



[Click Here to Enter Our Web Store](#)

Life, Law, and the UCC Underlying Principles

by Brian Lucas

Part 1

This article is about freedom, i.e. how to live free of the scourge of government usurpation and immunize yourself against the plague of the legal system, with its attorneys, courts, judges, agencies, police, etc. To establish this situation effectively you must have a basic understanding of fundamental principles that operate in life in general and in law in particular, as well as understand practical means for utilizing the knowledge in a manner that is easily comprehensible and doable.

The reason for concentrating on law is that it is unique among all of man's domains of activity. Namely, law is force—"official" exercises of deadly violence—and is therefore not merely another academic discipline. Indeed "law" can be defined as "the rules utilized by a government involving the use of deadly force." Because law involves life and death applications of ideas and principles, it is essential for survival and well being that we understand what these ideas and principles are and how they must be used for safeguarding one's "life, fortune, and sacred honor."

I. The Current State of the Law in America

Several years ago this author contacted WestLaw, Lexus, and several other issuers and publishers of materials bearing on law, requesting the purchase of several CDs involving State and Federal law. The uniform answer from all issuers was that they would rent the CDs but not sell them. Upon asking the reason for their unwillingness to sell the material, their answer was startling: the law changes so frequently and dramatically that continual updates are needed for the CDs. In fact, the representatives stated that attorneys must determine the current status of the law before going to court that day in order to know what the law is that can be used and relied on.

The response to all of these representatives was, "Suppose natural law behaved in such an erratic manner?" All agreed that the result would be chaos and perpetual unreliability. Does that

answer not likewise reflect the state of the legal/court system in the United States today? Anyone with actual experience with the courts knows that the laws are complex, ever-changing, ultimately unknowable in totality of scope and dependability, and generally unreliable. All of this occurs with people's lives and destinies attached.

It is well-known that the United States Library of Congress now has between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 books on law. Any law library is a daunting place, possessing row after row of shelves with books full of fine print. Making knowledge of such "law" even more unattainable is not only that what passes for law today perpetually changes, altered by every new court case/opinion, legislative enactment, and all of the ever-changing policies, rules, and regulations of administrative agencies, but an immense amount of the world's law today, as actually implemented, is unwritten and inaccessible. This is not only because judges operate in general equity in which the ultimate arbiter of a matter is the "conscience of the court" (i.e. how the judge feels about something that day), but because almost all of the world's law is the private Law Merchant of the Creditors in bankruptcy of the world's nations, essentially all of which are insolvent and in receivership to the Bankers.[1][1] This private Law Merchant is of ancient origin, and is implemented today by men whose identities are unknown to the mass of mankind.

In the face of this undependability of law we may ask some fundamental and ingenuous questions:

1. Is there such a thing as genuine law that is timeless, stable, and dependable?
2. If so, can such universal law be effectively invoked and utilized in practice today?
3. If genuine law exists, why is it not taught and uniformly utilized instead of the chaotic and colorable charade that dominates the legal field today?
4. Can we integrate said universal law with the ephemeral, desultory "law" that now enslaves the overwhelming majority of people on this planet?

Fortunately, affirmative answers re all of the above questions. Answering them, and providing clear understanding and effective, practical ways for utilizing genuine law, is the subject of this article.

II. Fundamental Principles.

Preceding and more fundamental than any codifications of man-made law is the underlying context within which all such law exists and is rendered operational. These "pre-law" principles consist of various intrinsic and timeless truths that are universal and inviolable regardless of the particulars of any law concocted by governments that might be superimposed over, against, and on top of such innate aspects of life. These existential/ethical principles and truths are:

1. *All existence originates and emerges from, and consists and expresses the essence, substance, nature, character, reality, and laws of being of, the prior, originating Source of itself.* In other words, it is axiomatic that everything is an expression of, and one with, that which caused, generated, and begets it, and also that all that exists functions in accordance with the laws that make it what it is. What something is, and the laws by which it subsists and functions, are merely different aspects of, or perspectives on, the same reality. The universe is a cosmos, not a chaos; every aspect of everything that exists manifesting sublime order and intelligence. This fact, combined with the fact that laws of existence are comprehensible, or at least codifiable, by man is the implicit basis of all of the science, technology, philosophy, and endeavors of man.

The implicit assumption of inherent coherence underlying all aspects of man's life, including law, and implies such fundamental ethical and existential consequences as:

- a. *Existing within and as an intrinsic aspect of every thought, word spoken, and act committed, is corresponding liability/accountability for that thought, word, and deed.* This is not only an ethical truth, but also an existential fact. From the perspective of cause/effect natural law, no one can escape liability and accountability for his thoughts, words, and deeds. All contrary ideas are illusory. Man deceives himself, and proceeds in self-delusion contrary to reality and its laws, by believing that he can, by some clever means or on the basis of any of an infinite number of possible sources of authority (e.g. one's boss, some government, religious leaders, "authority figures," or some other "assigned author"), escape personal liability and accountability for everything he thinks, speaks, writes, and does.

This principle formed the basis of the precedent of the Nuremberg Trials after World War II. Nazi officials who allegedly administered "death camps" were not excused of responsibility by pleading "I was just following orders," or "I was just doing my duty." This precedent would appear largely lost on "officials" today.

- b. *Existing within and as an intrinsic aspect of every thought, word, and deed are the precise action/reaction consequences thereof.* The exact results of anything one thinks, feels, says, writes, and does are structured within them at origin and inception. Ends are always the exact product of the particular means used for achieving them. The ends never "justify the means" because all ends are a function of whatever means are deployed in bringing them about. Were this not true, no basis could exist for any science, technology, or sane human endeavor. To achieve a precise result, the unique means necessary to produce it must be utilized. Different means always produce different ends, regardless of how similar any appearance to the contrary might be.
2. *It is a free will universe.* Man is a free-will being and the irreducible unit of experience, autonomy, self-responsibility, and free choice. It is free will that gives significance to man's life, making everyone responsible, accountable, and liable for everything he thinks, speaks, writes, and does and at the same time able and obligated to fashion his own destiny. People create themselves, their own fate, everything that they are and that happens to them. The free-will thought/decision upon which one acts is the prime origin of all events in the life of man. Each individual free-will being himself/herself is solely and uniquely responsible for who and what he/she is, and everything that unique being speaks, writes, does, and experiences. Thinking creates destiny.

One may reasonably postulate that the greatest source of man's suffering and problems, in individual and social/institutional life, is not realizing this crucial, central fact. Instead, people blame, project, believe, and attribute the responsible, genuine source of their own thoughts and actions falsely on an unlimited number of things outside of, and other than, themselves. Many people even believe that man is some kind of stimulus/response tropism devoid of autonomy, self-originating choice, and capacity for creating.

Some of the consequences and ramifications of this foundational premise are as follows:

- a. *One can accurately and ethically speak only for oneself.* Only each unique and unfathomable sentient being knows that being's own unique truth and possesses the responsibility and right for proclaiming it, in accordance with

his unique priorities and perspective in time and space.

- b. *One can experience the behavior, actions, and appearance of another being but not that being's inner experience, feelings, and sensations.* In the words of the Bible, "Man looketh upon the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh upon the heart." In his book, *The Politics of Experience*, C. D. Laing brilliantly elaborates on this aspect of man and his relationship with others.
 - c. *The prime cause of all events and actions in the life of man is the free-will thought/decision/act of some unique man or woman.* Human events do not cause themselves—individual people cause them. Documents do not write themselves—some particular being writes them, as well as acts on them or not as each particular actor decides of his/her own free will. Individual free-will thought/action is the "cause" referenced in the phrase "nature and cause" in the Sixth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States.
 - d. *Man can act in a win/win or win/lose manner.* A win/win interaction is an expression of peace, dignity, love, unity-harmony, mutual good faith, absence of malice and deceit, and all of the other ingredients in contract law required for a valid contract enforceable at law. Free consent of all contracting parties is essential. A win/lose interaction is an expression of separation, conflict, and disharmony, and never results in a genuine contract the "winner" claims exists. In actuality, a "win/lose" interaction is non-existent, since even the "winner" loses in the end. 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 consequences of every deed) by his harmful acts. The "Golden Rule" in existential terms might be expressed: "One who harms others harms himself," or "That which someone does unto someone else shall be done unto him." "He who lives by the sword dies by the sword."
3. *Manifest existence is the interplay of opposites.* What we call "creation," i.e. something manifest and perceptible as opposed to the "nothingness" of the eternal, uncreated, non-dual, absolute, is relative, ever-changing duality. Duality implies a "split," as it were, in the One, so that what can be perceived is what it is by virtue of its relationships with other aspects of manifestation. That which is called "up" is so only in relation to what is called "down." Similarly, dark is the absence of light. "Right" is what it is by virtue of perceiving its opposite, which is "left." Good is considered as being so based upon contrasting it with an opposite value, which, from some relative perspective, is considered as less good, or not good, i.e. "evil." All coins have a heads and tails side, just as every manifest thing has two sides. The bottom and top of any given thing exist simultaneously.

Therefore, in manifest existence, i.e. the ever-changing Relative, what something "is," and whatever values might be attached to it, are a function of the perspective and evaluation of the particular perceiver/evaluator. To a giant who is 20' tall, a man 6' 6" tall is a midget; to a midget 3' tall, the 6' 6" man is a giant. "All things are in relation," and indeed, they are what they are by virtue of their relationship with other things, as subjectively perceived and evaluated by some unique observer/knower in a matrix of manifestation from which that particular aspect of creation may be observed.

Because everyone is not only profoundly unique in nature, but necessarily cannot occupy any order and position in the total scheme of things other than what/where he is, and cannot be identical concerning these parameters with anyone else,

everyone necessarily perceives existence differently than anyone else. That which someone sees one way, another will view in a different manner. What one considers as right will be thought of as wrong by another. That which some consider "good" will be regarded as "evil" by others. This relativism engenders Shakespeare's comment in Hamlet, "There's nothing good or bad but thinking makes it so." There is no point in railing against this aspect of life as "moral relativism," or concluding that as a result "anything goes," since while values are possible only from the point of view of a given perspective, there are fundamental elements of man and life that all have in common. Only from this vantage point can any basis be presumed for assigning universal values to particular modes of behavior. Perhaps the most fundamental of these values is derived from the very nature of man and life as described by the next principle.

4. *The nature of life is to grow, progress, and evolve towards its fulfillment, towards ever fuller realization of its own unbounded divinity and infinity.* In order to be able to live to further life, something must first and foremost be able to live. This is why "survival is the first law of life." With that comes absolute right to engage in any just, lawful, or necessary measures for self-defense, as the steward of one's own life. Survival, however, is dynamic. It is not stagnant, but embodies direction consisting of a drive for more, different, and better. This is why problems are not solved on the level of the problem, and survival thrives on progress, which, in turn, thrives on solutions. Dwelling on and wallowing in problems creates and reinforces them while not creating solutions.

All life seeks fields of greater happiness. No one must be taught that he wishes happiness, or that he prefers such a condition in comparison with its relative opposite, unhappiness and suffering. Consequently, if one understands this universal nature is innate in all people, one may live the Golden Rule, and therefore experience a life of harmony (good) rather than dissonance (evil).

5. *The map is not the territory; the name is not the thing named; the symbol/idea/word is not the substantive thing being abstractly expressed.* One cannot spend the word "money" nor eat the word "pizza." This is the essence and prime principle of semantics. Although this principle may be self-evident, it does not prevent many people from mistaking the two. "Some people eat the menu and leave the dinner," as the late Gregory Bateson phrased the matter.
6. *All truth is subjective.* The nature, depth, structure, and complexity of each man and woman is unfathomable, and each man and woman experiences life in a unique manner. In addition, manifest existence is process in pattern—flows, interactions, and transformations of inscrutable energy moving at astronomical speeds in the vastness of empty space, emerging from and re-merging back into the absolute, unmanifest. The eternal, unbounded, absolute is unmanifest and possesses no properties ascertainable and definable by and in terms of the relative manifest it begets. Both source and manifestation are thereby infinite and unfathomable, and each man and woman is a unique aspect/expression of both. The manifest is unique in exact configuration at each precise moment anew, with each configuration unrepeatable, i.e. never the same as it ever was at any time, neither into the unlimited past nor as it ever will again be throughout the unendingness of time. Inasmuch as each man and woman is a unique expression of both the unbounded/unfathomable absolute and the ever-changing/non-repeating manifest, the particular perspective and experience of each man and woman, i.e. his/her truth, will likewise be unique for each conscious unit of experience and perceived and understood in a manner and perspective that is unique, and subjective, for each.

Moreover, because man's inherent nature is the knower and experiencer, everyone subjectively

considers that what he is doing, thinking, or feeling is justified from his own perspective. This perspective is unique to him and cannot be identically shared by anyone else. This should be a source of tolerance and deference between people.

7. *Man is a goal-oriented being.* Everything man does is for some purpose, i.e. for achieving some objective. This is borne of the above-described drive in all life for more happiness, abundance, achievement, power, peace, and bliss. It is self-evident that at any given instant, an infinite number of thoughts, feelings, perspectives, priorities, and actions are possible for man. It is equally self-evident that no one can act on more than a (relatively small) finite number of these infinite possibilities at the same time. The innate thrust/energy of life, however, is for more—towards full realization of its own infinite and divine nature.

Because everyone is unique in nature, structure, experiences, position in space/time, etc., the perspectives, needs, desires, and priorities of everyone are likewise unique, and thereby function to channel life's innate drive for more into directions that each being considers as being most beneficial for furthering the growth, progress, and fulfillment of that unique being. All achievements in the life of man are therefore steps, or even milestones, on this path towards fulfillment. The ultimate goal is paved by innumerable finite goals realized on one's life's course, all of which are chosen for the purpose of maximizing achievement, progress, and happiness. No one knowingly behaves in ways that retard and thwart the inherent life-drive within him for his own success and ultimate fulfillment. Man acts in accordance with his situation and state of being at any given time in the manner that he deems best further his interests, and would consider alternative courses of action as at best useless and at worst destructive of his own desired ends. In other words, if one knew an alternative that was superior re obtaining an objective he would adopt it.

8. *In every living being is to be observed supreme self-love.* This is simply life loving itself, providing the impetus for safeguarding and furthering its innate drive for growth and fulfillment. Without self-love life would long ago have disappeared for want of impetus to preserve itself. Primal self-love makes sense of the world.
9. *"All law is contract." or "Contract makes the law."* All law of every kind, including the laws of being, laws of thought, natural law, and every species of man-made law that is, was, and ever will be or could be, is contract. The essence and foundation of a contract is agreement. People, things, and processes relate in mutual agreement that certain things are true, operational, expected, committed, and, if this-or-that happens such-and-such will occur. Each of the ten (10) Articles of Amendment of the Constitution, i.e. the so-called "Bill of Rights," express principles of commercial law. For instance, the term "nature" in the phrase "nature and cause" in the Sixth Amendment of the Constitution refers to the underlying contract (whether "civil" meaning money/specific performance or "criminal" meaning a contract of indebtedness of an aggressor to his victim for the wrongs or damages done), along with the proof (of default on the contract or commission of the criminal acts). Moreover, every document or instrument involved must be executed by identified free-will beings each taking personal responsibility for the truth, accuracy, relevance, and verifiability of each and every thing alleged that can adversely affect another, under oath by affidavit certified and sworn on the commercial liability of the affiant sworn true, correct, and complete. This is the "nature" to which the term refers.

Perhaps the foundational presumption (and possibly the only valid one) is that every individual free-will being is the unit of responsibility, accountability, and sovereignty. Were this premise not regarded as axiomatic, no basis for any law could exist in society, as no one could be held liable for anything. Most of the remainder of the presumptions of law on which the system functions are self-serving and specious.

All governmental law operates on presumptions, such as the presumption that you freely assent to, i.e. ratify, implied adhesion contracts in which the terms and conditions are created and enforced by the government without realistic capacity of the "ruled" to prevail against the stronger party. "Adhesion contract" is defined in law as:

"Standardized contract form offered to consumers [citizens] of goods and services [government laws, statutes, and benefits] on essentially "take it or leave it" basis without affording consumer realistic opportunity to bargain and under such conditions that consumer cannot obtain desired product or services except by acquiescing in form contract [i.e. what the government says things are]. Distinctive feature of adhesion contract is that weaker party has no realistic choice as to its terms." *Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th Edition, page 38.

One thing that renders the system hopelessly problematic unless one understands the game, is that one of the system's presumptions of law is that no one in the system is required to divulge the presumptions (undisclosed) under which the system functions. Rebutting mere "law" and "facts" does not access, nor does it neutralize, the presumptions of law that constitute the system's power over you. These presumptions must be negated if you are to have any chance of prevailing against the system.

10. *Love is the realization in consciousness of the eternal and innate unity/harmony of all manifest things with each other and their common source.* By definition, that which we regard as the opposite of love, i.e. "hate," is the result of non-realization of this unity/harmony. Hate is, therefore, borne of and characterized by conscious absorption in the illusion of separation. From this fundamental illusion of separation all of man's ills and conflicts emerge, i.e. the whole gamut of human problems, discords, and suffering: need and lack, failure, disunity, insufficiency, requirement, judgment, divine condemnation, conditionality, superiority, and ignorance.

One's happiness and grief are a function of the extent that one understands and lives in accordance with the above ten (10) universal principles/truths. Indeed, virtually all of life can be resolved down to a single duality concerning life, i.e. whether one loves or does not love. The corresponding ethical choice concerning one's dealing with one's fellow man is, accordingly, whether one relates sincerely from the heart towards others in accordance with the genuine intent of interacting on a win/win basis or whether one attempts to further one's innate life drive for more by relating in a win/lose manner.

The alleged "necessity" for religions is a function of non-realization of the simple truth that whatever life, existence, consciousness, and their Source and essence are, one is an expression of and is inherently and unalterably one with that Source and essence, and cannot be otherwise. (No one can ever not exist.) Similarly, the purported "necessity" for governments is founded on the fact that some men interact with others on a win/lose basis, and government must "fight fire with fire" by functioning by similar win/lose means. Those occupying positions in a "government" consider "winning" vis-à-vis the "governed" as dominating people's lives by enforcing win/lose exchanges. In other words, a "government," in order to treat the symptoms of man's alleged ethical and existential deficiencies deals with supposed wrongdoers by application of destructive, physical force. The fact that governments purportedly exist for the purpose of protecting people, property, and rights from assault and destruction by those who play win/lose games, and resolve disputes between people by being an impersonal, independent and fair arbiter of conflicts, is all a function of the fact that people don't realize their unity with each other in and from their common Source, and thereby do not love each other enough not to transgress against each other in the first place.[2][2]

A government's nature as an organization that functions for the purpose of preventing and

rectifying wrongdoing gives rise to all of man's law and the principle on which that law is adjudicated: *The court is the substitute for the dueling field.* An arbitration tribunal is intended as being a "civilized" means for resolving disputes in an orderly and dignified manner instead of letting disputants resort to violence between themselves for settling differences.

The alleged justification for the existence of governments and their authority for establishing laws, courts, police, armies, and legal systems, is based on presumptions such as the following:

- a. Man's cultural, social, and communal life is hopelessly adversarial, rendering the existence of some kind of government necessary;
- b. Most people have neither the ability nor fundamental priority for resolving disputes harmoniously among each other;
- c. When left alone mankind is incapable of developing free means for upholding law and order and resolving disputes, rendering an independent and over-arching coercion monopoly necessary;
- d. A non-involved third party possesses authority for expropriating the right of arbitrating disagreements; and,
- e. Such a third party arbitrator can successfully achieve just resolution of the dispute.

Once the axiomatic presumption that governments are necessary is adopted—usually implicitly and unconsciously, without thorough, sincere, and rational thought that analyzes whether the premise is sound or not—all of the game from that point on is what kind of government should exist and how it should be structured, manned, financed, and operated. Discussion and advocacy of the various shapes, forms, and functions of government are perfectly acceptable, i.e. "politically correct." Whenever one points out that the emperor has no clothes, however, and no governments should exist at all because all of them are organizations through which some men rule (exploit, plunder, dominate, and enslave) others by deadly, physical force—without ethical authority, devoid of adequate knowledge, and in the absence of capacity for achieving genuine, self-existing results—all hell breaks loose. Such primal sanity triggers deep-seated cognitive dissonance and is instantly branded as "anarchy," "extreme," and "unworkable." In the words of the psychologist David Viscott, "When truth is proclaimed in a hostile environment it is labeled 'insane.'" Clear perception and understanding of the truth, however, is the opposite of insanity. And, to paraphrase Gertrude Stein, "the truth is the truth is the truth."

If man, both individually and collectively, does not establish life and law on the truth (the real way things are), then man is engaging in the futile effort of attempting to achieve sound and enduring results by actualizing principles that are neither real nor ethical. The result of the folly is foregone disintegration and destruction. The point of this article is that because our current civilization—and especially its law—functions on the basis of largely specious principles, it is on its way to ruin. Our task, if we would establish our affairs on a firm foundation and not be swept along with the herd like lemmings to the sea, is for understanding true principles and securing our fate by structuring our lives and affairs by correct actualization of those principles.

Part 2

For many people it might come as a surprise (in many cases a pleasant one) if they were informed

that essentially all of the law of the world is founded on, derived from, and is a function of ten simple, essential, and fundamental Commercial Maxims—seven (7) basic ones plus three (3) corollaries. These foundational principles/axioms underlie all of man's law. Notwithstanding the vastness and complexity of the law today, it is safe to say that all of the world's law is fundamentally a function of the ten Commercial Maxims. Although the dazzling complexity and ever-changing forms, parameters, and labels obfuscate this fact, the essence of the matter remains intact.

The Commercial Maxims constitute the basic rules involved in preventing and resolving disputes, including relating in life and commercial affairs as if disputes might arise and written proof of one's position, in time and content, must be securely established. Although commerce is usually thought of as "buying, selling, and trading," all of man's interactions with his fellow man are considered as being "commerce." Commerce encompasses all relationships between people. *Black's Law Dictionary*, Fifth Edition, for instance, defines "commerce" as follows:

Commerce. "The exchange of goods, productions, or property of any kind; the buying, selling, and exchanging of articles.... Intercourse by way of trade and traffic between different peoples or states...including not only the purchase, sale, and exchange of commodities, but also the instrumentalities and agencies by which it is promoted and the means and appliances by which it is carried on, and transportation of persons as well as of goods, both by land and sea.... Also interchange of ideas, sentiments, etc., as between man and man." Page 244.

The Commercial Maxims codify the fundamental principles/maxims of law and commerce upon which man's law and governments have operated on this planet for at least the past 4-6 thousand years. They constitute, as it were, the rules of the game. Part of the grief of mankind today is that the vast, overwhelming percentage of the populace does not know the basic rules of the game they are playing and are hence incapable of playing it. If one who does not know the rules of a game is playing that game with others who are masters of the rules, the outcome is a foregone conclusion: the one who knows the rules wins the game while the one who does not know the rules necessarily loses. Such is the state of the world.

Elucidating the underlying, fundamental rules so that one understands what is going on helps greatly in "leveling the playing field." These rules, therefore, are set forth below with the understanding that they operate within the context and setting of the universal Underlying Principles discussed in Part One. The Commercial Maxims are the most basic, enduring, and minimalist codification of universal, real law extant on earth. They are very simple, largely self-evident, and based on common sense. The Jews, for instance, have studied, analyzed, practiced, and refined Commercial Law, founded on these Maxims, for thousands of years. This continuous, relentless, single-minded absorption in the law over millennia has "worked the bugs out." Every angle, facet, ramification, application, and nuance of practice of Commercial Law has been seasoned over time, and is deeply and thoroughly known by those who "own, run, and rule the world."

Indeed, the "Elite" are precisely where they are because they do know this fundamental law, because it is real, that it must work, always works, and it is impossible for it not to work, since it is grounded in natural law. Those who do not know and use the law by which everything functions necessarily and always lose. This esoteric truth must be obscured and concealed from the "masses" by every means possible. Otherwise, those who would rule mankind would have no way of obtaining their positions of power, privilege, and plunder (all of which are frauds). By knowing and using the law themselves and keeping the knowledge of such law from the masses, the people are deliberately rendered defenseless, confused, emasculated, dependent, helpless "sheeple," considered as existing for the purpose of being exploited, herded, sheered, gelded, and slaughtered at will.

The Powers That Be thus achieve and operate their monopoly on "law" (the very thought is absurd, like stating one has a monopoly on light or life), by propagandizing the lie that law is so complex, esoteric, obtuse, vast, and confusing that only they and their hatchet men called "attorneys" and "judges" can administer it. The law is "mystified," made into some kind of quasi-religious cult, operated by a high priesthood that alone has the knowledge and authority for operating the resulting "legal system" that rules the life of man. Law must be transformed into a "closed union shop" such as the Bar Association, into whose hands the people must entrust their "lives, fortunes, and sacred honor" without availability of alternative sources of remedy and redress of grievances. Where can one go for relief when the fox guards the henhouse?

If the so-called "Rulers of the World" did not withhold from general understanding the knowledge that the foundational principles of real law are few in number and easily mastered by everyone, and that all of the documents and instruments used in all law and commerce are likewise few in number and comprehensible to laymen, such con men would have to abandon their aristocratic "titles of nobility" and find real jobs based on genuine productivity, contribution, and "win-win" interactions with their fellow man. It is empowering and exhilarating to understand that the ever-changing, monstrous vastness of "law" can be distilled into a handful of universal principles that can be contained on a 3" X 5" card, and that all of the legal documents and instruments functioning today can be mastered by nearly anyone.

Attorneys and Judges deliberately conceal the fact that the only significance inhering in court cases and statutes consists of the simple and universal principles of commercial law codified by the Maxims. All legal documents, proceedings, and processes are obscured by re-naming and mislabeling said documents and processes in accordance with whatever degrees of multiplicity and complexity are needed for preserving its inaccessible aloofness. Law is made diffuse, enormously complex, and allegedly far beyond the ken of regular folks. With knowledge of the truth underlying all of that misdirection and deception, i.e. seeing through the Wizard's Light Show, you can understand what is happening and place yourself in a position of mastery of the situation instead of being relegated to the status of a confused, helpless victim forever in the dark and at the mercy of those who exploit your ignorance of the rules and processes by which law (i.e. organized, deadly force) operates. In short, "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

As mentioned above, the word "commerce" encompasses all interactions and interchanges between people, including exchanges of such "non-commercial" things as "ideas, sentiments, etc." The fundamental principles and precepts of universal commercial law that have for millennia formed the underpinnings of civilized law on this planet are both biblical and non-biblical, i.e. their truth and validity is a function of themselves and the long-accepted usage and practice by many cultures and peoples, in diverse forms, throughout the world for thousands of years. These fundamental *Maxims of Commerce*, which underlie all commercial documents, instruments, and processes, are enumerated herewith (with biblical references in parenthesis):

- 1) *A workman is worthy of his hire* (Exodus 20:15; Lev. 19:13; Matt. 10:10; Luke 10:7; II Tim. 2:6. Legal maxim: "It is against equity for freemen not to have the free disposal of their own property.").
- 2) *All are equal under the Law* (God's Law--Ethical and Natural Law). (Exodus 21:23-25; Lev. 24:17-21; Deut. 1:17, 19:21; Matt., 22:36-40; Luke 10:17; Col. 3:25. Legal maxims: "No one is above the law."; "Commerce, by the law of nations, ought to be common, and not to be converted into a monopoly and the private gain of a few.").
- 3) *In Commerce truth is sovereign* (Exodus 20:16; Ps. 117:2; Matt. 6:33, John 8:32; II Cor. 13:8. Legal maxim: "To lie is to go against the mind." Oriental proverb: "Of all that is good, sublimity is supreme.").
- 4) *Truth is expressed by means of an affidavit* (Lev. 5:4-5; Lev. 6:3-5; Lev

19:11-13; Num. 30:2; Matt. 5:33; James 5:12).

- 5) *An unrebutted affidavit stands as the truth in Commerce* (1 Pet. 1:25; Heb. 6:13-15. Legal maxim: "He who does not deny, admits.").
- 6) *An unrebutted affidavit becomes the judgment in Commerce* (Heb. 6:16-17. Any proceeding in a court, tribunal, or arbitration forum consists of a contest, or "duel," of commercial affidavits wherein the points remaining unrebutted in the end stand as the truth and the matters to which the judgment of the law is applied.).
- 7) *A matter must be expressed to be resolved* (Heb. 4:16; Phil. 4:6; Eph. 6:19-21. Legal maxim: "He who fails to assert his rights has none.").
- 8) *He who leaves the field of battle first loses by default* (Book of Job; Matt. 10:22. Legal maxim: "He who does not repel a wrong when he can, occasions it.").
- 9) *Sacrifice is the measure of credibility* (One who is not damaged, put at risk, or willing to swear an oath that he consents to claim against his commercial liability in the event that any of his statements or actions is groundless or unlawful, has no basis to assert claims or charges and forfeits all credibility and right to claim authority.) (Acts 7, life/death of Stephen, maxim: "He who bears the burden ought also to derive the benefit.").
- 10) *A lien or claim can be satisfied only through rebuttal by Counteraffidavit point-for-point, resolution by jury, or payment* (Gen. 2-3; Matt. 4; Revelation. Legal maxim: "If the plaintiff does not prove his case, the defendant is absolved.").

Perhaps the simplest way of expounding on the nature and validity of Commercial Law is to comment on each of the Maxims in the order given.

1) *A workman is worthy of his hire* (Exodus 20:15; Lev. 19:13; Matt. 10:10; Luke 10:7; II Tim. 2:6).

The eighth Commandment, "Thou shalt not steal" (Exodus 20:15), signifies the absolute right of every man to all honorably acquired property. This basic human right originates fundamentally from the inherent, unalienable right of self-ownership and the free-will nature of man. If a man is the sovereign owner/steward of himself, and exercises his free will for engaging in ethical use of faculties that result in his accumulation of property, said property ownership is, ethically and existentially, inviolably the man's own as distinguished from the property of anyone else. No one has a higher claim on said property nor any right to steal it by any means, whether by force or fraud.

Were this fundamental property right not universal and inviolate, no coherent basis for interrelating could exist in the society of man. Man is a purposeful, goal-oriented being, capable of abstract thought and free choice. People engage in thinking, use of faculties, and expenditure of time and life-diminishing energy for the purpose of achieving rationally cognized results. There are an infinite number of possibilities of thought and action. Inasmuch as man's manifest existence is finite, i.e. contained within boundaries, man must use his machinery of thought and being in the ways that he comprehends as best further his well being, life progress, consciously chosen duty, and priorities born of his world view. The *I Ching* comments on this principle in Hexagram 60, "Limitation":

"Therefore what concerns us here is the problem of clearly defining these discriminations, which are, so to speak, the backbone of morality. Unlimited possibilities are not suited to man; if they existed, his life would only dissolve in the boundless. To become strong, a man's life needs the limitations ordained by duty

and voluntarily accepted. The individual attains significance as a free spirit only by surrounding himself with these limitations and by determining for himself what his duty is."^{[3][1]}

If someone does not think, act, and exert life-diminishing time and energy for the purpose of achieving specifically cognized goals, he cannot legitimately expect to realize the ends he desires. It is both a biblical and Zen maxim that: "He who does not work shall not eat." The *Bhagavad-Gita* states in Chapter 3, Verse 8:

"Do your allotted duty. Action is indeed superior to inaction. Even the survival of your body would not be possible without action."^{[4][2]}

A Chinese proverb phrases the matter more caustically: "Some people sit around waiting for a roasted chicken to fly into their mouths."

Negating the legitimacy of property ownership by claiming that someone who works is not thereby entitled to the anticipated rewards of his efforts makes a mockery of man's nature and life, as well as ethical and natural law. A man engages in a particular course of action for the purpose of achieving anticipated results and if he did not thus expect his efforts to accomplish the desired goals he would not act in the manner he considers to be the best and most efficient possible means for achieving them. If his actions did not express his best possible judgment it is safe to assume that he would be indulging in alternatives that he considered as being superior. Moreover, man utilizes cause/effect natural law throughout all his goal-oriented actions, i.e. the one acting attempts to discern the most effective and efficient means possible to accomplish his goals. Invoking particular natural-law processes brings about the precise consequences of whatever processes are used.

It is self-evident that stealing is a violation of ethical law inasmuch as the one who performs the life-diminishing labor for acquiring the property necessarily has the highest, if not exclusive, claim thereon. He is the one who decided, thought, acted, and utilized his faculties, not someone else. Who can claim a greater right to someone's property than the one who acquired ownership by expenditure of thought, effort, time, and energy? Stealing a man's property is literally stealing a part of his life, since the time, energy, and effort the man expended in earning the property is irretrievably gone and not the efforts of gods or men can return the life-diminishing labor he expended in acquiring the property (even if the same or similar property is subsequently bestowed upon the man). In the words of a Zen master, "An evil done can never be undone."

All governments exist by virtue of promulgating an endless panoply of alleged "higher" reasons why the "government" is entitled to the fruits of people's earnings instead of the earners thereof. The terse Libertarian maxim is correct: "Taxation is theft." As eloquently expressed by Bastiat in *The Law*, when the law, which is force and can be legitimately used only in defense of just rights to life and property, is perverted into an instrument of aggression, slavery, theft, and plunder, it has destroyed its own object. Man's history on this planet has universally shown that the governmental approach to law is a catastrophe since it trashes ethical and natural law, structures degeneracy through perpetrating fraud, deceit, violence, lies, and every manner of crime in the name of law and justice, thereby obviating all hope for coherence, integrity, and peace in the social order. All of this is borne of efforts to structure organized and "respectable" ways to abrogate the First Maxim and expropriate the fruits of the labor of others.

The conundrum, of course, is that while on the one hand a substantial portion of mankind may be incapable of self-government (a hypothesis that is only an arbitrary postulate), no externally imposed government can compensate for the lack. The best that can result from a man-made government, i.e. a legal-force institution, is that restraints on human action, interference in people's exercises of free will, are used for the purpose of protecting life and property. In doing, however, a government uses organized force for imposing some contrived, abstract, finite,

and arbitrary order onto the natural condition that would otherwise exist if people were left free. Through state rulership, artificial palliatives, superficial behavior/conditions borne of coercively re-configuring the manifest expression of life, are proffered either as "solutions" (which they are not and never can be), or at least superior to leaving people free.

Whenever society has a government with some alleged overarching "right" to steal wealth instead of everyone in the culture honorably gaining through constructive/productive use of faculties and quid-pro-quo honorable exchanges, the society is "legally" structured on a hopelessly self-contradictory, unethical, and schizophrenic basis. Organizing life in such a way pre-ordains the civilization to disintegration by systematically rupturing both natural and ethical law. Only the real thing is the real thing. Plastic models of how things "should" be, superimposed by force, neither are the real thing nor can cause its spontaneous manifestation.

A man-made government is therefore an outside-in/top-down artificial order and set of processes imposed by physical force over and against the self-existing transcendence of an organic, inside-out/ground-up holistic unfolding of life. As stated, the catch-22 of man's condition is that while a substantial proportion of the populace of this planet has not awakened and spiritually evolved to the place that they are naturally able to govern themselves, any kind of "other governing" organization that might be structured as compensation for the lack is a fraudulent, invasive, distorting, falsifying, and a disruptive failure method. Any such "other-governing" utilized as compensation for lack of sufficient inner/existential development not only cannot bring about what can ensue only by virtue of self-existing suchness spontaneously manifesting transcendence in its natural fullness and integrity, but all such approaches necessarily stifle, destroy, suppress, and obviate the possibility for the desired situation to manifest. The bottom line of the matter is that the problem, and its solution, is inner, spiritual, and existential, not political. Namely, the cause of the problem is insufficient consciousness, development, and love; the cure is more of those things. Only the actual reality can be and engender a true, self-existing condition that satisfies the heart and soul of man and fulfills life.

Since all governments exist by non-disclosure, there is therefore no true meeting of the minds between the people and the government, i.e. there is no actual agreement. Such a situation is institutionalized lying—perjury by omission and misrepresentation. No government ever does, or can, provide full disclosure of all of the rights, privileges, and immunities the people forfeit in exchange for submitting to government rule, nor does—or can—any government articulate what honorable goods and services are provided by the government as valuable consideration, so that the resulting interaction can constitute a *bona fide* contract enforceable at law. If no genuine agreement exists—or can exist—from the outset, no valid contract can exist. The situation is a fraudulent, criminal con game that establishes a condition of "mixed war" whereby the government is inherently and permanently at war with the "governed." Governments can exist only by deceit, misrepresentation, and concealment of material fact in contract, and cannot otherwise exist at all. Establishing any kind of human government, i.e. an organization on the basis of which some men (those occupying positions of "authority" in the institution) may "legally" take things of value from others without open, honorable, good-faith, quid-pro-quo exchange, i.e. "win/win" interactions, inherently abrogates the First Maxim. All governmental power is discretionary, and must be or it is not power. Discretionary power is privilege, which is fraud.

The point of this discourse, including what might be considered a "digression" into the nature of law and government, is that this First Maxim is in a sense the foundation of everything. It is the essence of the Golden Rule, the entire basis of law and justice, the core and point of a contract and all contract law, and the basis in society of peace, stability, coherence, and sanity. When that which poses as "law" is the institutionalized abrogation of this First Maxim, confusion, frustration, futility, and ultimate ruin are the inevitable results. Such a pattern characterizes the history of man's civilizations on this planet.

2) *All are equal under the Law* (God's Law--Moral and Natural Law). (Deut. 1:17; Luke 10:17;

Col. 3:25).

It should be self-evident that every man, by virtue of simply existing, is subject to the laws by which he exists. Everyone is obviously equally the product of and inherently obedient to the laws of being, thought, and nature. Nothing can exist without expressing the laws through which and on the basis of it exists and functions.

Similarly, since all relationships are contractual, everyone is likewise bound by ethical law. The equal-exchange principle upon which the inherent balance and cause/effect nature of existence subsists also applies in the life of man. Otherwise, there is no basis for stating that ethics exist, or that man is an ethical being, or that ethics in human life can have any basis of discernment at all. If two people relate and one can validly say: "I have a legitimate right to take from you, cause loss to you, without correspondingly enriching you by giving you something of equal or greater value in exchange," on what basis can he prove the validity for his "special" right of engaging in win/lose interactions? Is it because one claims to be "better," or more "deserving" than the one from whom he wants to gain something for nothing? Thousands and thousands of such "reasons" have been promulgated throughout human history, especially concerning "government's" alleged right to take without giving in exchange. A few such "reasons" are:

- I'm an aristocrat.
- I'm a part of the ruling elite. My nature and destiny is to rule.
- I'm better (e.g. smarter, wiser, holier, more noble, more deserving) than you.
- I represent God.
- I represent higher truth.
- I represent natural law.
- I'm acting for the good of society (or the "General Will," or "law and order," or "the greatest good for the greatest number," etc.).
- I'm authorized by law (whatever that is).
- I'm authorized by government (e.g. "I have a license to kill").
- "I proclaim that might is right, justice the interest of the stronger," Plato (i.e. "might makes right and I've got the guns").
- I'm authorized by treaty (Between whom? With what authority? With what binding relevance to the victimized party?).
- I'm poor and needy so I deserve it.
- "Equality" and "social justice" (whatever those are) should prevail in society.

Once again, one begins with a cognized and concocted end (the desire for power) and then provides the alleged justification after the fact for validating his actions. In this case, the essence of the matter is: "I want to steal your property or rights instead of productively earning what I want or need." The reasons proffered for legitimizing the crime can be any of an infinite number of high-sounding non-sequiturs. If man had extended a fraction of the thought, energy, creativity, and ingenuity in working for the purpose of succeeding by honorable means instead of by cheating of his fellow man, we would not be in the mess we are in today.

3) *In Commerce truth is sovereign* (Exodus 20:16; Ps. 117:2; John 8:32; II Cor. 13:8).

The word "truth" can be defined in two distinct ways:

1) The actual state of existence, i.e. what things are and the way they function in and as themselves, in their actual reality—the thing in itself. Webster's 1828 *American Dictionary of the English Language*, defines what might be designated as "Truth":

"True state of facts or things."

2) An abstract representation or mapping of some aspect of reality that can be objectively discerned and verified as "accurate," as per Webster's, *supra*:

"Conformity to fact or reality; exact accordance with that which is, or has been, or shall be. The *truth* of history constitutes its whole value. We rely on the *truth* of the scriptural prophecies. The duty of a court of justice is to discover the *truth*. Witnesses are sworn to declare the *truth*, the whole *truth*, and nothing but the *truth*."

One of the most important of all philosophical and epistemological questions was asked by Pontius Pilot: "What is truth?" I.e., what is the relationship, the correlation, between reality as it actually is and that which transpires within a particular human mind? Given the state of man on this planet the question has a vast spectrum of answers and possibilities. Some people attempt to be scrupulously accurate in what they think and believe concerning reality. Other people are so deluded that a point is reached whereby they are labeled "insane" due to vast gulf between what they consider as being real and the way other people experience existence.

Consequently, notwithstanding the degree that whatever someone thinks, feels, believes, says, or acts upon may be "objectively" verifiable by other people, with or without technical instruments used as extensions/surrogates of the senses, truth must be considered as subjective concerning man's interactions with others. Everyone perceives and experiences existence through the state and functioning of his unique nature, mind, body, nervous system, state of development, and world view.

It is supremely essential that man act truthfully as the basis upon which he lives, acts, and relates with others. As the requirement involves oneself, only the truth, i.e. actual reality as it is, provides a dependable basis for living one's life. If someone falsely believes there is a fortune in gold buried in some specific location and spends money on that basis he could be financially ruined through having spent all his money on chasing a delusion. If one relates with others on the basis of false information, speaking other than one's actual perspective and intent, harm can accrue to all concerned. In other words, the map (truth) must be a faithful representation of the territory (Truth).

Exodus 20:16, the ninth Commandment, states: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Lies are weapons and can destroy lives. People can believe and act on what they are told, and both kill and be killed on a false basis, such as by marching off to war on the basis of what their "leaders" tell them. The Bible is especially harsh on those who bear false witness. In Israel, the penalty in Orthodox circles for bearing false witness is death. In the United States, the penalty can be social and commercial ostracism for life. Who wants to deal with someone who lies? Multi-billion dollar diamond deals close with a handshake and a few words exchanged. Lying in such a context is implicitly understood as utterly unthinkable.

The core of the matter is that if truth were not sovereign in Commerce ("commerce" meaning all

human intercourse of any kind, i.e. money, property, and otherwise) there would be no way society could exist and function. There would be no dependability in human relations, nor any rules, nor basis of ethics, nor grounds for any remedy and recourse. No contracts could be executed, nor any terms and conditions set forth on which anyone could rely. All society would disintegrate for want of any fundamental basis for interrelating.

This third Maxim is in a very real sense the most fundamental of all the principles of law, and constitutes the focal point around which everything else revolves. It is the fulcrum upon which all else hinges in order to function and possess validity. It is entirely reasonable to regard truth as the most important of all things. Truth is extolled in all valid systems of philosophy, religion, and law. Lao-tzu, for instance, phrased the matter as follows:

Man at his best, like water,
 Serves as he goes along:
 Like water he seeks his own level,
 The common level of life,
 Loves living close to the earth,
 Living clear down in his heart,
 Loves kinship with his neighbors,
The pick of words that tell the truth,
 ... The fair profit of able dealing,
 The right timing of useful deeds,
 And for blocking no one's way
 No one blames him.^[5]_[3] [Emphasis added.]

It is possible that more court cases revolve around whether someone is telling the truth than everything else put together. The remainder of the Maxims pertains largely to practical application—how and when to speak one's truth and appropriate remedies and recourses available in the event of someone does not tell the truth.

4) *Truth is expressed by means of an affidavit* (Lev. 5:4-5; Lev. 6:3-5; Lev 19:11-13; Num. 30:2; Matt. 5:33; James 5:12).

As stated above, man's truth is subjective. Each individual perceives existence from the "inside out" as it were, experiencing whatever he does through his unique nature and machinery of consciousness, from his own particular perspective in time and space. Truth, like beauty, is in the eye of the beholder.

If someone expresses his subjective truth and others verify the same truth in their own subjective terms, the truth is labeled as an "objective fact," i.e. the abstract map is perceived by others as accurately representing the territory. That which is uttered conceptually may be dependably acted upon concretely and the results are realized as they are symbolically represented.

Inasmuch as everyone has free will and is the non-reducible unit of experience, choice, responsibility, and self-government, only each particular being can speak his/her own truth and has the right and obligation to do so. No one is obligated, or qualified, to express the truth of another, as per the famous line in Tennyson's book, *The Courtship of Miles Standish*: "Why don't you speak for yourself, John."

Law requires a universally accepted means whereby someone may assert his subjective truth in a manner that all understand is intended as being uttered without equivocation, concealment, deception, or insincerity. An "affidavit," especially an affidavit "sworn true, correct, and complete," has evolved over time as the accepted process by which someone expresses his truth in the most solemn, absolute, ceremonial means possible, past which nothing exists. An affidavit, as a solemn and sworn statement of truth, automatically renders the affiant subject to charges of perjury if anything concerning which he swears in his affidavit is false.

Black's Law Dictionary, 5th edition, defines "Affidavit" and "Oath" as follows:

"*Affidavit*. A written or printed declaration or statement of facts, made voluntarily, and confirmed by the oath or affirmation of the party making it, taken before a person having authority to administer such oath or affirmation." pp. 28-29.

"*Oath*. Any form of attestation by which a person signifies that he is bound in conscience to perform an act faithfully and truly.... An affirmation of truth of a statement, which renders one willfully asserting untrue statements punishable for perjury. An outward pledge by the person taking it that his attestation or promise is made under an immediate sense of responsibility to God. A solemn appeal to the Supreme Being in attestation of the truth of some statement. An external pledge or asseveration, made in verification of statements made, or to be made, coupled with an appeal to a sacred or venerated object, in evidence of the serious and reverent state of mind of the party, or with an invocation to a supreme being to witness the words of the party, and to visit him with punishment if they be false...." p. 555.

So that a document can be regarded as an "affidavit" it must contain the characteristics and properties itemized below. I.e., an affidavit:

1. States facts (truth) on the basis of firsthand, personal knowledge, not conjecture, theory, or hearsay. The facts stated must express direct knowledge of the affiant (not "information and belief," which is hearsay).
2. Cannot be argumentative.
3. Must not draw conclusions of law.
4. Can be executed and served at any time without notice to the adverse party. Because an affidavit is not subject to cross-examination, it is an *ex parte* proceeding.
5. Must be certified (witnessed) by someone authorized to take oaths, usually a notary public.^[6]^[4] If it is not sworn before someone authorized to administer oaths it will not be considered as being an affidavit.
6. Constitutes one of three kinds of testimony, the other two being deposition and direct oral examination, and stands as uncontroverted evidence if not timely rebutted point-for-point by proper counteraffidavit executed by the adverse party.

7. Must be executed by being sworn true, correct, and complete, i.e. under oath, defining the degree and nature of the commercial liability being staked by the affiant for the veracity, accuracy, relevance, and verifiability of everything stated in the affidavit.
8. Can be invalidated or nullified only by being rebutted point-for-point by counteraffidavit sworn true, correct, and complete.
9. Stands as the truth concerning each point that is not rebutted by counteraffidavit as above; the entire affidavit stands as the truth if not answered at all (see Maxim Five).
10. Stands in full as the judgment (application) of the law if completely unrebutted by counteraffidavit as above; invokes execution of the law concerning the points in the affidavit that are not expressly rebutted by the counteraffiant (see Maxim Six).

Without a "competent witness," i.e. personal testimony, no court has any power to act. Judgments may be made solely on evidence, but all evidence requires competent witnesses for attesting to its validity, i.e. for the purpose of verifying the evidence submitted. Without a competent witness, a judgment is void.

In court, an adverse party has the right of cross-examination. When testimony is issued via affidavit, the adverse party has the right (and obligation, if he/she desires not to have the affiant's affidavit stand as the truth and judgment of the law) to respond to the affidavit point-for-point via counteraffidavit sworn true, correct, and complete.

Regardless of the form in which testimony is introduced into a proceeding or dispute, once a "competent witness" has submitted testimony, by affidavit or otherwise, the adverse party must:

1. Disprove stated facts or prove alternative facts;
2. Prove application of law to stated or alternative facts.

In the event that the adverse party fails to comply with the above two (2) essentials, the "testimony" of the "competent witness" becomes established as uncontroverted evidence.

For the most part (almost always), no attorney can be a "competent witnesses" because (1) he does not have firsthand knowledge of facts, and (2) he does not submit whatever he says under oath, i.e. via affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete. Attorneys act under authority of the corporate, limited-liability "system," not in their own right as unlimited-liability beings. Furthermore, they relate second-hand information, i.e. what is told them by others. Legally, therefore, what attorneys state is hearsay. Their utterances are not the result of what they experience directly and concerning which they can attest on the basis of direct, firsthand, personal knowledge.^{[7][5]}

In addition to the above, an affidavit must, or to the greatest extents possible should:

1. Be a seven-point instrument, i.e. include all of the seven (7) points that are essential for any legal/commercial document to be 100% complete and valid, and therefore invincible.
2. Have all paragraphs numbered, for the purpose of, *inter alia*, identifying particular points/passages for future reference.

3. Have a form number on the bottom, unique to each affidavit, constituting a basis of unambiguous future reference and enhancing its admissibility as evidence in court.
4. Be written in clean, clear, matter-of-fact, minimalist style: "just the facts, ma'am."
5. Be written in the present tense.
6. Avoid using pronouns and the words, "to" and "or," which are ambiguous. The less ambiguity, the less need/excuse exists for a third party, such as a judge, to intervene in the matter to "interpret" the text.
7. Use as few adjectives and adverbs as possible, since they color matters and try to tell people what to think. Often the more nakedly words and terms are expressed, the more definitive and ironclad the result.
8. Be signed in red ink, signifying blood. Signing in red ink demonstrates that you, as the affiant, are pledging your unlimited liability ("the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth") on the veracity, relevance, accuracy, and verifiability of everything that you assert. It proclaims that you are stating your truth in the capacity of being a living, biological being and not as a corporate fiction functioning in limited liability (a commercial, lawful, and existential fraud because it arbitrarily limits the alleged liability of a legal person by fiat and force).
9. Be notarized, with the notary constituting third party witness (one of the essential seven (7) points referenced above).
10. Have as much "commercial paperwork," i.e. exhibits and attachments, supporting the affiant's assertions, as possible. Obviously, the more incontrovertible the substantiation the better.

5) *An un rebutted affidavit stands as the truth in commerce.* (1 Pet. 1:25; Heb. 6:13-15. Legal maxim: "He who does not deny, admits.")

In court, when oral testimony is given, the adverse party must disprove the facts that have been stated under oath, or prove alternative facts, and likewise prove the application of law re the stated facts. When testimony is provided by all adverse parties, i.e. by all disputants, under affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, then what is actually occurring is a duel of commercial affidavits.

A properly executed affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete is one of the essential ingredients that must be included within a 7-point instrument so that the resulting document can be invincible. One must always keep in mind the following essentials of the commercial process:

1. All commercial documents must be executed by affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, although for the sake of streamlining commercial paperwork this process is rendered implied and not express. The force and effect remain the same, since those who execute commercial paperwork can be held liable for the accuracy, validity, and verifiability of what is stated in the document.
2. Every document one sends and receives in law and commerce is a paper soldier, i.e. a dueling combatant in the judicial arena that is an abstract and verbal substitute for a real dueling field. Soldiers do battle for the purpose of winning vis-à-vis an opposing side. Law involves a winner and a loser; commerce involves someone

- paying and someone being paid. In both cases, the lives, rights, and property of people are involved in the interaction, signifying that anything that anyone executes that can adversely affect somebody else must be asserted with liability and accountability. Otherwise, anyone can make any allegations, claims, and charges against anyone for anything and no penalties accrue for any specious action.
3. If one's paper soldiers would be invincible combatants and not paper tigers, they must be seven-point instruments, all of which must be present in order that the result be sound and devoid of weaknesses. One of these essential seven (7) points is the necessity for being executed via affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, with the signer's commercial liability staked on the validity, veracity, relevance, and verifiability of everything that the signer claims/charges/alleges that might result in someone else experiencing loss.
 4. As mentioned above, neither attorneys nor government agents—unless speaking for themselves with firsthand, personal knowledge—can ever execute a document by affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete. This is because such persons deal in hearsay and as agents of other people and the system, not for/as themselves. This is a fundamental weakness/defect in all of their paperwork, which those who are not encumbered by acting as agents of the public are not inflicted. Nothing prevents a private party, if he is speaking for and as himself, from executing all his paperwork by affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, and thereby by such means alone overcoming the paper soldiers of those whose paperwork is defective by virtue of the omission.
 5. All attorneys and agents of the government executed paperwork by declaring "true and correct under penalty of perjury." "True and correct" is not "true, correct, and complete." In fact, declaring "true and correct" is perjury by omission, granting the alleging party carte blanche for asserting off-point irrelevancies. Indeed, all attorneys, the whole system, and everything that passes for "law" today functions by this means. The game is alleging any old thing, no matter how untrue, absurd, and bizarre, and then tricking the receiver of the nonsense into denying, i.e. traversing, and thereby enjoining the argument on the alleging party's ground and departing from the affected party's ground of truth.

In commerce, when someone executes an affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete that affects someone else, the affected party must rebut point-for-point by counteraffidavit sworn true, correct, and complete. Whatever points are unrebutted stand as the truth. When this occurs in a court trial, there might be, for instance, ten (10) counts leveled against the defendant. If the defendant successfully rebuts, i.e. neutralizes, seven (7) of the counts, it is the three (3) that remain that stand as the truth. From this scenario the following Commercial Maxim logically follows.

6) *An unrebutted affidavit becomes the judgment in Commerce* (Heb. 6:16-17).

This point is now rendered self-evident. At the end of the duel, when the truth has been decided on the basis of the loser having not rebutted particular accusations, claims, charges, and the like, what stands as the truth is that concerning which the judgment of the law is applied. The defendant must then pay the appropriate price for whatever wrongs/debts are determined as valid by his having not successfully rebutted them.

7) *A matter must be expressed to be resolved* (Heb. 4:16; Phil. 4:6; Eph. 6:19-21. Legal maxim: "He who fails to assert his rights has none.").

This Maxim and the following one are corollaries. By means of utilizing them one may accomplish

virtually anything in the world of law and commerce, certainly in the way of self-defense. Such success is achieved by knowing the principles/rules and applying them in practice.

One must first of all never forget that all law is contract. Furthermore, contracts are very often (in fact probably more often than not) ratified by saying and doing nothing, i.e. default, than by any express words and action. If you speak your mind contractually in the proper manner, a contract between you and any party coming after you can be finalized in which the tables have been turned and what began with you on the defensive and your opponent as the aggressor is reversed 180° and you are the commercial and financial victor, with your opponent rendered impotent in law and obligated contractually/commercially for paying you the sums of money established in the terms and conditions of the finalized contract. This is accomplished by the means outlined under the following Maxim.

8) *He who leaves the field of battle first loses by default* (Book of Job; Matt. 10:22. Legal maxim: "He who does not repel a wrong when he can, occasions it.").

As example of the nature and power of the Commercial Maxims, we can make an analogy of a court trial and a tennis match. Both occur in a context called a "court"—a tennis court and a court of law. In a trial, if one stands mute and does not answer/rebut the charges of which he is accused, then all charges leveled against him stand as the truth. Silence is deemed as acquiescence/consent. This course of action is akin to standing on a tennis court and not hitting any of your opponent's balls back.

If, however, you are in court and become involved in the trial, i.e. a duel involving answering, denying, rebutting, and explaining, you are traversing, which is in tennis the equivalent of endeavoring to return all of your opponent's volleys in a manner that he cannot then return the ball to you. Certainly the possibility exists that one can win such a match, but never without exertion and the loss of many points.

A third strategy exists, which would be disallowed in tennis but can be invoked when dealing with the system. That strategy would consist, in tennis, of placing a 100' high wall along the full length of the tennis net, prohibiting your opponent from ever hitting any ball into your court whatsoever. Everything he hit—no matter how hard or skillfully—would simply rebound back on him and you would remain unscathed, the winner without needing to hit a single ball.

In a situation of dealing with the law, building a 100' high wall is accomplished by the following strategy, by means of which you may remain immune from the plague of the legal/judicial system and go about your life without the obligation for becoming embroiled in legal games that you might not wish to play:

1. Copyright your name by publishing a Copyright Notice four (4) times in a newspaper of general circulation that publishes legal notices. The publishing should be done once a week for four (4) weeks. This Copyright Notice informs any potential User of any name that is intended as pertaining to you that any unauthorized use thereof without your express, prior, written permission signifies the User's consent for becoming the debtor on a self-executing UCC Financing Statement in the amount of \$500,000 per unauthorized use of any name used with the intent of obligating you, plus costs, plus triple damages.[8][6]
2. Execute a Private Agreement by and between the real you, as the Creditor, with your name in upper- and lower-case letters (John Henry Doe) and your all-capital-letter name (JOHN HENRY DOE) as the Debtor. This document is private and is not filed, but retained by you.

3. File a properly executed UCC Financing Statement, with Security Agreement and Hold Harmless and Indemnity Agreement (both of which are contracts between the abstract you, i.e. the all-caps name, and the real you, i.e. your upper- and lower-case name), in the UCC Department of the Secretary of State, preferably in the State in which you live.
4. In the event that any person in the system levels accusations, claims, charges, bills, fines, summons, indictments, etc., against you, his presentment constitutes an offer for contracting with you, i.e. for doing business. As a counteroffer, setting forth your terms and conditions for doing business with him, send him an affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete containing the following items, notices, and requirements:
 - a. Notify him of your paramount claim on your straw man and providing him with the details of what the cost is to that person for doing business with you, i.e. by using your all-caps name in commerce without your permission for his unjust commercial enrichment.
 - b. Require that he validate/verify the alleged debt, under oath, in accordance with the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, at 15 USC 1692(g).
 - c. Require that he provide proof of his authority for collecting the alleged debt, with certified, true copies of all agency agreements from whatever principal(s) are allegedly providing him with authority for acting against you.
 - d. Require that he provide a copy of the underlying contract in which you are allegedly in default, including an accounting of all goods and services with which you were provided and for which you have not paid (i.e. all the proper commercial paperwork).
 - e. Require that he provide the contractual and statutory source of his authority for issuing currency (that never before existed in the history of the universe) by creating a promissory note with your all-caps name as debtor and requiring that you, the real being, become the surety for the alleged debt.
 - f. Provide him with a Privacy Act Notice informing him that he is foreclosed from imparting any information about you and your affairs for the benefit of any third parties.
 - g. Require that he respond to you within a specified period of time via counteraffidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, notifying him that his failure to respond within the designated time via point-for-point rebuttal under oath sworn true, correct, and complete invokes the doctrine of consent/acquiescence by silence and constitutes his tacit agreement that your position is correct in totality and that all of his allegations and actions are bogus, null and void, and of no force and effect.
 - h. In form him further that all continued action against you in the absence of full compliance with all of your "put up or shut up" demands constitute his agreement and consent, i.e. "confession and consent of judgment," that he grants you full authorization for collecting against him in his personal capacity by such means as filing a UCC Financing Statement against all of his property, which may be non-judicially seized (strict foreclosure) for the payment of his

obligation.

5. If he does not withdraw his offending claims, charges, presentment, etc., within the specified time frame for him to do so, then his default constitutes a finalized contract between you and him. By the terms of this consummated, ratified contract he is now indebted to you for the amounts that you informed him he would owe should he proceed as he was doing without substantiating his position and negating yours. He has then lost the game of "put up or shut up," left the field of battle, and lost by default. The transaction that he initiated as a position of would-be creditor, attempting to make you a debtor, has been reversed and you are established in the end as the creditor and he is placed in the position of being your debtor. Such is the power of truth combined with understanding and use of the appropriate principles.

9) *Sacrifice is the measure of credibility* (One who is not damaged, put at risk, or willing to swear an oath that he consents to claim against his commercial liability in the event that any of his statements or actions is groundless or unlawful, has no basis to assert claims or charges and forfeits all credibility and right to claim authority.) (Acts 7, life/death of Stephen, maxim: "He who bears the burden ought also to derive the benefit."). In the vernacular, the principle embodied in this Maxim is encapsulated in the admonitions: "Talk's cheap," "Put your money where your mouth is," and "Put up or shut up."

For instance, if someone attempts to join a high-stakes poker game but will not place any stakes while wishing to take the pot without ever risking any loss, he would probably be thrown out of the building. Judges and attorneys, however, function from their aloof strata of "true and correct" (perjury by omission and irrelevancy) while requiring that all of the disputants bind themselves by swearing to tell the "truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," which is the judicial equivalent of swearing "true, correct, and complete." While nearly any document the system would have people sign requires execution "under penalty of perjury, true, correct, and complete" (see, for instance, an IRS Form 1040, application for Social Security, etc.), the chances of anyone receiving a document from anyone in the system, e.g. an IRS agent, that is sworn under penalty of perjury true, correct, and complete are essentially non-existent. In 28 USC 1746 those "within the United States" relieved themselves of any such encumbrance.

This unwillingness for sacrificing, therefore, i.e. staking some risk on the validity, veracity, relevance, and verifiability of everything agents and officials of the system say and do, renders the totality of their undertakings shams. No sacrifice, no credibility.

10) *A lien or claim can be satisfied only through rebuttal by Counteraffidavit point-for-point, resolution by jury, or payment* (Gen. 2-3; Matt. 4; Revelation. Legal maxim: "If the plaintiff does not prove his case, the defendant is absolved.").

As was stated earlier, the total number of commercial—and hence legal—documents is quite small. Technically, all of the documents must be affidavits executed by being sworn true, correct, and complete. These categories of documents, by which all of the law and commerce of the world function, are as follows:

1. Commercial paperwork (affidavit of accounting);
2. Declaration (affidavit of notice);
3. Contract (affidavit of agreement);
4. Notice of interest (three-week, unbonded distress);
5. Distress (affidavit of distraint/impound);

6. Criminal complaint (affidavit of information);
7. Lien (affidavit of obligation).

A lien is a "paper debt collector," and should be the culminating document borne of an adequate paper trail, i.e. accumulation of documents interchanged between the parties resulting in a finalized, consensual, private contract that grants one party authority for seizing another party's property that was contractually pledge for the purpose of collateralizing an obligation. It is of utmost importance that one understand that in law and commerce, the reality is the record. As a result, "the bookkeeper is king." If you would hope to succeed you must keep complete books and records. Always "get it in writing." Otherwise you have only thin air upon which to base any claims you might wish to assert.

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;
2. Record of responsibility 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, then, it is impractical for the trillions of documents involved in actual commerce to be done by having to take 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 some living, sentient being who takes responsibility for the validity of the document and the information that it contains. This must be so because every legal and commercial document involves someone paying and someone receiving gain. Since every such document thus involves a potential loss to someone else, accuracy and responsibility/accountability/liability must be inherent in everything. Therefore, although not in actuality sworn true, correct, and complete, all commercial documents are enforced as if they were. Reality cannot be cheated. No matter how fantastic and removed from reality and sanity matters become, 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.

While the Tenth Maxim provides an option of dealing with a lien via counteraffidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, if you have developed your lien properly, rebuttal by the adverse party is impossible. This is because finalization of the contract is derived from a series of defaults by the adverse party, i.e. contractual ratifications by invoking the doctrine of "consent and acquiescence by silence." In short, you give the adverse party X number of days to prove his position or abandon it, i.e. "put up or shut up," and notify him that if he fails to do either within the required time frame his non-doing signifies full agreement with all of the assertions you have noticed him by affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete.

By the time a lien is executed, your paper trail, i.e. record of property executed commercial paperwork, is significant, and that of the defaulting party is either woefully inadequate or non-existent (since their normal penchant is to ignore you). In the end, then, the only way the adverse party can rebut your lien is by proving on the record something that never happened and

does not exist, which is that he successfully rebutted, via counteraffidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, each and every affidavit you noticed him. Since he cannot prove the impossible, your position stands unrebutted as the truth and judgment of the law, granting you authority for seizing his property as payment of his obligation.

Dealing with a claim, which is established on the record by means of filing a UCC Financing Statement with a proper Security Agreement and Hold Harmless and Indemnity Agreement, is even more ironclad.

First of all, in your paperwork you do not reference such words as "lien," "distress," nor any terms with legal implications that can be construed as granting authority for commencing a justiciable controversy (legal dispute/court case). Restrict all your terms to strict commerce/UCC, e.g. "Financing Statement," "security interest," "Security Agreement," "claim," etc.

By such means you have neutralized the possibility for an adverse party to neutralize your claim by the first two means referenced in the Tenth Maxim, i.e. rebuttal and arbitration, leaving him with only the third option, which is payment.

Fortunately, non-judicial seizure of assets, i.e. "strict foreclosure," is a viable process, recognized and discussed in the new Article 9 of the UCC, and acted upon widely throughout the world. A properly executed lien and non-judicial collection thereon is the teeth and culmination of securing your life, rights, and property outside of the legal/judicial/governmental system.

Part 3

A. Principles.

All of creation can be thought of as music. Both consist of vibrations, rhythm, harmony, potential dissonance, and forms (melodies). Creation, like music, is characterized by a type of construction with which every musician is familiar: theme and variations. As examples, one may cite trees, people, birds, sex, essentially anything in creation. Based on something so simple as male and female, for instance, look at the variations and complexities that ensue.

The same situation pertains in law and commerce, where everything is a function of basic themes (principles) with variations (particular expressions, contexts, set of facts, events, combinations, and nuances). Ralph Waldo Emerson articulately expressed the paramount importance of understanding and applying principles in any given situation:

Without ambition one starts nothing.

Without work one finishes nothing.

The prize will not be sent to you.

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.

In the case of law and commerce, the basic themes are the fundamental principles and Commercial Maxims heretofore discussed in Parts One and Two, respectively. The bridge between the first set of universal principles, which may be considered as axiomatic in our universe, and the Commercial Maxims that apply in law and commerce, is the activation of a single, simple ethical choice, i.e. a single principle: *One may play either win/win or win/lose games in interacting with others.*

This ethical choice, regardless of which choice is adopted as a basis for achieving, is implemented for the purpose of actualizing another fundamental principle, discussed above: *The nature of life is to grow, progress, and evolve towards its fulfillment, towards ever-fuller realization of its own unbounded divinity and infinity.* In other words, "life" is a four-letter word spelled "more." Every living thing wants more. This includes "good guys," i.e. people who live by win/win interactions, and "bad guys," i.e. those who function in life on a win/lose basis. Everyone thereby makes an ethical choice concerning which approach he will adopt for furthering his inherent life-drive for more. Everyone wishes to succeed. What remains is the choices one makes as to the means, i.e. whether to pursue honorable or dishonorable action.

Another principle heretofore discussed that operates whenever someone acts on his innate drive for more is the fundamental source of man's problems: *the illusion of separation.* When one has conscious awareness that he, like all and everything, is an express of the One, and is therefore one with everything and everyone, playing win/lose games is perceived as ludicrous, since one is involved in attempting to cheat oneself, i.e. another aspect of oneself. This is like a hand trying to grasp itself.

George Gilder, in his book *Wealth and Poverty*, articulates this principle eloquently in the context of economics:

The belief that the good fortune of others is also finally one's own does not come easily or invariably to the human breast. It is, however, the golden rule of economics, a key to peace and prosperity, a source of the gifts of progress.

We now arrive at what is simultaneously the alleged "necessity" for the existence of governments, and the way in which all governments function (and must function in order for the institution to be classified as a "government"). Namely, some people relate with others by dishonorable means, i.e. by win/lose interactions, whereby someone attempts to gain the rewards of some relationship without giving something of equal or greater value in exchange. A thief, for instance, takes property that is the fruit of the labor of someone else, i.e. the cause/effect result of the rightful owner's labor, without engaging in any win/win actions that generate the rewards that the thief expropriates. Because almost everyone has the presence of some bit of larceny in his heart (those who have none are often called "saints," "sages," and the like), many people engage in actions that they think will be a shortcut in fulfilling their life-drive for more—they lie, cheat, steal, take by force, fraud, duress, etc. By such means, people who act in a win/lose manner think that they have taken a shortcut in fulfilling their life-drive for more. What such people do not realize is that such a "shortcut" takes longer in the end.

Ever since Eden the ways, contexts, nuances, and aspects of man's efforts at winning by playing win/lose games have been infinite in variety, creativity, and subtlety. The end result of all of them, however, include such consequences as the following:

1. Since man "reaps what he sows," i.e. the inviolable law of karma (action/reaction in the life of man) functions by virtue of natural law, the alleged "winner" causes harm not only to his victim, the larger community, and perhaps all of creation, but also ultimately to himself. For this reason there is existentially no such thing as "win/lose" success over time; all such approaches to action eventually generate "lose/lose" consequences, i.e. everyone loses and no one wins, including the purported "winner."
2. Discord and disharmony are generated in the fabric of social life.
3. The conflicts that necessarily result require, by the innate drive of life for more happiness and harmony, resolution of the ensuing dispute, i.e. restoration of coherence.
4. Governments exist primarily for the alleged reason of preventing people from engaging in win/lose activities, and even more, for pursuing means for achieving rectification, via "punishment" and other applications of destructive, physical force, against the perpetrators of win/lose games.

Further, as we have seen, *the map is not the territory; the name is not the thing named, and all law is contract*. All courts deal with words/abstractions/maps, i.e. legal persons and contracts between them. Thus, the lynchpin between the universal, existential principles and the activation of the ten (10) Commercial Maxims, consists of the principle: *The court is the substitute for the dueling field*. The court system is intended as being a forum wherein and whereby disputes can be arbitrated in a "civilized" and "objective" manner, thereby obviating the alleged necessity for the disputants taking retribution, fighting it out, engaging in duels, etc. Neither duels, nor courts, nor governments would exist if everyone played only win/win games.

By creating a ceremonial forum for dispute resolution called a "court," the duel is shifted from the direct, physical plane and into a structured setting wherein dispute resolution may occur in accordance with allegedly known and mutually agreed-upon rules, arbitrated by an alleged "impartial" referee called a "judge." Courts deal in words, abstract symbols, and ideas. Indeed, the legislative branch of a tripartite government actualizes the three (3) facilities by which man functions: 1) thought (legislative branch, i.e. a group of people who dream up the laws), 2) word (judicial branch, where words are used for arguments and arbitration, for the purpose of arriving the resolution of a dispute), and 3) deed (executive branch, that carries out the results of court decisions in the realm of concrete action, i.e. re-imposes the abstract result arrived at in court back upon reality in the form of fines and punishments).

B. Presumptions.

Some remarkable conclusions from the above-described gestalt become self-evident:

1. The courts, dealing with words and contracts, neither deal with, nor act directly upon, real beings; they involve themselves exclusively with abstract legal persons. [\[9\]\[1\]](#)
2. Once one is clear concerning the above fact, questions immediately arise concerning the abstract entity that is purportedly united with the real being in some manner:
 - a. What kind of legal person is the court dealing with that is allegedly some abstract representation of you?

- b. What is the relationship between the real you and the abstract version of you with which the courts deal?
- c. How did that alleged unification between the real you and the abstract you come about?
- d. What is the nature of the alleged nexus between the real you and the abstract representation of yourself?
- e. Whatever the above-reference nexus is presumed by the courts as being, can you sever the alleged nexus in a manner that forecloses the courts and legal system from trying the abstract representation of you and then having the executive (sheriff, police, wardens, etc.) re-impose the abstract sentencing back on you (re-impose the map back onto the territory)?

Of these questions, let us deal first with the nature of the alleged nexus between the abstract (reflection, mirror image) of you and the real (substantive, living) you. Inasmuch as all law is contract, the nature of the nexus can therefore be only one thing: contract. More accurately, the courts and legal system function on the basis of a presumption of contract. In other words, the system deals with concocted presumptions, which are "as if," or "what if," i.e. in the subjunctive mode of English grammar. All of this transpires in an imaginary realm, an Alice-in-Wonderland world of mental abstractions, playing a game that might be called "let's pretend." [10][2] From the primal premise that one can play "let's pretend" games and re-impose them on the real world derives our current colorable, malleable, ephemeral, mirage-like, infuriating system. In this make-believe world anything goes, for reasons that include the following:

1. Governments exist and function exclusively by win/lose interactions. Even when a government appears to be giving something, or engaging in some constructive action, it is at the expense of removing rights and resources from the people to secure its authority and financing. Moreover, whatever "good" a government may appear to do is superficial symptom-treatment, and does nothing to create genuine solutions, which do not reside with any government but within the hearts and minds of the people.

In the United States today the situation is far worse. What is called the "United States Government" is a bankrupt corporation underwritten by, in receivership in favor of, and a mere front for the Federal Reserve, International Monetary Fund (IMF), et al. This private government functions in its own commercial, military, international jurisdiction under the "law of necessity" characterizing the "state of emergency" that has prevailed since the Civil War. The law of necessity is actually "no law," i.e. the suspension of law for the purpose of dealing with the "emergency." In the law of necessity the "law of the jungle" prevails, in which anything goes, i.e. one may survive at the expense of the lives, rights, and property of others. This is a state of war, and truth, ethics, and compassion are the most serious casualties. All that matters is winning by any means; there are no rules except "just eat, baby." "All's fair in love and war," and all governments (no matter how structured, dressed up, and disguised) function in a perpetual state of war between the government and the people. This is now expressly codified in law, whereby every "citizen of the United States" is classified as an enemy of the private, commercial, corporate government (US Inc.) based upon the Amendatory Act re the Trading With The Enemy Act of March 9, 1933.

This perpetual "state of emergency," which was created by the very Government that is the beneficiary of its self-caused emergency, is codified, *inter alia*, at 12 USC 95 and in the Appendix of Title 50. The first act of every new US President is the reaffirmation

of his authority under the War Powers, 12 USC 95, inasmuch as that "authorization" is not only his exclusive source of power but the source of authority for the entire system, including Congress, all administrative agencies, law enforcement, and courts, i.e. all of US Inc. The power of all of these entities, i.e. every aspect of the so-called government and legal system today, derives from this private, military, commercial, international, admiralty-equity jurisdiction of the alleged Creditors of the bankrupt US Inc.

2. The Commercial Maxims become operationally dominant, most especially Maxims four (4) through seven (7), because people never rebut the presumption that they voluntarily agreed to play the "let's pretend" game. When one engages in tangible rebuttal, however, a catch-22 prevails:

If you directly rebut the presumption you enjoin the argument, grant credence to your opponent's cause and jurisdiction (and are now merely haggling about the particulars, i.e. the price), and traverse. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th Edition, defines "traverse" and "traverser" as follows:

Traverse. "In common law pleading, a traverse signifies a denial. Thus, where a defendant denies any material allegation of fact in the plaintiff's declaration, he is said to traverse it, and the plea itself is thence frequently termed a 'traverse.'" Page 1345.

Traverser. "In pleading, one who traverses or denies. A prisoner or party indicted; so called from his traversing the indictment." Page 1345. [By this definition, everyone in jail is there because he traversed, i.e. enjoined the argument.]

If you do not rebut the presumption you lose by default, i.e. Commercial Maxims four (4) through seven (7) operate and your failure is established.

The way out of this "damned if you do, damned if you don't" catch-22 is accomplished by rebutting the presumptions (essentially all of which are undisclosed) not by traversing, i.e. arguing, denying, addressing your adversary's issues, etc., but by unilaterally affirming your own position in a manner that simultaneously eliminates the presumptions operating against you.[11][3] In such case you are not arguing, denying, and the like, nor are you addressing any aspect of what any possible adverse party might assert, such the validity, veracity, authenticity, relevance, etc., of anything he might allege. You are remaining in your own domain, "minding your own business," asserting your own truth, all in a manner that simultaneously neutralizes and preempts his unrevealed presumptions. Now if an adverse party comes after you, it is he who is traversing, i.e. he leaves his ground and enters your domain, where you are sovereign and your truth rules, and where he does not belong, where your assertions stand, and for which he cannot speak.

The wise words of the *I Ching* are apt in the world of commerce: "A Superior Man goes only into his own domain." The great French political economist, Frederic Bastiat, phrased the matter more bluntly: "Minding one's own business is the only moral law." The same sentiment is echoed by a timeless maxim of law: "It is a fault to meddle with what does not belong to or does not concern you. Dig. 50, 17, 36; 2 Inst. 208. (See *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, Maxims.)"

This process of rebutting without traversing by unilaterally asserting your own truth without involving yourself in countering someone else's stated position is a powerful and subtle technique that operates in certain esoteric martial arts. In this article we call the process "non-rebuttal rebutting."

Some of the presumptions of law upon which the system functions are:

1. Man is the source of sovereignty, experience, free will, and government (possibly the only accurate and noble presumption in the entire legal system today). This foundational presumption is essential because otherwise no one could be held liable for anything, no one would be accountable, and no law would therefore be possible. The first thing a judge asks a defendant at an arraignment is "Do you understand the charges?" In other words, "Did you, as a conscious, sentient, autonomous being with free will and ethical discernment, knowingly and intentionally violate the law?"
2. We in the system always win, and you always lose.
3. We are under no compulsion, no obligation, to reveal the presumptions of law under which we function.
4. It is presumed that you knowingly, intentionally, and voluntarily contracted into the system and are bound by all of the terms and conditions of the contract, i.e. you contracted yourself into the position of being our subject, slave, and chattel property, so what's your beef?

The key elements of the entire scenario start becoming clear at this point, i.e.

1. You must rebut the presumptions of law (almost entirely unrevealed) on the basis of which the system functions, since it is the presumptions, not what passes as "law" and "facts," that constitute the source of the system's power over you. Dealing with the "law" and the "facts" is taking the bait and falling into a trap. It is following rabbit trails that lead away from your own turf and into their hostile jungle in the dark. The system deals entirely with fabricated, off-point irrelevancies and lures people into traversing, i.e. enjoining the argument, which is like joining their imaginary game of cops and robbers (in this case a game of "system vs. suckers"). This is akin to joining in the plot of a novel one is reading, as if it were real. What those in the system say and do is their truth, their business, their priorities—not yours. Why are you involving yourself with what is not your business and for which you cannot speak? Speak for yourself and recognize that they are speaking for themselves.
2. The central, foundational presumption that you must rebut is the presumption that you are contractually united with the corporate, abstract all-caps name that the Government creates and tricks/deceives you into identifying your real being with the fictitious name.

It is clear that if the Government creates a corporate entity, in this case your all-capital-letter name, which the Government owns and can therefore act on and against in any manner the Government wishes, and if you are presumed as being contractually bound with that entity, then you are rendered a permanent slave and your life is one of perpetual conflict and tension. The Government desires a mountain of compliance from you re the taxes you must pay, the regulations you must comply with, and the laws you must obey. Because all of these things are designed and enforced from the Government's perspective, and in accordance with its whims and priorities, and your natural life necessarily consists of a contrary set of understandings, goals, and desires, living in such a situation renders your life one of permanent conflict and tension. You are trying to "serve two masters" at the same time, each requiring contrary things from you. The result is the situation characterized by Thoreau's celebrated comment, "The mass of men live lives of quiet desperation."

C. Progression.

What is the nature of the presumed contractual nexus between the real you (owned by you) and the abstract, corporate image of you (owned by the Government until/unless you redeem it)? The set of facts and events, outlined below, arranged in historical progression, summarizes America's situation and how it developed. All of this progression is the acting out of an original ethical choice of the perpetrators, i.e. the decision of particular people that they can gain in life by playing win/lose games at the expense of others. Their first step in pursuing this win/lose course of action is inventing relating with the people in accordance with such imaginary games as "rulers and ruled, where I am the ruler and you are the ruled," which in turn is founded on another let's pretend postulate, "let's suppose that some men have a transcendent right for governing others." People are drawn into the phony game by promulgation of such make-believe ideas as, "I'm a citizen of the United States." The entire system thus consists of becoming absorbed in a vast mirage of endless artificially concocted, preposterous nonsense. No one possesses any existential/ethical right to rule others (everyone is a free-will sovereign), and no one can be a fictitious entity, i.e. a "citizen of the United States.

In basically chronological order, the following win/lose progression of growth of the power, scope, and pervasiveness of government vis-à-vis the rights, freedom, and well being of the people characterizes the sad—if not desperate—plight of America today:

1. The USA, a corporation of the English Crown, is bankrupt, and has been since at least 1788. *The Articles of Confederation* states in Article 12: "All bills of credit emitted, monies borrowed, and debts contracted by, or under the authority of Congress, before the assembling of the United States, in pursuance of the present confederation, shall be deemed as considered a charge against the United States, for payment and satisfaction whereof the said United States, and the public faith are hereby solemnly pledged." The "Founding Fathers," as constitutors, acknowledged and reorganized the debt in the US Constitution 1787, Article VI, hence "constitution." Bankruptcy occurred on January 1, 1788 based on 21 loans that the United States of America received from the King of England dating from February 28, 1778 through July 5, 1782, the repayment of which had been ratified by Congress on January 22, 1783. The United States Bank, created in 1791, was a private bank, with 18,000 of 25,000 shares owned by England.
2. No *de jure*, constitutional Congress has existed since March 27, 1861 when seven (7) Southern States walked out of Congress leaving Congress without a quorum for adjourning and therefore ending *sine die*. That which is called "Congress" today assembles and acts under the authority of the President acting in capacity of being Commander-In-Chief of the Armed Forces, under emergency war-powers rule, i.e. "law of necessity," i.e. no law (see 12 Stat 319, which has never been repealed and exists in Title 50 USC §§ 212, 213, 215, Appendix 16, 26 CFR Chapter 1 § 303.1-6(a), and 31 CFR Chapter 5 § 500.701 Penalties).
3. Since the above-referenced date, March 27, 1861, Americans have been under Fascist rule via presidential executive order under the aforementioned Emergency War Powers, 12 USC 95 a, b. Every "citizen of the United States" is now "legally" established as an "enemy" via the Amendatory Act of March 9, 1933, 48 Stat. 1, amending Trading With Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, H.R. 4960, Public Law No. 91.
4. December 6th, 1865, the 14th Amendment was proclaimed as ratified (even though it never properly was, see below). The 14th Amendment, which is private Roman Catholic Ecclesiastical Trust Law, constitutes a constructive, *cestui que* trust, a public charitable trust, "PCT," that was expressly designed to bring every corporate franchise artificial person called a "citizen of the United States" into an inseparable merging with the government until the two are united (with the power inhering in the government, not the people). A *cestui*

- que* trust is fundamentally different from a regular trust, which is express in nature and consists of a contractual indenture involving three (3) parties: Grantor (Creator or Trustor), Trustee, and Beneficiaries. In an express trust, legal ownership is transferred by written contract between Grantor and Trustee in which the Grantor surrenders ownership of property to the legal person, the Trust, to be managed by the Trustee on behalf of those who are to benefit from the arrangement, the Beneficiaries. A *cestui que* trust, on the other hand, differs from an express trust in several crucial ways:
- a. It is not formed by express contract, i.e. overt agreement expressed in writing, but by legal construction, i.e. fiat.
 - b. A *cestui que* trust has no Grantor, but, being a constructive trust created by operation of law, i.e. by make-believe, has only co-trustees and co-beneficiaries. The co-trustees are the parties with the duties for managing property for the "public good," i.e. for the benefit of those designated as co-beneficiaries.
5. The Legislative Act of February 21, 1871, Forty-first Congress, Session III, Chapter 62, page 419, chartered a Federal company entitled "United States," a/k/a "US Inc.," a "Commercial Agency" originally designated as "Washington, D.C.," in accordance with the so-called 14th Amendment, which the record indicates was never ratified (see Utah Supreme Court Cases, Dyett v Turner, (1968) 439 P2d 266, 267; State v Phillips, (1975) 540 P 2d 936; as well as Coleman v. Miller, 307 U.S. 448, 59 S. Ct. 972; 28 Tulane Law Review, 22; 11 South Carolina Law Quarterly 484; Congressional Record, June 13, 1967, pp. 15641-15646). A "citizen of the United States" is a civilly dead entity operating as a co-trustee and co-beneficiary of the PCT, the constructive, *cestui que* trust of US Inc. under the 14th Amendment, which upholds the debt of the USA and US Inc. in Section 4.
 6. In conformity with the above-referenced creation of United States (1871) and the 14th Amendment, the Legislature of each State created a limited-liability corporation, chartered in a private, military, international, commercial, admiralty/maritime jurisdiction, entitled "STATE OF..." e.g. "STATE OF CALIFORNIA," as evidenced by, *inter alia*, the change in the seal and the creation of a new constitution, e.g. Constitution of the State of California (1879), concerning which, re California:
 - a. A general partnership agreement, hereinafter "General Partnership," exists between the California Republic (1849), and STATE OF CALIFORNIA (1879), with STATE OF CALIFORNIA acting as governmental controller.
 - b. STATE OF CALIFORNIA now acts as an agent/instrumentality of United States, collecting whole life insurance premiums, known as "taxes," for the International Monetary Fund, based, *inter alia*, upon the Limited Liability Act of 1851 and the bankruptcy of United States of 1933, see 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; 31 USC 5112, 5119.
 7. Inasmuch as all law is contract, the contract involved in a constructive trust is an implied contract. An implied contract can be ratified by two (2) means:
 - a. Acquiescence by silence, i.e. the "government" asserts its intentions concerning your life, rights, and property and you assent, don't rebut, and compliantly go along with what they claim. In 1871 the Government changed the nature of its contract with the people from law as defined by the original Constitution of 1787 that recognizes law (common law), admiralty (on the sea only), and equity (functioning by voluntary contract between all participating parties), and began relating to people as if they were "citizens of the Unites States" within/under the private, commercial, international,

military jurisdiction of the new *de facto* corporation, i.e. US Inc. They offered people a “new deal,” and almost everyone bought it (based on naïve and foolish trust and assuming that everything was OK).^{[12][4]}

The people were thereby swindled out of access to law and placed on the ship of state of US Inc. where the captain’s word is law and no one has any rights. Shades of the Arabian Nights story of Aladdin and His Magic Lamp: “New lamps (shiny, worthless ones) for old (magical, but dull and dusty).”

The point is that in implementing this win/lose progression of ever-increasing government power, everything undertaken by the would-be “win” side is at the expense of loss to the “lose” segment. As Jefferson phrased the matter, “As government grows, liberty recedes.”

- b. You expressly accept “benefits” offered by the government, and thereby finalize the contract by deed. This is similar to finalizing a contract with a restaurant by sitting down at a table, reading a menu, and then ordering and consuming a meal. By your deeds you affirm to the restaurant that you will pay for the meal in accordance with the price stated on the menu. No written contract is signed, but a contract is formed nevertheless.
8. By the above two (2) means people give implied assent that they are bound by an alleged contract with US Inc. (a let’s pretend game) in accordance with the terms and conditions that inhere in being treated as a “citizen of the United States” under the 14th Amendment, and are therefore placed into permanent indentured servitude. In such a position people leave the ground of sovereignty and all capacity for asserting their unalienable rights in favor of being presumed as having exercised their sovereignty and free-will autonomy for the purpose of going along with the government’s assertion that they sacrifice everything for the “public good,” i.e. the PCT. By so doing people lose their standing in law, i.e. they “die a civil death in the law.” They are placed in the legal position of mortmain (i.e. as if deceased) and are shorn of capacity for asserting their rights, since the presumption is that they have already exercised those rights for the purpose of being placed in the position they are in, i.e. playing the imaginary game. The private being (the real individual) is sacrificed for the good of the public (the imaginary collective).
9. When people die such a civil death in they law they are like ghosts, and thereby incapable of managing their own affairs and enjoying their unalienable rights. Like the estate of a decedent, they are then managed by the executors/administrators of the estate, in probate. Such is the condition of every “citizen of the United States” today, managed by the government agencies acting as executors/administrators of their estates in bankruptcy, legal incapacity, and civil death as assets of the bankrupt US. The US is a mere front for the private Real Parties of Interest, the Creditors in bankruptcy, i.e. the families who own the Federal Reserve.
10. The 14th Amendment was allegedly established for the purpose of creating a citizenship for the liberated blacks, and other disenfranchised people, who otherwise had no citizenship because they could not comply with the requirements for state citizenship. What actually happened was that the blacks were taken off of the Southern slave plantations and placed into the slave plantation of US Inc., a far worse lot.^{[13][5]} The government then gradually absorbed everyone else—including state citizens—into the same condition.
11. 1871-1913. Officers of the actual government held office in dual capacity, i.e. in both USA and US Inc. status.
12. 1912. Bonds issued by US Inc. came due but US Inc. did not have the resources for paying their creditors (the seven families that founded the Federal Reserve Bank), so US Inc.’s

owner (the actual government) was required to pay the balance. The national government was also without sufficient funds to meet US Inc.'s obligations, so the creditors settled for all of the assets of both US Inc. and the national government instead of foreclosure on and liquidation of the entire country. By so doing they expropriated the nation—both USA and US Inc. *Sic transit America.*

13. 1912. US Inc. forms an agreement with the Federal Reserve Bank (It is important to note that both of these entities are private corporations which removes the general allegations of treason or fraud from this relationship). Through this agreement US Inc. must function in debt, even though they have neither funds nor resources for financing their operation.
14. 1912. The first corporate only Senators are seated in the next election year by popular vote of the US Inc. registered voters. The original-jurisdiction national Senators of the States did not assume office that year and at least one third of the nation's Senators seats were lawfully and voluntarily vacant.
15. February 3rd, 1913. US Inc. passes its 16th Amendment and Congress orders the Secretary of State to enter it as ratified even though the States had not ratified it according to Law. The Secretary complied. It should be noted that this would not have been lawful if it were a national Constitution amendment, however it was perfectly legal within the colorable, *de facto* corporation. It should also be noted that where the national Constitution already had a 16th amendment and where the Supreme Court says that the new 16th Amendment did not do anything, this corporate amendment must simply be a space filler entered such that US Inc.'s Constitution (1871) would have the same number of amendments as that of the national Constitution (1787).
16. April 8th, 1913. US Inc. passes its 17th amendment and Congress orders it to be entered as ratified in the exact same manner as they did with US Inc.'s 16th Amendment. This amendment changes where US Inc.'s Senators are elected. This amendment is not even lawfully possible as a national Constitution amendment for several reasons, not the least of which is that the amendment would have required that Congress first pass an amendment that stated that they had the power to say where Senators are elected before they could even deliberate on such a subject matter, after which they would then have to have competent ratifications performed on such amendments in accord with constitutional limits, not as was done with US Inc.'s 16th Amendment.
17. December 23, 1913. The Congress, late at night with only a small cadre of supporters present, passed the Federal Reserve Act, surrendering the creation and management of the nation's currency into the hands of a cartel of private—and mostly foreign—bankers. Currency is the single most essential and critical commodity in the world, embodying more law and principles of commerce than any other. Since all interactions are "commerce," and the medium of doing business in commerce is currency, money is in a very significant sense the measure of all things. By abandoning control and management of the money supply the nation surrendered all capacity for claiming sovereignty. The government lost its independent treasury (one of the requirements in law for national sovereignty). The United States Government became a mere fiefdom, or administrative arm, of the bankers, who now owned the store.

Passage of the Federal Reserve Act was a major milestone on the "road to serfdom" that this entire progression outlines. The conspiratorial nature of matters is exemplified in comments by one of the major actors in the triumph of the Federal Reserve, Edward Mandell House, who had this to say in a private meeting with President Woodrow Wilson:

"[Very] soon, every American will be required to register their biological property in

a national system designed to keep track of the people and that will operate under the ancient system of pledging. By such methodology, we can compel people to submit to our agenda, which will effect our security as a chargeback for our fiat paper currency. Every American will be forced to register or suffer being able to work and earn a living. They will be our chattel, and we will hold the security interest over them forever, by operation of the law merchant under the scheme of secured transactions. Americans, by unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of lading to us will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent, forever to remain economic slaves through taxation, secured by their pledges. They will be stripped of their rights and given a commercial value designed to make us a profit and they will be none the wiser, for not one man in a million could ever figure our plans and, if by accident one or two should figure it out, we have in our arsenal plausible deniability. After all, this is the only logical way to fund government, by floating liens and debt to the registrants in the form of benefits and privileges. This will inevitably reap to us huge profits beyond our wildest expectations and leave every American a contributor to this fraud which we will call "Social Insurance." Without realizing it, every American will insure us for any loss we may incur and in this manner, every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly. The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and, we will employ the high office of the President of our dummy corporation to foment this plot against America."

18. 1917. Corporate-only Senators begin participating in all matters with those Senators who still had original jurisdiction government capacity, as a result of which all activities of the government were performed in corporate capacity only.
19. 1917. President Wilson was re-elected by the Electoral College, but only US Inc.'s Senate performed the Senate confirmation necessary for seating the national President. There was no national government Senate confirmation; no national seats were seated and all remained vacant. Note: the national President is also the Military's Commander in Chief, and under the nation's status of being ruled by the private, commercial, martial-law rule of the Bankers and English Crown, the business needs of the nation have remained under US Inc. control since 1871, i.e. ever since US Inc. was incorporated and made operational over such matters.
20. 1917-1944. All national government seats are and remain vacant, and US Inc. continues maintaining the business needs of the government under martial-law rule.
21. June 5, 1933. US Inc. declares bankruptcy under House Joint Resolution, "HJR," 192.
22. 1935. The Social Security Act is passed.
23. On application, the new Social Security Administration (hereinafter "SSA") creates a private Trust with a trust name that sounds like the name of the applicant except the Trust's name is spelled with all capital letters. SSA makes the applicant a co-trustee of the namesake Trust, designates the SSA General Trust Fund as the Beneficiary of the namesake trust, and assigns the Trust a Social Security General Trust Fund Account number re the applicant for accounting and identification purposes.
24. 1938. In Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, 1938, 304 U.S. 64-92, the U.S. Supreme Court sets the presumption re the status and capacity of an individual as that of General Capacity/General Partnership relationship with the namesake Trust, as if the two (2) entities—individual and namesake Trust—were one-in-the-same person.
25. 1944. In the Bretton Woods Agreement US Inc. is quit-claimed into the newly formed International Monetary Fund (hereinafter "IMF") in exchange for the power allowing US

- Inc.'s President the right of naming (seating and controlling) the governors and general managers of the International Monetary Fund, The World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the Inter-American Bank also formed in that agreement (codified at United States Code Title 22 § 286). It must be noted that this act created an unlawful conflict of interest between US Inc. (with its new foreign owner) and its purpose of carrying out the business needs of the national government. This is the cause of our use of the term "original-jurisdiction" government. With the new foreign owner of US Inc. a conflict of interest is created between the national government and US Inc., even though the contracted purpose of US Inc. has not changed on its face.
26. Since 1953 – 1975 at least, MKULTRA (Mind Control, etc.), CIA, and Military are unlawfully engaging in human experimentation with and without the knowledge of the subjects. Military airborne toxins are sprayed on large cities without warning for the purpose of studying distribution and effect patterns, and other more sinister purposes (see numerous cites on the Internet re "chem-trails"). Cite: Joint Hearing before the US Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, 95th Congress, 1st Session, August 3, 1977.
 27. 1962. At the National Governor's Conference in Lexington, Kentucky, US Inc. informs the governors, under the guise of "public necessity", that they must all form, or reform existing, private corporations under US Inc. (in their state's interest), so that the people will not discover what the state governments are doing with the people's money (dabbling in foreign notes, i.e. Federal Reserve Notes (FRNs), bonds, and evidences of debt), which activity is forbidden from State governments by their own State Constitutions, which information would likely cause a people's revolt ending in the State official's being at worst killed and at least replaced. The proposed incorporation deadline was 1968.
 28. 1970. By this time each State revised its constitution and statutes and formed private corporate entities of the name "STATE OF (X)" (where "(X)" is representative of the common State name), and then vacated their original jurisdiction government seats in favor of foreign ownership and control under the mandate of US Inc.
 29. It appears that this was all done so a General Partnership could be presumed as existing between "The State" (of the national Union of States) and "STATE OF (X)", a private corporation. Said STATE OF (X), as General Partner, then assumes the role of governmental operator/controller. This scenario is further proven by the fact that these corporate entities cannot handle gold and silver coin of the United States of America in commercial transactions without violating the Par Value Modifications Act and the Foreign Currency Exchange Act.
 30. September 5, 1996, U.S. Patent & Trademark Office application number 709471 is filed, consisting of a plan for marking the alleged "human property" of US Inc., i.e. every "citizen of the United States," reminiscent of the Biblical reference in the nature of the Mark of the Beast. This plan is a violation of foundational law and is Luciferian in nature.
 31. April 19th, 1991. The Ruby Ridge Massacre occurs, carried out by FBI agents.
 32. April 19th, 1993. Federal agents end 51-day siege of 7th Day Adventists Branch Davidians compound killing several of the members of the sect, in Waco, Texas. No lawful cause existed for the siege and attack. All escaping children are shot.
 33. April 19th, 1994. Federal agents attack, burn, and raze the compound, killing approximately 100 of the members of the sect, without any lawful cause for the action.
 34. April 19th, 1995, Federal Building in Oklahoma was blown up. There were three sets of explosions recorded on seismographs, the least effective of which was in the Ryder truck.

The strongest of the explosions, which created the crater, was caused by a sub-nuclear device. The explosions that demolished the building were set with mil-spec C4 bombs attached to the columns in the basement and on the third floor. Only US Inc. officials could have orchestrated this sequence of events.

35. 50 USC 1520 et seq. demonstrates that there exists an agenda for using Americans (Sovereign and otherwise) as biological test subjects. This is a fundamental breach of an alleged Constitutional contract.
36. President Clinton pushes for a mandatory health care bill for the purpose of placing the physical bodies of all Americans under control of US Inc., with international identification attached, for the purpose of tagging the populace, as per the Biblical prophesy of the Mark of the Beast. The computer that would handle the tracking is even identified with the acronym: B.E.A.S.T.

What the above progression depicts is the systematic growth of the power, scope, and pervasive control of Government exercised against the American people by foreign, criminal, and hostile powers. The inherent win/lose nature of those who believe in and operate governments is actualized, driven by the life-drive for more, with the one and only single result that always occurs when the flawed premises upon which governments are founded become established in ruling a nation: the culture rises, grows to its zenith, and then—slowly or suddenly—decays, disintegrates, and disappears. This same dreary gestalt constitutes the nature of man's history on this planet as far back as the eye can see. Civilizations rise, fall, and disappear, replaced by new ones that—based upon being founded on, and functioning in accordance with, wrong principles—are foredoomed for extinction, as were all of their predecessors and as all future civilizations will be until mankind finally learns and ceases “beating a dead horse” by structuring law, commerce, religion, and social organization in general on principles that are existentially impossible and ethically wrong.

The above progression has proceeded in America by implementing such strategy as:

1. Relentlessly instilling in people the foundational idea that governments in general are absolutely essential in the society of man and that the Government in America is the people's friend and servant, i.e. a “government of the people, by the people, and for the people.” These premises are untrue—self-serving cons by those who want the power.
2. Creating governmentally owned corporate franchises, such as a “citizen of the United States” and one's all-capital-letter name, with which people are deceived into identifying.
3. Regarding every citizen of the United States as contractually being:
 - a. A corporate citizen, i.e. a corporate franchise;
 - b. A co-trustee (with duties) and co-beneficiary (with privileges) of the 14th Amendment Public Charitable *cestui que* Trust;
 - c. Pledged as an asset in the bankruptcy of US Inc., and therefore a co-surety for the debts of US Inc.;
 - d. An enemy of the Creditors;
 - e. Chattel property of the Bankers and Power Elite;
 - f. A slave with no capacity for asserting any rights, no standing in law, and no

capacity for contracting.

4. Functioning on the presumption that the individual being, with autonomy and free will, knowingly, intentionally, and voluntarily contracted into the situation of being united—like heads and tails of a coin—with a corporate entity created and owned by the Government.

As per the established maxim of law, "As a thing is bound, so it is unbound," the way out of the problem is within and through the problem. This is accomplished by understanding what the problem is, i.e. its structure and character, just as solving the problem of a plugged drain is accomplished by realizing that the problem is the plugged drain, whereby the solution consists of unplugging the drain. "Know the truth and the truth shall make you free." Understanding the problem and how it arose is the purpose of all of the foregoing.

D. Practice.

As repeatedly noted, "all law is contract," whereby solving the problem is achieved by invoking contract law. All contracts, both express and implied, must be formulated in accordance with the universal essentials of contract law concerning the interaction between the parties. These fundamentals are well codified in many places, e.g. the California Civil Code, Sections 1549 et seq.:

§ 1549. Contract, what

A contract is an agreement to do or not to do a certain thing.

§ 1550. Essential elements of contract

It is essential to the existence of a contract that there should be:

1. Parties capable of contracting;
2. Their consent;
3. Lawful object; and,
4. A sufficient cause or consideration.

§ 1556. Who may contract

All persons are capable of contracting, except minors, persons of unsound mind, and persons deprived of civil rights.

§ 1565. Essentials of consent

The consent of the parties to a contract must be:

1. Free;
2. Mutual; and,
3. Communicated by each to the other.

§ 1567. An apparent consent is not real or free when obtained through:

1. Duress;

2. Menace;
3. Fraud;
4. Undue influence; or
5. Mistake.

§ 1598. When contract wholly void

Where a contract has but a single object, and such object is unlawful, whether in whole or in part, or wholly impossible of performance, or so vaguely expressed as to be wholly unascertainable, the entire contract is void.

§ 1608. Effect of its illegality

If any part of single consideration for one or more objects, or of several considerations for a single object, is unlawful, the entire contract is void.

§ 1620. Express contract, what

An express contract is one, the terms of which are stated in words.

§ 1621. Implied contract, what

An implied contract is one, the existence and terms of which are manifested by conduct.

§ 1441. Impossible or unlawful conditions void

A condition in a contract, the fulfillment of which is impossible or unlawful, within the meaning of the article on the object of contracts, or which is repugnant to the nature of the interest created by the contract, is void.

§ 1636. Contracts, how to be interpreted

A contract must be so interpreted as to give effect to the mutual intention of the parties as it existed at the time of contracting, so far as the same is ascertainable and lawful.

§ 1668. Certain contracts unlawful

All contracts which have for their object, directly or indirectly, to exempt anyone from responsibility for his own fraud, or willful injury to the person or property of another, or violation of law, whether willful or negligent, are against the policy of the law.

§ 1709. Fraudulent deceit

One who willfully deceives another with intent to induce him to alter his position to his injury or risk, is liable for any damage which he thereby suffers.

A major Achilles heel of the system is that it is founded on lies, deceit, concealment of material fact, misrepresentation, duress, menace, fraud, undue influence, mistake, absence of valuable consideration, and no free mutual consent, i.e. the absence of essentially every required element for the existence of a valid contract. In short, the alleged presumption of an existing contract is a lie—no contract exists, based on the absence of true agreement derived from full disclosure of all terms and conditions, i.e. no mutual understanding by all involved parties of everything with which the parties are allegedly agreeing.

As we have noted, we must rebut the rebuttable presumption of the presumed contractual nexus that places us in such dire straits by an affirmative act, i.e. not denial and argument (which constitute traversing). We must engage in express action that, by its very nature, rebuts the

presumptions that are otherwise the source of all the mischief being perpetrated against us. The issue is then how and in what forum this non-rebutting rebuttal is exercised.

Non-rebutting rebuttal, first of all, occurs by establishing on the record the underlying commercial paperwork governing the situation—in this case paperwork bearing upon the virtual totality of your life. In commerce and law the reality is the record. Proper commercial paperwork is done by affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete (whether express or implied), and sets forth who owes whom what, on what basis (i.e. the underlying contract), and who is taking liability/responsibility for every bookkeeping entry, claim, charge, accusation, and anything asserted that might in any way affect the life of someone else.

In this case the underlying commercial paperwork of your life consists of the genuine, express, bilateral contracts by and between, the real being and the artificial, corporate entity, i.e. your all-capital-letter name. Correspondingly, the name, i.e. symbolic representation, that portrays yourself as a real being, is set forth in accordance with the rules of English grammar in upper- and lower-case letters. The difference is then between JOHN HENRY DOE (fictitious name, corporate entity) and John Henry Doe (real being).

What is the basis and nature of this contract between the real being and the fictitious entity? Each performs indispensable functions for and on behalf of the other. What the artificial entity does is serve as a “transmitting utility” in commerce—and law, which is a subset of commerce—since all law, commerce, contract, and governments function in the abstract realm in which the real being cannot enter, and needs a dummy, i.e. “straw man,” that can be the conduit for the flow of energy, goods, and services, back and forth between the world of commerce and the real being. Likewise, the straw man cannot enter the world of reality, which is an inaccessible domain for imaginary entities. Reality and abstraction are two different “meta-levels” re each other, just as are the waking and dreaming states of awareness. One cannot, as it were, kill the tiger of the waking state with the gun of the dream state. Further yet, as an imaginary concoction in abstraction, the straw man can neither think, nor act, nor even sign its name.

Therefore, the secret of the system is this: So long as the rebuttable presumption of contractual bondage is not eliminated from the equation by non-rebuttal rebutting, every time someone signs his name he is signing as a surety, accommodation party, and guarantor for the straw man, and is therefore guaranteeing that he will:

1. Pay whatever debts the straw man, i.e. “Debtor,” incurs;
2. Bind the Debtor contractually and will answer on behalf of the Debtor for whatever charges are leveled against the Debtor, both criminal and civil.

It is therefore of utmost importance that a *bona fide* contract be established on the record, in a manner that the system recognizes as the ultimate forum for notice of such contracts, expressly proclaiming *inter alia*, that under no circumstances is the real being a surety for the Debtor, nor an accommodation party, and therefore is not liable for any debts incurred by, nor for any charges leveled against, the Debtor.

When such a contract is executed, it is a genuine, express contract that is enforceable law. It fulfills all of the criteria of contract law for such a valid contract, unlike the phony presumption of contract on the basis of which the system otherwise functions and on the basis of which over six (6) billion people on this planet are slaves and chattel property. By recording this contract in the proper public forum one establishes on the record for public notice that the Debtor is the property of, and all of the property of the Debtor is pledge as the assets for collateralizing the contract with, the real being. This forum, of course, is the UCC Department, in the office of each Secretary of State. In UCC terminology, the real being in this equation is called the “Secured Party,” and the contract of obligation and indebtedness of the Debtor in favor of the Secured Party is called a

"Financing Statement." The particulars of the Financing Statement are delineated in another contract by and between the Debtor and Secured Party called a "Security Agreement," in which every conceivable item of property that the Debtor now owns and might ever acquire is pledged as an asset for collateralizing the Debtor's obligation in favor of the Secured Party.

At this point both the Debtor, and the Debtor's property, have been wrested away from being the presumed property and fair poaching preserve of the system and placed securely, by private contract, into the domain of the Secured Party. The Secured Party, as a real being, is not, as the Debtor is presumed by the system (unless one files a properly executed Financing Statement) as being:

1. The property of the Government;
2. Fair game for assuming and becoming obligated for fulfilling all of the debts the Government might pile on the Debtor, as well as answering for all of the charges the Government might level against the Debtor.
3. An abstract, corporate entity functioning in commerce in limited liability.[14][6]

The UCC Department, therefore, is the proper forum, and in the United States the supreme forum, for establishing on the record the private contractual relationship between the Secured Party and the Debtor. Such a UCC filing constitutes public record of private contract. The strength, power, validity, and teeth of this situation is not the UCC recordation *per se*. A UCC office is merely a convenient forum for filing Financing Statements, constituting a central location whereby anyone interested in doing business with the Debtor may determine what prior claims exist against that Debtor, i.e. who might have a prior claim and be "first in time and first in line." The reality of the matter is what is recorded, not the place of recordation, and this reality is the private contract between the Debtor and Secured Party.

The Constitution, at Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 prohibits any state from passing any law impairing the obligation of contracts. This issue, i.e. "impairing the obligation of contracts," is allegedly the most adjudicated of all issues in the Supreme Court. Why? Because all law is contract, and contract is above the Constitution. Indeed, the Constitution has validity only insofar as a *bona fide*, binding contract exists involving the Constitution.

The key, therefore, is the creation of a clear, complete, and ironclad set of contracts between the Debtor and Secured Party. When this is done, the contract cannot be "impaired," i.e. intruded upon, revised, negated, and otherwise influenced, by third parties. Such a contract is thus inviolable and entirely outside the judicial system. Since the entire government and legal system constitute third parties re the private contract by and between the Debtor and Secured Party, those in the system are in their domain doing their business (all win/lose rip-off games), and you are in your domain minding your business (which hopefully is only win/win transactions). Presumption of an amalgamation between you and the system is eliminated, and one may live free of the judicial system and invoke non-judicial remedies for intrusion and trespass by any agents of Government.

The whole judicial system is thus a vast, off-point, system of domination and usurpation that deals with the oblivious masses who have not properly protected themselves by filing Financing Statements founded on and consisting of private contracts outside the legal system. All such people, i.e. the vast majority of the populace, have not rebutted, have not asserted their rights, and thereby automatically have "Left the field of battle and lost by default." If one is not properly established as being outside the legal system by properly executed and filed commercial paperwork, i.e. private contracts, one is automatically within the legal system and has entered through the door of Dante's *Inferno* that says, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

We have stated that a citizen of the United States is devoid of standing in law and possesses no

capacity for contracting. How, then, can the Debtor contract with the Secured Party? The answer is founded upon the following principles:

1. No *bona fide*, conscionable contract ever existed by and between the Secured Party and the Government in the first place, based on the absence of such essentials of contract law as genuine agreement, true meeting of the minds, free consent, full disclosure, and the other criteria that are essential for the existence of a valid contract. The Government functions only an unrebutted presumption of contract, i.e. based on "let's pretend," coupled with such maxims of law and commerce as: "He who fails to assert his rights has none"; "A matter must be expressed to be resolved"; "He who leaves the field of battle first loses by default."

By not speaking your mind by drafting an express contract by and between yourself and your all-caps name, you "fail to assert your rights" and "lose by default." The practical consequence of this failure is that because you have not asserted it, your position is not on the table and therefore cannot be dealt with. Moreover, neither any judge, nor any Government agent, nor any other third party in existence, can speak for you and assert your rights and position if you do not. They could do so even if they so wished, and it is self-evident that they possess no such desire. Their desire is for gaining unjust enrichment in commerce at your expense by piling on debts and charges against your all-caps name and sending you the bills and summons for answering them. You must foreclose them from exercising this option by wresting the Debtor from the domain of presumed Government ownership and establishing your straw man in the realm of clear and solid ownership by you, re all of the Debtor's property pledged as collateral securing the Debtor's obligation to the Secured Party. This is accomplished by executing a properly drafted Financing Statement, supported by ironclad private contracts, and letting everyone in the system know of the result by filing it in the UCC Department.

Law is a two-way street, a double-edged sword. It flows and cuts both ways. If the Government regards the real being as possessing the capacity and right whereby that being can sign for the Debtor in a manner that forfeits the real being's rights, by the same token that being retains the right for entering into a contract that secures the real being's right, in essence stating:

"Excuse me, Government, but if I have the right to sign blindly for the Debtor in an open-ended manner that is a one-way street from which my life, substance, rights, and labor flow out of me—at my expense and diminishment—for your benefit, by the same token I have the equivalent right of signing for the Debtor as an authorized representative—not a surety and not an accommodation party—in a contract whereby I have paramount claim on the Debtor and all of the Debtor's property is contractually pledged as collateral for the purpose of securing the Debtor's obligation that is due me for my service of acting as the Debtor's basis of a pre-existing claim and being the living being who is authorized for signing on behalf of the Debtor.

"If, and to the extent, that the assemblage of all-capital letters you have created that might appear as possessing similarity with my true name, has nothing to do with me, i.e. is not loaded with any presumptions of obligating me, then no nexus exists between me and that all-caps name. If that all-caps name is not intended as involving me in any way, then I don't care what you do with it. To the extent, however, that the all-caps name is presumed as bearing on me in some manner I possess the exclusive right of stating otherwise and defining what, if any, relationship exists between myself and that all-caps name. Why is this so? Because I alone am the one that would be expected to be the surety for that name, not any of you third parties."

Many times Redemption-type filings are rejected on the basis that the Secured Party and the Debtor are the same person. This is of course not true, and is self-evident by virtue of the fact

that the Debtor's name is in all-capital letters while the name of the Secured Party is in upper- and lower-case letters, and also that the Debtor—not being a living, sentient being—cannot sign for himself while the Secured Party, being real and not abstract in nature, cannot function as a transmitting utility in the world of commerce where everything is contract between abstract legal persons of various kinds.^{[15][7]}

Since explaining these matters is usually futile when engaging in the actual process of getting your paperwork filed in the State UCC Department, as well as in the office of a county recorder, various strategies may be required. Some of these include:

1. Cross-file with others, e.g. friends, family members, etc., and then do a UCC-3 amendment switching Secured Parties so that each Secured Party is matched with his own all-caps name as Debtor.
2. If real estate is involved, file a simple UCC-1, with no attachments, in the office of the county recorder and then send a "true and accurate copy by document custodian" of the certified, true copy of the filing that you obtain from the county recorder to the State, where, because it is already filed with the county recorder, filing in the State is mandatory.

The bottom line of this entire matter is that by means of knowing and utilizing the law, fundamentally contract law and the Commercial Maxims, one can not only live outside the legal, judicial, court system but also activate non-judicial remedy, such as "strict foreclosure," against violators of your rights (police, judges, agents, and the like) without involving—and thereby being at the mercy of—the very legal/judicial/governmental system from which one would be free.

All of this is accomplished by understanding and acting upon the fundamental principles involved. Once again, Emerson was correct when he wrote:

Nothing brings peace at last but triumph of principles.

Footnotes:

[1][1] All wars of the 20th Century, in fact the last 100 years or so, are the result of the losing country's not having had an articles of agreement with the International Bankers. Phrased another way, before a war the country that was the eventual loser of the war did not have such agreement and after the country was defeated, it did.

[2][2] It is self-evident that if people restricted all of their interactions with others to win/win games, peace and harmony would reign and not even an excuse for governments could exist.

[3][1] I Ching, Wilhelm/Baynes, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1969, p. 232.

[4][2] Maharishi Mahesh Yogi on The Bhagavad-Gita, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1969, p. 191.

[5][3] Lao-tzu, op. cit., Aphorism 8.

[6][4] Certification of an affidavit, i.e. "third party witness," has been universally necessary from inception, probably for thousands of years. The process began with someone who

personally knew an affiant, affirming that the name of an affiant was truly his and not that of an imposter. This was to prevent fraud and forgery that would occur if someone other than the one whose name was being signed was actually signing the affidavit.

[7][5] Attorneys, and those in the system, do not swear true, correct, and complete that everything they state is "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." Rather, they "declare under penalty of perjury true and correct." By such means attorneys and officials have self-granted authority for committing perjury by omission, i.e. uttering off-point irrelevancies that may be deemed fictitious. Their intent is to trick, deceive, and intimidate people into traversing, i.e. joining issue with the fiction, and thereby leaving their ground of truth, sovereignty, and relevance and entering into the colorable, make-believe world of the legal system where "anything goes" and the owners of the private law can "make it up as they go." The lives and destinies of the people are attached to this scenario.

[8][6] Remember that the system can deal only with abstract persons, e.g. your all-caps name, so if no one can go against your all-caps name they cannot reach you.

[9][1] There are basically only four (4) categories of legal persons; all the rest are variations on a theme of these. These legal persons are 1) corporations, 2) partnerships, 3) sole proprietorships, and 4) trusts. The IRS Code at 7701(a)(2) lists seven (7), the additional three (3) being 5) estate, 6) association, and 7) company.

[10][2] What is not well known is that Lewis Carroll wrote Alice In Wonderland as a satire on the legal system.

[11][3] The entire governmental, legal, court system today is colorable, i.e. "phony." It is a domain of make believe, much like children's games. In grade school, for instance, a group of children might decide to spend their lunch recess playing such games as "cops and robbers," or "cowboys and Indians." Such a scenario is characterized by fake shootings and feigned deaths, together with arguments such as "Gotcha," "No, you missed," and other imaginary disputes. The point is that once you agree to play the game by joining in the let's pretend, you have left the real world and cannot invoke the rights and truth that obtain there. The point of the UCC process is for staying out of the make-believe game. It is like sitting on the sideline and saying, "Thanks anyway, guys, but I don't feel like playing today. Mom fixed a great lunch and I think I'll just sit this one out. Have fun."

[12][4] Never assume, especially when interacting in any manner with the Government. To "assume" makes an "ass" out of "u" and "me." Assuming that an interaction with the Government—a colossal win/lose Beast—is bona fide and undertaken in good faith is delusion. If one would assume, better one assume that the entirety of the system and all its interactions with people are for increasing the scope of governmental power, control, plunder, and enslavement at the expense of the people. Place the burden of proving good faith on the Government; never assume that such good faith already exists or that anything in the system's Alice-in-Wonderland world of make-believe is as it appears.

[13][5] By being placed in the jurisdiction of the colorable law of the 14th Amendment, the blacks became "colored." This term has nothing to do with skin pigmentation, only legal characterization.

[14][6] The Secured Party is, in fact, an unlimited-liability being, and therefore outside the domain of accessibility of the courts, government agencies, and legal system, all of which are contractually confined within the domain of corporate limited liability, and must be insured and bonded. In accordance with the 9th Commercial Maxim, "Sacrifice is the measure of credibility," whoever risks the most establishes the greatest credibility. The

Secured Party is thereby paramount over the entire third-party, limited-liability domain of laws, governments, and courts.

[15][7] The Secured Party and Debtor are no more the same person than one's real self and one's reflection in a mirror. If the Government is presumed as owning the Debtor, and thereby possessing carte blanche capacity for doing as it wishes with its property, the mirror is a greatly distorted one re the genuine nature of the real being, much like warped and wavy carnival mirrors. Furthermore, the situation itself is warped inasmuch as a condition now exists by which the reflection is presumed as the dominating entity, whereby the endlessly changing and distorted image of the Debtor is re-imposed by force of law back onto the real being who is therefore perpetually "bent out of shape."

This scenario is reminiscent of an old joke concerning a man who desired a new suit but could not afford one of his choosing, and went into a discount store. There was a suit of exquisite material, but improperly made. One sleeve was considerably shorter than the other, while likewise the pant's legs were of different lengths. Other irregularities also existed. When he tried it on it did not fit and looked terrible.

A clerk, however, pointed out that if he hunched up one shoulder, twisted his body, and leaned sideways the irregularities were compensated for. The man bought the suit and walked out dressed in it. As he was walking down the sidewalk in his highly distorted posture two ladies pass by the other way. One says, "My, look at that poor, deformed man. What a shame he is so contorted."

"Yes," replied the other lady, "but don't his clothes fit him beautifully?"

[|| Home](#) | [Current Updates](#) | [The U.S. Constitution](#) | [The Shadow Government a.k.a. the Illuminati](#) | [Secret Societies](#) | [The New World Order](#) | [Occultism](#) | [Banking & Paper Money](#) | [Politics](#) | [Business](#) | [Technology](#) | [Media Control](#) | [Government & Mind Control](#) | [Microchipping](#) | [Drugs](#) | [Nazism Today & In The Past](#) | [The War on Terrorism](#) | [Religions & Religious Wars](#) | [Wars Towards a New World Order](#) | [U.S. Patents to Control Us](#) | [Surveillance](#) | [Health](#) | [Miscellaneous](#) | [E-Books for Free](#) | [Links to Other Websites](#) | [Copyright Fair Use](#) | [E-Mail Us](#) ||

December 14, 2003