easily filed) than trying to file papers that are not in pleading format. Elaboration on the bond, its use, and history of success are discussed hereunder.

Or,

b. **Request for Appearance Bond.** This document is a court brief that instructs the court to have an appearance bond issued (at no cost to you) in order to underwrite the case and the appearance of your strawman at scheduled court hearings. The court's failure to issue the bond allows you to utilize their dishonor/obstruction as a grant of their signature by accommodation to be used in a subrogation surety bond. You notice the court that you are requesting an appearance bond, backed by your exemption (on the private side), at no cost to you. Technically the granting by the court of your request discharges all obligations connected with the case, ends the dispute, and makes you the owner of the matter. At this time we are awaiting final outcome of using this process.

If the matter is a commercial bill such as a credit card statement or other invoice, and they ignore what you have done and continue sending you more invoices, treat each new bill as an original presentment. Each statement is another offer on which you can do the same process. This is true of any matter, such as mortgages, credit cards, etc. The offerror's non-response signifies his tacit stipulation that he owes you the amount on your bill. He has implicitly agreed that he owes you the funds by not responding; he has invoked the doctrine of acquiescence and estoppel by silence.

As valuable as a judgment in estoppel on the law is, it is not the best we can make of a situation. We would like to make money from the event. For this we need a second judgment in estoppel—one on the facts/money. When you do this you establish on the record the amount that the offerror owes you in costs, fees, and damages. The amount can be anything you choose, since only you can decide what you think the matter is worth to you. Besides, it is all nothing but digits in the matrix.

If a court procedure is involved, as soon as possible file a court brief in standard court pleading format entitled "NOTICE OF ACCEPTANCE," by which you notice the court of the following:

1. You have accepted the charging instrument for value Banker's Acceptance and returned it in exchange for settlement and closure of the accounting concerning the matter.
2. Settlement of the account has been done privately by exchanging your exemption for discharge of the obligation by use of your Private Treasury UCC Contract Trust Account, No. [SS# w/o dashes].
3. You are operating in capacity of being the living principal, authorized representative and attorney in fact for the strawman.

As exhibits/attachments to your notice of acceptance, include color copies (preferably certified by a notary as true copies) of the following foundational documents:

1. Employer Identification I;
2. Private Agreement;
3. Security Agreement-Pains and Penalties;
4. SPA-IHHA.

Also file:

1. Notice of Request for Waiver.
2. Notice of Request for Remedy.

Put an autographed and bulled-stamped postage stamp on the back, lower right hand side of every page of every court brief you file. Obtain multiple copies of your documents to the court and have the clerk file stamp them all.

If the case is not dismissed (which it usually is), file the Court Bond.

B. Explanation of the process involved in accusation and prosecution

The situation involved in having to appear in court is as follows:

**Private/Substance/Fact**

Existential Event -> Subjective Interpretation by Accuser, with alleged Injured Party and Claim of Mens rea (criminal intent)

### **Public/Reflection/Interpretation**

Statutory Criminal Charges -> Civil Resolution by agreement of the parties

The sequence is this:

1. You commit some actual act (such as writing a check on a closed account), which is simply an event in reality. You inscribed something on a piece of paper. So what? You also walked to the grocery store, ran into a friend, and planned a dinner party; all are simple happenings, with no legal charge attached.
2. Someone (some living being, the complainant) has considered what you did to be a crime you committed with criminal intent (*mens rea*). In other words, out of an infinite number of possible subjective, inner motivations you might have had for doing something, and an infinite number of possible ways anyone can think about what he perceives of your action, the accuser chose to adopt the perspective that what you did was a crime that you committed with criminal intent. The first is a value judgment; the second, regardless of substance, is nothing for which anyone but you possesses authority to speak. The accuser can neither know your intent nor does he have any right to speak for it. He can observe your outer behavior, not your inner motivation.
3. The interpretation that what you did is a "crime," as well as what that "crime" is, what statutes you allegedly violated, the basis of prosecution, etc., are all applications of the facts to the accuser's presumptions/assumptions/priorities/interpretations/motivations.
4. The complainant swears out a complaint under affidavit that you did what he says you did and submits it to the prosecuting authorities for them, as "public servants" (serving the system, not you), to investigate, and thereafter prosecute, your strawman (with you attached unless you rebut the presumption of the contrived union).
5. The first thing across the mirror (the bar) onto the right hand side of the bar, i.e., public/debt/bankruptcy mirage-land, is the criminal charges, which is what the public side indicts you for. Since the public side is debt, reflection, and bankruptcy, nothing of substance and reality can originate there. The public side must reflect something real on the private/substance side and then adjudicate the imaginary dispute concerning the arbitrary interpretation of the actual event, calling it a "crime," and saying it violated one or more of their statutes. The event itself is nothing other than an occurrence in reality, a thing-in-itself that is completely neutral. If someone calls it a crime that is his projection/interpretation of his mental processes and priorities. What he makes of what you allegedly did is his business, not yours. What do his mental processes have to do with you? He is manufacturing fiction and projecting it on you, attempting to lure you into traversing into his imaginary, let's-pretend world and deal with what goes on there. You receive a complaint that says, "On or about June 5, 2001, John P. Smith (you) did willfully do blah, blah, blah." So you read this, blush, and say to yourself, angered and fearful inside, "That dirty rat, I did not!" If you join his game and try to disprove his fiction you have left your domain, departed from solid ground, and ensconced yourself firmly into a swirling mirage of your accuser's fertile imagination. Why write yourself into his novel?
6. In a criminal case the system functions by getting people to plead to the criminal statutes on the public side. Then the matter shifts from criminal to the civil (agreement of the parties) for resolution. If you take this route you are down the drain. The proper way is to obtain a civil (meaning money) resolution on the private side so that the dispute is ended at its source and there is no controversy for any tribunal to resolve. This resolution occurs by stipulation between the parties as real beings. Once that agreement is reached on the private side (the origin), the possibility for any public

action is eliminated. There is no longer anything to drag across the bar and into the public domain.

7. For securing the stipulation between the parties that ends the dispute on the spot, admit to the facts in the charging instrument (after having accepted everything for value, of course). This can be accomplished by a statement such as, "I have no problem with pleading guilty to the facts stated in the charges." The prosecution says you wrote a check on a closed account. OK, you did. That is a fact, not a charge, so agree with the statement. By so doing you are not agreeing that what you did was a crime, or violated any statute, or can be any basis for prosecuting you. You have merely agreed to a fact in reality, thereby reaching a stipulation with the prosecutor that end the negotiations. Because there is stipulation between the parties, there is no longer any controversy for a court to hear and entertain. The agreement between the two of you ends the matter. When there is agreement on the private/substance side the subject matter can never get to the public side, because no dispute exists.

8. Concerning the bonding of the case, your discharge of the matter by use of your exemption makes you owner of the transaction.

9. Keep in mind that if you follow their lure, what they present to you as the way to go, you're dead. They want you to plead to the statutes, not the facts. The statutes are their property, their "truth" (i.e., fiction), and jurisdiction concerning which you have no authority to deal. You own yourself on the substance side but have no claim on interpretation of facts that someone alleges on the private side (out of his belfry) that he wants you to deal with on the colorable, public side. If a matter is ended at its source (the private domain) there is nothing to bring into the public arena.

10. By pleading guilty to the facts on the private side you are demurring. "Who says I can't write a check on my own closed account? I placed some ink on a piece of paper, but so what?"

11. Remember that no one on the public side can charge anyone with a crime on the private side. Only people act; strawmen do not and cannot act. Therefore, deal with matters between you and your adversaries privately, forming private contract (usually by their tacit consent through non-response) between you and them. The terms and conditions of the contract include the fact, established on the notarial record, that that they stipulate that the matter is resolved, so no dispute exists. *Sic transit* case.

12. Someone invoking the system must post a bond to invoke the services of a court. The authorities cannot arrest you without an order (warrant, which is a check) from a court, and the only way a court can obtain the jurisdiction to issue a warrant is by someone having posted a bond indemnifying the court and granting the court subject matter jurisdiction (funds against which to execute the warrant/check) to adjudicate the matters you are being accused of. You must require that they provide the audit trail of the accounting on that bond that allegedly bonds the case.

13. If you are presented with a warrant, accept it for value, write "exempt from levy" on it, sign, date, and return it to the court. This grants the court authority to use your exemption in exchange for release of the property, i.e., return of the bond to you (as the creditor and insurer).

14. The Court Bond gives the court subject matter jurisdiction. If you are the creditor—paying with substance and not liability funds—it is your court. The court serves the creditor. When you have title to the bond behind the criminal prosecution there is no way you can go to jail because you have discharged the bond that would otherwise result in your being seized and incarcerated as the surety for your strawman that they treat as a debtor (defendant, loser) in a dispute.

15. If you enter a plea when no bond has been posted, you have broken the law by pleading to non-existent charges (i.e., color of charges). Also, you have granted the

court subject matter jurisdiction to prosecute your strawman on the public side as the debtor. Posting a Court Bond removes all basis for continuing; the matter is resolved by your discharge on the private side.

16. Having a hearing in an admiralty court is not a common-law right; it requires posting a bond so that the court can have in rem jurisdiction. The property at stake in the proceeding is the bond. You must secure title to the bond behind a criminal prosecution if you wish to be immune from conviction. How do you get title? There must be an agreement between the parties concerning the identity of the creditor on the bond. The court will probably try to secure title by asking you to pay a small fee for filing the bond. This is a trap.<sup>19</sup> One way or another you must provide the asset that balances the books. The issue is not whether you discharge the obligation, but what kind of funds, i.e., in asset funds or liability funds you use for doing so. If you use your exemption you secure title; if you use FRNs you forfeit title. Therefore, you suggest that either the court waive the public administration fee for registering the bond or secure the fee by performing an adjustment and offset through use of your Private Treasury UCC Contract Trust Account (EIN#). If the court does not do either it is in dishonor of you, as the king/creditor, authorizing you to discharge the matter by bringing involuntary bankruptcy against the court to discharge the bond because you have established yourself as the owner by your acceptance for value and willingness to allow your exemption to be used for discharging the obligation.

### C. Strategy concerning court

One of the most difficult positions to be in when inside a courtroom is sitting down. It is best to wait outside—or in the back of the courtroom—until the strawman's name is called. Then walk towards the bar to speak and don't sit down. Sitting is inferior to standing, and if you go through the drill of being in court before the judge enters, standing up upon hearing the bailiff announce, "All rise," and then sitting down when instructed to do so, you are signaling by your behavior that you are an obedient serf and subject of the court and within its jurisdiction. This is not a desirable position. A maxim of law concerning this states: "It is immaterial whether a man gives his assent by words or by acts and deeds." 10 Co. 52.

When your strawman's name is called, when spoken it sounds the same as your upper- and lower-case name (see "*idem sonens*," meaning "same sound," in *Black's Law Dictionary*, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition). When this happens, do not say "here." As soon as you give your name you testify that you are in the public side. You testify that the real you is the strawman/Defendant on the paperwork at which the judge is looking. You form a contract with the court by which you agree that the real you may be treated in accordance with the way they treat the strawman/Defendant. You surrender to the court's jurisdiction. You agree to leave your own ground and domain and go join them on the school yard in their let's-pretend cops-and-robbers game.

The crucial points to keep in mind in any court interaction are as follows:

1. The courts are equity/admiralty/probate/trust courts, not courts of law. In such courts there is neither law, nor substance, nor facts, nor evidence, nor charges. There are assumptions, presumptions, color of law, color of substance, color of facts, color of evidence, and color of charges. Officials and attorneys execute the paperwork and pleadings as if (let's pretend presumption) your strawman is the trustee (Defendant, actually co-trustee of the public, cestui que trust created by the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment ) with a duty and the State (Plaintiff) is the beneficiary (i.e., co-beneficiary of the public, *cestui que* trust created by the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment<sup>20</sup>) who has allegedly been deprived of his trust benefits by the delinquent trustee. Trustees are always outside common law.

<sup>19</sup> Even the use of the word "pay" is a trap. We are better off not using it in interacting with the system. Since there is no money, but only debt currency derived from borrowing against the people, there is no way to pay a debt. We discharge obligations, not pay debts.

20 The *cestui que* trust is a "public charitable (collective) trust," or "PCT," that is constructive and not express. "Constructive" means that the trust is constructed (created, manufactured, concocted) by "operation of law," i.e., out of nothing, as just another of an uncountable number of legal fictions of which the entire system consists, by the whim and fiat of those who own the particular law forum in which the trust is indentured and domiciled. In the case of the United States, this jurisdiction is the private, commercial, international, military jurisdiction of the original incorporation of US Inc. in 1871, within the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment and emergency war powers implemented at the advent of the civil war that suspended law and terminated thereafter operation of the "*de jure*" government under the original charter, the 1787 Constitution.

A "citizen of the United States" was created by/within the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment as a corporate, civilly dead entity operating as a co-trustee of the PCT. The 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment upholds the debt of the USA and US Inc. in Section 4 of the Amendment, which states that the "debt shall not be questioned." That is part of the terms and conditions of your co-trustee position. If you question the debt you are in violation of your own contractual obligations. Endeavoring to find fault with the system or any of those operating on its behalf is considered as arguing against yourself, which every judge immediately dismisses as self-evident error, if not insanity. No wonder judges are so fond of ordering psychiatric evaluations for those who appear in court these days.

It is presumed that everyone who states that he is a "citizen of the United States (Inc.)," or acts as if he were, has knowingly, intentionally, and voluntarily contracted into the private, military, international, commercial admiralty/equity law forum of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment PCT, surrendered all rights, and agreed to be bound by the alleged resulting contract. One is now "on the ship," where the captain's word is law and trying to protect your rights, find the system in error, or walk off the job is walking off the plank.

In the PCT, every citizen of the United States acts in a dual capacity: as co-trustee and co-beneficiary. This means that as a "citizen" you have on the one hand (as co-trustee) obligations and duties, such as the requirement to comply with all the system's codes, rules, regulations, laws, statutes, and public policy, and on the other hand (wearing the hat of co-beneficiary) you can receive benefits, such as welfare and other rob-Peter-to-pay-Paul token benefits such as "retirement benefits," "unemployment insurance," and other trinkets doled out in exchange for having, like Esau, sold your birthright for a bowl of porridge. There is no grantor or trustor (although there is a creator) to a PCT because it is an implied trust, i.e. constructed, and not formed by express, written, bilateral contract.

Once you are in the PCT, you can contract into Social Security, which is a reversionary, revocable trust in the New Deal, a socialist/communist scheme in which all participants are "tort feasons" who secure, by membership, benefits to which they are not entitled by having been extracted at legal gunpoint from other people. Accepting SS (or any other government) benefits is accepting stolen goods, providing the system with an excuse to consider you "guilty until proven innocent."

Therefore, in any court case, the action is being brought by the allegedly offended beneficiary, the Plaintiff, as (implied) co-beneficiary of the PCT, against Defendant, the (implied) co-trustee. This is why the "law" and "facts" are all completely irrelevant. If you go into court trying to argue either, you must necessarily lose since the only issue is whether your strawman faithfully performed its duty as trustee of the trust, such as to obey the statutes, pay the taxes, or whatever else is required in accordance with the ever-increasing ocean of by-laws of US Inc. If you raise objections of "law" or "facts," you not only traverse and dishonor (by arguing), and therefore automatically lose, but you give witness/testimony against yourself that you are a bad (delinquent) trustee trying to escape your duties as a co-trustee of the PCT. You are thereby presumed guilty. Your fatal error is not first and foremost that you argued, denied, rebutted, traversed, dishonored, and tried to avoid your contractual and fiduciary obligations (of a contract you ratified countless times by accepting innumerable government "benefits," such as Social Security, obtaining a driver license, getting a passport, etc., etc., etc.) as co-trustee, but that you failed to rebut the presumption that you are the co-trustee, i.e., the same as the Defendant/strawman/citizen. This is why there is only one issue and all the rest is so much irrelevant froth. The issue is whether or not you rebut the operational presumption. If you do not, nothing else matters; the presumption (where the power and teeth are) stands and you lose.

2. You, as the living principal, are real and exist on the substance/private side. The strawman, all-caps name, Defendant, is fictitious and exists on the imaginary/public side. The living principal cannot be seen, addressed, or dealt with by the public side, which is a reflection in the mirror and a chimera. The Defendant cannot enter or access the private side just as the living principal cannot enter the public domain.

3. It is essential to neutralize the presumption by which the system operates against us, which is that the living principal is presumed to be attached to and united with the strawman so that whatever is done to the strawman is imposed in the flesh on the living principal. It is the unrebutted presumption of the union of the real and fictitious that

enables the court to access the real you. This is why it is crucial to neutralize that presumption and render it inoperable.

4. You must not traverse or dishonor. You cannot win by arguing in let's pretend mirage-land.

5. You must end the controversy, i.e., terminate the presumption of the existence of a dispute, on both the private and the public sides. The obligations/charges must be discharged so that the books balance and you have complied with the law in both domains.

6. The public side is bankrupt, has no capacity to execute a sentence, and cannot charge you in common law. The charges are "in the nature of" (meaning colorable) civil or criminal charges in common law, meaning they are in form only without any of the substance. This is also (among other reasons) why you cannot lien public officials: doing so is a common-law (substance) process, and as bankrupt entities they cannot provide you with a remedy. Trying to lien public officials is a dishonor and crime by endeavoring to impose a common-law remedy in a sphere that cannot access common law.

Several possibilities (in lieu of or in addition to the Three Questions approach, below) for dealing with the name issue come to mind. These statements are intended as satisfying all of the above essential elements. When your strawman's name is called or the judge asks you your name, you could say one of the following (whatever you are comfortable with):

"I am here concerning that matter." Or,

"I am here as a third-party intervener<sup>21</sup> in that matter appearing as authorized representative for my client."

21 The third-party intervener is you, the living principal, acting in your own interests because you have a pre-existing claim against the Defendant that precludes them from acting against any version of your all-caps name based on your prior contract therewith (such as your UCC, Specific Power of Attorney and Indemnity and Hold Harmless Agreement, your Employer ID, etc.)."

Then continue:

"I accept for value and return for value all of the charging instruments in this matter and make my exemption available [not "offer," since we never make offers] for discharge of all obligations and charges connected with this case. I do not dispute any of the facts in the charging instruments."

We must remember that problems are not solved on the level of problems: we cannot resolve the imaginary dispute in the imaginary domain. We must not try to pay with public funds; we must not try to prove ourselves innocent; and we must not plead "not guilty" (which is arguing, traversing, dishonoring, and telling them that you are joining the imaginary game and treating it as if it were real). All attempts to do these things are traversing and dishonoring, breaking the law, and committing treason against the equity court by trying to deal with the dispute as if it were substantive, private, real, and in common law. The court then convicts us for contempt of court and imposes the common-law sentence.

We must also remember that they need us, as the living principal, to be a witness against ourselves, testify, and make the legal determination for them that we are the one they are looking for in their let's-pretend game and want to prosecute, convict, and punish. They need us to volunteer into contracting with them in their public domain. They cannot make the legal determination that the Defendant has anything to do with us; it is up to us to hang ourselves. The above statement satisfies all of the essential criteria, as follows:

1. The catch-22 of the matter is that under common law you are presumed innocent until proven guilty, whereas in their admiralty/equity courts you are presumed guilty



until you prove yourself innocent (which is impossible in their let's pretend/presumption game). If you try to prove yourself innocent you are in dishonor and are charged with a breach of trust to the beneficiary, the State. By so doing you commit treason against the court by trying to secure a common-law remedy where none is possible, and you do not neutralize the presumption (and indeed, ratify its force and effect) while admitting that you have been a delinquent trustee and acted in violation of your fiduciary duty.<sup>22</sup>

2. You, as the living principal on the substance/private side, are speaking on behalf of, but not as, your strawman/Defendant. Ideally you have filed before ever going to court your Court Bond and Notice of Acceptance, Standing, and Status; Request for Remedy, wherein you have attached your accepted-and-returned-for-value documents and your standing/status documents that define and clarify your standing as living principal and authorized representative for your juristic person, *ens legis*, strawman.

3. By proceeding in this manner, especially when supported by your notary-witnessed documents, you neutralize the presumption that you are attached to and united with your strawman.

4. You do not traverse or dishonor, thereby disarming and defusing the matter.

5. You end the controversy by your acceptance and return for value, filing the bond, and stating that you are not disputing the facts in the charging instruments. By not disputing the facts (on the private side) you remove the dispute at its origin and leave nothing to resolve in the public arena. By making your exemption available to discharge the charges you are in harmony with the law, leaving no violation to prosecute. Technically you could say, "As the living principal I do not dispute the facts on the private, substance side and my client pleads guilty to the charges on the public side."<sup>23</sup> The point is that if you end the controversy on both the private and public side there is no dispute for a court to hear and entertain. There is no one and nothing to prosecute. Then, if they wish to convict your strawman of something, let them find the strawman guilty on their own (leaving them exposed). They are welcome to put a piece of paper with the Defendant's all-caps name on it on the electric chair, throw the switch, and discharge the charges through the paper while you are out having dinner with your girlfriend.

22 An interesting property of their equity courts is revealed by remembering the maxim of law that "Anything inside a box is not there." Consequently, the following persons/players are not there: 1) the jury, which sits in the "jury box"; 2) the witness, who gives "testimony" in the "witness box"; and 3) the judge, who sits on a platform, which is also a box. Only the trustee (Defendant) and beneficiary (State) are there and relevant to the proceedings; all the rest are part of the Wizard's smoke-and-mirrors light show of diversion and misdirection.

23 The authors have never heard of this being done, so cannot vouch for the results that might accrue from doing so. Since this statement is accurate, explicit, and addresses both sides of the bar, it theoretically should be effective.

6. By not traversing into the game, and by not trying to defend yourself or your strawman against the charges, you do not enjoin the substantive, private, common-law side with the civil or criminal charges and thereby become the victim of sentencing as a result.

The intent of using the above approach is to truncate the time, effort, and dialogue involved in dealing with giving one's name in court. If you are this situation and it looks as if it is not getting the job done and getting you the closure you desire, you can at any time go to the Three Questions approach (discussed below).

#### Placing evidence in court

In the meantime, if you are in a court proceeding, although no one and nothing operating from the public side (i.e., all attorneys and government officials) can place actual evidence on the record, you, as the real being (especially with a notarial witness) can! People and documents you can subpoena for deposition and evidence in your favor include the following:

A. In both civil and criminal cases, subpoena persons for deposition and/or bringing in documents you require as evidence in the case. These parties can include the mayor of the municipality, as well as the risk management accountant of the municipality, with documentary proof that the insurance books on the case have been adjusted and a bona fide assessment has been made of the bond (the original complaint filed in the court). The voucher that must be issued (by/in the department of risk management of the municipality in which the court is located) is to monetize the complaint that created the funds by utilizing the derivative name (the all-caps name of the DEFENDANT), supported by municipal bonds.

Serving a subpoena *duces tecum*, hereinafter "SDT," whether or not you depose anyone for direct questions, is appropriate in both state and federal cases. Obtain several official, stamped subpoenas from the court in advance. In the section asking for documents subpoenaed, print, "See attached SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS SUBPOENAED, SET I." You can have the SDTs served by a process server, sheriff, or US Marshal, and serve the prosecuting attorneys, and perhaps also the mayor of the municipality in which the court is located, and the head of the department (or accounting department) of the municipality department of risk management. The documents you should subpoena and require them to provide you with are as follows:

(A) Civil.

1. Basis upon which prosecution concerning Case No. [Case #] Case No. [Case #] may continue after Authorized Representative has accepted and returned the charging instruments and Case for value and posted a bond secured by and through Authorized Representative's exemption (and therefore discharged the obligation and ended the controversy);
2. Certified copy of the assessment in fact on which the charges re Case No. [Case #] are based;
3. Certified, true copy of the order from the Secretary of the Treasury to collect the debt obligation of the Defendant re Case No. [Case #];
4. Certified audit trail of the voucher for monetizing the complaint/bond on the case.

(B) Criminal. All of the above items for civil, plus:

1. The detainer authorizing incarceration of [DEFENDANT] and the accompanying physical body of [Name] re Case No. [Case #].

Their failure to provide any of these items is a tort and grounds for habeas. As for the evidence you wish to establish on the record, first file what you want judicially noticed as evidence. This should include your Court Bond. As soon as your documents are filed, obtain at least two (2) certified copies from the clerk of the court. Keep one set in a safe place. Take the other set with you to place into evidence in open court. Once you serve the evidence on the court it cannot be denied. You give your documents to the bailiff, who serves the judge, and even if the judge throws everything back at you it does not matter. What you want to put into evidence has been served. The documents for you to file in the case and serve on the judge in open court should include the following:

1. The judge's oath of office that you received from the secretary of state (or whatever official source provided it to you);
2. Your Court Bond that bonds the case;
3. Proof that you have accepted the case and all charging instruments for value and returned them for value;

4. Your judgment in estoppel on the law (first certificate of non-response) that the notary served on the opposing parties;
5. Your judgment in estoppel on the facts/money (second notarial certificate of non-response).

[Part IV—Redemption in Court](#)

[Presentments Index](#)

---

## Part IV Redemption in Court

The following are points (allegedly derived from Roger E material) on the “Redemption,” or “Three Questions,” approach to functioning in court:

### Background

1. The word “law” comes from “llall.” The “l” was originally a double-“ll,” which came from hieroglyphs signifying “two legs walking.” “Law,” however, is an obstruction because the “two legs” walking around show that law is constantly changing. In the United States, for example, Americans get to live under approximately 150,000 new laws every year passed by combined federal, state, and municipal legislatures. In 1984 there were over 200,000 such new “laws.” We have been informed by attorneys, as well as West Law, Lexus, and Nexus, etc., that the law changes so rapidly that in many cases an attorney must check to see what the law is today before he goes to court. (My retort each time I was informed of that was, “What if natural law behaved in so unstable a manner?”)
2. A court is a “place where a contract or agreement is made.” [A court is a "commercial register."](#) One consequence of this is that all courts are “courts of record.” Indeed, there is nothing with which a judge can deal except the record. How can a judge act in the absence of paperwork in his possession that inform him what a case is?
3. In accordance with the principle of agreements, if someone fails to respond in protest you in essence have an agreement that includes his stipulation that he is in dishonor.
4. When you are formulating an agreement, the first thing you need is the name of the second party. This is why in court you first ask the judge if you may have his name. Note: the Court is working on an assumption of contract, not an agreement in fact.

### Procedure/Dialogue

The Redemption dialogue makes the court proceeding into a deposition that you are conducting for the purpose of establishing on the record who the claimant is in the case. You are there under threat, duress, and coercion, since guaranteed harmful repercussions are inevitable if you do not appear when/as commanded. You are also there because someone, somewhere, has made a claim—or color of claim (implying, or calling what they allege without foundation a “claim”—against you that allegedly justifies enforcing the claim against you by using the legal-violence system. By engaging in this deposition you are actualizing the maxim of law that “the burden of proof resides on him who asserts, not him who denies.” You want them to prove the nature and cause of their alleged or implied claim. In other words, you—as the creditor, owner of the court and both sides of the transaction—are requiring them to “put up or shut up.” When

you go into court like this you are exercising your rights under public international law to determine what kind of business these people are trying to do with you.

In any interchange between you and the judge, whether it is you requesting that the judge answer something you are asking him, or him asking you a question, you must persist until the judge sees that you are not going to give in. This is perhaps especially important if/when a judge asks you to state your name, or asks if you are so-and-so. He may ask at least three (3) times, since the system functions in threes. The judge needs to know that you are clear and secure about what you are doing and will not cave in under the psychological pressure that he is so well-trained in applying on those who are before him in court. Likewise, you may have to state your requests three (3) times until you receive either an answer, or a non-answer (which stands as an admission on the record of your position in the matter).

1. The first thing you do is ask the judge for his name so the record is set concerning the parties entering into an agreement. Therefore, when your name is called, you say, "I am here concerning that matter. May I have your name please?" Request number 1.
2. Pay attention to the fact that most Judges/Justices prefer to give their title, NOT THEIR NAME.
3. If the judge gives his name, request: "Would you please spell that for me."
4. If the judge gives his title (such as "Judge Smith"), request: "Your offer of communication is accepted for value and your dishonor is returned. Please state your name, NOT YOUR TITLE."
5. If the judge states that it is a TITLE/NAME, you can ask: "Is that TITLE/NAME (such as JUDGE SMITH) the same TITLE/NAME that is registered with the Secretary of State?" If not, it is fraud and the entire matter is void because the judge is doing business as a name (and therefore as a different entity) than that by which is registered as authorized to do business (another derivative).
6. Now if the judge won't give his name, then go ahead with your second request anyway. If someone with whom you are dealing in court fails to respond or is standing mute it means you are in control and he is waving his rights. Request number 2: "Do you have a claim against me?" He will either stand mute or he will decline to answer, signifying his intent to demur to the matter.
7. When you receive a "no" answer, or no response, or a non-responsive response, go on to Request number 3. "Do you know anyone who does have a claim against me?" Note that you do not say any "person" or "anybody that" has a claim. It is anyone "who" has a claim against me, i.e., a living principal who is alive and breathing in the real world. You are not pleading into a fiction or a legislative venue, which is the major legislative premise (presumption) on which the court functions. This presumption stands unless neutralized.
8. If the prosecutor answers you by saying something like "The State of California has a claim against you," you can say either "Your honor, would you please direct the prosecutor to produce the assessment for the charges," or, "I call the claimant to the witness stand," or, "I call the State of California to the witness stand."
9. Now if you receive a "No" answer or non-responsive reply to your request for the judge to inform you whether he knows anyone who has a claim against you, and the prosecutor also says "no," then continue by directing the Judge, 1st position as a request statement: "I request that TITLE/NAME please direct the prosecutor to answer whether there are any more charges." Asking the judge this cuts down on any more assumed charges. On a good day the prosecutor will refuse to answer and the Judge will dismiss the case on the spot!!!!

10. At this point you can direct the Judge, **2nd position as a request statement:** "I request that TITLE/NAME please direct the prosecutor to answer whether the assessment for the charges is in his/her possession." Making this request of the judge forecloses the system from acting on the otherwise un-neutralized assumption that you are not concerned whether there is a civil assessment to justify the charges. **Without an assessment there can be no charges** (see §§ 18 & 19, below). Asking this questions puts the prosecutor in trouble, as if he does not immediately drop the charges he is practicing law without a license, which is a felony!

11. At this point you can direct the Judge, **3rd position as a request statement:** "I request that TITLE/NAME direct the prosecutor to provide the assessment for the charges along with the certified audit trail of all transactions (held by the mayor of the municipality and the applicable risk management department) including the voucher and all disbursement documents and receipts."

12. At this point you direct the Judge, **4th position as a request statement:** "I request that TITLE/NAME please direct the prosecutor to provide the serial placement number of his/her bar card." NOTE: many times the prosecutor is not qualified even to be there (which is often the situation in federal court), and the bar card, which is an OMB number, can be used as the number for a surety bond.

13. At this point you direct the Judge: **5TH position as a request statement:** "I request that TITLE/NAME please state for the record if you have subject matter jurisdiction." NOTE – if there are no further charges, no assessment for the current charges, and no subject matter jurisdiction, the court is in a forfeit position.

14. If you elect to utilize the appearance bond matter within this Redemption approach, this would be the place to bring the matter up [as of this writing requesting an appearance bond may be eclipsed by the single-page Court Bond on court-pleading paper]. Then your **6th position consists of your request for the appearance bond.** Making this request in effect puts your name on the account and thereby charges the account so that when the appearance bond is discharged (by appearance) the operators of the account are put into immediate INVOLUNTARY BANKRUPTCY. If there is no assessment for the charges, more than likely they will not issue an appearance bond and you can therefore issue a subrogation surety bond.

15. Should anyone hand you any piece of paper, in particular a paper in which they want you to read the assumed "charges," scan the front and back of each page and say, "I cannot see any charges." Hand the paperwork back to the one who gave it to you and then direct/request the Judge to have the prosecutor read the charges.

16. **DO NOT LET THEM WAIVE THE READING OF THE CHARGES.** Once more repeat the request for the assessment for the charges. Persist on this point. Once that point is resolved, state that you are not disputing any of the facts in the matter and admit to the facts in the charging document. The point is that the system wants you to accept the face appearance of their documents and statements as gospel, so that you self-assess and testify as a witness against yourself. Do not waive the right to require them to provide you with the civil assessment. They never have any valid criminal charges, nor any assessment to support the civil charges (all actions today, both civil and criminal, are actually civil, i.e., commercial). Do not let them off the hook and hang yourself. Require that they substantiate the charges.

17. USE YOUR INTUITION AND WHETHER TO USE next phrase after the gavel fallen (the discharge)! "I request that the order of the court be released to me immediately."

18. This is not a question, it is a request. You do not move the court because doing so is asking for a benefit. By making the request, you are in essence saying, "If there is no firsthand witness or claimant present, on what are you operating? Give me your marching orders." You are demanding to see the order of the court.

19. When you say/ask/request these three things you create a small claims court. A small claims court has different rules and procedures than a commercial admiralty/equity court. In a small claims court there are no Titles of Nobility; attorneys cannot be present.

20. The parties themselves state the claims in small claims court, so we will know who has a claim and who does not.

21. If there are no claims then there is a default to investigate.

**22. This Three Questions process also constitutes an inquest hearing on a 'show cause.' You are doing a coroner's inquest or a probate into the matter of any claims against you.** In this inquest, only those who have firsthand information concerning the claims may testify.

23. If you are conducting a public inquest into the matter concerning any claims that may be brought against you, and no claims are brought, the matter is concluded, the public inquest is over and you are out of there. 24. Now, there are some variations that can happen with this. The judge or the prosecutor might say, "The State/Province/Department of \_\_\_\_\_ has a claim against you." No, they do not. They may have charges (i.e., what they call "charges" but which are actually only a presumption of charges, i.e., color of charges, since there is no assessment), but not a claim. Charges are not claims.

25. Some judges get cute, saying things like, "My name is judge so and so." Well, that's a fiction. That designation does not pertain to a real party, and is not a name that can be entered in the "commercial register." "Judge So and So" is an unregistered fiction, i.e., doing business under an unauthorized and unregistered name.

26. At that stage of the game, you should alter your questions somewhat. 27. **"Is there anyone present to press the claim against me in any alleged name other than his own?"**

28. If the prosecutor wants to stand up and press that claim (of which there is miniscule chance), then you demand that he be sworn in to testify under oath as to the damages creating and validating the claim concerning which he is testifying. Now you have your inquest.

29. He is not going to swear in<sup>24</sup>, so you say, **"There being no claimants who have sworn in under penalty of perjury today with a firsthand damage claim, it would appear as though there is no more public business concerning me. I am withdrawing."** There is no credible witness, and therefore no admissible evidence. No one will swear with responsibility and firsthand knowledge that there is a claim because it does not exist. Even if they have evidence, it is rendered hearsay and presumption for want of any credible witness to substantiate the validity of the evidence. Prosecutors are attorneys, and no attorney is a credible witness who can testify under oath on the witness stand that the evidence he places on the record is valid.

24 Attorney's statements are arguments, not evidence. That is a double fault, since such behavior is both dishonor and presumption. To be evidence, whatever documents are filed would have to be substantiated as valid and verifiable by testimony under oath. No attorney can do this, i.e., take the witness stand and swear in, because he is not speaking for/as himself, with firsthand knowledge and defined commercial responsibility. He represents, i.e., "re-presents," by derivative re-invention, what he has been told (hearsay) or thinks would be expedient to say (fiction).

**30. Don't allow the Judge to hoodwink you into allegiance.**

**31. Do not follow the orders of the judge or the judge becomes the head and you become the tail.**

32. It is either the judge's private business that's going to go on in there, which is the business of the corporate state, or your private rights under public law.

33. **If you traverse into his business you abandon your claim.** Don't traverse, make requests instead. Avoid even the appearance of dishonor. Politely requesting, rather than engaging in behavior that might be interpreted as confrontational, can work wonders.

34. What is an "order"? Public people are acting under the premise of legislative jurisdiction. They MUST have delegation orders that give them authority to do what they are doing. Once you have gone through the first 3 questions: The name, the claim, know anyone who has a claim, if there is no response, then nobody has come forward with a claim against the one asking the questions, i.e., you. In such case there is no cause of action and your adversary has "failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted."

35. Where would an order of the court come from? The order would have to come from the Secretary of the Treasury, because he is liable for all the books and is the one that appraised the security instrument. So, if they don't have an order going back to the Secretary of the Treasury, they don't have any authority to collect the debt. Remember the universal operating premise on which the legal system functions: Unrebutted presumptions rule.

36. When they issue a citation, complaint, information, or indictment, somebody has already established a commercial value on that instrument. Although there might be a set of papers in the administrative process, like the court documents, we know (and reason, logic, and common sense tell us) that there is a set of commercial (banking) documents and accounts paralleling the legal. Commerce is more fundamental than law. Commerce can function without the legal system, but not vice versa. Law is a subset and derivative of commerce. There is an equivalent commercial world and universe in bookkeeping that parallels and underlies the legal judicial bookkeeping.

37. If an indictment is issued, such as on tax evasion, there must be an appraisal that says that the appraised value of this indictment is \$100,000.00.

38. So, in the Treasury, whenever an indictment goes out it claims an asset by way of the security instrument in the sum certain amount of \$100,000.00. Then there is a corresponding side to the ledger sheet which is an accounts receivable of \$100,000.00 to back up the asset. Is this not DOUBLE ENTRY BOOKKEEPING?

39. If you don't address the commercial aspects of the citation, complaint, information, or indictment, then they have an asset on their books that remains. If it is not adjudicated they have an accounts receivable that is aging.

40. If you dishonor the asset—the indictment—then, their books are out of whack because a dispute exists as to the asset, and the accounts receivable of \$100,000.00 that they are looking for remains uncollected.

41. If the prosecutors have no order from the Secretary of the Treasury to collect the alleged debt against the Defendant in the case, they are acting as rogue agents. Obviously the order is an item that one could subpoena the prosecutors to produce by subpoena duces tecum.

42. Remember, you (i.e., your strawman) are there in your "public capacity." Under public international law, private rights are recognized, authorizing you, as the living principal appearing as authorized representative and attorney in fact for your client (your strawman). The real you can be damaged by the proceedings, and, in addition, you have a pre-existing claim against the debtor, the alleged Defendant (your strawman), such as is noticed by your UCC Financing Statements. But as soon as you engage in a co-business venture in their private business (by traversing, dishonoring, or

not accepting for value, posting bond, and discharging the charges), you are in their court in a business contract.

43. By requesting that the order of the court be released to you immediately, you are demanding that if you are there on public business involving you, then you want to know who is behind the claim. That request constitutes a public verbal demand for a Bill of Particulars! This removes any assumptions/presumptions around the agreement in question. You are trying to determine the nature and cause of the claim—what it is and who made it.

44. If you receive no response from anyone you are entitled to make the following statement, "It would appear as though I have completed my public business here today. There being no further public business to carry on, I'm withdrawing." Now you're giving your equitable notice to the parties present. You turn and walk out. If anyone tries to stop you, start the Three Question process all over again with him.

45. You don't care what the judge says, you just go on, and you just go through the routine and direct it at him. Usually they will give their name to start with. Anybody who addresses anything in there is doing so in your court if you have not traversed, not dishonored, and have posted a bond. By bonding the action through your exemption you discharge the charges and end the controversy on the private side, thereby owning the transaction and the court. They are now your employees and, without any reality on the private side to reflect, the public side is left in an untenable position. If, however, you start acknowledging any of their procedures in there, then they are going to assume you are in their court and not yours. They want you to recognize, i.e., make the legal determination concerning the identity of, the accuser, either by body language, testimony, or otherwise so you become a witness against yourself. If you accuse yourself, no one else is required to do so.

Further considerations on all of this are set forth as follows:

1. "Circuit courts" are geared to track the circuitry of the human body or the human mind, which determines, structures, and operates the circuitry through which the current (currency) flows.
2. A direct examination is examining the "conscious mind"; a cross-examination examines the "subconscious mind."
3. Your subconscious mind is totally innocent of everything. It believes everything your conscious mind tells it. That is why people have to stay in "good standing" with their own consciences. What they are trying to get you to do is to alter the agreement between your "conscious" mind and your "subconscious" mind. When that happens, your immune system breaks down. You must be totally honest to keep your immune system together.
4. When we press them for this kind of testimony concerning their affairs they back away. We continue to the point that they must compromise their conscience when we bring the fact of the matter to them.
5. The "law" knows only two types of persons; "employees" and "employers" as identified by the "Tax Identification Number (S.I.N./S.S.N.)."
6. The "employer" is the Preferred Stockholder, while the "employee" is the Common Stockholder, of the "Corporate Government" (bankrupt US Inc.).
7. The Preferred Stockholder has this position via the "Birth Certificate."
8. The Preferred Stockholder holds both the "debit" and the "credit" side of the account.



9. A "traffic ticket," for instance, represents "common stock."

10. What the Judge is doing here is attempting to get you to agree with the operational assumptions, such as agreeing to be the collateral on whatever the charge is, i.e. Ticket, Non-Filing, etc., thereby stipulating that the charge is valid.

11. When you tender currency, which is the "public exchange," you do not pay any debt. You cannot reduce a negative (public charge) with another negative (public money).

12. If you are faced with a fine involving a serious criminal charge, and you pay with "public money," it is a bribe.

13. When you request that the court release the order to you, what you are asking them to give you the "common stock." Release the stock ("order of the court") to me immediately.

14. The "order" represents the One World Order, for one thing. It is also a "money order," or possibly a "work order."

15. Whoever has presented the "charge(s)" is the one with the "claim"; the one with the claim is the payee.

16. When you accept the account for value, they must bring the amount into existence from your private account, at which point they have a "tax obligation" on their hands.

17. When you accept the property for value, they are the payees because they are in possession. We're saying, "I accept that claim," because they are holding a "lien" on the "claim," and they have it in their possession, so they are the payees in fact. The payee in fact has to answer to the Internal Revenue for the funds.

18. Accepting a charging instrument for value means that you accept the claim. I accept the claim, and I am the taxpayer in fact, because I allow them to pass through "my account" to discharge the charges.

19. They have to release the order of the court to you. They have to release the "claim," i.e., the money, the account. The account, however, is already prepaid, because you are the principle. They obtained the money from you in the first place, since where that is where all the currency in circulation today derives from. You already paid the claim, and you are asking them to release the claim that you have already paid.

20. So what you do is interrogate the witness. You ask the three magic questions and don't go beyond that.

21. When you are interrogating a judge you don't care what he says because anything he says can and will be used against him. He is testifying, not you! That is the essence of taking testimony because when you enter it into their courts the situation inverts. The Miranda warning says "anything you say can and will be used against you." It does not say "might."

The jurisdiction of courts today is international. All commerce occurs in international admiralty/maritime. That means that you and I, as the owners of the account, do not do any of the work. We are the sovereigns, so our employees (public officials) do the work. When there is a credit and a debit, we have two employees involved: one state and one federal. These employees handle the matching funds.

[Part V—Court Bond](#)

[Presentments Index](#)

---

## Part V - Court Bond

Just recently, long after the writing of this article commenced, we were provided with the text of, and explanation about, a single-page document (on standard court-pleading format, so that it looks like a normal court brief) that has allegedly had dramatic success when used. The bond, i.e., "Court Bond," (revised by several people from the original version), plus the explanation we received concerning the instrument (essentially intact as we received it), accompany this article.

The Court Bond is not a pleading or motion needing determination from the court. It is not an argument, opinion, or point of law, nor is it a negotiation. It is just a bond! Who could object? **The Court Bond is a *special* bond as described in Rule E of the Supplemental Admiralty Rules in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure in 28 USC. Admiralty is the only place mentioned in the rules where bonds apply. A bond seems to be appropriate only on an admiralty proceeding. This includes bail bonds, general bonds, special bonds, etc. Anything that has bonding involved is admiralty or some degree of admiralty.** Since all commerce is international, and international commerce exists in admiralty/maritime jurisdiction, and every legal matter is commercial, **in any court case in which you are involved, always put in a bond.**

Since the bond you file becomes a permanent part of the record, if anyone tries to remove the filed bond, you have a file-stamped copy that substantiates the filing.

Since the public side is a reflection in a mirror of content in the private side, if there is no private side/ledger, there can be no public side/ledger. Without any reality, a mirror has nothing to reflect. The books/ledgers must balance—public and private.

Filing the bond removes you from the controversy. You cannot be required to pay any claim for losses or costs because you have covered any and all of them by providing a bond backed by your exemption, which is unlimited. You have covered every outcome by your good-faith effort. A court exists to resolve disputes, which requires adverse parties. The bond removes you from the arena by ending the controversy and discharging any obligation there might be via the bond, whether or not there is any assessment in fact.

Strategically, it might be wise to file your bond at the last minute, just before going to court, to foreclose them from sufficient time to study it and brainstorm on how they can get around it. Use of a notary and autographed stamp renders dishonoring the bond considerably more difficult. So does sending a copy to the court administrator, mayor of the municipality, the municipality risk management department, and perhaps even the Army Corps of Engineers.

The judge is holding the original books, which is OK with us. Let him own the account and make the adjustments. Then he is responsible. Since the judge is not going to go to jail, if anyone has to take the fall for the charges it must be the attorneys.

All admiralty courts require posting a bond to initiate a cause of action. A case commences and is bonded when the prosecuting attorney files the complaint. The complaint is the bond, and is signed by the prosecuting attorneys. It is a firm offer, an original issue, offered to the clerk, who buys the contract. That is the original money, which is brought under the Bar Numbers of the filing attorneys (prosecutors). The clerk buys it because of the attorneys' guarantee that they will produce someone to pay the fines and go to jail. The clerk takes the complaint to the court, which is the bank, and issues a voucher. The voucher is a security. The commercial bank credits the court's account in the commercial bank and then monetizes the voucher by sending it to Freddie Mac or Fanny Mae, making the instrument an insured government security.

We believe that this process creates the public funds by the charges made against the strawman, for which the real being ends up paying as the surety if the presumption that the

real you may be treated as, and is therefore liable for the obligation of, the strawman/Defendant, is not eliminated from the equation. We further think that these public funds are credited (possibly by going through the commercial bank's TT&L account) to the customer's (i.e., the court's) account. In other words, when your strawman is charged as a Defendant in an action, it appears that what happens is that the public funds are created by using your exemption to create the public money that covers the check the commercial bank writes to deposit in the court's account.

Let's say you, i.e., your strawman, are indicted. You go to court, you get an attorney, you go through a trial, and the jury finds your strawman guilty. At the sentencing hearing, the judge says openly, as if addressing no one in particular, "Will the defendant please rise." The terms "Defendant," and "the defendant" are different. Until sentencing, all attorneys, officials, judges, etc., have been engaged in prosecuting your all-caps name strawman/Defendant, not you. At sentencing, in order to procure enforcement of the judgment, you must provide the legal determination that the real you and the fictitious you are contractually united—married. Then you go along for the ride concerning anything the system wants to do to your strawman, such as fining or imprisoning you, or both.

The term designated as "the defendant" is not identified in a case until either someone pleads guilty or pays a fine and goes to prison. In court paperwork the one accused or indicted is designated as "Defendant." The real you is simply a being/body waiting to be placed into the slot of "the defendant," who must pay with dollars and incarceration time for the alleged crime, after the strawman/Defendant has been found guilty. Anyone who makes an appearance in the case (every attorney) could also fall into the category "the defendant" or "the plaintiff," including any "Defendant" or "Plaintiff" named or identified. This dance is a dynamic scam that can change at any time during the proceedings, including long after you have been convicted, sentenced, and incarcerated.

Maxims of law that pertain to this include:

Once a fraud, always a fraud. 13 Vin. Abr. 530.□

Things invalid from the beginning cannot be made valid by subsequent act.□ Trayner, Max. 482.

A thing void in the beginning does not become valid by lapse of time. 1 S.□ & R. 58.

Time cannot render valid an act void in its origin. Dig. 50, 17, 29; Broom,□ Max. 178.

Because both the private and public set of books are involved, what gets sent to prison is an amalgamation: JOHN DOE SMITH/Body/John Doe Smith. The interesting thing is that at the time you go into prison, and your body is admitted, your all-caps name is placed on the ID tag. When you receive a discharge from the Department of Corrections the paperwork issued has your name in proper English, upper- and lower-case letters. Why? Speculation is that any time up to and including discharge you could be freed for some other reason than serving your time, such as on appeal, habeas corpus, the real criminal having been discovered, etc. In other words, the contract formed by the union/marriage of the strawman, private name, and body is not fulfilled until the terms and conditions of the bond filed by the attorney in the form of a complaint are fulfilled. The case was bonded "on the come" by the attorney's guarantee (by staking his bar/bonding number) that a Defendant would pay the penalty in fines and/or incarceration to cover the bond, thereby getting the attorney off the hook.

To use the automobile situation as an example, when you purchase a new car, one of the documents in the "9-Pack" is one the dealership glosses over and does not elaborate on. Most people are so busy signing their name on all the paperwork that they don't questions everything anyway. What this document does is gift title of the automobile to the State (Department of Motor Vehicles), to whom the Manufacturer's Certificate of Origin (MCO) is sent. The MCO is title, i.e., equitable (substance) title. You, as the user, have "legal title," meaning they get the elevator (substance) and you get the shaft (legal liability). You receive a "pink slip"

at the end of your payments, which is a "certificate of title." A certificate of title is not title; it is simply a document stating that title exists somewhere.

So if the gendarmes give you a ticket and impound your car, it is incarcerated until you have paid the ransom to get it out.

In the case of a conviction/prison situation, you (body/car) are impounded, sitting in jail under control of the jailer (user, your strawman) on the basis of a charge by a prosecutor (owner, i.e., State) having made a complaint (citation, bonded by his bar number). It matters not what the complaint is as it is all a smokescreen and misdirection to divert attention away from what is really going on. They have put your name on an account and are using your body during the time of their impounding your body (in accordance with the terms of the bond/complaint filed by the prosecuting attorneys). Suddenly, you ask them for the bond that was posted that allows them to do this. No reply! Hmmm!!!

It appears that the private books, dealing with body/John Doe Smith, are held privately in the office of the trial judge, which is where the commercial action of record happens. No one goes to jail or pays a fine in any case unless and until the private accounting books are in conformance with the public record. In other words, there is a credit/debit accounting cross on the private side and an equivalent (mirror image) of that cross on the public side. If you end and own the matter on the private side by using your exemption to discharge the obligation, the private books have been balanced, both asset and liability sides have been filled in, and discharge (and therefore termination of controversy) has occurred.

As a result of filing the Court Bond, your proper English name must be removed from their title. They can no longer use your private name because you have posted the Court Bond for record and paid for everything with your private exemption. This discharges the obligation (charge/imbalance) on the private side ends the controversy and fulfills the obligation on the private side, thereby ending the possibility for any public dispute resolution to occur. When there is nothing on the private books for the public side to mirror, and the private side establishes your ownership of the matter, the illusory public side is left hanging out to dry. By discharging the matter on the private side by use of your exemption, you not only end the dispute and become owner of the transaction, but owner of any court in which the matter may remain for resolution of the non-existent claim.

Consequences and ramifications of the foregoing include the following:

1. By the private man posting a bond, through his private exemption, into the public record with the clerk, a separation has occurred between the version criminally charged (ALL CAPS) and the version they want to put on the books in the back office, which is upper- and lower-case (private) name. If the private version is not available then they can't take the body because the account is no longer whole. You can't put half a body in jail. They need your ALL-CAPS name in the public record, and your lower-case name on their private books held by the judge, in order to make the accounting whole and take your body. The bond made with your lower-case name and placed into the public record with the clerk splits the account into two disjointed halves. By losing one side of the account they lose both. They cannot admit "JOHN DOE SMITH/body" to jail if there is no longer any "body/John Doe Smith" to discharge at the end of the sentence.
2. Since the imbalance still remains on the un-discharged public side that must be discharged, the attorney no longer has a Defendant/body to fulfill the terms of the bond filed in the form of the original complaint. The result is that within seventy-two (72) hours they must either dismiss the case, find another Defendant/body to satisfy the pledge in the attorney's on-the-come bond, or the attorney(s) who filed the complaint must be held liable.

The history of the use of this bond thus far appears to be that all incarcerated users were released. Not all of them, however, remained free. It seems that the ones who stayed out permanently were those who had filed documents (such as a UCC Financing Statement, Employer Identification—with jurat, if possible—and other documents that clarify that the real

being and the strawman are two different things and that the real being is the "living principal" who autographs instruments and operates in capacity of being the authorized representative, attorney in fact, and secured party for the strawman. Those who did not put in any paperwork that states and declares this were re-incarcerated after a few weeks, since they never rebutted the rebuttable presumption (which is where the power is) that the real being is united and amalgamated with the strawman (presumed to be the property of the system), so that whatever the system wants to do with its property (the strawman) gets enforced on the real being.

Also of supreme importance is not giving one's name in court when asked, and not saying "yes" in any form when the judge asks "Are you so-and-so?" to act as discussed herein-above.

Further, whenever possible have your documents notarized with the acknowledgment/jurat. Although the notary text is labeled "acknowledgment," which is it, since the text contains the words "subscribed and sworn," it is also a jurat. Notarial acknowledgment is mandatory admissibility in court, and a jurat is an oath, the strongest use of a notary, and is regarded as an apostille. The fact that the text contains the use of your name three (3) times, and that your name as set forth, i.e., [Name]©®TM[Birth Year], is intended as referring to the real you as living principal operating in the matter as the authorized representative and attorney in fact for your strawman, is express, witnessed notice of your standing. One should put several variations in the spelling of the strawman, i.e. "JOHN HENRY DOE," the all-caps name of the Defendant, and "DOE, JOHN HENRY." The latter is the military designation of the strawman's name, and all legal/commercial matters today are military and function under military accounting (as per the military accounting manual, ER 37210).

Lastly, always (if at all possible) put a postage stamp (two-cent stamps in US are fine) on the lower right-hand corner on the back of every page in any document you file into court. Autograph (sign your full name in longhand) diagonally across the stamp in purple (royalty) or blue (source of the bond) ink. Also, if you have had your bullet stamp made, stamp it (gold ink) on the upper left hand part of the postage stamp in addition to inscribing your autograph by hand. This escalates the seriousness of your instrument by making you the postmaster of the transaction and placing the matter under the UPU, a jurisdiction in international law formed by treaty that is higher than, and untouchable by, the courts. It provides you with what might well be an insurmountable position vis-à-vis those in the system acting against you, notwithstanding any other considerations. By use of the postage stamps in this manner you are posting your document to them through the mail, making you an official mail carrier delivering your document. They cannot interfere or tamper with the mail or the carrier thereof (you)!!!

It is our understanding that the reason a court has seventy-two (72) hours to deal with the Court Bond from the time it is filed is the requirement to adjust the books on the international stock/bond exchange within that time frame. What has occurred in actual cases seems to confirm this, since people who filed the Court Bond have been brought into court the following morning, if not sooner. Their time frame within which they can act to take themselves off the hook is very short.

See [JAILS, PRISONS, BONDS](#)

[Part VI—Postal Power](#)

[Presentments Index](#)

---

## Part VI - Postal Power

The UPU (Universal Postal Union) in Berne, Switzerland, is an extremely significant organization in today's world. It is formulated by treaty. No nation can be recognized as a nation without being in international admiralty in order to have a forum common to all nations for engaging in commerce and

resolving disputes. **That is why the USA under the Articles of Confederation could not be recognized as a country.** Every state (colony) was sovereign, with its own common law, which foreclosed other countries from interacting with the USA as a nation in international commerce. Today, international admiralty is the private jurisdiction of the IMF, *et al.*, the creditor in the bankruptcy of essentially every government on Earth.

The UPU operates under the authority of treaties with every country in the world. It is, as it were, the overlord or overseer over the common interaction of all countries in international commerce. Every nation has a postal system, and also has reciprocal banking and commercial relationships, whereby all are within and under the UPU. The UPU is the number one military (international admiralty is also military) contract mover on the planet.

**For this reason one should send all important legal and commercial documents through the post office rather than private carriers, which are firewalls. We want direct access to the authority—and corresponding availability of remedy and recourse—of the UPU. For instance, if you post through the US Post Office and the US Postmaster does not provide you with the remedy you request within twenty-one (21) days, you can take the matter to the UPU.**

Involving the authority of the UPU is automatically invoked by the use of postage stamps. **Utilization of stamps includes putting stamps on any documents** (for clout purposes, not mailing) we wish to introduce into the system. As long as you use a stamp (of any kind) you are in the game. If you have time, resources, and the luxury of dealing with something well before expiration of a given time frame, you can use stamps that you consider ideal. The most preferable stamps are ones that are both large and contain the most colors. In an emergency situation, or simply if economy is a consideration, any stamp will do. Using a postage stamp and autograph on it makes you the postmaster for that contract.

Whenever you put a stamp on a document, inscribe your full name over the stamp at an angle. The color ink you use for this is a function of what color will show up best against the colors in the stamp. Ideal colors for doing this are purple (royalty), blue (origin of the bond), and gold (king's edict). Avoid red at all cost. Obviously, if you have a dark, multi-colored stamp you do not want to use purple or blue ink, since your autograph on it would not stand out as well if you used lighter color ink. Ideally one could decide on the best color for his autograph and then obtain stamps that best suit one's criteria and taste. Although a dollar stamp is best, it is a luxury unless one is well off financially. Otherwise, reserve the use of dollar stamps for crucial instruments, such as travel documents. The rationale for using two-cent stamps is that in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century the official postage rate for the *de jure* Post Office of the United States of America was fixed at two (2) cents. For stamps to carry on one's person for any kind of unexpected encounter or emergency use, this denomination might be ideal.

Use stamps on important documents, such as a check, travel documents, paperwork you put in court, etc. Where to put the stamp and how many stamps to use depend on the document. On foundational documents and checks, for instance, **put a stamp on the right hand corner of the instrument, both on the front and on the back.** The bottom right hand corner of the face of a check, note, or bill of exchange signifies the liability. Furthermore, the bottom right hand corner of the reverse of the document is the final position on the page, so no one can endorse anything (using a restricted endorsement or otherwise) after that. **You want to have the last word.** If you have only one stamp, put it where you are expected to sign and autograph over it cross-wise. In the case of a **traffic ticket**, for instance, put a stamp on the lower right hand corner where you are supposed to sign and autograph across the stamp at an angle.

**Autographing a stamp not only establishes you as the postmaster of the contract but constitutes a cross-claim.** Using the stamp process on documents presents your adversaries with a problem **because their jurisdiction is subordinate to that of the UPU, which you have now invoked for your benefit.** The result in practice of doing this is that whenever those who know what you are doing are recipients of your documents with autographed stamps **they back off. If they do not, take the matter to the US Postmaster to deal with.** If he will not provide you with your remedy, take the matter to the UPU for them to clean up.

**The countries whose stamps would be most effective to use are China, Japan, United States, and Great Britain.** Utilizing these countries covers both East and West. However, since the US seems to be the point man in implementing the New World Order, one might most advisably use US stamps.

If you put stamps on documents you submit into **court, put a stamp on the back of each page, at the bottom right hand corner.** Do not place any stamps on the front of court paperwork since doing so alarms the clerk. By placing your autographed stamp on the reverse right hand corner you prevent

being damaged by one of the tricks of judges these days. A judge might have your paperwork on his bench, but turned over so only the back side, which is ordinarily blank on every page, is visible. Then if you ask about your paperwork he might say something like, "Yes, I have your paperwork in front of me but I don't find anything." He can't see anything on the blank side of a page. If you place an autographed stamp on the lower right hand corner you foreclose a judge from engaging in this trick.

In addition, when it comes to court documents, one side is criminal and the other is civil. Using the autographed stamp that you rubber-stamp with your seal (bullet stamp) on the back side of your court documents is evidence that you possess the cancelled obligation on the civil side. **Since there can be no assessment for criminal charges, and you show that you are the holder of the civil assessment, there is no way out for the court.**

**Also, in any court document you put in, handwrite your EIN number [SS# w.o. dashes] in gold on the top right corner of every page, with the autographed stamp on the back side.**

Use of a notary combined with the postage stamp (and sometime Embassy stamps) gives you a priority mechanism. Everything is commerce, and all commerce is contract. **The master of the contract is the post office, and the UPU is the supreme overlord of the commerce, banking, and postal systems of the world.** Use of these stamps in this manner gets the attention of those in the system to whom you provide your paperwork. It makes you the master of that post office. Use of the stamp is especially important when dealing with the major players, such as the FBI, CIA, Secret Service, Treasury, etc. They understand the significance of what you are doing. Many times they hand documents back to someone using this approach and say, "Have a good day, sir." They don't want any untoward repercussions coming back on them.

If anyone asks you why you are doing what you are doing, suggest that they consult their legal counsel for the significance. It is not your job to explain the law, nor explain such things as your exemption or Setoff Account. The system hangs us by our own words. We have to give them the evidence, information, contacts, and legal determinations they require to convict us. The wise words of Calvin Coolidge, the most taciturn president in US history, are apt. When asked why he spoke so little, he replied, "I have never been hurt by anything I didn't say."

The bottom line is that whenever you need to sign any legal/commercial document, put a stamp (even a one (1) cent stamp) over where you sign and sign at an angle across it. Let the recipient deal with the significance and consequences of your actions. **If you are in a court case, or at any stage of a proceeding (such as an indictment, summons, complaint, or any other hostile encounter with the system), immediately do the following:**

1. Make a color copy of whatever documents you receive, or scan them in color into your computer;
2. Stamp the original of the first page of every document with the ARFV stamp, put a postage stamp in the signature space, and autograph across it at an angle with your full name, using purple or blue ink, handwritten with upper- and lower-case, with your gold-ink bullet stamp (seal) on the upper left-hand portion of the postage stamp;

Make a color copy of the stamped, autographed pages and/or scan into your computer;

3. Put a stamp on the lower right-hand-corner of the back of every page and bullet-stamp and autograph it;
4. Have a notary send each document back to the sender, with a notarial certificate of service, with or without an accompanying/supporting affidavit by you;
5. If you have an affidavit, put an autographed stamp on the upper right hand corner of the first page and the lower right hand corner of the back of every page.

People who have engaged in this process report that when any knowledgeable judge, attorney, or official sees this, matters change dramatically. All of these personages know what mail fraud is. Since autographing the stamp makes you the postmaster of the contract, anyone who interferes is tampering with the mail and engaging in mail fraud. You can then subpoena the postmaster (either of the post office from which the letter was mailed, or the US Postmaster General, or both), and have them explain what the rules are, under deposition or testimony on the witness stand in open court.

**In addition, most of the time when you get official communication it has a red-meter postage mark on the envelope rather than a cancelled stamp. This act is mail fraud.** If the envelope has a red-meter postage mark on it, they are the ones who have engaged in mail fraud, because there is no cancelled

stamp. It is the cancelled stamp that has the power; an un-cancelled stamp has nothing. A red-meter postage mark is an uncancelled stamp. If it is not cancelled, it is not paid. One researcher has scanned everything into his computer, and has more red-meter postage marks than he "can shake a stick at." Officials sending things out by cancelled stamp is a rarity—perhaps at most 2%.

With the red-metered postage you can trace each communication back to the PO from which it was sent, so you can get the postmaster for that PO, as well as the postmaster general for the US, to investigate the mail fraud involved. It is reasonable to conclude that canceling a stamp both registers the matter and forms a contract between the party that cancels the stamp and the UPU. Using a stamp for postage without canceling it is prima facie evidence that the postmaster of the local PO is committing mail fraud by taking a customer's money and not providing the paid-for service and providing you with the power of a cancelled stamp, **as required under the provisions of the UPU.** When you place an autographed stamp on a document you place that document and the contract underlying it under international law and treaty, with which the courts have no jurisdiction to deal. The system cannot deal with the real you, the living principle (as evidenced and witnessed by jurat). Nor can officials, attorneys, judges, *et al.*, go against the UPU, international law, and treaty. In addition, they have no authority/jurisdiction to impair a contract between you (as the living principal) and the UPU (overseer of all world commerce).

You cancelled the stamp by sealing it and autographing across it. You did so in capacity of being the living principal, as acknowledged by your seal and the Jurat on your documents.

If you are in a court case, bring in your red-metered envelopes in court and request the judge to direct the prosecutor to explain the red-meter postage stamp. Then watch their jaws drop. Doing this is especially potent if you also have asked the prosecutor to provide his bar number, since most attorneys in court—especially in US—are not qualified. **An attorney in federal court had better have a six-digit bar card or he committed a felony just by walking in and giving his name.**

Lastly, if you are charged with mail fraud, subpoena the prosecutor(s) to bring in the evidence on which mail fraud is being alleged, as well as the originals of all envelopes used for mailing any item connected with the case. **Then the mail fraud involved was committed by the postmaster of the PO in which the envelope was stamped.**

[Part VII—Esoteric knowledge](#)

[Presentments Index](#)

<http://www.wealth4freedom.com/law/Presentments-I.htm>

---

## Part VII - Esoteric knowledge

As is common knowledge, the "world system," i.e., the system by which the world is governed, is the product of millennia of development and use. This system functions on the basis of an integrated utilization of four (4) of the major cons that have successfully exploited mankind throughout history. These four (4) major cons are:

1. The science/technology con, whereby a scientific priesthood attains power and essentially a monopolistic position to dictate what the laws of physics, chemistry, etc., are. Some of the consequences of this phenomenon include foreclosing exploration of deeper, more powerful, and more universal knowledge, as well as alternative "outside-the-box" ways of looking at things, and, most importantly, fostering external dependency at the expense of people's realizing their own true nature and actualizing its potential. One who is awake and empowered cannot be exploited. The esoteric heart of the con is that all of the technological development and manipulation that occurs in the realm of science, including the design, engineering, and manufacture of all industrial products involving scientific knowledge (essentially everything produced today), are accomplished by projecting into the outer world things that we, as spiritual beings, are inwardly capable of knowing, being, and doing in, by, and through ourselves. Examples



of this are various yogis and masters who possess such “supernatural,” or at least extraordinary, powers (“siddhis,” in Sanskrit) as invisibility, transporting one’s body anywhere instantly at the speed of thought, being multiple places at the same time, etc.

2. The religious con, in which the doctrine and dogma of some religion are promulgated as truth (perhaps the best, or at least most important, truth), and if you want to get to God you must go through that religion’s priesthood and live your life in accordance with the teachings of the religion. Fostering fear, such as by invoking “hell” and the “devil,” is often a part of the control mechanism utilized.

3. The law/government con, consisting of instilling as deeply, securely, pervasively, and unquestioningly as possible the belief that man must have governments, i.e., that some people must be governed by other people. It could be considered a remarkable phenomenon that people who are otherwise incredibly intelligent and discerning never think about questioning this premise, living their lives without ever addressing such a seminal idea. As Socrates purportedly said, “The unexamined life is not worth living.” Ideas govern man’s life, whether or not those ideas are consciously held, and, in the words of Spinoza, “Nature abhors a vacuum.” Something will control one’s life. If one does not analyze the ideas that govern his thinking and acting, his life will be controlled by random ideas and ideas deliberately instilled in him by others.

The operational consequences of this con are that the overwhelming percentage of mankind implicitly and unthinkingly believes, as if it were an unshakeable aspect of existence itself, that man must have human governments. One may openly question and analyze what kind of government might be best, but if one questions the implicit premise of the necessity and propriety of the existence of government in the first place, all hell breaks loose. Such a doubter is instantly ridiculed and derided (powerful weapons), and labeled (another powerful weapon) as an “anarchist,” or “anti-social,” or “a rebel,” or other such opprobrium, as if that resolved the matter and eliminated the need to evaluate the ideas of someone espousing so radical (meaning “of or from the roots”) a concept.

This unshakeable and unassailable premise of the necessity of governments is immediately rendered questionable by pondering a few elementary considerations: “What does ‘governing’ mean?” “Does man, with the sublime attribute of free will, exist to be ruled by other men?” “If so, which men are supposed to rule what other men? i.e., Who should govern whom?” “Am I to govern you or are you to govern me?” “Who decides who governs whom?” “What source of authority authorizes structuring society on the premise that some men must rule others?” “Who is to be entitled to act in what manner to dominate what areas of what other people’s lives?” “What are the mechanics that should be used for governing?” Etc., etc., etc.

The problem with governments, when thought about clearly and with an open mind, is that the institution itself is hopelessly, irredeemably, and fatally flawed and cannot be rendered sound and legitimate by any variations in the institution whatsoever. These flaws are: 1) Absence of valid ethical authority for one free-will being to dominate the life of another free-will being, whom he did not create, cannot fathom, does not own, and who is innately possessed of the inherent right/responsibility to live his own life; 2) Absence of adequate knowledge, i.e., no one is omniscient, and everyone has his hands full in ascertaining how best to live and fulfill his own life without meddling in the lives of others—especially masses of people—whom he cannot comprehend, and has neither the right, nor the ability, to try to impose such knowledge even if he knew it; 3) No effective mechanics, since the only operational tool of power available to governments is endless applications of deadly physical force, i.e., legalized violence, which needless to say does not enlighten and uplift people, transform their inner natures so that the deficiencies that created the alleged problems (who defines anything as a “problem,” and why?) simply are not there, or even bring about existential rectitude (true justice).

As a result of this fundamental premise being rendered operational by those who would rule others, the history of man on this planet is the monotonously endless replay of the

same dreary earth dramas: civilizations form, grow and expand, reach a zenith, and then decline, disintegrate, and disappear—either suddenly and violently or gradually. As Lao-tzu observed concerning this foregone inevitability, “Most people who miss after almost winning should have known the end from the beginning.”

4. The last, and in many ways the most important, con is the money (paper-money banking swindle) con, consisting of exchanging symbols of wealth (e.g., pieces of paper that cost the issuer nothing) for real wealth (i.e., people’s labor, property, freedom, and rights, which cost the people their life force and freedom to fulfill their destinies). When one has achieved a monopoly on the implementation of this con (as exists today), one is essentially at the pinnacle of the attainment of the objective of all cons, since mastery of this con enables purchasing all the other cons.

The knowledge of these cons and how to effectuate them has been transmitted through the ages through various “secret societies,” i.e., groups of people who not only learn the knowledge and feel justified in using it for their own advantage vis-à-vis the “masses,” but function in a manner that seeks to foreclose the general populace from knowing and implementing the knowledge.

Today, in accordance with the inherent operational nature of life that “Truth will out,” more and more esoteric knowledge and the use thereof is being revealed. One reason for this is that “mankind will not be reasoned out of the feelings of humanity,” and one of the profoundest feelings of humanity is for freedom and knowledge of the truth.

The main reason for this mini-discourse on the four (4) cons is that those who have structured, transmitted, and continue to perpetrate the cons for their own self-aggrandizement vis-à-vis others have sought to anchor their system in aspects of understandings of existence that they consider the most profound, accurate, and powerful possible. The result is that law and commerce function in accordance with esoteric knowledge that has been sought and pondered by innumerable people throughout history, such as Confucius, Pythagoras, Euclid, DaVinci, etc., and has been implemented by countless other people in power over extended periods of time. The result is that law and commerce are structured to function on a number of universal things that most people do not know anything about. Chief among these is how to create and sustain power and magic through use of language, symbols, colors, and codes.

Based on the foregoing, findings of a number of intelligent and tenacious researchers are now emerging. Such knowledge includes ever-increasing understanding of the significance and use of numerology, the colors used for the paper that are intended as being sent where and accomplishing what results, the substances of which the paper is made, the colors used in printing particular texts, the dimensions of the paper, etc.

In order to achieve the successful results we all desire when dealing with/in the system we must actualize this deeper knowledge, which is not only vast and extensive, but only partially known because finding and understanding it is an on-going process. By way of providing examples of the applied esoteric knowledge of which we speak we cite the following:

1. The color of the paper used in particular documents, or duplicates of documents, is a function of where the documents are to be sent and what they are supposed to accomplish. These colors are white, blue, yellow, goldenrod, pink, green, and violet.
2. A different weight of paper (20 lb., 40 lb., etc.) is appropriate for different documents.
3. The content of the paper is important, such as whether the paper should be made of cotton, linen, hemp, a mixture of linen and hemp, and whether the paper should have such things as threads of gold and silver interwoven into it.
4. The dimensions of the paper are also important, i.e., whether one should use 8½ X 11 or 8½ X 14.

5. It is also useful to have an imprint of one's footprint on the paper used for some documents, preferably watermarked (and of course reduced in size). A footprint (more than fingerprints) constitutes supreme forensic evidence of one's identity as a living, biological being. Having it on the paper not only identifies you in such capacity, but symbolically informs the recipients of your documents that you are standing on the ground (even holy ground) and are not "up in the air" where the public, fictitious side operates.

The merits of much of the above can be substantiated by observing documents involved in commerce, such as shipping. In the case of legal documents (which are also in commerce), such as a traffic ticket, the original is white, your copy is blue, the pink copy (ownership) goes to the court, the green (constituting the money) goes to the administration of the court.

As of the time of this writing we are receiving immense amounts of material elaborating on, confirming, and exemplifying the use of this esoteric knowledge, to which we have merely alluded here. Obviously any extensive discourse on the subject is beyond the scope of this article, which is intended as outlining fundamental concepts and processes. As a result of exposure to this deeper understanding of how the system is structured and why it was formulated as it is, we are drafting our documents as fully in accord with the information as possible.

Finally, a practical consideration perpetually concerns anyone dealing with the system. Given the obvious facts that we can never know everything, that we are perpetually growing in knowledge, experience, and understanding, and that we want to do what succeeds, how can we know at what point to act? The answer is often determined by the seriousness of a matter and the time frames involved in having to deal with it. This conundrum is a major incentive not only for studying for and by oneself, but networking with as many others as possible who are likewise engaged in ascertaining truth and securing freedom on the basis thereof. The knowledge resulting from synergistic interaction, and the feedback gained from learning the result the actions of people when attempting to succeed vis-à-vis the system, are incomparable. One thing is certain: remaining ignorant and doing nothing ensures losing from the outset. In the words of Bob Dylan, "He who is not busy being born is busy dying."

[Presentments Index](#)