

# **LEGAL NOTICE OF CHANGE IN DOMICILE/CITIZENSHIP RECORDS AND DIVORCE FROM THE “UNITED STATES” FORM INSTRUCTIONS**

Last revised: 02/25/12

## **1. PURPOSE:**

- 1.1. To allow people to legally, politically, and commercially completely divorce the state and government they were born in under the civil law without expatriating or abandoning their nationality and becoming an alien on every country on earth.
- 1.2. To facilitate becoming a sovereign individual immune from the jurisdiction of state and federal courts in your state.
- 1.3. To become a “nontaxpayer” not subject to any part of the Internal Revenue Code.
- 1.4. To become a “de facto stateless person” without giving up one’s nationality. This condition is described in the Social Security Program Operations Manual System (POMS), Section

[RS 02640.040 Stateless Persons](#)

### **A. DEFINITIONS**

*There are two classes of stateless persons:*

- **DE JURE**—Persons who do not have nationality in any country.
- **DE FACTO**—Persons who have left the country of which they were nationals and no longer enjoy its protection and assistance. They are usually political refugees. They are legally citizens [really they mean NATIONALS, not statutory CITIZENS] of a country because its laws do not permit denaturalization or only permit it with the country's approval.

### **B. POLICY**

#### **1. De Jure Status**

*Once it is established that a person is de jure stateless, he/she keeps this status until he/she acquires nationality in some country.*

*Any of the following establish an individual is de jure stateless:*

- a. a “travel document” issued by the individual's country of residence showing the:
  - holder is stateless; and
  - document is issued under the United Nations Convention of 28 September 1954 Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons. (The document shows the phrase “Convention of 28 September 1954” on the cover and sometimes on each page.)
- b. a “travel document” issued by the International Refugee Organization showing the person is stateless.
- c. a document issued by the officials of the country of former citizenship showing the individual has been deprived of citizenship in that country.

#### **2. De Facto Status**

*Assume an individual is de facto stateless if he/she:*

- a. says he/she is stateless but cannot establish he/she is de jure stateless; and
- b. establishes that:
  - he/she has taken up residence outside the country of his/her nationality;
  - there has been an event which is hostile to him/her, such as a sudden or radical change in the government, in the country of nationality; and  
**NOTE:** In determining whether an event was hostile to the individual, it is sufficient to show the individual had reason to believe it would be hostile to him/her.
  - he/she renounces, in a sworn statement, the protection and assistance of the government of the country of which he/she is a national and declares he/she is stateless. The statement must be sworn to before an individual legally authorized to administer oaths and the original statement must be submitted to SSA.

*De facto status stays in effect only as long as the conditions in b. continue to exist. If, for example, the individual returns [changes his/her domicile, NOT physically returns] to his/her country of nationality, de facto statelessness ends.*

[SOURCE: Social Security POMS Manual, Section RS 0024640.040

<https://s044a90.ssa.gov/apps10/poms.nsf/lnx/0302640040>]

## 2. **INTENDED AUDIENCE:**

Those born anywhere in the American Union, including states of the Union, federal territories, and U.S. possessions but who are PRESENTLY domiciled either abroad or within constitutional but not statutory states of the Union at the time they send in the document.

**NOTE:** If you have questions about whether you are eligible to use this document, please read the following document in its entirety in an effort to understand citizenship well enough to answer your question by yourself BEFORE contacting us for help. This is an important part of exercising your due diligence as a sovereign:

*Why You are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen*, Form #05.006

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/MemLaw/WhyANational.pdf>

FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

## 3. **REASON WHY THIS DOCUMENT IS NECESSARY:**

3.1. It is extremely important to build a complete administrative record documenting your status and intentions relating to the government to prevent injurious presumptions that financially benefit them and violate the law. This document is one of the first steps in doing that. See:

*Techniques for Building a Good Administrative Record*, Form #09.008

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3.2. If you DON'T submit this document, then it will be very difficult later in a court setting to get this kind of evidence in the record. This is because a corrupted government and corrupt judges frequently will abuse the rules of evidence to prejudice your case because they lose jurisdiction when this kind of information used against them in a civil proceeding.

3.3. There is no form or procedure published by any government agency or website that accomplishes what this document accomplishes. The government doesn't want you to know you can do this, but you have a legal right to.

3.4. We have found no form available from any private organization or individual that accomplishes what this form accomplishes. The evidence and facts contained in this Legal Notice protect and preserve your Constitutional and religious Rights in a way that no other approach we are aware of can.

3.5. People and organizations who offer similar techniques for civilly divorcing the state typically do so incorrectly and in a way that unnecessarily undermines the rights of the party, using expatriation. Expatriation is defined as "the process of abandoning nationality and allegiance". Expatriation is completely unnecessary to do in order to become a "transient foreigner" or "stateless person" immune from the civil jurisdiction of courts in your state. Domicile, not citizenship, is where nearly all of the government's civil jurisdiction originates from. An example of a group that incorrectly asserts that "expatriation" is necessary is the Minnesota Common Law Court. If you don't understand the significance of domicile, see:

*Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent*, Form 05.002

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

## 4. **GETTING YOUR SUBMISSION INTO THE PUBLIC RECORD AND PROTECTING YOUR EVIDENCE**

4.1. Apostille of documents: If you want to apostille your document with the secretary of state of your state, you must file an original and not a copy and include the correct fee. Fees vary depending on the state, so you will need to visit the secretary of state's website to find out the correct fee. Keep the following in mind:

4.1.1. The thing to be apostilled is the Certificate of Service for this document and NOT the entire document because the Secretary of State typically charges an exorbitant amount by the page to apostille the entire document.

4.1.2. Both federal and state Secretaries of State can apostille documents.

4.1.3. For details on apostille of documents, read our document on apostilles so you can find out how it works:

*Apostille of Documents*, Form #09.004

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4.1.4. To find the secretary of state websites for each state, visit:

<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/LegalRef/StateLegalResources.htm>

4.2. On some occasions, secretary of states have been known to try to interfere with the apostille process because this document is too damning for them. Hence, they may not even acknowledge receipt of your submission and not return the original you sent them for apostille. For this reason, we recommend making FOUR originals:

- 4.2.1. Keep one.
- 4.2.2. One for backup.
- 4.2.3. Send one to the Secretary of state of your state.
- 4.2.4. Send one to the Secretary of state of the United States.
- 4.3. This document also incorporates in section 0 a request to have the document apostilled. This process makes the document the highest form of legal evidence available. This is important as a way to obtain legally admissible evidence of your civil legal status that you can use and admit in any court of law as evidence as a public record. If the Secretary of State of the United States or of your State do not honor the request in section 0 and refuse to apostille the document, you wish to try again using the following procedure:
  - 4.3.1. Make two more copies of the package.
  - 4.3.2. Read our document on apostilles so you can find out how it works:  
[Apostille of Documents, Form #09.004](http://sedm.org/Documents/Form#09.004)  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
  - 4.3.3. Write a short cover letter explaining what you want.
  - 4.3.4. Mail the original to the Secretary of State of your state asking them to apostille the document and return one of the documents to you promptly. Usually, the Secretary of State will only apostille originals and not copies.

**WARNING:** Some of our readers have reported that the Secretary of State of their State has received communication from the Secretary of the State of the United State instructing them NOT to apostille this document. They are doing this because this document is very effective at accomplishing the purposes it was intended for and the government wants to avoid the severe adverse consequences to them of handing you this key to your chains as one of their indentured slaves. For such a case, please communicate to us as much evidence as you can obtain of the government's efforts to interfere with developing evidence of your status and citizenship by doing a FOIA for a copy of the communication received by the Secretary of State of your State and then either faxing it to us or preferably PDFing it and emailing it to us so we can use this as evidence of violation of rights by the government. Thanks!

- 4.4. Keep the original in a safe place locked up, preferably away from your house so that it may not be seized. Also, scan it in as a full color PDF and make backups you keep in several locations. One of the first things a judge will do if you want the document admitted as evidence in a legal trial is ask about the chain of custody of the document and whether it has remained under your own control at all times so that there is an assurance that it is a reliable source of evidence.

## 5. **PROCEDURE FOR USE:**

- 5.1. This form has the effect of creating dual citizenship: 1. In the country and Republic of your birth; 2. In Heaven. It also makes one of the two citizenships subordinate to the other. You may therefore benefit from reading the dual citizenship questions and answers found on the internet at the address below:  
<http://www.richw.org/dualcit/>
- 5.2. Form #10.001 consists of a Certificate of Service, a cover letter, two self-contained enclosures and the title-pages for five other enclosures obtained from external sources. The cover letter with its seven enclosures is a rather large set of documents (348 pages total as of October 2011). Therefore it is recommended that the cover letter and its enclosures be bounded together into a book using what is sometimes called a "19-hole punched plastic comb binder". Use a heavy clear plastic front cover and a heavy solid color plastic rear cover for your books to help prevent damage to any of the pages. You will want the Certificate of Service to be a stand-alone document, not bound with the cover letter and enclosures, for ease of authenticating the Certificate of Service in the form of an apostille. The goal of the below detailed steps is to generate 2 originals and 4 copies of the book as well as 6 originals of the Certificate of Service. While you are assembling your books, before binding them, consider keeping the contents of each book in its own separate envelope/folder to keep the pages sorted in the right order and to prevent losing or mixing up the pages between the books.
- 5.3. The documents will be distributed to the below listed people as follows:
  - 5.3.1. **Submitter:** the 2 original books and 2 Certificate of Services. Keep 1 book and certificate in a save place and keep the other book and certificate in another safe place at some other address.
  - 5.3.2. **U.S. Secretary of State:** 1 copied book and 2 Certificate of Services. The Secretary of State is to authenticate the Certificate of Services. One authenticated Certificate of Service is to be filed by the Secretary of State and the other is to be returned to you.
  - 5.3.3. **U.S. Attorney General:** 1 copied book
  - 5.3.4. **Secretary of State of your state:** 1 copied book and 2 Certificate of Services. The Secretary of State is to authenticate the Certificate of Services. One authenticated Certificate of Service is to be filed by the Secretary of State and the other is to be returned to you.

- 5.3.5. **Attorney General of your state:** 1 copied book
- 5.4. The cost of this process is as follows:
  - 5.4.1. Six notarizations. At \$10/notarization that is \$60.
  - 5.4.2. Four registered mailings. Typically, these cost about \$10 for a total of \$40.
  - 5.4.3. About 350 pages times 5 photocopies, or 1750 pages. At 5 cents per page, that works out to \$87.
  - 5.4.4. A twenty dollar tip each to the mail server and the notary respectively for a total of \$40.
  - 5.4.5. Total cost: \$227. Well worth the effort and time to regain your freedom.
- 5.5. Start the process by gathering all the needed information
  - 5.5.1. Name of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General for the United States
  - 5.5.2. Name and address of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General for your state
  - 5.5.3. You can find the names and addresses of the addressee from the below listed resources:
    - 5.5.3.1. *SEDM Jurisdictions Database*, Litigation Tool # 10.010, <http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>.
    - 5.5.3.2. *State Legal Resources*, <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/LegalRef/StateLegalResources.htm>
  - 5.5.4. The fee to apostille a document by the Secretary of State of your state.
  - 5.5.5. The fee to apostille a document by the Secretary of State of the United States.
- 5.6. Gather all the materials that you will need in addition to Form #10.001, which are the external enclosures and Certified mail slips, envelopes, and money order checks. Some of the enclosures for Form #10.001 are self-contained within the form while others must be obtained from external sources.
  - 5.6.1. Enclosure 1: a certified copy of your birth certificate from the county recorder where you were born. You will need two of these. You can obtain this document from the following link: <http://www.vitalchek.com/>
  - 5.6.2. Enclosure 3: *Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status*, Form #02.001 at: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
  - 5.6.3. Enclosure 5: A copy of your last passport, if you have one.
  - 5.6.4. Enclosure 6: *Why you are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen*, Form #05.006 at: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
  - 5.6.5. Enclosure 7: *USA Passport Application Attachment*, Form #06.007 at: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
  - 5.6.6. Four Certified Mail slips from a U.S. Postal Office
  - 5.6.7. Four 10" x 13" high strength bubble postal envelopes.
  - 5.6.8. Two money order checks: one to cover the apostille fees for two documents from the Secretary of State of United States, and one to cover the apostille fees for two documents from the Secretary of State of your state.
- 5.7. Build your master set of documents. The master set of documents will be used to make all needed copies and will also serve as one of your original set of documents.
  - 5.7.1. The form is electronically fillable with the free Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available at the link below. Please download and install the latest version of the program. <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep2.html>
  - 5.7.2. If you have the full version of Acrobat instead of the free Reader, you can also save copies of the form containing all the values you typed in each field.
  - 5.7.3. Electronically fill out Enclosure 3 as directed in its instructions
  - 5.7.4. Electronically fill out page 1 of Form #10.001 (from top to bottom)
    - 5.7.4.1. At the top right corner fill in your name, your mailing address, followed by today's date
    - 5.7.4.2. Fill in the name of the Secretary of State of the United States
    - 5.7.4.3. Fill in the name of the Attorney General of the United States
    - 5.7.4.4. Fill in the name and address for the Secretary of State for your state
    - 5.7.4.5. Fill in the name and address for the Attorney General for your state
  - 5.7.5. Print a set of documents
    - 5.7.5.1. To save paper, print all documents using double sided paper.
    - 5.7.5.2. Print Form #10.001 – Form #10.001 contains several documents. To ensure that each documents starts on the front side of a page, print out the following sections separately: Certificate of Service, Cover Letter, Enclosure 1 title-page, Enclosure 2, Enclosure 3 title-page, Enclosure 4, and the title-pages for enclosures 5, 6, and 7.
    - 5.7.5.3. Print out Forms # 02.001, 05.006, and 06.007
  - 5.7.6. Remove the instruction sections from the enclosure print-outs.
  - 5.7.7. Print by hand your name at Section 12 (Affirmation section) of the Cover Letter.
  - 5.7.8. Fill in each of the four Certified Mail slips with an addressee and address from the page 1 of the Cover Letter.

- 5.7.9. Fill in by hand the Certified Mail numbers on page 1 of the Cover Letter and on the Certificate of Service. Be certain to match the same number to the same addressee as shown on the Certified Mail slips.
- 5.7.10. Fill in by hand item 1 of the Certificate of Service with the correct total number of pages for each listed document, the correct number of listed documents and the correct number of total pages for all of the listed documents combined. Also fill in item 2 of the Certificate of Service with the addresses of the addressees as shown on page 1 of the Cover Letter.
- 5.7.11. Fill in by hand all other fields on the Certificate of Service that are known at this time. The reasons for you yourself doing this rather than the Mail Server are to minimize the risk of errors being made by the Mail Server and to simplify the efforts of the Mail Server, making it easier for you to find a person willing to act as your Mail Server. Potentially, you could fill in all fields except for the name of Mail Server, the name of the city, the date, and the method documents will be mailed.
- 5.7.12. Page 2 of the Affidavit of Oath of Allegiance – fill in by hand the address of a federal territory near you (a post office or federal building) where you enunciated your oath.
- 5.7.13. Write by hand “ENCLOSURE 3” at the bottom right corner of every page to Form #02.001.
- 5.7.14. Write by hand “ENCLOSURE 5” at the bottom right corner of your passport photocopy.
- 5.7.15. At the bottom right corner of the first few pages to Form #05.006, line out the word “EXHIBIT” and write “ENCLOSURE 6”
- 5.7.16. Write by hand “ENCLOSURE 7” at the bottom right corner of every page to Form #06.007
- 5.7.17. Assemble your master book - Gather the following documents in the order listed: Cover Letter, enclosure 1 title-page, Enclosure 2, title-page and enclosure for Enclosure 3, Enclosure 4, title-page and enclosure for Enclosures 5, 6, and 7.
- 5.8. Make another original book by photocopying your master book one time using 2-sided paper. Your master book will also serve as one of your original books, giving you a total of two original books.
- 5.9. On the bottom right corner of your two Birth Certificates, write “ENCLOSURE 1”. Insert one of the certificates immediately following the enclosure 1 title-page for both your master book and your original book.
- 5.10. Make another five original Certificate of Services by photocopying your master Certificate of Service five times using 2-sided paper. Your master Certificate of Service will also serve as one of your original certificate of Services, giving you a total of six original Certificate of Services.
- 5.11. Pre-address the four envelopes with the addressees and addresses from page 1 of the cover letter.
- 5.12. Sign, date and notarize documents for both the master book and the original book.
- 5.12.1. Find a Postal Annex or Mailboxes etc. or other business services provider that has two people on duty, one of which is a notary and the other which would be willing to act your Mail Server. The Mail Server will complete the Certificate of Service form and then mail out all documents in accordance to that described in the Certificate of Service. Alternatively, you can search for a Mail Server from the people that you know and use a bank as your Notary Public. Banks will typically be cheaper than a business service provider. Also, finding someone that you know to act as your Mail Server will probably be easier than finding a business service provider that can provide both a Public Notary and a Mail Server.
- 5.12.2. Sign, date, and print your name on the Affirmation section of Enclosure 7
- 5.12.3. In the presence of a Notary Public, in blue ink (not black ink), sign and date the Signature Section (section 6) of Enclosure 3 and have the form notarized
- 5.12.4. In the presence of a Notary Public and Mail Server, in blue ink (not black ink), sign the Affirmation section of the Cover Letter and then have the notary notarize your identity in the space provided below your signature
- 5.12.5. Have the Mail Server sign and date under “Signature of witness” in the Affirmation section of the Cover Letter.
- 5.13. Make the documents for your four copied books - photocopy your master book four times using 2-sided paper.
- 5.14. Bind all six books as described above. You keep the master and original books
- 5.15. Prepare the six Certificates of Services
- 5.15.1. Have your Mail Server fill out the remaining fields on the Certificate of Services.
- 5.15.2. Have the Notary Public fill out the Notary Public Jurat at the end of the Certificate of Services, which authenticates the identity of the Mail Server.
- 5.15.3. You keep two of the original Certificate of Services
- 5.16. Mail the documents
- 5.16.1. Have the Mail Server place the documents into the four envelopes as follows:
- 5.16.1.1. One copied book (with money order attached) and TWO original Certificate of Services in the envelope going to the Secretary of State of the United States.
- 5.16.1.2. One copied book in the envelope going to the Attorney General of the United States.



- 5.16.1.3. One copied book (with money order attached) and TWO original Certificate of Services in the envelope going to the Secretary of State of your state
- 5.16.1.4. One copied book in the envelope going to the Attorney General of your state.
- 5.16.2. Accompany the Mail Server to your local post office
- 5.16.3. Give the Mail Server the four Certified Mail slips that you previously filled out.
- 5.16.4. Have the Mail Server mail the documents, certified mail
- 5.16.5. Take possession of the stamped Certified Mail receipts after the documents are mailed.
- 5.17. Wait until the apostilled Certificate of Services comes back from the Secretary of State of your state and the Secretary of State of the United States. When they do arrive, you might want record one of the apostilled Certificate of Services with your County Recorder so that it becomes a public record which is automatically admissible as evidence in any court trial. The reason is that under [Federal Rule of Evidence 902](#), public records are not subject to the Hearsay Rule.
- 5.18. If by chance you do not receive an apostilled Certificate of Service from the Secretary of State of the United States or the Secretary of State of your state, then you will want to take action yourself to authenticate the two original Certificate of Services in your possession as describe in section 4 above. Some states offer document authentication services on a walk-in basis. If your state is one of them, consider using the service on a walk-in basis. Advantages of services on walk-in versus mail-in basis are: You never lose sight of the documents and you are more likely to get full cooperation.
- 5.19. We always want to improve the quality of the information we offer on our website and feedback helps with that improvement. If you receive a negative or derogatory response from the government to this form, we would appreciate if you would fax the response to the fax number on our Contact Us page.

<http://sedm.org/khxc/index.php?app=ccp0&ns=contact>

## 6. **FURTHER READING AND RESEARCH:**

The following documents will help you preserve the sovereignty established or re-established by this document:

- 6.1. *Developing Evidence of Citizenship and Sovereignty Course*, Form #12.002-describes the process for restoring the sovereignty you unknowingly surrendered by misrepresenting your status on government forms, of which this form is a part.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.2. *Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status*, Form #02.001-use this form to describe your citizenship and tax status to all financial institutions, government, and private employers after you send this in.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.3. *How to Apply for a Passport as a "non-citizen national"*, Form #09.007:  
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Citizenship/ApplyingForAPassport.htm>
- 6.4. *USA Passport Application Attachment*, Form #06.007. Use this attachment to protect your sovereign status when applying for a U.S.A. passport.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.5. *Voter Registration Attachment*, Form #06.003. Attach to voter registration to prevent waiver of sovereign immunity.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.6. *Jury Summons Response Attachment*, Form #06.015  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.7. *Tax Form Attachment*, Form #04.201: Use this form whenever you submit a tax form to prevent compromising the legal status established by this document.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.8. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Instructions, Step 3.13: Correct government records documenting your citizenship status:  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Instructions/3.13ChangeUSCitizenshipStatus.htm>
- 6.9. *Federal Enforcement Authority within States of the Union*, Form #05.032. Proves that the federal government has no enforcement authority in states of the Union over anyone other than government entities and instrumentalities.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.10. *About SSNs/TINs on Government Forms and Correspondence*, Form #05.012. Free memorandum of law that explains the nuances of using SSNs and TINs on government forms and correspondence.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.11. *Citizenship and Sovereignty Course*, Form #12.001:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.12. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004: How to become sovereign.  
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr.htm>

- 6.13. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Manual*, Form #10.005. Free Adobe Acrobat ebook on how to become sovereign.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.14. *Laws of the Bible*, Form #13.001. Memorandum of law that details all the laws that you are now exclusively and only subject to after sending in this document.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.15. *Wrong Party Notice*, Form #07.002. Free form you can use if the government tries to address you using the Social Security Number after you have ended compelled participation in the system.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 6.16. *Social Security: Mark of the Beast*, Form #11.407. Free electronic book containing detailed legal research into Social Security. Available from:  
<http://famguardian.org/Publications/SocialSecurity/TOC.htm>
- 6.17. *Socialism: The New American Civil Religion*, Form #05.016. Free electronic book about how socialism is taking over the American body politic in fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. Available from:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Republic of \_\_\_\_\_)  
Subscribed and Affirmed \_\_\_\_\_)  
County of \_\_\_\_\_)

I, \_\_\_\_\_, the undersigned mailer/server, being of sound mind and under no duress, do hereby certify, attest and affirm that the following facts are true and correct, to wit:

1. That, at the city of \_\_\_\_\_, County of \_\_\_\_\_ and the Republic of \_\_\_\_\_ (statename), on the \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, that, on behalf of (name) \_\_\_\_\_, a natural person, the undersigned personally deposited the following documents (listed below) inside the envelope, sealed them and transmitted them via the carrier indicated in item 2 below, to wit:

Item #	Document Description	Number of pages
1	Certificate of Service	3
2	Cover Letter: Declaration of Intention to Change Domicile/Citizenship and Divorce the "United States"	109
3	Enclosure (1): Certified copy of Certificate of Naturalization by Notary or Certified Copy of Birth Certificate (certified by Notary stamp at the end of this letter)	2
4	Enclosure (2): Affidavit as Oath of Allegiance Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1452(b)(2)	7
5	Enclosure (3): Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status	
6	Enclosure (4): Declaration of Personal Independence	9
7	Enclosure (5): Copy of last U.S. passport (optional)	1
8	Enclosure (6): Why you are a "national" or "state national" and not a "U.S. Citizen"	
9	Enclosure (7): USA Passport Application Attachment	

Total of \_\_\_\_ ( ) documents with combined total of \_\_\_\_\_ (\_\_\_\_) pages.

2. That I personally mailed said document(s) via (initial those which apply):

\_\_\_\_\_ United States Postal Office, by regular mail, postage prepaid  
\_\_\_\_\_ United States Postal Office, by **Certified Mail** # \_\_\_\_\_, Return Receipt Requested  
\_\_\_\_\_ United Parcel Service (UPS), tracking number # \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ Federal Express, tracking number # \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

at said City and State, one (1) set of copied documents numbered 2 through 9 in item 1 above and two (2) original certificates of of Service (document numbered one in item 1 above), properly enveloped and addressed to (addressee and address):

1. Secretary of State; U.S. Department of State; 2201 C Street NW; Washington, DC 20520.  
Cert. Mail #: \_\_\_\_\_



2. Secretary of State; State of \_\_\_\_\_,  
Cert. Mail #: \_\_\_\_\_

and one (1) set of copied documents numbered two through nine in item 1 above, properly enveloped and addressed to (addressee and address):

1. Attorney General; U.S. Department of Justice; 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW; Washington, DC 20530-0001  
Cert. Mail #: \_\_\_\_\_

2. Attorney General; State of \_\_\_\_\_,  
Cert. Mail #: \_\_\_\_\_

3. That I am at least 18 years of age;
4. That I am not related to \_\_\_\_\_ by blood, marriage, adoption, or employment, but serve as a “disinterested third party” (herein “Server”); and further,
5. That I am in no way connected to, or involved in or with, the person and/or matter at issue in this instant action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE AND NOTARY JURAT ON NEXT PAGE

I now affix my signature to these affirmations.

(Signature): \_\_\_\_\_, Mailer/Server

(Printed name): \_\_\_\_\_

---

## NOTARY PUBLIC'S JURAT

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, a Notary Public, of the County of \_\_\_\_\_,  
Republic of \_\_\_\_\_ (statename), this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_,  
\_\_\_\_\_, the Mail Server did personally appear and was identified by (check all that  
apply):

1. ☐ Passport
2. ☐ Birth Certificate
3. ☐ Military ID
4. ☐ Driver license
5. ☐ Other

..and who, upon first being duly sworn and/or affirmed, deposes and says that the foregoing asseveration is true to the best of his/her knowledge and belief.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of \_\_\_\_\_ that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_ SEAL  
Notary Public

My Commission Expires On:

---

---

---

---

**TO:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary of State  
U.S. Department of State  
2201 C Street NW  
Washington, DC 20520.

Registered/Certified Mail #:  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney General  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Registered/Certified Mail #:  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

Registered/Certified Mail #:  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

---

Registered/Certified Mail #:  
\_\_\_\_\_

**DECLARATION OF INTENTION  
TO CHANGE DOMICILE/CITIZENSHIP,  
DIVORCE THE "UNITED STATES",  
AND CRIMINAL COMPLAINT**

**Enclosures:**

1. Certified copy of Certificate of Naturalization by Notary or Certified Copy of Birth Certificate (certified by Notary stamp at the end of this letter)
2. Affidavit as Oath of Allegiance Pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1452\(b\)\(2\)](#) .
3. Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status.
4. Declaration of Personal Independence

5. Copy of last U.S. passport (optional)
6. Why you are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen
7. USA Passport Application Attachment

#### **References:**

1. *Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent*, Form #05.002. Available from:  
DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>  
FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	2
LIST OF TABLES .....	3
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	3
1. PURPOSE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.....	17
1.1 Legal authority for sending this communication .....	19
1.2 Why you in particular received this communication .....	19
1.3 Request for correction-violation of fiduciary duty NOT to correct .....	22
1.4 Intended effect of this communication upon the government .....	23
1.5 Consequences of interfering with the filing of or government action related to this communication .....	25
2. WHAT THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT.....	26
2.1 Not an attempt to abandon Constitutional citizenship .....	28
2.2 Not an act of allegiance to a “foreign” human ruler or man-made government .....	29
2.3 Not an attempt to “simulate legal process” or threaten any person or government with violence .....	30
2.4 Not an act of expatriation or abandonment of “nationality” under 8 U.S.C. ....	31
2.5 Not an act of “expatriation” under the I.R.C. ....	32
2.6 Not connected with the “sovereign citizen movement” .....	33
2.7 Not associated with any known flawed argument advanced by the government.....	33
2.8 Not an act of “paper terrorism” .....	33
2.9 Not an attempt to promote “anarchy”, lawlessness, or violence of any kind.....	34
3. DETAILS OF CHANGE IN MY LEGAL DOMICILE/CITIZENSHIP AND PERSONAL ALLEGIANCE RECORDS .....	41
4. CONTRACTUAL AND COMMERCIAL DIVORCE FROM THE STATE AND UNITED STATES.....	51
4.1 Constraints upon my right to contract .....	51
4.2 Reservation of rights.....	54
4.3 Perpetual abandonment of all statutory “employment”, agency, or “public office” on behalf of the U.S. government or any State government .....	54
4.4 Perpetual Abandonment of all “benefits”, privileges, and “public rights” arising under Titles 26 and 42 of the United States Code .....	58
5. EFFECT ON MY CITIZENSHIP AND LEGAL STATUS .....	59
6. EFFECT ON FEDERAL JURISDICTION.....	62
7. EFFECT ON STATE JURISDICTION .....	66
8. FACTS AND PRESUMPTIONS ESTABLISHED BY THIS LEGAL NOTICE .....	69
8.1 Privacy Act Warning, License Agreement, and “Shrink Wrap” License applying to all correspondence sent to government .....	70
8.2 Penalty of Perjury and jurat statements on government forms submitted .....	70
8.3 All alleged “taxes” paid UNDER PROTEST presumptions.....	70
8.4 Presumptions Against the existence of Federal Jurisdiction in States of the Union .....	76
8.5 Federal Identifying Number Presumptions.....	79
8.6 Presumptions about Meaning of words in all correspondence to or from the government .....	81
8.6.1 Specific terms .....	81
8.6.2 Capitalization within Statutes and Regulations .....	86
8.6.3 Terms in quotation marks .....	86
8.6.4 Geographical terms.....	87
8.7 Facts about Penalties for submission of this form .....	87
8.8 Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA) Presumptions .....	90
8.9 Federal Court Litigation Presumptions.....	91

8.10	NONConsent to an extension of time to file presumptions .....	92
9.	AFFIDAVIT OF DURESS .....	92
10.	ACTIONS REQUESTED OF YOU AND YOUR RESPONSE.....	97
10.1	Secretary of State of United States and Secretary of State of a state of the Union Must Apostille both copies of this document they receive, return one copy, and record the other copy .....	97
10.2	AMEND PAST and FUTURE USA Passport applications by appending Enclosure (7).....	97
10.3	Certificate of Non-Citizen National Status Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1452 .....	97
10.4	Update NUMIDENT status with the Social Security Administration .....	99
10.5	Update all SS-5, IRS Form W-8, DOS Form I-9, and E-Verify applications on file.....	99
10.6	Update of all existing government records describing me.....	102
10.7	Removal of all information about me in all government records .....	102
10.8	Legal Requirements Imposed Upon Your Response.....	102
10.9	Significance of behaviors and responses to this correspondence .....	103
11.	CRIMINAL COMPLAINT .....	105
11.1	Request to criminally and civilly prosecute violations of law by Social Security and other government personnel .....	105
11.2	Criminal Complaint against those engaged in the Government ID Scam documented in section 9.....	105
12.	ADVANCE REBUTTAL OF GOVERNMENT LIES AND PROPAGANDA DESIGNED TO DISCREDIT THE SUBMITTER OR THIS COMMUNICATION .....	108
13.	AFFIRMATION .....	109
14.	ENCLOSURE (1): CERTIFIED COPY OF BIRTH or NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATE .....	14-1
15.	ENCLOSURE (2): AFFIDAVIT AS OATH OF ALLEGIANCE PURSUANT TO 8 U.S.C. §1452(b)(2) .....	15-1
16.	ENCLOSURE (3): AFFIDAVIT OF CITIZENSHIP, DOMICILE, AND TAX STATUS .....	16-1
17.	ENCLOSURE (4): DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INDEPENDENCE .....	17-1
18.	ENCLOSURE (5): COPY OF LAST U.S. PASSPORT .....	18-1
19.	ENCLOSURE (6): WHY YOU ARE A “NATIONAL”, “STATE NATIONAL”, AND CONSTITUTIONAL BUT NOT STATUTORY CITIZEN .....	19-1
20.	ENCLOSURE (7): USA PASSPORT APPLICATION ATTACHMENT.....	20-1

## **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Example terms.....	81
Table 2: Tabular Summary of Citizenship Status on Government Forms .....	101

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

### **Constitutional Provisions**

14th Amend., Sect. 1 .....	101
14th Amendment .....	17-2
16th Amendment .....	17-3
Article 1, Section 10.....	42, 87
Article 1, Section 2, Clause 3 .....	17-2
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 .....	60, 77
Article 1, Section 9, Clause 4 .....	17-2
Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 .....	21
Article 4, section 4 .....	17-1
Article I, Section 10 .....	17-2
Article I, Section 9, Clause 8.....	94
Article III.....	63, 82
Article III, Section 2.....	63
Bill of Rights .....	60, 69, 17-1
Const. art. 6, cl. 2 .....	40
Declaration of Independence .....	27, 34, 36, 38, 51, 60, 106, 15-6, 17-7, 17-8
Declaration of Personal Independence .....	1
Federalist Paper # 78 .....	15-4

Federalist Paper #51 .....	24
Federalist Paper #58 .....	24
Federalist Paper No. 46 .....	15-3
Federalist, No. 79 .....	17-4
Fifth Amendment .....	26, 17-4
First Amendment.....	17, 18, 25, 26, 29, 30, 41, 42, 47, 48, 50, 63, 65, 76, 89, 92, 103, 107, 15-1, 17-3
Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1 .....	32, 53, 105
Ninth and Tenth Amendment .....	39
Ninth and Tenth Amendments .....	25
Tenth Amendment.....	17-8
Thirteenth Amendment.....	26, 28, 30, 31, 42, 82, 89, 105, 17-2
Titles of Nobility Clauses .....	17-5
U.S. Constitution .....	86
U.S. Constitution Article IV, Section 2.....	87

## Statutes

1 U.S.C. §204 .....	102
12 Stat. 411.....	53
15 U.S.C. §1692g .....	90
15 U.S.C. §1692g(b) .....	90
18 U.S.C. §§1001, 1002, 1028, 1028A, 1029, 1039.....	97
18 U.S.C. §§3 and 4 .....	80
18 U.S.C. §1001 .....	26, 97
18 U.S.C. §1028(a)(7) .....	95, 106
18 U.S.C. §1028A .....	95, 106
18 U.S.C. §1030 .....	92
18 U.S.C. §112 .....	45
18 U.S.C. §1201 .....	106
18 U.S.C. §1512 .....	26
18 U.S.C. §1512(b) .....	87
18 U.S.C. §1542 .....	26, 97
18 U.S.C. §1581 .....	42, 17-1, 17-5
18 U.S.C. §1583 .....	82
18 U.S.C. §1589 .....	89
18 U.S.C. §1621 .....	26, 97
18 U.S.C. §1622 .....	26
18 U.S.C. §1951 .....	41
18 U.S.C. §1956 .....	75
18 U.S.C. §201 .....	73, 82
18 U.S.C. §208 .....	26, 57, 70, 82, 17-4
18 U.S.C. §2381 .....	25
18 U.S.C. §241 .....	26, 55
18 U.S.C. §3 .....	97
18 U.S.C. §371 .....	94
18 U.S.C. §4 .....	97
18 U.S.C. §597 .....	82
18 U.S.C. §641 .....	80
18 U.S.C. §654 .....	95, 105
18 U.S.C. §872 .....	54, 57
18 U.S.C. §911 .....	97, 105
18 U.S.C. §912 .....	21, 80, 95, 105
22 U.S.C. §2721 .....	29
26 U.S.C. §1313 .....	82
26 U.S.C. §3121(e).....	17, 99
26 U.S.C. §3401(a).....	81, 84
26 U.S.C. §3401(c ).....	83, 87
26 U.S.C. §6013(g) and (h) .....	80



26 U.S.C. §6013(g) or (h).....	56
26 U.S.C. §6020(b) .....	55
26 U.S.C. §6041 .....	54, 75
26 U.S.C. §6065 .....	40, 90
26 U.S.C. §6109 .....	79, 80
26 U.S.C. §6671(b) .....	55, 90
26 U.S.C. §6700 .....	57
26 U.S.C. §7343 .....	55
26 U.S.C. §7408(c).....	77
26 U.S.C. §7408(d) .....	95
26 U.S.C. §7434 .....	54, 75
26 U.S.C. §7491 .....	102
26 U.S.C. §7601 .....	77
26 U.S.C. §7621 .....	77
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(10).....	86
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(12)(B).....	77
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14) .....	33, 79, 82, 88
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16) .....	94
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) .....	54, 59, 75, 77, 82, 83, 84, 87, 88, 105, 17-5
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30) .....	60, 80, 84
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31) .....	81, 82, 83, 84
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(39) .....	77, 95
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) .....	77, 83, 93
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A) .....	59, 60, 80, 83, 93, 94
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B).....	46, 56, 59, 60, 80, 82, 83
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(4)(B).....	56, 80
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(5).....	84
26 U.S.C. §7701(c) ).....	84
26 U.S.C. §871 .....	79, 84, 88
26 U.S.C. §877 .....	32
26 U.S.C. §911 .....	84
26 U.S.C. Subtitles A, B, or C.....	83
28 U.S.C. §§754 and 959(a) .....	63
28 U.S.C. §1332 .....	63
28 U.S.C. §1332(c) and (d) .....	44
28 U.S.C. §1332(d) .....	45, 63
28 U.S.C. §1346, 2671-2680 .....	97
28 U.S.C. §144 .....	82, 17-4
28 U.S.C. §1603(b) .....	44
28 U.S.C. §1605(a)(2) .....	46
28 U.S.C. §1653 .....	31
28 U.S.C. §1746 .....	81, 88
28 U.S.C. §1746(1) .....	17, 70, 109
28 U.S.C. §1746(2) .....	89
28 U.S.C. §2201 .....	33
28 U.S.C. §2201(a).....	32
28 U.S.C. §297(a) and (b) .....	47
28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A) .....	15-2
28 U.S.C. §455 .....	57, 70, 82
28 U.S.C. §636(b)(2).....	92
31 U.S.C. §3113 .....	73
4 U.S.C. §§105-113.....	86
4 U.S.C. §106 .....	54, 80
4 U.S.C. §110(d) .....	86
4 U.S.C. §72.....	77, 17-5
40 U.S.C. §3112 .....	84
42 U.S.C. §1301(a)(1) .....	58
42 U.S.C. §1981 .....	105

42 U.S.C. §1994 .....	42, 82, 89, 17-5
42 U.S.C. §405(c)(2)(C)(i) .....	95, 106
42 U.S.C. §408(a)(7) .....	95
42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8) .....	105
48 U.S.C. §1612 .....	77
5 U.S.C. §5517 .....	54, 80
5 U.S.C. §552(a) .....	88
5 U.S.C. §552a(a)(2) .....	59, 83
5 U.S.C. §552a(b) .....	70, 102
50 U.S.C. §841 .....	20
53 Stat 1, Section 4 .....	102
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) .....	31, 47, 56, 59, 60, 80, 93, 99, 101, 15-2
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22) .....	62
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(B) .....	59, 101
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3) .....	94, 101
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(36) .....	15-1
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(38) .....	15-1
8 U.S.C. §1302 .....	60
8 U.S.C. §1401 .....	17, 28, 31, 32, 33, 44, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 80, 83, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 101
8 U.S.C. §1408 .....	59, 101
8 U.S.C. §1452 .....	31, 47, 62, 80, 93, 98, 99, 101
8 U.S.C. §1452(b) .....	23
8 U.S.C. §1452(b)(1) and (2) .....	97
8 U.S.C. §1452(b)(1)&(2) .....	97
8 U.S.C. §1452(b)(2) .....	1, 15-1
8 U.S.C. §1481 .....	31
8 U.S.C. §1481(a)(2) .....	29, 47
Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. §§551-559 .....	97
Administrative Procedures Act, 5 U.S.C. §556(d) .....	102
Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005 .....	21
Bretton Woods Agreement Act .....	17-4
Buck Act of 1940 .....	54
Calif.Evid.Code, §600 .....	70
California Civil Code, Section 1589 .....	76
California Revenue and Taxation Code (R&TC) sections 17018 and 6017 .....	86
California Revenue and Taxation Code, section 17018 .....	87
California Revenue and Taxation Code, section 6017 .....	87
California Vehicle Code .....	69
California Vehicle Code, Section 12505 .....	68
California Vehicle Code, Section 12805 .....	68
Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Title 15, Chapter 41, Subchapter V .....	90
False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §3729 .....	59, 75, 105
Federal Reserve Act of 1913 .....	17-3
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act .....	65
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA), 28 U.S.C., Chapter 97 .....	85
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976 .....	45
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. §1602 et seq .....	66
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. §1605(a)(2) .....	64
German Emergency Power Law, Article 48 .....	17-3
Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1452(b)) .....	98
Internal Revenue Code .....	38, 73, 76, 82, 87, 102
Internal Revenue Code of 1986 .....	33
Internal Revenue Code Subtitles A, B, or C .....	84
Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A .....	32, 77
Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A or C .....	84
P.L. 102-14 .....	17-5
P.L. 97-280 .....	17-5
Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) .....	102

Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a .....	70
Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a(b).....	102
Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a(d)(2) .....	97
Public Law 99-396, Section 16(c) .....	98
Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B.....	29
Revised Statutes, Section 3228.....	72
Rules of Decision Act, 28 U.S.C. §1652 .....	103
Section 16(c) of Pub. L. 99-396 .....	98
Social Security Act.....	58, 64, 76
Title 17 of the U.S. Code.....	79
Title 22 of the United States Code .....	17-4
Title 26 .....	83
Title 48 of the U.S. Code.....	87
Title 5 of the U.S. code.....	59
Trading with the Enemy Act .....	17-3
Tucker Act (Judicial Code, sec. 24, par. 20, ch. 397, 24 Stat. 635).....	72
Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. §1491 .....	76
U.C.C. §1-207 .....	54
U.C.C. §1-308 .....	54
U.C.C. §9-307 .....	79
U.S. Code .....	55
Uniform Commercial Code .....	79
Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), Section 1-205 .....	102

## Regulations

20 CFR §422.103(d).....	80, 94
20 CFR §422.104 .....	79, 80, 94
26 CFR §1.1-1(c ).....	17, 99
26 CFR §1.1441-1(c )(3).....	80, 81, 83, 84
26 CFR §1.1441-1(c )(6).....	84
26 CFR §1.469-9(b)(4).....	85
26 CFR §1.872-2(f) .....	56
26 CFR §301.609-1(d)(3).....	80
26 CFR §301.6109-1(g) .....	61, 80
26 CFR §301.6109-1(g)(1)(i) .....	102
26 CFR §31.3401(a)-3.....	81
26 CFR §31.3401(a)-3(a) .....	84
26 CFR §31.3401(c )-1.....	83, 87
26 CFR §31.3402(p)-1 .....	84
26 CFR §601.702(a)(2)(ii) .....	88
8 CFR §215.1 .....	15-1
Federal Register.....	88

## Rules

F.R.E. 803(8)(A) .....	92
Fed.R.Civ.P. 17(b).....	44
Fed.R.Civ.P. 44.1 .....	63
Fed.R.Crim.P. 43 .....	91
Fed.R.Evid. 802.....	103
Fed.Rul.Civ.Proc. 72(b) .....	92
Fed.Rule Civ.Proc. 19(b).....	31, 64
Fed.Rule.Civ.Proc. 29 .....	91
Federal Rule of Civil Proc. 17(b) .....	67
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b) .....	44, 45, 62, 103, 15-3
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 44.1 .....	44
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(c ), prior to Dec. 2002.....	76

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6).....	104
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54(c ) .....	76
Federal Rules of Evidence.....	59, 103
FRE 803(8)(A) .....	92

## Cases

99 Pratt Street Corp. v. Stand Realty Corp., 27 Conn Supp 101, 230 A.2d. 613 .....	74
Aboud v. Detroit Bd. of Ed., 431 U.S. 209, 97 S.Ct. 1782, 52 L.Ed.2d. 261, 95 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2411, 81 Lab. Cas. (CCH) ¶ 55041 (1977).....	18
Aboud v. Detroit Board of Education [431 U.S. 209] (1977) .....	26
Adams v. New Bedford (155 Mass. 317) .....	71
Adkins v. Children's Hospital, 261 U.S. 525, 544 , 43 S.Ct. 394, 24 A.L.R. 1238 .....	40
Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 253, 87 S.Ct. 1660 (1967).....	62
Afroyim v. Rusk, 387 U.S. 254 (1967) .....	62
Alder v. Crosier, 50 Utah 437, 168 P. 83 .....	74
Andrews v. Andrews, 188 U.S. 14 .....	67
Ashton v. Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 1, 298 U.S. 513, 56 S.Ct. 892 (1936) .....	78
Aspinwall v. Sabin, 22 Neb. 73, 34 N.W. 72 .....	74
Baker v. Grice, 169 U.S. 284, 290 , 42 S.L.Ed. 748, 750, 18 Sup.Ct.Rep. 323.....	78
Bancroft & Masters, 223 F.3d. at 1087 .....	66
Bancroft & Masters, Inc. v. Augusta Nat'l Inc., 223 F.3d. 1082, 1087 (9th Cir. 2000).....	66
Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326 .....	73, 96
Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308 (1976).....	104
Baylies v. Vanden Boom, 40 Wyo. 411, 278 P. 551, 70 A.L.R. 924 .....	74
Beagle v. Motor Vehicle Acc. Indemnification Corp., 44 Misc.2d. 636, 254 N.Y.S.2d. 763, 765 .....	15-3
Beer v. Moffatt (192 Fed. 984, affirmed 209 Fed. 779) .....	71
Bell v. Bell, 181 U.S. 175.....	67
Berry v. Stevens, 168 Okla. 124, 31 P.2d. 950.....	74
Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.....	75
Block v. Block, 165 Ohio.St. 365, 60 Ohio.Ops. 1, 135 N.E.2d. 857 .....	74
Boyd v. State of Nebraska, 143 U.S. 135 (1892) .....	23
Brady v. U.S., 397 U.S. 742 (1970) .....	53
Brookhart v. Janis, 384 U.S. 1, 86 S.Ct. 1245, 16 L.Ed.2d. 314 (1966).....	53
Brown v. Keene, 8 Pet. 112, 115 (1834) .....	31, 63
Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall 205, 19 L.Ed. 134.....	73, 96
Brown v. Scott, 140 Md. 258, 117 A. 114, 22 A.L.R. 810.....	74
Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 U.S.T.C. ¶ 9346, 15 A.F.T.R. 1069 .....	75
Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325 .....	77
Calder v. Jones, 465 U.S. 783 (1984).....	65
Calder v. Jones, 465 U.S. 783, 789-90 (1984).....	65
Carmichael v. Southern Cole and Coke Co, 301 U.S. 495 (1937) .....	64
Carroll v. Fetty, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521, cert den 308 U.S. 571, 84 L.Ed. 479, 60 S.Ct. 85 .....	96
Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936) .....	25, 40, 42
Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238, 56 S.Ct. 855 (1936) .....	79
Caruth v. Int'l Psychoanalytical Ass'n, 59 F.3d. 126, 128 (9th Cir. 1995) .....	66
Cary v. Curtis (3 How. 236) .....	72
CE Distrib., LLC v. New Sensor Corp., 380 F.3d. 1107, 1111 (9th Cir. 2004) .....	65
Chesebrough v. United States (192 U. S. 253).....	71
Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452.....	23, 99
Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181 .....	23, 99
Chisholm, Ex'r. v. Georgia, 2 Dall. (U.S.) 419, 1 L.Ed. 454, 457, 471, 472 (1793).....	27, 15-4
Christie Street Commission Co. v. United States (126 Fed. 991) .....	71
Christie Street Commission Co. v. United States (136 Fed. 326) .....	72
Cincinnati & C. R. Co. v. Hamilton County (120 Tenn. 1).....	71
City of Boerne v. Florez, Archbishop of San Antonio, 521 U.S. 507 (1997).....	59
City of Dallas v. Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944 .....	37, 59
Clark v. United States, 95 U.S. 539 (1877) .....	53

Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215.....	42, 69
Coffin v. United States, 156 U.S. 432, 453 (1895).....	69
Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264, 6 Wheat. 265, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821).....	30
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392, and n. 10 (1979).....	56
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10.....	56
Commissioner of Banks v. Cosmopolitan Trust Co., 253 Mass. 205, 148 N.E. 609, 41 A.L.R. 658.....	74
Cook v. Hart, 146 U.S. 183, 194, 36 S.L.Ed. 934, 939, 13 Sup.Ct.Rep. 40.....	78
Cook v. Hudson, 511 F.2d. 744, 9 Empl.Prac.Dec. (CCH) ¶ 10134 (5th Cir. 1975).....	18
Core-Vent Corp. v. Nobel Indus. AB, 11 F.3d. 1482 (9th Cir. 1993).....	66
Corkie v. Maxwell (7 Fed. Cas. 3231).....	71
Crane v. Conklin, 1 N.J.Eq. 346.....	74
Davis v. Beason, 133 U.S. 333, 342, 10 S.Ct. 299, 300.....	46
Davis v. Davis, 305 U.S. 32, 41.....	67
Delany v. Moralitis, C.C.A.Md., 136 F.2d. 129, 130.....	15-3
Delo v. Lashely, 507 U.S. 272 (1993).....	69
Dexter v. Boston (176 Mass. 247).....	71
Doe v. Glanzer, 232 F.3d. 1258, 232 F.3d. 1258 (9th Cir. 11/17/2000).....	104
Dole Food Co. v. Watts, 303 F.3d. 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2002).....	65
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).....	29, 30, 51, 93
Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1856).....	43, 15-2
Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972).....	32, 88
Elk v. Wilkins, 112 U.S. 94 (1884).....	17-2
Elliott v. Swartwout (10 Pet. 137).....	71, 72
Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64 (1938).....	89, 103
Estelle v. Williams, 425 U.S. 501 (1976).....	69
Ettlinger v. National Surety Co., 221 N.Y. 467, 117 N.E. 945, 3 A.L.R. 865.....	74
Ex parte Fonda, 117 U.S. 516, 518, 29 S.L.Ed. 994, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 848.....	78
Ex parte Royall, 117 U.S. 241, 250, 29 S.L.Ed. 868, 871, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 734.....	78
Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144.....	73, 96
Federal corn: Procter & Gamble Co. v. United States (281 Fed. 1014).....	71
Field v. Seabury, 19 How (US) 323, 15 L.Ed. 650.....	74
Fitts v. McGhee, 172 U.S. 516, 533, 43 S.L.Ed. 535, 543, 19 Sup.Ct.Rep. 269.....	78
Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603, 608 -611 (1960).....	64
Flower v. Lance (59 N.Y. 603).....	71
Fong Yu Ting v. United States, 149 U.S. 698 (1893).....	19
Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935).....	56
Fred Martin Motor Co., 374 F.3d. 797, 802 (9th Cir. 2004).....	65
Frost & Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n of California, 271 U.S. 583.....	92
Gar v. Hurd (92 Ills. 315).....	71
Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524.....	22, 98
Georgia R. & Power Co. v. Atlanta, 154 Ga. 731, 115 S.E. 263.....	95
Giaccio v. State of Pennsylvania, 382 U.S. 399, 86 S.Ct. 518 (1966).....	70
Glass v. The Sloop Betsy, 3 (U.S.) Dall 6.....	37, 15-3
Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60, 70-71, 86 L.Ed. 680, 699, 62 S.Ct. 457.....	53
Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)) 352 S.W.2d. 773.....	73, 96
Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 339, 345.....	92
Gould v. Hennepin County (76 Minn. 379).....	71
Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis, 165 U.S. 150 (1897).....	35, 86
Hammer v. Dagenhart, 247 U.S. 251, 275, 38 S.Ct. 529, 3 A.L.R. 649, Ann.Cas.1918E 724.....	79
Harman v. Forssenius, 380 U.S. 528 at 540, 85 S.Ct. 1177, 1185 (1965).....	92
Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States, 379 U.S. 241 (1964).....	59
Heider v. Unicum, 142 or 416, 20 P.2d. 384.....	73, 96
Hisquierdo v. Hisquierdo, 439 U.S. 572, 575 (1979).....	64
Hobbs v. McLean, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870.....	75
Hooven and Allison v. Evatt, 324 U.S. 652 (1945).....	61
Hughes v. United States, 953 F.2d. 531, 536-537 (9th Cir. 1991).....	33
Iasigi v. Van De Carr, 166 U.S. 391, 395, 41 S.L.Ed. 1045, 1049, 17 Sup.Ct.Rep. 595.....	78
Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172.....	23, 99

Insurance Co. of North America v. Kunin, 175 Neb. 260, 121 N.W.2d. 372, 375, 376.....	91
International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945).....	65, 67
Jackson v. State, 210 App.Div. 115, 205 N.Y.S. 658, affd 241 N.Y. 563, 150 N.E. 556.....	73
James v. Bowman, 190 U.S. 127, 139 (1903) .....	59
Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.....	22, 98
Johnson v. Waters, 111 U.S. 640, 28 L.Ed. 547, 4 S.Ct. 619.....	74
Joseph Martinelli & Co. v. Simon Siegel Co. (CA1 Mass) 176 F.2d. 98, 13 A.L.R.2d. 1243.....	74
Juilliard v. Greenman, 110 U.S. 421 (1884).....	15-2, 15-3
Keeton v. Hustler Magazine, 465 U.S. 770 (1984) .....	66
Kentucky Bank v. Stone (88 Fed. 383) .....	71
Kulko v. California Superior Court, 436 U.S. 84, 91 (1978).....	66
Lake v. Lake, 817 F.2d. 1416, 1421 (9th Cir. 1987) .....	65
Lamborn v. County Commissioners (97 U. S. 181) .....	71
Lansing v. Smith, 21 D. 89, 4 Wendel 9 (1829).....	15-3
LaSalle Bank Lake View v. Seguban, 54 F.3d. 387, 391 (7th Cir. 1995) .....	104
Lathrop v. Donohue, 367 U.S. 820, 81 S.Ct. 1826, 6 L.Ed.2d. 1191 (1961).....	18
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866) .....	77
Lippencott v. Allander, 27 Iowa 460.....	95
Little v. Bowers (134 U. S. 547, 554) .....	71
Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 (1922).....	88
Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697 .....	22, 98
Malkin v. United States (2nd Cir.2001), 243 F.3d. 120, 124 .....	92
Manly v. Ohio Shoe Co. (CA4), 25 F.2d. 384, 59 A.L.R. 413.....	74
Manning v. Leighton, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A. 258, motion dismd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A. 630.....	75
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137 (1803) .....	99
Marbury v. Madison, 5 U.S. 137, 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803) .....	105
Markuson v. Boucher, 175 U.S. 184 , 44 L.Ed. 124, 20 Sup.Ct.Rep. 76 .....	78
Maxwell v. Dow, 176 U.S. 581 (1899) .....	28
McAfferty v. Conover, 7 Ohio.St. 99.....	74
McCloud v. Testa, 97 F.3d. 1536, 12 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 1833, 1996 Fed.App. 335P (6th Cir. 1996) .....	19
McCue v. Monroe County (162 N.Y. 235).....	71
McElvaine v. Brush, 142 U.S. 155, 160 , 35 S.L.Ed. 971, 973, 12 Sup.Ct.Rep. 156.....	78
McGee v. International Life Ins. Co., 355 U.S. 220, 223 (1957) .....	67
McNair v. Southern States Finance Co., 191 N.C. 710, 133 S.E. 85.....	74
Mcnelly v. United States, 483 U.S. 350 (1987).....	53
Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484 (1987).....	56
Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987) .....	56
Miller Brothers Co. v. Maryland, 347 U.S. 340 (1954).....	24
Milliken v. Meyer, 311 U.S. 457, 463 (1940) .....	65, 67
Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966).....	38, 53
Montgomery v. Cowlitz County (14 Wash. 230) .....	71
Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust Co., 339 U.S. 306, 313 -314 (1950) .....	67
Munn. v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876) .....	28
Nash v. United States, 229 U.S. 373, 377 (1913).....	53
Nat'l Acceptance Co. v. Bathalter, 705 F.2d. 924, 930 (7th Cir. 1983).....	104
Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100.....	77
Newhall v. Jordan (160 Fed. 661) .....	71
Newman-Green v. Alfonso Larrain, 490 U.S. 826 (1989) .....	31, 64
Nichols v. Michael, 23 N.Y. 264.....	74
Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc. 894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663.....	35
Nudd v. Burrows, 91 U.S. 426, 23 L.Ed. 286.....	74
Oakland Cemetery Association v. Ramsey County (98 Minn. 404).....	71
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928).....	20, 30, 34, 49, 85
Ortiz-Pinero v. Rivera-Arroyo, 84 F.3d. 7 (1st Cir. 1996) .....	18
Panavision, 141 F.3d. at 1321 .....	66
Parrish v. Nikolits, 86 F.3d. 1088 (11th Cir. 1996) .....	18, 19
Peebles v. Pittsburgh. (101 Pa.St. 304) .....	71
Peiffer v. Lebanon Sch. Dist., 848 F.2d. 44, 46 (3d Cir. 1988).....	104



Pennoyer v. Neff, 95 U.S. 714, 732-733 (1878).....	50, 67
People of Territory of Guam v. Fegurgur, 800 F.2d. 1470 (9th Cir. 1986) .....	38, 50
Pepke v. Cronan, 155 U.S. 100 , 39 L.Ed. 84, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 34 .....	78
Perkins v. Elg, 307 U.S. 325, 59 S.Ct. 884, 83 L.Ed. 1320 (1939) .....	31
Pocatello Secur. Trust Co. v. Henry, 35 Idaho 321, 206 P. 175, 27 A.L.R. 337 .....	74
Railroad Co. v. Commissioner (98 U. S. 541, 543).....	71
Railway Emp. Dept. v. Hanson, 351 U.S. 225, 76 S.Ct. 714, 100 L.Ed. 1112 (1956) .....	18
Rathbun v. Baumel, 196 Iowa 1233, 191 N.W. 297, 30 A.L.R. 216.....	74
Re Chapman, 156 U.S. 211, 216, 39 S.L.Ed. 401, 402, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 331 .....	78
Re Duncan, 139 U.S. 449 , 454, sub nom. Duncan v. McCall, 35 L.Ed. 219, 222, 11 Sup.Ct.Rep. 573.....	78
Re Ernst, 179 Wis. 646,192 N.W. 65, 30 A.L.R. 681 .....	74
Re Frederick, 149 U.S. 70, 75 , 37 S.L.Ed. 653, 656, 13 Sup.Ct.Rep. 793 .....	78
Re Wood, 140 U.S. 278 , 289, Sub nom. Wood v. Bursh, 35 L.Ed. 505, 509, 11 Sup.Ct.Rep. 738.....	78
Robertson v. Cease, 97 U.S. 646, 648-649 (1878) .....	31, 63
Robin v. Hardaway, 1 Jefferson 109 (1772).....	17-6
Robins v. Latham (134 No. 466).....	71
Roboz v. Kennedy, 219 F.Supp. 892 (D.D.C. 1963), p. 24 .....	50, 60
Rowen v. U.S., 05-3766MMC. (N.D.Cal. 11/02/2005).....	33
Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62, 110 S.Ct. 2729, 111 L.Ed.2d. 52, 5 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 673 (1990) .....	18
Sage v. United States (250 U. S. 33) .....	72
Salter v. Aviation Salvage Co. 129 Miss 217, 91 So 340, 26 A.L.R. 987.....	74
Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 295 U.S. 495, 549 , 550 S., 55 S.Ct. 837, 97 A.L.R. 947.....	40
Schwarzenegger, 374 F.3d. at 803.....	65, 66
Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. 393 .....	17-2
SEC v. Colello, 139 F.3d. 674, 677 (9th Cir. 1998).....	104
Shaffer v. Heitner, 433 U.S. 186, 211 , n. 37 (1977).....	67
Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U.S. 700 (1878) .....	43
Slimmer v. Chickasaw County (140 Iowa, 448) .....	71
Smietanka v. Indiana Steel Co. (257 U. S. 1).....	72
Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649, 644 .....	92
State ex re. Maisano v. Mitchell, 155 Conn. 256, 231 A.2d. 539, 542.....	15-3
State ex rel. Hutton v. Baton Rouge, 217 La 857, 47 So.2d. 665 .....	95
State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321 .....	22, 98
State of Minnesota v. Brundage, 180 U.S. 499 (1901).....	78
State v. Chicago & C. R. Co. (165 No. 597) .....	71
Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000) .....	56
Stoddard v. Chambers, 2 How (US) 284, 11 L.Ed. 269 .....	74
Strawbridge v. Curtiss, 3 Cranch 267 (1806) .....	64
Sutton v. U.S., 256 U.S. 575 (1921).....	52
Talbot v. Janson, 3 U.S. 133 (1795).....	15-1
Taylor v. Philadelphia Board of Health (31 P.St. 73).....	71
Taylor v. State, 73 Md. 208, 20 A. 914.....	74
Texas v. White, 7 Wall. 700, 725 .....	25, 39
The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66, 10 Wheat 66, 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825) .....	27, 54, 85
The Scotia, 81 U.S. (14 Wall.) 170 (1871).....	37
Thorpe v. R. & B. Railroad Co., 27 Vt. 143.....	28
Tinsley v. Anderson, 171 U.S. 101, 105, 43 S.L.Ed. 91, 96, 18 Sup.Ct.Rep. 805 .....	78
Tower v. Tower & S. Street R. Co., 68 Minn 500, 71 N.W. 691 .....	95
Trowbridge v. Oehmsen, 207 App.Div. 740, 202 N.Y.S. 833.....	73
U.S. v. Cooper, 312 U.S. 600, 604, 61 S.Ct. 742 (1941).....	15-2
U.S. v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605 (1931) .....	47
U.S. v. Seeger, 380 U.S. 184, 85 S.Ct. 863 (1965).....	15-1
U.S. v. William M. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936).....	35
U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649, 18 S.Ct. 456, 42 L.Ed. 890 (1898).....	28, 45
United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 A.F.T.R. 4628 .....	75
United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz, 449 U.S. 166 (1980) .....	64
United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223 .....	23, 99
United States v. Conkins, 9 F.3d. 1377, 1382 (9th Cir. 1993).....	50

United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875).....	41, 43
United States v. Goodwin, 457 U.S. 368, 372, 102 S.Ct. 2485, 2488, 73 L.Ed.2d. 74 (1982).....	38, 50
United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966).....	59
United States v. Harris, 106 U.S. 629, 639 (1883).....	59
United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304.....	23, 99
United States v. Hvoslef (237 U.S. 1, 12).....	72
United States v. Kusche, D.C.Cal., 56 F.Supp. 201 207, 208.....	15-3
United States v. Minker, 350 U.S. 179, 76 S.Ct. 281 (1956).....	53
United States v. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co. (200 U. S. 488, 493, 494).....	71
United States v. Reese, 92 U.S. 214, 218 (1876).....	59
United States v. Solano-Godines, 120 F.3d. 957, 962 (9th Cir. 1997).....	104
United States v. State Bank, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.....	75
United States v. The Amistad, 15 Pet (US) 518, 10 L.Ed. 826.....	74
United States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61, 25 L.Ed. 93.....	74
United States vs. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S.Ct. 240 (1882).....	25
Vaughan v. Riordan (280 Fed. 742, 745).....	71
Vickery v. Jones, 100 F.3d. 1334 (7th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1553, 137 L.Ed.2d. 701 (U.S. 1997).....	18
Vlandis v. Kline (1973) 412 U.S. 441, 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235.....	42, 69
Warren v. San Francisco (150 Calif. 167).....	71
Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990).....	30, 34
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945).....	56
Whitbeck v. Minch (48 Ohio St. 210).....	71
Whitten v. Tomlinson, 160 U.S. 231, 242, 40 S.L.Ed. 406, 412, 16 Sup.Ct.Rep. 297.....	78
Williams v. Merritt (152 Mich. 621).....	71
Williams v. North Carolina, 325 U.S. 226 (1945).....	68
Wilson v. Shaw, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233.....	75
Wooley v. Maynard [430 U.S. 703] (1977).....	26
World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286 (1980).....	67
Wright v. Blakeslee (101 U. S. 174, 178).....	71
Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre Le Racisme Et L'Antisemitisme, 433 F.3d. 1199 (9th Cir. 01/12/2006).....	66
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 369, 6 S.Supp.Ct. 1064, 1071.....	35, 86
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886).....	15-2
Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 6 S.Ct. 1064 (1886).....	15-3

## Other Authorities

106 A.L.R. Fed. 396.....	18
107 A.L.R. Fed. 21.....	18
108 A.L.R. Fed. 117.....	18
109 A.L.R. Fed. 9.....	18
17 Am Jur 2d, Contracts § 151.....	74
17 Am Jur 2d, Contracts § 191.....	74
17 Am Jur 2d, Contracts § 509.....	74
2 FAM 1292.1.....	97
2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992).....	56
32 Am Jur 2d, False Pretenses §§ 88-96.....	75
37 Am.Jur.2d, Fraud and Deceit, Section 8.....	75
63C Am.Jur.2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247.....	23, 99
97 L.Ed.2d. 903.....	18
Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Tax Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005.....	96
Am.Jur.2d, Franchises, §4: Generally.....	95
American Bar Association.....	17-5
American Bar Association (ABA).....	21
American Jurisprudence 2d, Constitutional law, §546: Forced and Prohibited Associations.....	19
American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, Section 21.....	73, 96
American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45.....	75
Ayn Rand, Atlas Shrugged.....	17-7
Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693.....	36, 51

Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1185.....	70
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1407.....	15-3
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1473.....	91
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1498.....	63
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 281.....	37
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 485 under "domicile" .....	68
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 501.....	15-4
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581.....	77
Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 97.....	91
Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856.....	104
Common Sense, Thomas Paine.....	23
Conduct and Belief: Public Employees' First Amendment Rights to Free Expression and Political Affiliation. 59 U Chi LR 897, Spring, 1992 .....	19
Conflicts in a Nutshell, David D. Siegel and Patrick J. Borchers, West Publishing, p. 24.....	50, 60
Congressional Record-Senate, Volume 77- Part 4, June 10, 1933, Page 12522 .....	58
Congressional Research Report 97-59A.....	103
Cooley on Taxation (vol. 2, 3d ed. p. 1495).....	71
Corporatization and Privatization of the Government, Form #05.024 .....	94
Corpus Juris Secundum (C.J.S.), Territories, Section 1 .....	91
Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001 .....	20
De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043 .....	22, 27, 33
Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007 .....	52
Department of State Form I-9 .....	100
Dept of Justice.....	17-7
Enclosure (3): Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status .....	62
Enclosure (7).....	97
Enclosures (3) and (6) .....	98
E-Verify application.....	100
Executive Order 10289.....	77
Executive Order 12612.....	23
Executive Order 12612, Oct. 26, 1987 .....	24
Federal Enforcement Authority in States of the Union, Form #05.032.....	88
Federal Petition/Pleading/Motion Attachment, Litigation Tool #01.002 .....	92
Federal Reserve.....	21, 17-7
First Amendment Law in a Nutshell, Second Edition, pp. 266-267, Jerome A Barron, West Group .....	48
First Amendment Law, Barron-Dienes, West Publishing, ISBN 0-314-22677-X, pp. 266-267 .....	26
Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004.....	108
Form DS-11 or DS-82.....	20-1
George Washington, (letter to Patrick Henry, 9 October 1775) .....	52
George Washington, Farewell Address.....	50
Government Burden of Proof, Form #05.025.....	83
Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023 .....	48, 94
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030.....	45, 106
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 5.2.11 .....	87
Greenawalt, Religion As a Concept in Constitutional Law, 72 Cal. L.Rev. 753 (1984).....	48
Henry David Thoreau.....	57
Highlights of American Legal and Political History CD, Form #11.202 .....	17-9
How to Apply for a Passport as a "non-citizen national", Form #09.007 .....	94
Identity Theft Laws: State Penalties and Remedies and Pending Federal Bills, Congressional Research Service Report #RL34028 / 2007-08-06.....	106
Internal Revenue Manual, Section 4.10.7.2.8.....	103
Internal Revenue Manual, Section 4.10.7.2.9.8.....	103
Internal Revenue Manual, Section 4.10.7.2.9.8 (05/14/99).....	89
International Monetary Fund.....	17-3
IRM 1.1.1.1 .....	88
IRM 4.10.7.2.8 .....	90
IRS "The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments" .....	103
IRS Form 1040.....	56

IRS Form 1042-S .....	55
IRS Form 1098 .....	55
IRS Form 1099 .....	55
IRS Form 4868 .....	92
IRS Form 8300 Currency Transaction Reports .....	55
IRS Form K-1 .....	55
IRS Form RACS006.....	90
IRS Form W-2.....	55
IRS Form W-4.....	55
IRS Form W-8.....	99
IRS Forms 1040 and 1040NR jurat/perjury statement .....	88
IRS Forms W-2, 1098, 1099 .....	75
IRS Forms W-2, K-1, 1042-S, 1098, 1099.....	85
IRS Forms W-4, 1040, 1042-S, 1098, 1099, W-2 .....	99
IRS Individual Master File (IMF) .....	92
Jesus Is an Anarchist .....	44
John Adams, 2nd President .....	50
Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001 .....	44, 63
Letter from Social Security Administration, Exhibit #07.004.....	81
Meaning of the Words “includes” and “including”, Form #05.014 .....	20, 55, 15-7
Memorandums of Law, Forms 05.001 through 05.099 .....	91
Merriam Webster Dictionary.....	44
Minimum Contacts Doctrine .....	65
National Conference Commissioners of State Law .....	17-5
Norton v. Shelby County, 118 U.S. 425 (1885) .....	22
Patrick Henry.....	17-8
Policy Document: Rebutted Arguments Against this Website, Form #08.011 .....	108
Policy Document: Rebutted Arguments Against this Website, Form #08.011, Sections 6.1 through 6.4.....	33
Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017 .....	55, 70
Professor Kent Greenawalt.....	48
Property and Privacy Protection Page, Section 10: Identity Theft .....	106
Prosecuting Social Security Number Misuse: Attacking Identity Theft at its Source, U.S. Attorney Bulletin, Vol. 53, No. 1 .....	106
Public Employees and the First Amendment Petition Clause: Protecting the Rights of Citizen-Employees Who File Legitimate Grievances and Lawsuits Against Their Government Employers. 90 N.W. U LR 304, Fall, 1995 .....	19
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Roscoe Pound, Second Edition, 1925, p. 2 .....	20
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Roscoe Pound, Second Edition, 1925, p. 4.....	39
Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007.....	20, 81, 83, 102
Rebutted Version of “Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions”, Form #08.007 .....	108
Rebutted Version of Congressional Research Service Report 97-59A: Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the Federal Income Tax, Form #08.006 .....	108
Rebutted Version of the IRS “The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments”, Form #08.005.....	108
Ref. (1) .....	41, 45, 59
Ref. (1), Sections 14 thru 14.5.....	96
Reference (1).....	28
Requirement for Reasonable Notice, Form #05.022 .....	55
Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002.....	59, 79, 80, 93, 95, 106
Resources to Rebut Government, Legal, and Tax Profession Deception and False Propaganda .....	33
Restatement 2d, Contracts § 174.....	73, 96
Rights of British America, 1774.....	60
Rutter Group Practice Guide, Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Sections 8:2786-8:2799.1, Year 2007, pp. 8G-118-8G-119 .....	92
Rutter Group Practice Guide-Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, paragraph 8:4993, page 8K-34.....	42, 69
SEDM Exhibit #06.001 .....	83
Social Security Form SS-5 .....	99
Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016.....	37, 15-6
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites By Topic.....	81
Sovereignty Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027 .....	36

SSA Forms SS-4 and SS-5 .....	99
The “Trade or Business” Scam, Form #05.001 .....	56, 77, 84, 95
Thomas Jefferson .....	17-1, 17-2, 17-3, 17-8
Thomas Jefferson to A. L. C. Destutt de Tracy, 1820. FE 10:175 .....	17-2
Thomas Jefferson to John Wayles Eppes, 1813. ME 13:272 .....	17-1
Thomas Jefferson to John Wayles Eppes, 1813. ME 13:357 .....	17-2
Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, 1816. ME 15:39 .....	17-2
Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801.....	52
Treasury Decision 3445.....	70
Treasury Decision 3445, February 27, 1923 .....	73
Treasury Order 150-02 .....	77
Treatise on Government, Joel Tiffany, p. 49, Section 78 .....	79
U.S. Department of State Website, Foreign Affairs Manual .....	97
U.S. Supreme Court .....	25
W.N. Grigg .....	106
We Are the Church.....	107
What Happened to Justice?, Form #06.012.....	57
When Freedoms Conflict: Party Discipline and the First Amendment. 11 JL & Pol 751, Fall, 1995 .....	19
Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002.....	85
Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a “Taxpayer Identification Number”, Form #04.205 .....	93, 106
Why Penalties are Illegal for Anything But Federal Employees, Contractors, and Agents, Form #05.010 .....	55
Why the Government Can’t Lawfully Assess Human Beings With an Income Tax Liability Without Their Consent, Form #05.011 .....	55
Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006.....	19-1
Why You Aren’t Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001 .....	106
Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a “Public Officer” for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008 .....	32
William Penn.....	29

## Scriptures

1 Cor. 3:16-17 .....	107
1 John 2:3-6.....	15-6
1 John 4:16.....	63, 15-6
1 Peter 2:15-16 .....	33
1 Peter 2:18 .....	15-4
1 Sam. 12:12-19 .....	15-6
1 Sam. 8:4-8 .....	15-5
1 Tim. 6:10.....	55, 17-1
2 Cor. 6:17.....	57, 15-6
2nd Corinthians 5:20 .....	49
Deut. 10:14.....	63
Deut. 6:13.....	47
Deuteronomy 10:14.....	48
Exodus 20.....	45
Exodus 20:2-3 .....	29
Exodus 20:2-6 .....	49
Exodus 20:3.....	52
Exodus 23:32-33 .....	52, 17-6
Exodus 23:8.....	57
Exodus 34:12.....	52
Ezekial 20:10-20 .....	52
Ezra 8:21-22 .....	45
Gal 5:14.....	15-5
Gal. 5:18.....	44
Holy Bible .....	63
Isaiah 33:22 .....	42, 44, 17-6
Isaiah 40:15 .....	17-6
Isaiah 40:17 .....	17-6

Isaiah 40:23 .....	17-6
Isaiah 41:29 .....	17-6
Isaiah 45:12 .....	48
James 4:4 .....	46
James 5:12 .....	15-1
John 14:21 .....	63, 15-6
Leviticus 16:3-5 .....	17-6
Luke 11:52 .....	17-5
Luke 16:13 .....	37
Mark 12:28-33 .....	15-5
Matt. 10:42-45 .....	29
Matt. 23:1-36 .....	41
Matt. 4:10 .....	17
Matt. 5:33-37 .....	47, 15-1
Matt. 8:19-20 .....	44
Matthew 5:33-37 .....	15-1
Numbers 15:30 .....	103
Philippians 3:20 .....	45
Prov. 17:15 .....	57
Prov. 21:6-7 .....	55
Prov. 29:12 .....	57
Psalms 118:8-9 .....	49
Psalms 119:19 .....	45
Psalms 47:7 .....	44, 48, 63
Psalms 69:8-9 .....	45
Psalms 89:11-13 .....	48
Psalms 9:17 .....	15-5
Rev. 18:1-8 .....	34
Rev. 18:4-8 .....	57, 107, 15-7
Rev. 19:19 .....	107
Rev. 5:9-10 .....	43
Revelation 13:16-18 .....	17-3
Revelation 19:19 .....	46
Romans 13:9-10 .....	15-5
Ten Commandments .....	29, 45, 15-6



Dear Sir/Mam:

## **1. PURPOSE OF THIS COMMUNICATION**

This Declaration of Intention and the attachments provided constitute reasonable and formal legal notice of an important change in legal status and the legal relation between the submitter and the recipient which needs to become a permanent part of the government's records. This Declaration of Intention and the attachments hereto:

1. Constitutes a notice and demand to do all the things documented in section 10 later.
2. Constitutes a Declaration of Intention to permanently change domicile to without the "United States" and to abandon statutory "U.S. citizen" status pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401, 26 U.S.C. §3121(e), and 26 CFR §1.1-1(c ) but not constitutional citizenship.
3. **Does not** constitute any of the things described in Section 2, the next section.
4. Constitutes a notice and demand to update all records about me that may be in your possession which describe either my citizenship or my legal domicile by all of the following entities
  - 4.1. The government of the United States.
  - 4.2. Every state of the Union.
  - 4.3. The state of the Union in which the submitter maintains a transient place of abode.
  - 4.4. You as the recipient.
5. Constitutes legal notice that if the above things are NOT done, then you will become party to the crimes documented herein.
6. Constitutes a formal request to eliminate the criminal and illegal duress documented herein, and especially in section 9 because the ability to act in a "voluntary" manner is impossible unless and until all such sources of duress are completely and systematically eliminated.

I have a personal knowledge as a witness of the truthfulness and accuracy of all the facts described in this Declaration of Intention and consistent with 28 U.S.C. §1746(1) , have verified same with a notarized signature at the end. You are personally in receipt of this notice because not only are you the person responsible for the records which need to be modified and the actions which are requested to be taken on your part, but also because you will become the person responsible as a public official if the actions requested are not taken and injury results to me personally because of omissions on your part or breach of your oath.

This political, legal, and commercial divorce from the "government" but not the "state" instead represents a decision to maintain dual citizenship in the following order of precedence: 1. Citizenship in the Kingdom of God; 2. Citizenship in the country of my birth. It also defines and prescribes that:

1. Citizenship in the country of my birth is subordinate to, and inferior to my citizenship in Heaven and all the legal obligations arising from it under God's Law found in the Holy Bible.
2. My earthly allegiance to the "state", which is the Sovereign people (We The People) and not the de facto "government" that serves them, is secondary to that of my Lord, Savior, Lawgiver, and Judge, Jesus Christ and His laws. Since Jesus Christ says I can serve ONLY God and not any man, then I can only obey God's laws and not any vain substitute for His laws written by any ruler or legislator:

*"Away with you , Satan! For it is written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and Him ONLY [NOT our SERVANTS in government!]* you shall serve.'"  
*[Matt. 4:10, Bible, NKJV]*

3. The voluntary decision to abandon all man-made domiciles and surrender exclusively to God's authority and His Holy Law and ONLY the Common Law that implements it documented herein is an act of religious worship in satisfaction of the tenets of my religious faith. The recipient is reminded that the First Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits any government, state or federal, from interfering with the free exercise of my religious beliefs, including those practices which completely remove and destroy all legal connections between me and the government or state.

This document therefore describes an act of political and legal disassociation which is a fulfillment of my right to freely associate and to be free from the compelled association with persons, governments, and laws which I view as harmful to my best interests and that of my family and friends.

1 “The right to associate or not to associate with others solely on the basis of individual  
2 choice, not being absolute, may conflict with a societal interest in requiring one to  
3 associate with others, or to prohibit one from associating with others, in order to  
4 accomplish what the state deems to be the common good. The Supreme Court, though  
5 rarely called upon to examine this aspect of the right to freedom of association, has  
6 nevertheless established certain basic rules which will cover many situations involving  
7 forced or prohibited associations. Thus, where a sufficiently compelling state interest,  
8 outside the political spectrum, can be accomplished only by requiring individuals to  
9 associate together for the common good, then such forced association is constitutional. <sup>1</sup>  
10 But the Supreme Court has made it clear that compelling an individual to become a  
11 member of an organization with political aspects [such as a GOVERNMENT], or  
12 compelling an individual to become a member of an organization which financially  
13 supports, in more than an insignificant way, political personages or goals [using  
14 voluntary donations deceitfully called “TAXES”] which the individual does not wish to  
15 support, is an infringement of the individual's constitutional right to freedom of  
16 association. <sup>2</sup> The First Amendment prevents the government, except in the most  
17 compelling circumstances, from wielding its power to interfere with its employees'  
18 freedom to believe and associate, or to not believe and not associate; it is not merely a  
19 tenure provision that protects public employees from actual or constructive discharge.  
20 <sup>3</sup> Thus, First Amendment principles prohibit a state from compelling any individual to  
21 associate with a political party [or GOVERNMENT as a private individual], as a  
22 condition of retaining public employment. <sup>4</sup> The First Amendment protects  
23 nonpolicymaking public employees from discrimination based on their political beliefs or  
24 affiliation. <sup>5</sup> But the First Amendment protects the right of political party members to  
25 advocate that a specific person be elected or appointed to a particular office and that a  
26 specific person be hired to perform a governmental function. <sup>6</sup> In the First Amendment  
27 context, the political patronage exception to the First Amendment protection for public

---

<sup>1</sup> Lathrop v. Donohue, 367 U.S. 820, 81 S.Ct. 1826, 6 L.Ed.2d. 1191 (1961), reh'g denied, 368 U.S. 871, 82 S.Ct. 23, 7 L.Ed.2d. 72 (1961) (a state supreme court may order integration of the state bar); Railway Emp. Dept. v. Hanson, 351 U.S. 225, 76 S.Ct. 714, 100 L.Ed. 1112 (1956), motion denied, 351 U.S. 979, 76 S.Ct. 1044, 100 L.Ed. 1494 (1956) and reh'g denied, 352 U.S. 859, 77 S.Ct. 22, 1 L.Ed.2d. 69 (1956) (upholding the validity of the union shop provision of the Railway Labor Act).

The First Amendment right to freedom of association of teachers was not violated by enforcement of a rule that white teachers whose children did not attend public schools would not be rehired. Cook v. Hudson, 511 F.2d. 744, 9 Empl.Prac.Dec. (CCH) ¶ 10134 (5th Cir. 1975), reh'g denied, 515 F.2d. 762 (5th Cir. 1975) and cert. granted, 424 U.S. 941, 96 S.Ct. 1408, 47 L.Ed.2d. 347 (1976) and cert. dismissed, 429 U.S. 165, 97 S.Ct. 543, 50 L.Ed.2d. 373, 12 Empl.Prac.Dec. (CCH) ¶ 11246 (1976).

Annotation: Supreme Court's views regarding Federal Constitution's First Amendment right of association as applied to elections and other political activities, 116 L.Ed.2d. 997, § 10.

<sup>2</sup> Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62, 110 S.Ct. 2729, 111 L.Ed.2d. 52, 5 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 673 (1990), reh'g denied, 497 U.S. 1050, 111 S.Ct. 13, 111 L.Ed.2d. 828 (1990) and reh'g denied, 497 U.S. 1050, 111 S.Ct. 13, 111 L.Ed.2d. 828 (1990) (conditioning public employment hiring decisions on political belief and association violates the First Amendment rights of applicants in the absence of some vital governmental interest).

<sup>3</sup> Rutan v. Republican Party of Illinois, 497 U.S. 62, 110 S.Ct. 2729, 111 L.Ed.2d. 52, 5 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 673 (1990), reh'g denied, 497 U.S. 1050, 111 S.Ct. 13, 111 L.Ed.2d. 828 (1990) and reh'g denied, 497 U.S. 1050, 111 S.Ct. 13, 111 L.Ed.2d. 828 (1990).

Annotation: Public employee's right of free speech under Federal Constitution's First Amendment—Supreme Court cases, 97 L.Ed.2d. 903.

First Amendment protection for law enforcement employees subjected to discharge, transfer, or discipline because of speech, 109 A.L.R. Fed. 9.

First Amendment protection for judges or government attorneys subjected to discharge, transfer, or discipline because of speech, 108 A.L.R. Fed. 117.

First Amendment protection for public hospital or health employees subjected to discharge, transfer, or discipline because of speech, 107 A.L.R. Fed. 21.

First Amendment protection for publicly employed firefighters subjected to discharge, transfer, or discipline because of speech, 106 A.L.R. Fed. 396.

<sup>4</sup> Abood v. Detroit Bd. of Ed., 431 U.S. 209, 97 S.Ct. 1782, 52 L.Ed.2d. 261, 95 L.R.R.M. (BNA) 2411, 81 Lab. Cas. (CCH) ¶ 55041 (1977), reh'g denied, 433 U.S. 915, 97 S.Ct. 2989, 53 L.Ed.2d. 1102 (1977); Parrish v. Nikolits, 86 F.3d. 1088 (11th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1818, 137 L.Ed.2d. 1027 (U.S. 1997).

<sup>5</sup> LaRou v. Ridlon, 98 F.3d. 659 (1st Cir. 1996); Parrish v. Nikolits, 86 F.3d. 1088 (11th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1818, 137 L.Ed.2d. 1027 (U.S. 1997).

<sup>6</sup> Vickery v. Jones, 100 F.3d. 1334 (7th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1553, 137 L.Ed.2d. 701 (U.S. 1997).

Responsibilities of the position of director of a municipality's office of federal programs resembled those of a policymaker, privy to confidential information, a communicator, or some other office holder whose function was such that party affiliation was an equally important requirement for continued tenure. Ortiz-Pinero v. Rivera-Arroyo, 84 F.3d. 7 (1st Cir. 1996).

employees is to be construed broadly, so as presumptively to encompass positions placed by legislature outside of "merit" civil service. Positions specifically named in relevant federal, state, county, or municipal laws to which discretionary authority with respect to enforcement of that law or carrying out of some other policy of political concern is granted, such as a secretary of state given statutory authority over various state corporation law practices, fall within the political patronage exception to First Amendment protection of public employees.<sup>7</sup> However, a supposed interest in ensuring effective government and efficient government employees, political affiliation or loyalty, or high salaries paid to the employees in question should not be counted as indicative of positions that require a particular party affiliation.<sup>8</sup>"

[American Jurisprudence 2d, Constitutional law, §546: Forced and Prohibited Associations]

This communication and request is a lawful exercise of rights established and protected by the Constitution of the United States of America. The reader will note that those rights attach to the place of my transient occupancy on land protected by the Constitution, and not to either my citizenship or domicile or statutory status under a franchise of any kind.

*"It is locality that is determinative of the application of the Constitution, in such matters as judicial procedure, and not the status of the people who live in it."*

[Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 (1922)]

## **1.1 Legal authority for sending this communication**

The authority for submitting this document to you was described by the U.S. Supreme Court, which said on this subject:

**"This right of domicile [. . .] is not established unless the person makes sufficiently known his intention of fixing [or NOT fixing] there, either tacitly or by an express declaration."**

[Fong Yu Ting v. United States, [149 U.S. 698](#) (1893)]

This document therefore constitutes an "express declaration" or "declaration of intention" of my political intentions into perpetuity in relation to both the "United States" as well as every state of the Union. As a government agency that must keep track of and interface with foreigners domiciled or present anywhere within your jurisdiction and who therefore have volunteered to be subject to your civil laws, you are the proper party to receive this Legal Notice. Notice to the agent is notice to the principle. Please copy and distribute the paper only version of this document to all interested parties within your government agency and other government agencies who might require this information in order to update their records to properly reflect my change of status.

## **1.2 Why you in particular received this communication**

A very important reason I am sending this document to the so-called "Department of Justice" is because "justice" as legally defined is the right to be LEFT ALONE:

**"Justice, as a moral habit, is that tendency of the will and mode of conduct which refrains from disturbing the lives and interests of others, and, as far as possible, hinders such interference on the part of others. This virtue springs from the individual's respect for his fellows as ends in themselves and as his co equals. The different spheres of**

---

<sup>7</sup> McCloud v. Testa, 97 F.3d. 1536, 12 I.E.R. Cas. (BNA) 1833, 1996 Fed.App. 335P (6th Cir. 1996), reh'g and suggestion for reh'g en banc denied, (Feb. 13, 1997).

Law Reviews: Stokes, When Freedoms Conflict: Party Discipline and the First Amendment. 11 JL & Pol 751, Fall, 1995.

Pave, Public Employees and the First Amendment Petition Clause: Protecting the Rights of Citizen-Employees Who File Legitimate Grievances and Lawsuits Against Their Government Employers. 90 N.W. U LR 304, Fall, 1995.

Singer, Conduct and Belief: Public Employees' First Amendment Rights to Free Expression and Political Affiliation. 59 U Chi LR 897, Spring, 1992.

As to political patronage jobs, see § 472.

<sup>8</sup> Parrish v. Nikolits, 86 F.3d. 1088 (11th Cir. 1996), cert. denied, 117 S.Ct. 1818, 137 L.Ed.2d. 1027 (U.S. 1997).

interests may be roughly classified as follows: body and life; the family, or the extended individual life; property, or the totality of the instruments of action; honor, or the ideal existence; and finally freedom, or the possibility of fashioning one's life as an end in itself. The law defends these different spheres, thus giving rise to a corresponding number of spheres of rights, each being protected by a prohibition. . . . To violate the rights, to interfere with the interests of others, is injustice. All injustice is ultimately directed against the life of the neighbor; it is an open avowal that the latter is not an end in itself, having the same value as the individual's own life. The general formula of the duty of justice may therefore be stated as follows: Do no wrong yourself, and permit no wrong to be done, so far as lies in your power; or, expressed positively: Respect and protect the right."  
[Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Roscoe Pound, Second Edition, 1925, p. 2]

The Constitution gives me a RIGHT, not a PRIVILEGE, to be left alone, and it costs you nothing to leave me alone.

"The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. **They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.**"

[Olmstead v. United States, [277 U.S. 438, 478](#) (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper, [494 U.S. 210](#) (1990)]

The main and only thing I need protection from is a [CORRUPTED DE FACTO GOVERNMENT](#), which positively refuses its constitutional duty to recognize my right of PRIVATE property and my right to be LEFT ALONE. Instead, I and others who know the truth and have carefully read, studied, and obeyed the laws that PREVENT this criminal mafia protection racket are being:

1. Illegally and perpetually harassed by de facto officers. This constitutes duress.
2. Made the illegal target of "selective enforcement" that denies equal protection and equal treatment that is the foundation of the United States Constitution.
3. Slandered and intimidated using information I provide on government forms.
4. Fraudulently deceived using words of art. See:

[Meaning of the Words "includes" and "including", Form #05.014](#)  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

5. LIED to in government publications about what the law requires. See:

[Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007](#)  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

6. Made the target of FALSE and FRAUDULENT information return reports connecting me to a public office. See:

[Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001](#)  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Collectively, the above tactics amount to acts of INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM in a legislatively foreign state, the states of the Union. It amounts to the equivalent of a Stalinist purge and financial genocide of all political dissent. That sort of terrorism is also communist, because the essence of what it means to be a communist is an absolute failure and refusal by those in government to recognize ANY legal constraints on the nature of their activities. See 50 U.S.C. §841.

[TITLE 50](#) > [CHAPTER 23](#) > [SUBCHAPTER IV](#) > Sec. 841.  
[Sec. 841. - Findings and declarations of fact](#)

The Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States [consisting of the IRS, DOJ, and a corrupted federal judiciary], although purportedly a political party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the [de jure] Government of the United States [and replace it with a de facto government ruled by the

1 judiciary]. It constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship [IRS, DOJ, and corrupted federal  
2 judiciary in collusion] within a [constitutional/ republic, demanding for itself the rights  
3 and privileges [including immunity from prosecution for their wrongdoing in violation of  
4 Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution] accorded to political parties, but  
5 denying to all others the liberties [Bill of Rights] guaranteed by the Constitution.  
6 Unlike political parties, which evolve their policies and programs through public means,  
7 by the reconciliation of a wide variety of individual views, and submit those policies and  
8 programs to the electorate at large for approval or disapproval, the policies and  
9 programs of the Communist Party are secretly [by corrupt judges and the IRS in  
10 complete disregard of the tax laws] prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world  
11 Communist movement [the IRS and Federal Reserve]. Its members [the Congress, which  
12 was terrorized to do IRS bidding recently by the framing of Congressman Traficant] have  
13 no part in determining its goals, and are not permitted to voice dissent to party  
14 objectives. Unlike members of political parties, members of the Communist Party are  
15 recruited for indoctrination [in the public schools by homosexuals, liberals, and  
16 socialists] with respect to its objectives and methods, and are organized, instructed, and  
17 disciplined [by the IRS and a corrupted judiciary] to carry into action slavishly the  
18 assignments given them by their hierarchical chieftains. Unlike political parties, the  
19 Communist Party [thanks to a corrupted federal judiciary] acknowledges no  
20 constitutional or statutory limitations upon its conduct or upon that of its members.  
21 The Communist Party is relatively small numerically, and gives scant indication of  
22 capacity ever to attain its ends by lawful political means. The peril inherent in its  
23 operation arises not from its numbers, but from its failure to acknowledge any limitation  
24 as to the nature of its activities, and its dedication to the proposition that the present  
25 constitutional Government of the United States ultimately must be brought to ruin by any  
26 available means, including resort to force and violence [or using income taxes]. Holding  
27 that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile foreign power [the Federal Reserve and  
28 the American Bar Association (ABA)] renders its existence a clear present and  
29 continuing danger to the security of the United States. It is the means whereby  
30 individuals are seduced into the service of the world Communist movement, trained to do  
31 its bidding, and directed and controlled in the conspiratorial performance of their  
32 revolutionary services. Therefore, the Communist Party should be outlawed

33 The result of this INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM is that I am being compelled in effect to LIE about my status on  
34 government forms and BRIBE you to procure a public office in a corrupted government under various unconstitutionally  
35 administered franchises. The status I am being compelled to procure under these unconstitutionally administered franchises  
36 is identified by various words of art such as "citizen", "resident", "taxpayer", "driver" (under the vehicle code), "spouse"  
37 (under the family code), etc. and if I refuse to procure these statuses, I am being made the target of illegal enforcement,  
38 selective enforcement, being denied remedies and equal protection, and being financially penalized by high legal fees of the  
39 priesthood of thieves who administer these franchises in the government church called "court". The nature of that duress is  
40 documented in:

Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

41 If you REALLY, SINCERELY, GENUINELY care about "justice", meaning the protection of PRIVATE RIGHTS by  
42 simply LEAVING THEM ALONE AND NOT CONVERTING THEM INTO PUBLIC RIGHTS OR OFFICES, then you  
43 will protect my right to be left alone WITHOUT forcing me to bribe a mafia protection racket with bribes called "taxes"  
44 that really aren't taxes as legally defined, unless paid by a REAL public officer. I am NOT a public officer, it is a CRIME  
45 to impersonate a public officer per 18 U.S.C. §912, and I won't falsify government documents to misrepresent myself as  
46 such a party in order to indemnify criminal government coworkers from liability for their organized extortion.

47 Even the U.S. Supreme Court recognizes that de facto governments can and do illegally CREATE or enforce public  
48 officers, and that such acts are UNCONSTITUTIONAL, when it held:

49 "An unconstitutional act is not a law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties; it affords  
50 no protection; it creates no office; it is in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though  
51 it had never been passed."



I remind you that the reason that all governments are created, according to the Declaration of Independence, is to protect ONLY PRIVATE rights. The very first step in protecting PRIVATE rights is to prevent such rights from being converted into PUBLIC rights, PUBLIC offices, or franchises. A government that:

1. Won't recognize or protect such rights. OR
2. Forces the owner to donate the right to a public office or franchise before they will protect it. OR
3. Turns the status of "citizen", "resident", or "inhabitant" into a public office and a franchise within the national government.
4. Forces you to bribe them to become a public officer called a "taxpayer" before they will leave you alone. OR
5. Removes all PRIVATE statuses from options on government forms so that the only choice you have is to accept a public office. OR

. . . is NO GOVERNMENT AT ALL, but mafia protection ring that does not deserve and is not entitled to my allegiance and especially financial support. If the so-called "government" won't protect me from its OWN abuses and violations of law, they certainly don't deserve to be hired to protect me from anyone else. The nature of such a de facto mafia government and the criminal nature of your employer is exhaustively documented and proven in the following document:

*De Facto Government Scam*, Form #05.043

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

### **1.3 Request for correction-violation of fiduciary duty NOT to correct**

If you believe that I have sent this document in error to an improper party, then please promptly notify me of same and provide the following information necessary to direct it to the proper parties:

1. The department or agency, address, and name of the improper party appearing at the beginning of this correspondence.
2. The department or agency, address, phone, email, and name of the proper party to replace the improper party.
3. The statute and implementing regulation that delegates authority to the agency or bureau you are directing me to for assistance.
4. The government publication and delegation of authority order that delegates authority to the agency or bureau you are directing me to for assistance

Please do NOT leave me hanging, by telling me that you can't service this request, without ALSO telling me WHO can within the governmental unit you are part of. Such an indifferent response certainly could not be truthfully classified as "public service" in relation to a member of the public, such as myself.

I furthermore remind the recipients that they have sworn an oath as "public officials" to support and defend the Constitution, and pursuant to that oath, they are fiduciaries and trustees of the public trust and I am the beneficiary of the trust as a member of the public. They therefore have a fiduciary duty prescribed by oath to put my best interests, who is the "public", ahead of their own, and to read and obey everything that I, the Sovereign and their master as "public servants" ask them to do that is a lawful exercise of my constitutionally protected rights.

*"As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer."*<sup>9</sup> **Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts.**<sup>10</sup> **That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or**

<sup>9</sup> State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321; Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.

<sup>10</sup> Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524. A public official is held in public trust. Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697, app gr 117 Ill.Dec. 226, 520 N.E.2d. 387 and revd on other grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145, 538 N.E.2d. 520.



1 she serves.<sup>11</sup> and owes a fiduciary duty to the public.<sup>12</sup> It has been said that the  
2 fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private  
3 individual.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the  
4 public official which tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of  
5 security for individual rights is against public policy.<sup>14</sup>”  
6 [63C Am.Jur.2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247]

7 This document shall also constitute my formal request for a "Certificate of non-citizen national status" in accordance with [8](#)  
8 [U.S.C. §1452](#)(b). Additionally, this document constitutes my formal oath of allegiance to the United States of America.

#### 9 **1.4 Intended effect of this communication upon the government**

10 Thomas Paine, author of the book [Common Sense](#), which is credited with starting the American Revolution, said the  
11 following:

12 “That government is best which governs least.”  
13 [[Thomas Paine](#)]

14 That government governs least which has no “subjects” or “jurisdiction” over the people it governs because they fired the  
15 government and decided instead to govern and support themselves:

16 “The words ‘people of the United States’ and ‘citizens,’ are synonymous terms, and mean  
17 the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican  
18 institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government  
19 through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the ‘sovereign people,’  
20 and every citizen [of HEAVEN] is one of this people, and a constituent member of this  
21 sovereignty. ...”  
22 [[Boyd v. State of Nebraska](#), [143 U.S. 135](#) (1892)]

23 Within our system of government, federalism is the official policy or method by which limited constitutional government is  
24 ensured and self-government is preserved and expanded. This was described by the President of the United States as  
25 follows:

26 *Executive Order 12612*  
27 *Sec. 2. Fundamental Federalism Principles.*

28 *In formulating and implementing policies that have federalism implications, Executive*  
29 *departments and agencies shall be guided by the following fundamental federalism*  
30 *principles:*

- 31 (a) **Federalism is rooted in the knowledge that our political liberties are best assured by**  
32 **limiting the size and scope of the national government.**  
33 (b) *The people of the States created the national government when they delegated to it*  
34 *those enumerated governmental powers relating to matters beyond the competence*  
35 *of the individual States. All other sovereign powers, save those expressly prohibited*  
36 *the States by the Constitution, are reserved to the States or to the people.*  
37 (c) *The constitutional relationship among sovereign governments, State and national, is*  
38 *formalized in and protected by the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution.*

<sup>11</sup> [Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc.](#), 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181, appeal after remand (1st Dist) 107 Ill.App.3d. 222, 63 Ill.Dec. 134, 437 N.E.2d. 783.

<sup>12</sup> [United States v. Holzer](#) (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed. 2d 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7 Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343, cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed. 2d 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds by [United States v. Osser](#) (CA3 Pa) 864 F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in [United States v. Little](#) (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among conflicting authorities on other grounds noted in [United States v. Boylan](#) (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223).

<sup>13</sup> [Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane](#), 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452, later proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434 N.E.2d. 325.

<sup>14</sup> [Indiana State Ethics Comm’n v. Nelson](#) (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App) 659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28, 1996).

- (d) **The people of the States are free,** subject only to restrictions in the Constitution itself or in constitutionally authorized Acts of Congress, **to define the moral, political, and legal character of their lives.**
- (e) In most areas of governmental concern, **the States [and the individuals within them] uniquely possess** the constitutional authority, **the resources, and the competence** to discern the sentiments of the people and **to govern accordingly.** In Thomas Jefferson's words, the States are "the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against antirepublican tendencies."
- (f) The nature of our constitutional system encourages a healthy diversity in the public policies adopted by the people of the several States according to their own conditions, needs, and desires. In the search for enlightened public policy, individual States and communities are free to experiment with a variety of approaches to public issues.
- (g) Acts of the national government--whether legislative, executive, or judicial in nature--that exceed the enumerated powers of that government under the Constitution violate the principle of federalism established by the Framers.
- (h) Policies of the national government should recognize the responsibility of--and should encourage opportunities for--individuals, families, neighborhoods, local governments, and private associations to achieve their personal, social, and economic objectives through cooperative effort.
- (i) In the absence of clear constitutional or statutory authority, the presumption of sovereignty should rest with the individual States. Uncertainties regarding the legitimate authority of the national government should be resolved against regulation at the national level.
- [Executive Order 12612, Oct. 26, 1987]

The best way to limit the size and scope of government is to entirely withdraw our political and financial support for it and to cease to participate in any of its franchises, and it is our constitutional right to do so. The obligation to financially support the government comes from our voluntary choice of legal domicile, and therefore the way to exercise our legal right to withdraw financial and political support is to change our domicile and thereby dis-associate politically and financially.

**"Thus, the Court has frequently held that domicile or residence, more substantial than mere presence in transit or sojourn, is an adequate basis for taxation, including income, property, and death taxes. Since the Fourteenth Amendment makes one a citizen of the state wherein he resides, the fact of residence creates universally reciprocal duties of protection by the state and of allegiance and support by the citizen. The latter obviously includes a duty to pay taxes, and their nature and measure is largely a political matter. Of course, the situs of property may tax it regardless of the citizenship, domicile, or residence of the owner, the most obvious illustration being a tax on realty laid by the state in which the realty is located."**

[Miller Brothers Co. v. Maryland, [347 U.S. 340](#) (1954)]

The Founding Fathers said the best method of ensuring accountability of government to the people is for the government to be dependent on the **voluntary consent** of the people, and that is why both citizenship and domicile must be voluntary and cannot be coerced:

"A dependence on the [consent of and financial support by the] people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government;"

[Federalist Paper #51, Alexander Hamilton]

"This power over the purse may, in fact, be regarded as the most complete and effectual weapon with which any constitution can arm the immediate representatives of the people, for obtaining a redress of every grievance, and for carrying into effect every just and salutary measure."

[Federalist Paper #58, James Madison]

1 The above is consistent with our Declaration of Independence, which says that all just powers of government derive from  
2 the voluntary consent of the people, which implies that anything not entirely consensual and voluntary is UNJUST. The  
3 only departure from this requirement for consent is found in the criminal laws, whereby persons who commit crimes may  
4 be deprived of their life, liberty, and property without their consent as a punishment for the impairment of the EQUAL  
5 rights of their fellow men.

6 The United States government is a creature of law and everything that it does is a consequence of executing law.<sup>15</sup> One of  
7 the purposes of this document is to destroy all the government's civil jurisdiction over the Submitter in order to restore  
8 complete and unimpaired self-government to the Submitter. All such jurisdiction derives from my voluntary choice of  
9 domicile. This right of self-government is protected by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the Constitution of the United  
10 States, as indicated above. In that sense, it's main goal is to restore "good government" and "limited government" and  
11 personal responsibility to America. The recipient will note that the main goal of the Constitution, according to the U.S.  
12 Supreme Court was to preserve unimpaired self-government to everyone. To wit:

13 *"The determination of the Framers Convention and the ratifying conventions to*  
14 *preserve complete and unimpaired state [and personal] self-government in all matters*  
15 *not committed to the general government is one of the plainest facts which emerges*  
16 *from the history of their deliberations.* And adherence to that determination is  
17 *incumbent equally upon the federal government and the states. State powers can neither*  
18 *be appropriated on the one hand nor abdicated on the other. As this court said in Texas*  
19 *v. White, 7 Wall. 700, 725, 'The preservation of the States, and the maintenance of*  
20 *their governments, are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the*  
21 *preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the National government.* The  
22 *Constitution, in all its provisions, looks to an indestructible Union, composed of*  
23 *indestructible States.' Every journey to a forbidden end begins with the first step; and the*  
24 *danger of such a step by the federal government in the direction of taking over the*  
25 *powers of the states is that the end of the journey may find the states so despoiled of their*  
26 *powers, or-what may amount to the same thing-so [298 U.S. 238, 296] relieved of the*  
27 *responsibilities which possession of the powers necessarily enjoins, as to reduce them to*  
28 *little more than geographical subdivisions of the national domain. It is safe to say that if,*  
29 *when the Constitution was under consideration, it had been thought that any such danger*  
30 *lurked behind its plain words, it would never have been ratified. "*  
31 *[Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936)]*

## 32 **1.5 Consequences of interfering with the filing of or government action related to this** 33 **communication**

34 Those public dis-servants who would willfully interfere with this attempt by the Submitter of this document at unimpaired  
35 self-government are at war with the legislative intent of the Constitution, are interfering with the principles of Federalism,  
36 and are guilty of TREASON in violation of [18 U.S.C. §2381](#). Treason is punishable by DEATH. No man or group of men  
37 such as yourself deserves the right to call itself a "government" which maliciously deprives other men the EQUAL right to  
38 self-government. To deny this fact would be hypocrisy of the highest order. Furthermore, no public servant can truthfully  
39 claim to be pursuing the "public good" while at the same time interfering with or preventing personal responsibility of any  
40 kind. This document represents the highest, most mature exercise of personal responsibility, which is to completely FIRE  
41 the government from my life and pursue unimpaired self-government.

42 The First Amendment protects my right to associate and my freedom from compelled association. The way I "associate" is  
43 choosing absent duress whatever civil status I want within your jurisdiction, including whether I want to be a statutory  
44 "citizen", "resident", inhabitant, "person", "individual", or "taxpayer". The foundation of all civil law in America is

<sup>15</sup> "No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives," 106 U.S., at 220. "Shall it be said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the Citizen has been deprived of his property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government without any lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the protection of personal rights," 106 U.S., at 220, 221.  
[United States vs. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S.Ct. 240 (1882)]

“consent of the governed”, according to the Declaration of Independence. My civil status and how I describe myself defines and circumscribes what I will and will not consent to. The first, most important duty of government is to protect the requirement for my consent in ALL human interactions, and especially between the government and those under its care and protection.

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, -“  
[Declaration of Independence]*

Anything not based on express consent, or which assigns a status to me that I do not choose to have, is, ipso facto, UNJUST. This reality, is, in fact, the very essence of what it means to be sovereign.

*Just as there is freedom to speak, to associate, and to believe, so also there is freedom not to speak, associate, or believe. "The right to speak and the right to refrain from speaking [on a government tax return, and in violation of the [Fifth Amendment](#) when coerced, for instance] are complementary components of the broader concept of 'individual freedom of mind.'" [Wooley v. Maynard \[430 U.S. 703\] \(1977\)](#). Freedom of conscience dictates that no individual may be forced to espouse ideological causes with which he disagrees:*

*"[A]t the heart of the [First Amendment](#) is the notion that the individual should be free to believe as he will, and that in a free society one's beliefs should be shaped by his mind and by his conscience rather than coerced by the State [through illegal enforcement of the revenue laws]." [Aboud v. Detroit Board of Education \[431 U.S. 209\] \(1977\)](#)*

**Freedom from compelled association is a vital component of freedom of expression.** *Indeed, freedom from compelled association illustrates the significance of the liberty or personal autonomy model of the [First Amendment](#). **As a general constitutional principle, it is for the individual and not for the state to choose one's associations and to define the persona which he holds out to the world."**  
[\[First Amendment Law, Barron-Dienes, West Publishing, ISBN 0-314-22677-X, pp. 266-267\]](#)*

Anyone who changes my status without my consent, and especially on government forms or as part of a government franchise is, in fact:

1. Practicing law on my behalf without my consent.
2. Engaging in involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment by making me into involuntary surety for his choices and actions.
3. Tampering with a witness in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1512.
4. Engaging in a conspiracy against rights in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §241.
5. Engaging in a conspiracy to commit perjury, because all government forms are signed under penalty of perjury.
6. Committing perjury in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1001, 18 U.S.C. §1542, 18 U.S.C. §1621.
7. Suborning perjury in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1622.

## **2. WHAT THIS DOCUMENT IS NOT**

It is quite common for malicious and malingering public servants to try to:

1. Invent reasons why they cannot or should not do the things requested in this correspondence, as a way to deflect personal responsibility in violation of their fiduciary duty as public officers.
2. Misconstrue the purpose of this communication in order to slander, intimidate, or injure people they are hired INSTEAD to protect and help.
3. Misconstrue words in this communication in order to benefit themselves personally or commercially in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §208.

The simple purpose of this communication is to restore the proper relationship between the submitter and the government in which the government is the SERVANT, the submitter is the MASTER.

**“Sovereignty is the right to govern; a nation or State-sovereign is the person or persons in whom that resides. In Europe the sovereignty is generally ascribed to the Prince; here it rests with the people; there, the sovereign actually administers the Government; here, never in a single instance; our Governors are the agents [fiduciaries] of the people, and at most stand in the same relation to their sovereign, in which regents in Europe stand to their sovereigns. Their Princes have personal powers, dignities, and pre-eminences, our rulers have none but official; nor do they partake in the sovereignty otherwise, or in any other capacity, than as private citizens.” at 472.**  
[Justice Wilson, Chisholm, Ex'r. v. Georgia, 2 Dall. (U.S.) 419, 1 L.Ed. 454, 457, 471, 472 (1794)]

The mission of the SERVANT government is to protect PRIVATE property and PRIVATE rights by:

1. Recognizing their existence.
2. Recognizing the right of all to NOT contract with any government and NOT be party to a social compact and the CIVIL statutes that implement it WITHOUT expatriating.
3. NOT enforcing the social compact and the civil law that implements it extraterritorially in a legislatively but not constitutionally foreign state, such as a state of the Union.
4. Providing administrative remedies for their protection, and thus equal protection to both FRANCHISEES and NON-FRANCHISEES.
5. NOT converting them to PUBLIC RIGHTS, OFFICES, OR FRANCHISES without the EXPRESS consent of the owner.
6. NOT converting their ownership from ABSOLUTE to QUALIFIED by tricking the owner with “words of art” into volunteering for franchises, and especially those they are not eligible for.
7. Recognizing and protecting the right of the owner of PRIVATE property and PRIVATE rights to NOT CONSENT and NOT PARTICIPATE in any government franchise. All franchises are contracts. Franchises, include Social Security, the income tax, Medicare, Obamacare, driver licensing, marriage licensing, professional licensing, etc.

Imputing anything more than the above is FRAUD, MISREPRESENTATION, THEFT, a CONSPIRACY AGAINST PRIVATE RIGHTS protected by the CONSTITUTION, and TERRORISM. Stopping terrorism BEGINS with stopping GOVERNMENT terrorism. It is truly ironic that those who expect and require that government satisfy the ONLY purpose for its creation, being that of protecting PRIVATE rights as the Declaration of Independence requires, should be branded as a anti-government, violent, or even a terrorist. If expecting a so-called “government” to ACT like a government is wrong, then the government we have is NOT a government, but a band of international terrorists masquerading as a government whose activities are thoroughly documented in:

De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

This document simply converts ownership over my body and the fruit of my labor to EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE status and places it entirely beyond government CIVIL control, regulation, or taxation.<sup>16</sup> This right is recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court in the following quote. Keep in mind that by “citizen” they are referring to STATUTORY citizen, meaning someone who CHOSE a domicile within the EXCLUSIVE jurisdiction of the government in question, and thereby elected a “protector”. It does NOT mean CONSTITUTIONAL citizenship by birth or naturalization, but DOMICILE. Domicile is the method by which one nominates and subsidizes a SPECIFIC “protector” called government and thereby becomes party to the civil “social compact”. The right to choose a civil domicile and thereby contract with the government for CIVIL protection implies an EQUAL right not to be protected and NOT to have to pay for protection that one does not want or need. The purpose of establishing government is to protect the right not only to CONTRACT, but also the right to NOT CONTRACT with those who are harmful or inefficient, such as the present de facto state and federal governments.

*When one becomes a member of society, he necessarily parts with some rights or privileges which, as an individual not affected by his relations to others, he might retain.*

<sup>16</sup> “Every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits, and appropriate them against his will...” [The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66, 10 Wheat 66, 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825)]



1 "A body politic," as aptly defined in the preamble of the Constitution of Massachusetts,  
2 "is a social compact by which the whole people covenants with each citizen, and each  
3 citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws for the common  
4 good." This does not confer power upon the whole people to control rights which are  
5 purely and exclusively private, Thorpe v. R. & B. Railroad Co., 27 Vt. 143; but it does  
6 authorize the establishment of laws requiring each citizen to so conduct himself, and so  
7 use his own property, as not unnecessarily to injure another.  
8 [Munn. v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876),  
9 SOURCE: [http://scholar.google.com/scholar\\_case?case=6419197193322400931](http://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=6419197193322400931)]

10 The nature of the "social compact" spoken of above is exhaustively described in Reference (1).

## 11 **2.1 Not an attempt to abandon Constitutional citizenship**

12 This document does not constitute an attempt to abandon any type of constitutional citizenship, but rather to abandon  
13 STATUTORY citizenship per 8 U.S.C. §1401 and not constitutional citizenship as exhaustively described in Enclosure (6).  
14 There is no question that a human being born or naturalized in a state of the Union is a Fourteenth Amendment citizen and  
15 therefore a Constitutional citizen, whether they want to be or not.

16 "It is impossible to construe the words 'subject to the jurisdiction thereof,' in the opening  
17 sentence, as less comprehensive than the words 'within its jurisdiction,' in the concluding  
18 sentence of the same section; or to hold that persons 'within the jurisdiction' of one of  
19 the states of the Union are not 'subject to the jurisdiction of the United States[\*\*\*].'"  
20 [U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, [169 U.S. 649](#), 18 S.Ct. 456; 42 L.Ed. 890 (1898), emphasis  
21 added]

22 The status of being a statutory "U.S. citizen" per 8 U.S.C. §1401 is a franchise, because it is associated with "privileges".  
23 All privileges, in turn, attach to offices in the government:

24 "The privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States do not necessarily  
25 include all the rights protected by the first eight amendments to the Federal  
26 Constitution against the powers of the Federal Government.  
27 [Maxwell v. Dow, 176 U.S. 581 (1899)]

28 I seek to avoid privileges and franchises associated with office in the government or domicile on federal territory. To  
29 compel me to accept the duties of any office furthermore constitutes involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth  
30 Amendment. The cite below proves that those domiciled on federal territory have no rights, but only privileges, and that  
31 these people also are not protected by the Constitution. As explained in Downes below, I don't want to be associated with  
32 any jurisdiction that behaves like a "British Crown Colony" rather than a "republican state of America", which is the status  
33 of those who claim the status of being statutory "U.S. citizens" per 8 U.S.C. §1401.

34 "Indeed, the practical interpretation put by Congress upon the Constitution has been  
35 long continued and uniform to the effect [182 U.S. 244, 279] that **the Constitution is**  
36 **applicable to territories acquired by purchase or conquest, only when and so far as**  
37 **Congress shall so direct. Notwithstanding its duty to 'guarantee to every state in this**  
38 **Union a republican form of government' (art. 4, 4), by which we understand, according**  
39 **to the definition of Webster, 'a government in which the supreme power resides in the**  
40 **whole body of the people, and is exercised by representatives elected by them,'**  
41 **Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of the territories of Louisiana,**  
42 **Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan,**  
43 **Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form**  
44 **of government bearing a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a**  
45 **republican state of America,** and to vest the legislative power either in a governor and  
46 council, or a governor and judges, to be appointed by the President. It was not until they  
47 had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a legislature by  
48 vote of the people. In all these cases, as well as in territories subsequently organized west  
49 of the Mississippi, Congress thought it necessary either to extend to Constitution and  
50 laws of the United States over them, or to declare that the inhabitants should be entitled

1 to enjoy the right of trial by jury, of bail, and of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus,  
2 as well as other privileges of the bill of rights.”  
3 [Downes v. Bidwell, [182 U.S. 244](#) (1901)]

## 4 **2.2 Not an act of allegiance to a “foreign” human ruler or man-made government**

5 “Those people who are not governed by GOD will be ruled by tyrants.”  
6 [William Penn (after which Pennsylvania was named)]

7 This document also does not constitute an oath or expression of allegiance to any other earthly man-made government or  
8 “state”, which [8 U.S.C. §1481](#)(a)(2) indicates causes a loss of nationality:

9 [TITLE 8 > CHAPTER 12 > SUBCHAPTER III > Part III > § 1481](#)  
10 [§ 1481. Loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizen; voluntary action;](#)  
11 [burden of proof; presumptions](#)

12 (a) A person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization,  
13 shall lose his nationality by voluntarily performing any of the following acts with the  
14 intention of relinquishing United States nationality—

15 [...]

16 (2) taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to  
17 a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof, after having attained the age of eighteen  
18 years; or

19 The actions of the current American government reveal that it is definitely hostile and “foreign” in relation to God and His  
20 holy laws found in the Bible, but the First Amendment, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, [42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B](#),  
21 and 22 U.S.C. §2721 also prohibit making allegiance to God into a basis for discrimination or denial of a passport because  
22 doing so would:

- 23 1. Interfere with my religious exercise, which is based on supreme allegiance to God.  
24 2. Violate the first four commandments of the Ten Commandments by causing me to serve or worship “other Gods”,  
25 which include governments or civil rulers. The essence of religious worship is obedience to the laws and dictates of a  
26 superior being, and that superior being CANNOT be a civil ruler or government without violating my religion.

27 “I am the LORD your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of  
28 bondage.  
29 “You shall have no other gods before Me.  
30 [Exodus 20:2-3, Bible, NKJV]

- 31 3. Disestablish a religion, by interfering with my religious exercise.  
32 4. Establish a pagan religion that places allegiance to government and civil rulers ABOVE that of allegiance to my  
33 Creator. The Bible says it is a sin to have anyone in government ABOVE me. They must SERVE me from below and  
34 may not govern me from above:

35 But Jesus called them to Himself and said to them, “You know that those who are  
36 considered rulers over the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise  
37 authority over them. Yet it shall not be so among you; but whoever desires to become  
38 great among you shall be your servant. “ And whoever of you desires to be first shall be  
39 slave of all. For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to  
40 give His life a ransom for many.”  
41 [Matt. 10:42-45, Bible, NKJV]

## 2.3 Not an attempt to “simulate legal process” or threaten any person or government with violence

This document is not intended as an attempt to simulate legal process, but rather an attempt to simply give the requisite legal notice or WHICH of the two mutually exclusive political and legal jurisdictions that I am a member of, which are described in the following:

*“It is clear that Congress, as a legislative body, exercise two species of legislative power: the one, limited as to its objects, but extending all over the Union: the other, an absolute, exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia. The preliminary inquiry in the case now before the Court, is, by virtue of which of these authorities was the law in question passed?”*

*[Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264, 6 Wheat. 265; 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821)]*

*“The idea prevails with some, indeed it has found expression in arguments at the bar, that we have in this country substantially two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all of its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside the independently of that instrument, by exercising such powers [of absolutism] as other nations of the earth are accustomed to.. I take leave to say that, if the principles thus announced should ever receive the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system of government will result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative absolutism.. It will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of a government outside the supreme law of the land finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violation of the principles of the Constitution.”*

*[Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)]*

Any attempt to continue compelling me to accept any of the obligations associated with membership in the community that includes federal territory or government franchises as a human being protected by the Constitution represents a criminal act of:

1. Involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and a theft of his/her property.
2. Compelled association in violation of the First Amendment.
3. Identity theft.

This document also does not in any way represent any effort to condone, endorse, or participate in any acts of violence, terrorism, or unlawful activity. I do not and will not condone, subsidize, sanction, or tolerate any such activities. Do not put me on any “terrorist blacklist” simply because I want you to do what the Constitution requires, which is to respect my sovereignty and simply leave me alone to worship my God, which the U.S. Supreme Court has held is the main right established by the Constitution.

*“The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.”*

*[Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990)]*

Any attempt to threaten, harass, detain, or otherwise make the Submitter of this legal notice the target of “selective enforcement” because of the unlawful government activities it exposes shall constitute and be treated as:

1. Obstruction of justice.
2. Tampering with a witness of criminal activities documented herein.
3. International terrorism, because the states of the Union are “nations” within the meaning of international law.



4. Extortion.
5. Racketeering.
6. Slavery and involuntary servitude in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment.

## **2.4 Not an act of expatriation or abandonment of “nationality” under 8 U.S.C.**

This document does *not* describe an act of expatriation, which is legally defined as an act of “abandoning nationality and allegiance”. To wit:

*"Expatriation is the voluntary renunciation or abandonment of nationality and allegiance."*  
[Perkins v. Elg, [307 U.S. 325](#); 59 S.Ct. 884; 83 L.Ed 1320 (1939)]

Expatriation is only one of *two* possible lawful methods for becoming a “stateless person” and a “transient foreigner”. The other method is to abandon domicile in the country of one’s birth or domicile and to re-associate with a state or political or religious group which is “foreign” with respect to one’s state or nation of birth. The U.S. Supreme Court described the result of not having a domicile within any state of the Union or within the country of one’s birth as causing them to become stateless, when it said:

*In order to be a citizen of a State within the meaning of the diversity statute, a natural person must both be a citizen of the United States and be domiciled within the State. See Robertson v. Cease, 97 U.S. 646, 648-649 (1878); Brown v. Keene, 8 Pet. 112, 115 (1834). The problem in this case is that Bettison, although a United States citizen, has no domicile in any State. **He is therefore "stateless" for purposes of § 1332(a)(3). Subsection 1332(a)(2), which confers jurisdiction in the District Court when a citizen of a State sues aliens only, also could not be satisfied because Bettison is a United States [citizen under the Fourteenth Amendment but NOT under 8 U.S.C. §1401] citizen. [490 U.S. 829]***

*When a plaintiff sues more than one defendant in a diversity action, the plaintiff must meet the requirements of the diversity statute for each defendant or face dismissal. Strawbridge v. Curtiss, 3 Cranch 267 (1806).{1} **Here, Bettison's "stateless" status destroyed complete diversity under § 1332(a)(3), and his United States citizenship destroyed complete diversity under § 1332(a)(2).** Instead of dismissing the case, however, the Court of Appeals panel granted Newman-Green's motion, which it had invited, to amend the complaint to drop Bettison as a party, thereby producing complete diversity under § 1332(a)(2). 832 F.2d. 417 (1987). The panel, in an opinion by Judge Easterbrook, relied both on 28 U.S.C. §1653 and on Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as sources of its authority to grant this motion. The panel noted that, because the guarantors are jointly and severally liable, Bettison is not an indispensable party, and dismissing him would not prejudice the remaining guarantors. 832 F.2d. at 420, citing Fed.Rule Civ.Proc. 19(b). The panel then proceeded to the merits of the case, ruling in Newman-Green's favor in large part, but remanding to allow the District Court to quantify damages and to resolve certain minor issues.{2} [[Newman-Green v. Alfonso Larrain, 490 U.S. 826 \(1989\)](#)]*

You will note that Mr. Bettison in the above styled case was domiciled outside of every state of the Union, and that he was a constitutional citizen, which means a “national” under [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#), but not a statutory “citizen” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1401](#). This is further explained in Enclosure (6). He could not be a statutory citizen because he was not domiciled within the “United States” at the time and therefore was a “national but not a citizen” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1452](#). This is precisely the status that this correspondence shall document on my part in the context of all future legal or business dealings we may have.

This document is NOT an attempt to abandon nationality or *constitutional* CITIZENSHIP allegiance pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1481](#). Therefore, please do NOT respond with LAME statements like the following, because they are NOT RESPONSIVE to what I am asking you for in this letter:

1           *"We have received your letter of \_\_\_\_\_. It appears that you are attempting to*  
2           *renounce your United States citizenship. In addition to this letter, please read carefully*  
3           *the enclosed flyer, which in detail outlines the procedure and effects of renouncing U.S.*  
4           *citizenship.*

5           *Generally, United States citizens have the right to remain citizens until they intend to give*  
6           *up citizenship. Renunciation is the most unequivocal way in which a person can manifest*  
7           *an intention to relinquish U.S. citizenship. In order for a renunciation to be effective, all*  
8           *of the conditions of the statute must be met. Most significantly, a person may not*  
9           *renounce U.S. citizenship while present in the United States, unless the United States is in*  
10           *a state of war. Since the United States is not currently in a state of war, U.S. citizenship*  
11           *must be renounced abroad.*

12           *Loss of citizenship only occurs when a Certificate of Loss of Nationality is issued. The*  
13           *certificate may only be issued by the Department of State, after a careful review in which*  
14           *it is determined whether the person (1) has voluntarily performed an act made potentially*  
15           *expatriating by statute and (2) did so with the intention of relinquishing U.S. citizenship.*

16           *Persons who are considering renouncing U.S. citizenship should carefully review the*  
17           *enclosed information. We hope that this information will be helpful to you.*

18       Instead, this document abandons *all political and legal allegiance* originating through choice of domicile AND "residence"  
19       and exercise of political rights that arise from them *only within federal territory under the exclusive or general sovereignty*  
20       *of the federal government.* Therefore, please *do NOT* respond to this correspondence by telling me how to abandon  
21       CONSTITUTIONAL CITIZENSHIP or NATIONALITY, because I don't seek to do this. I want to abandon  
22       STATUTORY "U.S. citizen" status pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1401](#), but NOT my CONSTITUTIONAL citizenship pursuant  
23       to Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment. The distinctions between CONSTITUTIONAL citizenship and  
24       STATUTORY citizenship are described in detail in Enclosure (6) . If you do not understand these distinctions, please  
25       carefully read and rebut, if necessary, this enclosure so that you can properly and timely respond to this request.

## 26       **2.5       Not an act of "expatriation" under the I.R.C.**

27       This document does not constitute the act of expatriation described in 26 U.S.C. §877 because:

- 28       1. I am not a "taxpayer" and the only thing the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A can pertain to is "taxpayers".

29           *"Revenue Laws relate to taxpayers [officers, employees, and elected officials of the*  
30           *Federal Government] and not to non-taxpayers [American Citizens/American Nationals*  
31           *not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government]. The latter are*  
32           *without their scope. No procedures are prescribed for non-taxpayers and no attempt is*  
33           *made to annul any of their Rights or Remedies in due course of law. With them[non-*  
34           *taxpayers] Congress does not assume to deal and they are neither of the subject nor of*  
35           *the object of federal revenue laws."*  
36           *[Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 (1972) ]*

- 37       2. I am NOT a statutory "individual" or a statutory "nonresident alien individual", but rather a nonresident who is NOT  
38       an statutory "individual". The only party described in 26 U.S.C. §877 are "nonresident alien *individuals*". All such  
39       "individuals" are government officers and employees and not private parties. This is exhaustively demonstrated by the  
40       following:

<p>Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a "Public Officer" for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008 <a href="http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm">http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</a></p>
--

- 41       3. The Courts are without authority to declare me or assign to me any civil status other than what I assign myself under  
42       the terms of the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A franchise agreement, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201(a). This is  
43       another way of saying that I am the "customer", the customer is always right, and the customer has the right to choose  
44       whether he wants to hire the protection racket called "government". Those who don't are called nonresident  
45       nontaxpayers, "transient foreigners", "stateless persons", etc.

Specifically, Rowen seeks a declaratory judgment against the United States of America with respect to "whether or not the plaintiff is a taxpayer pursuant to, and/or under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14)." (See Compl. at 2.) **This Court lacks jurisdiction to issue a declaratory judgment "with respect to Federal taxes other than actions brought under section 7428 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986," a code section that is not at issue in the instant action. See 28 U.S.C. §2201; see also Hughes v. United States, 953 F.2d 531, 536-537 (9th Cir. 1991) (affirming dismissal of claim for declaratory relief under § 2201 where claim concerned question of tax liability).** Accordingly, defendant's motion to dismiss is hereby GRANTED, and the instant action is hereby DISMISSED. [[Rowen v. U.S., 05-3766MMC. \(N.D.Cal. 11/02/2005\)](#)]

## 2.6 **Not connected with the "sovereign citizen movement"**

The submitter of this correspondence is not connected with the so called "sovereign citizen movement". Being "sovereign" and being a statutory "citizen" pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401, are, in fact, mutually exclusive and therefore the status of being a "sovereign" and a "citizen" simultaneously is an oxymoron that only morons use or associate with themselves. For the reasons, see:

*Policy Document: Rebutted Arguments Against this Website*, Form #08.011, Sections 6.1 through 6.4  
FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>  
DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/PolicyDocs/RebArgAgWebsite.pdf>

## 2.7 **Not associated with any known flawed argument advanced by the government**

*"For this is the will of God, that by doing good you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men— as free, yet not using liberty as a cloak for vice, **but as bondservants of God.**"*  
[[1 Peter 2:15-16](#), Bible, NKJV]

Neither I nor this notice is associated with any flawed tax or freedom arguments or deranged groups who advance them that are presently identified or documented by the government. In fact, I denounce the use of stereotypes of any kind and insist that everyone should be treated respectfully, with dignity, and consistent with every aspect of who and why they provably are. The relationship of this request to all known and published government guidance documents on the subject of freedom or tax arguments is found in the following. Failure to rebut the rebuttals to the government's publications in the following shall constitute consent that we are not in conflict with the government and that you agree with our position:

*Resources to Rebut Government, Legal, and Tax Profession Deception and False Propaganda*  
<http://sedm.org/LibertyU/LibertyU.htm>

## 2.8 **Not an act of "paper terrorism"**

This document is NOT an act of "paper terrorism". In fact, it is intended to PREVENT YOUR terrorism and paper terrorism. That terrorism is exhaustively described in:

*De Facto Government Scam*, Form #05.043  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

The reason you keep communicating with me and enforcing against me is obviously because you FALSELY think I am a "customer" of your protection racket called a "citizen", "resident", "inhabitant", "domiciliary", "person", or "individual". I AM NOT any of these entities and I not only don't want your protection. In fact, the only thing I need protection from is YOU. YOU are the terrorist. I simply want to be LEFT ALONE by you, which can't be turned into a franchise and which the Constitution gives me the right to FOR FREE:

*"The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs,*

1           *their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. **They conferred, as against the***  
2           ***Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right***  
3           ***most valued by civilized men.**"*

4           *[Olmstead v. United States, [277 U.S. 438, 478](#) (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also*  
5           *Washington v. Harper, [494 U.S. 210](#) (1990)]*

6       Stop deluding yourself that people need you or want you anymore. God says you have outlived your usefulness because  
7       the only thing you protect anymore is your own CRIMINAL wrongdoing of your own officers while they are terrorizing  
8       and enslaving and stealing from me without my consent.

9           **"Come out of her, my people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive her**  
10          **plagues.**

11          *For her [our [corrupted de facto WHORE government](#)] sins have reached to heaven, and*  
12          *God has remembered her iniquities."*

13          *[[Rev. 18:1-8](#), Bible, NKJV]*

14       It's the height of hypocrisy and arrogance to:

- 15       1. Call that kind of "public service" a "benefit" or make it into a franchise.
- 16       2. Charge me for the "privilege" of being the object of it.
- 17       3. PRESUME (in violation of due process of law) that I consent to it by calling me a "citizen", "resident", "inhabitant",  
18       "domiliary", "person", "individual", "taxpayer", etc. I don't authorize you to represent me or determine my legal  
19       status at all.
- 20       4. Force me to consent to it by not providing any forms or administrative remedies to INDICATE my NON-CONSENT  
21       to it.
- 22       5. Interfere with efforts to correct false information return reports that connect me with consent to it. That's a conspiracy  
23       to file or perpetuate false returns and COMPUTER fraud.
- 24       6. Interfere with efforts on government forms to correctly describe my status as a non-consenting party, thus FORCING  
25       me to commit perjury on government forms in order to exercise my unalienable rights granted not by you, but by God.  
26

## 27       **2.9 Not an attempt to promote "anarchy", lawlessness, or violence of any kind**

28       This document also does not represent an attempt to promote anarchy, meaning lawlessness, or violence of any kind. I  
29       personally deplore violence and use it only as a last resort in defending myself from equal physical violence by others.

30       I do not ever say or advocate any of the following:

- 31       1. That I am above "the law".
- 32       2. That I am not subject to "law" as legally defined.
- 33       3. That I am "better" or "superior" to any other "person" or human being.
- 34       4. That I am not subject to the criminal laws of the place I physically am at any given time.

35       In fact, I seek to enforce the Constitutional requirement established in the Declaration of Independence that:

- 36       1. "all men are created equal" by the "Creator".
- 37       2. All "persons", including governments, are treated equally IN EVERY RESPECT.
- 38       3. The only way anyone, whether human or artificial, can become UNEQUAL or inferior in any way to any other person  
39       or human being is to CONSENT in a manner that they and no one else prescribes and defines. See:

<a href="#">Requirement for Consent</a> , Form #05.003 <a href="http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm">http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</a>
---

40       The implication of the above is that no creation of men, including a government, can have any more authority or powers  
41       than a single man. The United States government is a government of delegated power ALONE, as declared by the U.S.  
42       Supreme Court, and The People CANNOT delegate any authority that they themselves do not INDIVIDUALLY also  
43       possess.

1       *"The question is not what power the federal government ought to have, but what powers,*  
2       *in fact, have been given by the people... **The federal union is a government of delegated***  
3       ***powers. It has only such as are expressly conferred upon it, and such as are reasonably***  
4       ***to be implied from those granted.** In this respect, we differ radically from nations where*  
5       *all legislative power, without restriction or limitation, is vested in a parliament or other*  
6       *legislative body subject to no restriction except the discretion of its members."*  
7       *(Congress)*  
8       *[[U.S. v. William M. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 \(1936\)](#)]*

9       Equality of rights is the foundation of ALL of your freedom, as held by the U.S. Supreme Court. Anyone who insists that  
10      they SHOULD NOT be treated equally IN EVERY RESPECT to a government in a civil court is essentially admitting that  
11      they DO NOT want to be "free" as the U.S. Supreme Court defines it:

12       *"But arbitrary selection can never be justified by calling it classification. The equal*  
13       *protection demanded by the fourteenth amendment forbids this. No language is more*  
14       *worthy of frequent and thoughtful consideration than these words of Mr. Justice*  
15       *Matthews, speaking for this court, in Yick Wo v. Hopkins, [118 U.S. 356, 369](#), 6 S.Sup.Ct.*  
16       *1064, 1071: 'When we consider the nature and the theory of our institutions of*  
17       *government, the principles upon which they are supposed to rest, and review the history*  
18       *of their development, we are constrained to conclude that they do not mean to leave room*  
19       *for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power.' The first official action*  
20       *of this nation declared the foundation of government in these words: 'We hold these*  
21       *truths to be self-evident, [165 U.S. 150, 160] that all men are created equal, that they*  
22       *are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life,*  
23       *liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' While such declaration of principles may not have*  
24       *the force of organic law, or be made the basis of judicial decision as to the limits of right*  
25       *and duty, and while in all cases reference must be had to the organic law of the nation*  
26       *for such limits, yet the latter is but the body and the letter of which the former is the*  
27       *thought and the spirit, and it is always safe to read the letter of the constitution in the*  
28       *spirit of the Declaration of Independence. **No duty rests more imperatively upon the***  
29       ***courts than the enforcement of those constitutional provisions intended to secure that***  
30       ***equality of rights which is the foundation of free government.**"*  
31       *[Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis, [165 U.S. 150](#) (1897)]*

32      No government can or should therefore have any more authority than a single man. Anyone who insists otherwise is:

- 33      1. Imputing "supernatural powers" to government, because the ONLY "natural" source are the people protected by said  
34      government from whom all the powers of the government derive.  
35      2. Committing paganism and idolatry towards governments and/or civil rulers. The foundation of this idolatry are the  
36      "supernatural powers" that form the basis for establishing a state-sponsored civil religion that worships, serves, and  
37      obeys corrupt governments or civil rulers instead of the one and only living God.

38       ***"Religion. Man's relation to Divinity, to reverence, worship, obedience, and submission***  
39       ***to mandates and precepts of supernatural or superior beings. In its broadest sense***  
40       ***includes all forms of belief in the existence of superior beings exercising power over***  
41       ***human beings by volition, imposing rules of conduct, with future rewards and***  
42       ***punishments. Bond uniting man to God, and a virtue whose purpose is to render God***  
43       ***worship due him as source of all being and principle of all government of things.***  
44       *Nikulnikoff v. Archbishop, etc., of Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, 142 Misc.*  
45       *894, 255 N.Y.S. 653, 663."*  
46       *[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1292]*

- 47      3. An elitist.  
48      4. A fool.  
49      5. What the soviets called a "Useful Idiot" for socialist tyrants.

50      Consistent with the above, the Sovereignty Franchise protecting me and mentioned in Enclosure (3) later confirms that its  
51      main purpose is to ensure the EQUALITY of all rights in every respect between a single human being and an entire



government. This could hardly be referred to as elitist in any respect, unless of course YOU are the elitist who wants a big government that acts as a nanny state and has rights above ALL:

Sovereignty Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

The implication of COMPLETE equality between each separate human being and an entire government is that if a government claims "sovereign immunity" and insists that it cannot be sued without its express written consent, then the government, in turn, when it is enforcing any civil liability against ANY American, has the EQUAL burden to produce evidence of consent IN WRITING to be sued. That consent must, in turn, be given by a person domiciled in a place OTHER than that protected by the Constitution, because the Declaration of Independence says the rights of people in states of the Union are "unalienable", which means they CANNOT be sold, bargained away, or transferred by ANY process, including a franchise or contract.

*"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that **all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, -"*  
*[Declaration of Independence]*

*"Unalienable. Inalienable; incapable of being aliened, that is, sold and transferred."*  
*[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693]*

Therefore, the only people who can lawfully "alienate" any Constitutional right in relation to a real, de jure government by exercising their right to contract, are those **NOT** protected by the Constitution and who therefore are either domiciled on federal territory or situated abroad, which also is not protected by the Constitution.

To me, there is ONLY ONE law, which is the two Great Commandments spoken of by Jesus:

*Then one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, perceiving that He had answered them well, asked Him, "Which is the first commandment of all?"*

*Jesus answered him, "**The first of all the commandments is: 'Hear, O Israel, the LORD our God, the LORD is one. And you shall love the LORD your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength. This is the first commandment. And the second, like it, is this: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself. There is no other commandment greater than these.'**"*

*So the scribe said to Him, "Well said, Teacher. You have spoken the truth, for there is one God, and there is no other but He. And to love Him with all the heart, with all the understanding, with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love one's neighbor as oneself, is more than all the whole burnt offerings and sacrifices."*  
*[[Mark 12:28-33](#), Bible, NKJV]*

I fulfill the above commandments by educating people about law and helping them obey and enforce it so as to help them honor the two main requirements of the common law, which are:

1. Do not harm the equal rights of your neighbor. The term "neighbor" includes "government", which is just an artificial entity created by men. This is a fulfillment of the second Great Commandment above to love your neighbor as yourself.
2. Honor all contracts and commitments you make.

Therefore, my mission, when you merge the requirements of God's Law and Man's law is:

1. Do not harm the equal rights of your neighbor. The term "neighbor" includes "government", which is just an artificial entity created by men. This is a fulfillment of the second Great Commandment above to love your neighbor as yourself.
2. Honor all contracts and commitments you make.

3. Enforce the requirement for consent in all interactions between everyone, including between any government or civil ruler and “the governed”. Emphasize that the MAIN purpose of government is to prosecute those who injure others without the consent of the injured:

*Requirement for Consent*, Form #05.003

FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/MemLaw/Consent.pdf>

4. Do not respect, subsidize, or cooperate with any effort to enforce or impute any more rights to a government or civil ruler than the people individually themselves have. Otherwise, the first Great Commandment above has been violated because idolatry and a state sponsored religion has been established. This is described in:

*Socialism: The New American Civil Religion*, Form #05.016

FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/MemLaw/SocialismCivilReligion.pdf>

5. Do not allow the government to make those protected, meaning “citizens” and “residents”, into a public officer, and therefore to serve TWO masters, because this is not only idolatry, but a violation of the [separation of powers](#) between what is public and what is private.

*"No servant [or religious ministry or biological person] can serve **two masters**; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. **You cannot serve God and mammon [government].**"*  
*[[Luke 16:13](#), Bible, NKJV]*

*The origin of the great divide between the Civil law and Criminal law is the requirement for “consent of the governed”. Criminal law does not require consent while Civil law does. One becomes subject to the civil law by voluntarily choosing a domicile within a specific jurisdiction. This process of choice is called “animus manendi” and it cannot be compelled. Its purpose is to politically associate with a specific group and to procure the protection of that group and it is an exercise of your First Amendment right to politically associate.*

*"The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the citizenship to the agencies of government."*  
*[City of Dallas v. Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944]*

*"Undoubtedly no single nation can change the law of the sea. That law is of universal obligation, and no statute of one or two nations can create obligations for the world. **Like all the laws of nations, it rests upon the common consent of civilized communities.**"*  
*[The Scotia, 81 U.S. (14 Wall.) 170 (1871)]*

All civil laws passed by the government are an implementation of what the courts call the “social compact”.

*"In Europe, the executive is synonymous with the sovereign power of a state...where it is too commonly acquired by force or fraud, or both...In America, however the case is widely different. **Our government is founded upon compact [consent expressed in a written contract called a Constitution or in positive law]. Sovereignty was, and is, in the people [as individuals: that's you!]**."*  
*[Glass v. The Sloop Betsy, 3 (U.S.) Dall 6]*

A “compact” is the equivalent of a contract.

***“Compact**, n. An agreement or contract between persons, nations, or states. Commonly applied to working agreements between and among states concerning matters of mutual concern. A contract between parties, which creates obligations and rights capable of being enforced and contemplated as such between the parties, in their distinct and independent characters. A mutual consent of parties concerned respecting some property or right that is the object of the stipulation, or something that is to be done or forborne. See also Compact clause; Confederacy; Interstate compact; Treaty."*  
*[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 281]*

1 You become a party to the “social compact” by voluntarily choosing a civil domicile within the jurisdiction of a specific  
2 government. This choice makes you a consenting party to the “social compact” and is an exercise of your First Amendment  
3 right to politically associate. One’s domicile is the civil law you consent to be subject to. The Declaration of Independence  
4 says that ALL the just authority of government derives from the consent of the governed.

5 Implicit in the exercise of the right to associate is the right NOT to associate with ANY group if one so chooses. Those  
6 who never choose such a domicile and never politically and legally associate are not subject to the civil laws of that  
7 jurisdiction and instead are described by any of the following names:

- 8 1. “nonresidents”
- 9 2. “transient foreigners”
- 10 3. “stateless persons”
- 11 4. “in transitu”
- 12 5. “transient”
- 13 6. “sojourner”

14 Hence, you can be governed CIVILLY only if you consent to be governed. Obviously, the criminal law does not require  
15 consent of the governed, but the civil law DOES. The vast majority of law published by government is civil law and even  
16 tax crimes are really PENAL rather than CRIMINAL in nature, and therefore are voluntary for those who are nonresident.

17 Some laws are civil in nature while others are criminal. Criminal laws apply to EVERYONE physically present on the  
18 territory of the government whether they consent or not, while civil laws only apply to those who choose a domicile on that  
19 territory. All franchises and the excise taxes that implement them are civil in nature and therefore “activate” or “acquire the  
20 force of law” ONLY by your voluntary choice of domicile. Even the criminal provisions of the tax laws, for instance, are  
21 in fact civil franchises that are penal rather than criminal in nature. An example of this are the so-called “criminal”  
22 provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. All income taxes are civil franchises and a civil liabilities that attach to one’s  
23 VOLUNTARY choice of civil domicile. This is covered in:

*The “Trade or Business” Scam*, Form #05.001  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

24 Hence, the criminal provisions of the I.R.C. in fact are CIVIL and PENAL provisions that acquire the “force of law” based  
25 on domicile on federal territory not within the jurisdiction of any state of the Union. Furthermore, you CANNOT lawfully  
26 acquire a domicile in a place you have never been physically present in and most Americans have never been physically  
27 present on federal territory.

28 I am therefore not saying that I am ABOVE any law, but simply that a large component of what most Americans think of as  
29 “law” is really just a voluntary franchise or what the courts call a “compact” that you FIRST must volunteer for before you  
30 can be subject to. It is NOT a crime to NOT volunteer for the “benefits” of such franchises or compacts. The courts have  
31 routinely held, in fact, that the exercise of any right cannot be penalized or criminalized if the result does not harm the equal  
32 rights of any specific person:

33 *“It is an unconstitutional deprivation of due process for the government to penalize a*  
34 *person merely because he has exercised a protected statutory or constitutional right.*  
35 *United States v. Goodwin, 457 U.S. 368, 372, 102 S.Ct. 2485, 2488, 73 L.Ed.2d. 74*  
36 *(1982).”*  
37 *[People of Territory of Guam v. Fegurgur, 800 F.2d. 1470 (9th Cir. 1986)]*

38 *“Where rights secured by the Constitution there can be no rule making or legislation*  
39 *which would abrogate them.”*  
40 *[Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966)]*

41 A classic book on the common law written by a Harvard Law professor admits that all franchises, in fact, are not “law” in a  
42 classical sense, but rather “compacts”. The implication is that anyone who calls a franchise “law” is LYING to you,  
43 keeping in mind that the income tax is a franchise:



1           *"Municipal law, thus understood, is properly defined to be "a rule of civil conduct*  
2           *prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting*  
3           *what is wrong."*

4           [. . .]

5           ***It is also called a rule to distinguish it from a compact or agreement; for a compact is a***  
6           ***promise proceeding from us, law is a command directed to us. The language of a***  
7           ***compact is, "I will, or will not, do this"; that of a law is, "thou shalt, or shalt not, do***  
8           ***it." It is true there is an obligation which a compact carries with it, equal in point of***  
9           ***conscience to that of a law; but then the original of the obligation is different. In***  
10           ***compacts we ourselves determine and promise what shall be done, before we are***  
11           ***obliged to do it; in laws, we are obliged to act without ourselves determining or***  
12           ***promising anything at all. Upon these accounts law is defined to be "a rule."***

13           *[Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Roscoe Pound, Second*  
14           *Edition, 1925, p. 4]*

15       The issue is NOT whether government should GOVERN and thereby satisfy the purpose of its creation, but rather whether:

- 16       1. Any government can civilly govern those who expressly do NOT consent. By “civilly govern”, we mean enforce any  
17       portion of the CIVIL laws upon them. The Declaration of Independence specifically says NO, because it says that all  
18       JUST powers of [CIVIL] government derive from the EXPRESS consent of the people.
- 19       2. A government that only protects PUBLIC property and refuses to recognize or PROTECT EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE  
20       property is really a “government”. Right now, the only way they will protect it is if you donate it to the government  
21       and become the QUALIFIED owner rather than the ABSOLUTE owner.
- 22       3. Any CIVIL government should have a MONOPOLY on civilly governing. The Declaration of Independence says they  
23       DO NOT and that we have a DUTY to provide “better safeguards for our future security” when rulers become corrupt  
24       or the government ceases to protect PRIVATE rights.
- 25       4. Any government, by promoting a monopoly on “protection”, can prohibit anyone else from CIVILLY governing any  
26       aspect of their lives that they deem to be EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE, and thereby beyond the control of government.
- 27       5. By civilly governing, any government can use its authority to enact CIVIL law to impose any kind of duty, regulation,  
28       or tax upon the populace that they did not FIRST consent to by choosing a specific status under specific franchise and  
29       being PROTECTED in the right NOT to choose such status.
- 30       6. It is a violation of the legislative intent of the Constitution or constitutes duress to implement any of the following:  
31       6.1. Ensure that NO POWERS are delegated or reserved to the people to govern their own lives as required by the  
32       Ninth and Tenth Amendment by destroying all such authority by illegally enforced or imposed franchises.  
33       6.2. Compel people to be subject to a “social compact” and therefore contract that they don’t consent to. Governments  
34       are created to protect your right to both contract and not be compelled to contract.  
35       6.3. Interfere with self-government by the people.

36           ***The determination of the Framers Convention and the ratifying conventions to***  
37           ***preserve complete and unimpaired state self-government in all matters not committed***  
38           ***to the general government is one of the plainest facts which emerges from the history***  
39           ***of their deliberations.*** And adherence to that determination is incumbent equally upon  
40           *the federal government and the states. **State powers can neither be appropriated on the***  
41           ***one hand nor abdicated on the other. As this court said in Texas v. White, 7 Wall. 700,***  
42           ***725, 'The preservation of the States, and the maintenance of their governments, are as***  
43           ***much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union***  
44           ***and the maintenance of the National government.*** The Constitution, in all its provisions,  
45           *looks to an indestructible Union, composed of indestructible States.' Every journey to a*  
46           *forbidden end begins with the first step; and the danger of such a step by the federal*  
47           *government in the direction of taking over the powers of the states is that the end of the*  
48           *journey may find the states so despoiled of their powers, or-what may amount to the same*  
49           *thing-so [298 U.S. 238, 296] relieved of the responsibilities which possession of the*  
50           *powers necessarily enjoins, as to reduce them to little more than geographical*  
51           *subdivisions of the national domain. It is safe to say that if, when the Constitution was*  
52           *under consideration, it had been thought that any such danger lurked behind its plain*  
53           *words, it would never have been ratified.*

**And the Constitution itself is in every real sense a law-the lawmakers being the people themselves, in whom under our system all political power and sovereignty XE "SOVEREIGNTY:Political power and sovereignty" primarily resides, and through whom such power and sovereignty primarily speaks. It is by that law, and not otherwise, that the legislative, executive, and judicial agencies which it created exercise such political authority as they have been permitted to possess. The Constitution speaks for itself in terms so plain that to misunderstand their import is not rationally possible. 'We the People of the United States,' it says, 'do ordain and establish this Constitution.' Ordain and establish! These are definite words of enactment, and without more would stamp what follows with the dignity and character of law. The framers of the Constitution, however, were not content to let the matter rest here, but provided explicitly-'This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; ... shall be the supreme Law of the Land.' (Const. art. 6, cl. 2.) The supremacy of the Constitution as law is thus declared without qualification. That supremacy is absolute; the supremacy of a statute enacted by Congress is not absolute but conditioned upon its being made in pursuance of the Constitution. And a judicial tribunal, clothed by that instrument with complete judicial power, and, therefore, by the very nature of the power, required to ascertain and apply the law to the facts in every case or proceeding properly brought for adjudication, must apply the supreme law and reject the inferior stat- [298 U.S. 238, 297] ute whenever the two conflict. In the discharge of that duty, the opinion of the lawmakers that a statute passed by them is valid must be given great weight, Adkins v. Children's Hospital, 261 U.S. 525, 544, 43 S.Ct. 394, 24 A.L.R. 1238; but their opinion, or the court's opinion, that the statute will prove greatly or generally beneficial is wholly irrelevant to the inquiry. Schechter Poultry Corp. v. United States, 295 U.S. 495, 549, 550 S., 55 S.Ct. 837, 97 A.L.R. 947.**

[Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238 (1936)]

I think the very definition of "anarchy" is governments and/or civil rulers who:

1. Claim and protect their own sovereign immunity, but refuse to recognize the same EQUAL immunity of the people from whom that power was delegated to begin with. Hypocrites.
2. Are not directly accountable to the people or the law. They prohibit the PEOPLE from criminally prosecuting their own crimes, reserving the right to prosecute to their own fellow criminals. Who polices the police? THE CRIMINALS.
3. Have a monopoly on anything, INCLUDING "protection", and who turn that monopoly into a mechanism to force EVERYONE to become uncompensated public officers in exchange for the "privilege" of being able to even exist or earn a living to support oneself.
4. Can tax and spend any amount or percentage of the people's earnings over the OBJECTIONS of the people.
5. Can print, meaning illegally counterfeit, as much money as they want to fund their criminal enterprise, and thus to be completely free from accountability to the people.
6. Impute to themselves more rights or method of acquiring rights than the people themselves have. In other words, who are the object of PAGAN IDOL WORSHIP because they possess "supernatural" powers. By "supernatural", we mean that which is superior to the "natural", which is ordinary human beings.
7. Only enforce the law against others and NOT themselves, as a way to protect their own criminal activities by persecuting dissidents. This is called "selective enforcement". In the legal field it is also called "professional courtesy". Never kill the goose that lays the STOLEN golden eggs.
8. Deceive and/or lie to the public with impunity by telling you that you can't trust anything they say, but force YOU to sign everything under penalty of perjury when you want to talk to them. 26 U.S.C. §6065.
9. Can enact or enforce any law that they themselves are not subject to. This is a violation of the Constitutional requirement for equal protection and equal treatment.

The above type of "lawlessness" by de facto government actors is the SAME "lawlessness" that Jesus criticized the Pharisees (lawyers) for in the Holy Bible.

**"Woe to you, scribes [religious leaders] and Pharisees [lawyers], hypocrites! For you cleanse the outside of the cup and dish [OTHER people], but inside they are full of**

1                   *extortion and self-indulgence. Blind [to their own sin] Pharisee, first cleanse the inside*  
2                   *of the cup and dish, that the outside of them may be clean also.*

3                   **“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs**  
4                   **which indeed appear beautiful outwardly, but inside are full of dead men’s bones and**  
5                   **all uncleanness. Even so you also outwardly appear righteous to men, but inside you**  
6                   **are full of hypocrisy and lawlessness.**

7                   *[Matt. 23:1-36, Bible, NKJV]*

8       The ONLY thing Jesus and God ever got visibly angry at was the hypocrisy, inequity, and irresponsibility of the Pharisees,  
9       so it MUST be important for you who are lawyers to understand and eliminate this hypocrisy.

10      If you would like to know more about how the government is LYING TO YOU by calling any franchise such as the income  
11      tax “law” when in fact it is NOT “law” in order to deceive people into obeying it who in fact can choose NOT to be subject  
12      to it, please read:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030 <a href="http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm">http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</a>
---

### 13   **3. DETAILS OF CHANGE IN MY LEGAL DOMICILE/CITIZENSHIP AND PERSONAL** 14   **ALLEGIANCE RECORDS**

15      Ref. (1) contains facts and evidence that explains that choosing a domicile is an entirely voluntary act that cannot lawfully  
16      be compelled, because it amounts to an exercise of the protected [First Amendment](#) right of free political association.  
17      Domicile is not simply a by-product of physical presence somewhere, but has two criteria in order to establish it:

- 18      1. Physical presence in a place either currently or in the past. AND
- 19      2. An intent to not only remain there, but to have voluntary, consensual political allegiance to the people and the laws of  
20      that place.

21      The above is consistent with the requirement that minors and incompetent persons may not declare a domicile, but take on  
22      the domicile of their caregivers: Because they are incapable of giving informed consent. The allegiance and “intention”  
23      (consent) to make a place one’s domicile cannot be compelled. This was confirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court when it  
24      said:

25                   **“The [domiciled] citizen cannot complain [about the civil laws or the tax system],**  
26                   **because he has voluntarily submitted himself to such a form of government [by**  
27                   **choosing a domicile therein]. He owes allegiance to the two departments, so to speak,**  
28                   **and within their respective spheres must pay the penalties which each exacts for**  
29                   **disobedience to its laws. In return, he can demand protection from each within its own**  
30                   **jurisdiction.”**

31                   *[United States v. Cruikshank, [92 U.S. 542](#) (1875) (emphasis added)]*

32      If the choice of domicile is compelled, if the requirement for consent and intent is removed from domicile so that only  
33      physical presence determines it, then those instituting the duress or making the false presumption of domicile inconsistent  
34      with the wishes of the subject or with stare decisis on this subject are:

- 35      1. Engaging in criminal racketeering and extortion, by forcing me to nominate you as my protector and pay “protection  
36      money” at gunpoint called “taxes”. In effect, you are compelling me, under threat of illegal actions directed against my  
37      life, liberty, and property, to pay “protection money” to a terrorist de facto private corporation masquerading as a  
38      lawful government in violation of [18 U.S.C. §1951](#). This is a RICO violation of the highest order.
- 39      2. Interfering with local and personal self-government, which was and is central to the legislative intent of the United  
40      States Constitution:

41                   **“The determination of the Framers Convention and the ratifying conventions to**  
42                   **preserve complete and unimpaired state [and personal] self-government in all matters**

not committed to the general government is one of the plainest facts which emerges from the history of their deliberations. And adherence to that determination is incumbent equally upon the federal government and the states.”  
[Carter v. Carter Coal Co., [298 U.S. 238](#) (1936)]

3. Instituting slavery and involuntary servitude, by expecting the target of the presumption to satisfy the obligations of a legal status and relation that he never consented to. This violates the [Thirteenth Amendment](#), [42 U.S.C. §1994](#), and [18 U.S.C. §1581](#).
4. Violating due process of law by prejudicing constitutionally protected rights of the person who is the object of the presumption.

(1) [8:4993] **Conclusive presumptions affecting protected interests:**

*A conclusive presumption may be defeated where its application would impair a party's constitutionally-protected liberty or property interests. In such cases, conclusive presumptions have been held to violate a party's due process and equal protection rights. [Vlandis v. Kline (1973) [412 U.S. 441](#), 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235; Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) [414 U.S. 632](#), 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215-presumption under Illinois law that unmarried fathers are unfit violates process] [\[Rutter Group Practice Guide-Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, paragraph 8:4993, page 8K-34\]](#)*

5. Engaging in “compelled association” in violation of the [First Amendment](#), by compelling a person to associate with a “state” and/or a government that he does not wish to associate with.
6. Interfering with my private right to contract. The Bible identifies itself as a covenant, promise, and “protection” contract between me and my God. I have every right to choose who my EXCLUSIVE protector is.

*“For the LORD is our Judge, the LORD is our Lawgiver, the LORD is our King; He will save [and protect] us.”  
[\[Isaiah 33:22, Bible, NKJV\]](#)*

The U.S. Constitution says in Article 1, Section 10 that states may not interfere with the enforcement of contracts. The U.S. Supreme Court has said that the federal government may not either:

*“Independent of these views, there are many considerations which lead to the conclusion that the power to impair contracts [either the Constitution or the Holy Bible], by direct action to that end, does not exist with the general [federal] government. In the first place, one of the objects of the Constitution, expressed in its preamble, was the establishment of justice, and what that meant in its relations to contracts is not left, as was justly said by the late Chief Justice, in Hepburn v. Griswold, to inference or conjecture. As he observes, at the time the Constitution was undergoing discussion in the convention, the Congress of the Confederation was engaged in framing the ordinance for the government of the Northwestern Territory, in which certain articles of compact were established between the people of the original States and the people of the Territory, for the purpose, as expressed in the instrument, of extending the fundamental principles of civil and religious liberty, upon which the States, their laws and constitutions, were erected. By that ordinance it was declared, that, in the just preservation of rights and property, 'no law ought ever to be made, or have force in the said Territory, that shall, in any manner, interfere with or affect private contracts or engagements bona fide and without fraud previously formed.'* The same provision, adds the Chief Justice, found more condensed expression in the prohibition upon the States [in Article 1, Section 10 of the Constitution] against impairing the obligation of contracts, which has ever been recognized as an efficient safeguard against injustice; and though the prohibition is not applied in terms to the government of the United States, he expressed the opinion, speaking for himself and the majority of the court at the time, *that it was clear 'that those who framed and those who adopted the Constitution intended that the spirit of this prohibition should pervade the entire body of legislation, and that the justice which the Constitution was ordained to establish was not thought by them to*

1 *be compatible with legislation [or judicial precedent] of an opposite tendency.*' 8 Wall.  
2 623. [99 U.S. 700, 765] *Similar views are found expressed in the opinions of other*  
3 *judges of this court."*  
4 [[Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U.S. 700 \(1878\)](#)]

5 I am a Christian, and as a Christian, my God says that it amounts to idolatry to put myself under any king, ruler, or earthly  
6 government. I must be served from below, not ruled from above as the King and Priest God appointed me to be per Rev.  
7 5:9-10. Either you put me in charge of the government as the Sovereign fiduciary and ambassador of my Lord, or you can  
8 take your pagan socialist government that worships and glorifies men and money and power and remove it and yourself to a  
9 country where you will not be violating God's law, the people's rights and the Constitution of the United States of America.  
10 Therefore, my religious beliefs and practices compel me to:

- 11 1. Claim the same sovereign immunity as you do. In America, the government is a government of delegated powers  
12 alone that came from the people as individuals. The sovereign People cannot delegate an authority they don't have,  
13 nor can the government they created for their own protection claim any right or authority that they themselves do not  
14 ALSO possess, including sovereign immunity. Therefore, if you are going to insist on any obligation, you will have to  
15 produce an express written waiver of sovereign immunity signed both by me AND the government, and prove that I am  
16 domiciled on federal territory outside of the protection of the Constitution for the waiver to be effective. On land  
17 protected by the Constitution, rights are "unalienable" so that even if I did contract them away, the act would be a  
18 nullity and not surrender any rights. An "unalienable right" is one that cannot be sold, bargained away, or transferred  
19 by any commercial process, including a franchise.

20 *"The Government of the United States is one of delegated powers alone. Its authority is*  
21 *defined and limited by the Constitution. All powers not granted to it by that instrument*  
22 *are reserved to the States or the people."*  
23 [[United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 \(1875\)](#)]

24  
25 *"Whatever these Constitutions and laws validly determine to be property, it is the duty of*  
26 *the Federal Government, through the domain of jurisdiction merely Federal, to recognize*  
27 *to be property.*

28 *"And this principle follows from the structure of the respective Governments, State and*  
29 *Federal, and their reciprocal relations. They are different agents and trustees of the*  
30 *people of the several States, appointed with different powers and with distinct purposes,*  
31 *but whose acts, within the scope of their respective jurisdictions, are mutually*  
32 *obligatory."*  
33 [[Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 \(1856\)](#)]

34  
35 *"You [Jesus] are worthy to take the scroll,*  
36 *And to open its seals;*  
37 *For You were slain,*  
38 ***And have redeemed us to God by Your blood***  
39 *Out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation,*  
40 ***And have made us kings and priests to our God;***  
41 ***And we shall reign on the earth.***  
42 [[Rev. 5:9-10](#), Bible, NKJV]

- 43 2. Completely disassociate with all earthly governments and rulers and to accept ONLY God as my King, Lawgiver, and  
44 Judge.

45 *"For the LORD is our Judge,*  
46 *The LORD is our Lawgiver,*  
47 *The LORD is our King;*  
48 *He will save [and protect] us."*

1 [\[Isaiah 33:22, Bible, NKJV\]](#)

- 2 3. Formally change my domicile to that of the Kingdom of God and not within any man-made government.
- 3 4. Recognize, obey, and cooperate ONLY with the enforcement of God's Holy Law and the Holy Bible and not any civil
- 4 law system. God's law therefore forms the only basis for "choice of law" within the context of all civil litigation that
- 5 involves me pursuant to:
- 6 4.1. God's Laws found in the memorandum of law below:
- 7 [Laws of the Bible, Form #13.001](#)
- 8 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 9 4.2. [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17\(b\)](#)
- 10 4.3. [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 44.1](#)
- 11 5. Follow the example of Jesus, who declared that he had no domicile within any man-made government and was a
- 12 "transient foreigner". See the following:

13 *Then a certain scribe came and said to Him, "Teacher, I will follow You wherever You*

14 *go." And Jesus said to him, "Foxes have holes and birds of the air have nests, but the*

15 *Son of Man has nowhere to lay His head [NO domicile]."*

16 [\[Matt. 8:19-20, Bible, NKJV\]](#)

- 17 6. Follow the leadings of the spirit, and thereby escape the dictates of the civil but not criminal law:

18 *"But if you are L.Ed. by the Spirit, you are not under the law [man's law, because you*

19 *have no domicile]."*

20 [\[Gal. 5:18, Bible, NKJV\]](#)

- 21 7. Follow the example of my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, by adopting anarchy as my only form of self-government.
- 22 See:

*Jesus Is an Anarchist*

<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Spirituality/ChurchvState/JesusAnarchist.htm>

23 To practice of anarchy is not harmful or chaotic, but instead implies to live without any earthly ruler by surrendering

24 governance of my life to God Himself and becoming His fiduciary, and relying only on God's Laws in the Holy Bible

25 and other believers as the method of settling disputes:

26 *"Main Entry: **an-ar·chy***

27 *Function: noun*

28 *Etymology: Medieval Latin anarchia, from Greek, from anarchos **having no***

29 ***[earthly] ruler**, from an- + archos ruler -- more at [ARCH-](#)*

30 *[Source: Merriam Webster Dictionary]*

- 31 8. Become a fiduciary of God, who is a "[nontaxpayer](#)", and therefore becoming a "nontaxpayer". My legal status takes on
- 32 the character of the sovereign who I represent pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 17(b). Therefore, I become a "[foreign](#)
- 33 [diplomat](#)".

34 *"**For God is the King of all the earth**: Sing praises with understanding."*

35 [\[Psalm 47:7, Bible, NKJV\]](#)

36 *"For the LORD is our Judge, the LORD is our Lawgiver, the LORD is our King; He will*

37 *save [and protect] us."*

38 [\[Isaiah 33:22, Bible, NKJV\]](#)

- 39 9. Become or restore my lawful status as a "[Nonresident alien](#)" and a "[national](#)" but not "[citizen](#)" pursuant to federal law.
- 40 The reason this must be so is that a *statutory* "[citizen of the United States](#)" (who are all born in and resident within or
- 41 domiciled within exclusive federal jurisdiction under [8 U.S.C. §1401](#)) may not be classified as an instrumentality of a
- 42 foreign state under [28 U.S.C. §1332\(c\)](#) and (d) and [28 U.S.C. §1603\(b\)](#). I am a "citizen" under the Fourteenth
- 43 Amendment because born within a state of the Union, but not a "citizen" under [8 U.S.C. §1401](#) because not born on
- 44 federal territory. States of the Union and federal territories are part of two separate, mutually exclusive jurisdictions
- 45 and I cannot permit them to be confused.



10. Correct government records to reflect the fact that I am not, and cannot be a statutory "resident" of any earthly jurisdiction without having a conflict of interest in executing my fiduciary duty to God and violating the first four Commandments of the Ten Commandments found in Exodus 20. Heaven is my exclusive legal "domicile", and my "permanent place of abode", and the source of ALL of my permanent protection and security. I cannot and should not rely upon man's vain earthly laws as an idolatrous substitute for Gods sovereign laws found in the Bible. Instead, only God's Laws and the Common law, which is derived from God's Law, are the only suitable protection for my God-given rights.

*"For I was ashamed to request of the king an escort of soldiers and horsemen to help us against the enemy on the road, because we had spoken to the king, saying 'The hand of our God is upon all those for good who seek Him, but His power and His wrath are against all those who forsake Him.' So we fasted and entreated our God for this, and He answered our prayer."*

*[Ezra 8:21-22, Bible, NKJV]*

11. Become a "Foreign Ambassador" and "Minister of a Foreign State" called Heaven. The U.S. Supreme Court said in U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark below that "ministers of a foreign state" may not be statutory "citizens of the United States".

***"For our citizenship is in heaven [and not earth], from which we also eagerly wait for the Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ"***

*[Philippians 3:20, Bible, NKJV]*

***"I am a stranger in the earth; Do not hide Your commandments [laws] from me."***

*[Psalms 119:19, Bible, NKJV]*

***"I have become a stranger to my brothers, and an alien to my mother's children; because zeal for Your [God's] house has eaten me up, and the reproaches of those who reproach You have fallen on me."***

*[Psalms 69:8-9, Bible, NKJV]*

*"And Mr. Justice Miller, delivering the opinion of the court [legislating from the bench, in this case], in analyzing the first clause [of the Fourteenth Amendment], observed that **"the phrase 'subject to the jurisdiction thereof' was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign states, born within the United States."***

*[U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649, 18 S.Ct. 456; 42 L.Ed. 890 (1898)]*

12. Turn my dwelling into a "Foreign Embassy". Notice I didn't say "residence", because only "residents" can have a "residence". See Ref. (1) for details on this SCAM.
13. You are required by 18 U.S.C. §112 and the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act of 1976 to treat me as a "protected foreign official" of a foreign government called Heaven.
14. Become a "stateless person" immune from the jurisdiction of federal courts. I am "stateless" because I do not maintain a domicile anywhere within any of the "States" YOU have identified as federal territories in 28 U.S.C. §1332(d). Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b), the only law that may be applied to a "stateless person" is the law of the state where he maintains domicile, which in this case are the laws of God documented in the Holy Bible. These laws are summarized at the address below:

[http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/ChurchVState/BibleLawIndex/bl\\_index.htm](http://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/ChurchVState/BibleLawIndex/bl_index.htm)

15. Terminate participation in any and all commercial franchises offered by any and every government, including marriage licenses, driver's licenses, social security, income taxes, etc. See:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

16. Immediately cease all "commerce" or "intercourse" with the government by sending to it our money or receiving benefits we did not earn. Black's Law Dictionary defines "commerce" as "intercourse". The Bible defines "the Beast" as the "kings of the earth"/political rulers in Rev. 19:19:

*"And I saw the beast, the kings [heathen political rulers and the unbelieving democratic majorities who control them] of the earth [controlled by Satan], and their armies,*

gathered together to make war against Him [God] who sat on the horse and against His army.”  
[Revelation 19:19, Bible, NKJV]

This is consistent with the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act found in [28 U.S.C. §1605\(a\)\(2\)](#), which says that those who conduct "commerce" with the "United States" federal corporation within its legislative jurisdiction thereby surrender their sovereignty. See the following for details: [http://travel.state.gov/law/info/judicial/judicial\\_693.html](http://travel.state.gov/law/info/judicial/judicial_693.html)

My Lord, God, King, and Lawgiver agreed with the above conclusions when He said:

*"Adulterers and adulteresses! Do you now know that friendship [and "citizenship"] with the world [or the governments of the world] is enmity with God? **Whoever therefore wants to be a friend ["citizen" or "taxpayer" or "resident" or "inhabitant"] of the world makes himself an enemy of God.**"*  
[James 4:4, Bible, NKJV]

If you would like to know why some pastors agree that I must do this, please listen to a message from Pastor Mike Macintosh of [Horizon Christian Fellowship](#) given on 5/14/2006 confirming the above. He uses the word "aliens", but what he really means is "foreigners". A person who is a "national" but not a "citizen" is a "foreigner" and a "nonresident alien" pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B) but not a "foreign person" or "individual" in relation to the national government.

<http://sedm.org/Aliens-20060514-Macintosh-MothDay.mp3>

The U.S. Supreme Court also ruled that I am ENTITLED to do this, when it said the following when speaking about a person with conflicting allegiances between God and the Government:

*Much has been said of the paramount duty to the state, a duty to be recognized, it is urged, even though it conflicts with convictions of duty to God. Undoubtedly that duty to the state exists within the domain of power, for government may enforce obedience to laws regardless of scruples. When one's belief collides with the power of the state, the latter is supreme within its sphere and submission or punishment follows. But, in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral power higher than the state has always been maintained. The reservation of that supreme obligation, as a matter of principle, would unquestionably be made by many of our conscientious and law-abiding citizens. The essence of religion is belief in a relation to God involving duties superior to those [283 U.S. 605, 634] arising from any human relation. As was stated by Mr. Justice Field, in Davis v. Beason, [133 U.S. 333, 342](#), 10 S.Ct. 299, 300: 'The term 'religion' has reference to one's views of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for his being and character, and of obedience to his will.' One cannot speak of religious liberty, with proper appreciation of its essential and historic significance, without assuming the existence of a belief in supreme allegiance to the will of God. Professor Macintosh, when pressed by the inquiries put to him, stated what is axiomatic in religious doctrine. And, putting aside dogmas with their particular conceptions of deity, freedom of conscience itself implies respect for an innate conviction of paramount duty. The battle for religious liberty has been fought and won with respect to religious beliefs and practices, which are not in conflict with good order, upon the very ground of the supremacy of conscience within its proper field. What that field is, under our system of government, presents in part a question of constitutional law, and also, in part, one of legislative policy in avoiding unnecessary clashes with the dictates of conscience. There is abundant room for enforcing the requisite authority of law as it is enacted and requires obedience, and for maintaining the conception of the supremacy of law as essential to orderly government, without demanding that either citizens or applicants for citizenship shall assume by oath an obligation to regard allegiance to God as subordinate to allegiance to civil power. The attempt to exact such a promise, and thus to bind one's conscience by the taking of oaths or the submission to tests, has been the cause of many deplorable conflicts. The Congress has sought to avoid such conflicts in this country by respecting our happy tradition. In no sphere of legislation has the intention to prevent such clashes been more conspicuous than in relation to the bearing of arms. It would*



1                   *require strong evidence [283 U.S. 605, 635] that the Congress intended a reversal of its*  
2                   *policy in prescribing the general terms of the naturalization oath. I find no such evidence.*  
3                   [\[U.S. v. Macintosh, 283 U.S. 605 \(1931\)\]](#)

4       Note that this declaration of new domicile and allegiance does not constitute or imply:

- 5       1. An abandonment of allegiance to the “state” as a “national” born in a state of the Union, which is a “foreign state”, and  
6       a “foreign country” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1101](#)(a)(21) and 28 U.S.C. §297(a) and (b).
- 7       2. An abandonment of citizenship as a “national” but not a “citizen” of the United States of America under [8 U.S.C.](#)  
8       [§1452](#).
- 9       3. A decision of expatriation from the state pursuant to any part of [8 U.S.C. §1481](#)(a)(2) or by any other provision of this  
10       section.

11                   [TITLE 8 > CHAPTER 12 > SUBCHAPTER III > Part III > § 1481](#)  
12                   [§ 1481. Loss of nationality by native-born or naturalized citizen; voluntary action;](#)  
13                   [burden of proof; presumptions](#)

14                   *(a) A person who is a national of the United States whether by birth or naturalization,*  
15                   *shall lose his nationality by voluntarily performing any of the following acts with the*  
16                   *intention of relinquishing United States nationality—*

17                   *(1) obtaining naturalization in a foreign state upon his own application or upon an*  
18                   *application filed by a duly authorized agent, after having attained the age of eighteen*  
19                   *years; or*

20                   *(2) taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to*  
21                   *a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof, after having attained the age of eighteen*  
22                   *years; or*

23       Since this voluntary decision of mine is a fulfillment of my religious beliefs and an exercise of religious liberty protected by  
24       the [First Amendment](#), you cannot lawfully punish me in said exercise by, for instance, taking away my citizenship by birth  
25       or naturalization because my allegiance to God (heavenly citizenship) or His laws (heavenly domicile) assumes a role  
26       SUPERIOR to that of the state. You will note that my religion COMMANDS me to take oaths to my Lord and Savior and  
27       ONLY to Him. To wit:

28                   *“You shall fear the LORD your God and serve Him, and shall take oaths [to Him and ] in*  
29                   *His name.”*  
30                   [\[Deut. 6:13, Bible, NKJV\]](#)

31                   

---

  
32                   *"Again you have heard that it was said to those of old, 'You shall not swear falsely, but*  
33                   *shall perform your oaths to the Lord.'*

34                   *"But I say to you, **do not swear at all: neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by***  
35                   ***the earth, for it is His footstool; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King.***

36                   *"Nor shall you swear by your head, because you cannot make one hair white or black.*

37                   *"But let your 'Yes' be 'Yes,' and your 'No,' 'No.' For whatever is more than these is from*  
38                   *the evil one.*  
39                   [\[Jesus in Matt. 5:33-37, Bible, NKJV\]](#)

40       An important requirement in changing one’s domicile is that the person changing domicile must reside on the territory of  
41       the sovereign either presently or in the past. Well, the Lord owns the entire earth and I am physically present on earth at the  
42       time of this formal declaration.

43                   ["For God is the King of all the earth; Sing praises with understanding."](#)

1 [\[Psalm 47:7, Bible, NKJV\]](#)  
2

3 *The heavens are Yours [God's], the earth also is Yours;*  
4 *The world and all its fullness, You have founded them.*  
5 *The north and the south, You have created them;*  
6 *Tabor and Hermon rejoice in Your name.*  
7 *You have a mighty arm;*  
8 *Strong is Your hand, and high is Your right hand."*  
9 [\[Psalm 89:11-13, Bible, NKJV\]](#)  
10

11 *"I have made the earth,*  
12 *And created man on it.*  
13 *I—My hands—stretched out the heavens,*  
14 *And all their host I have commanded."*  
15 [\[Isaiah 45:12, Bible, NKJV\]](#)  
16

17 *"Indeed heaven and the highest heavens belong to the Lord your God, also the earth with*  
18 *all that is in it."*  
19 [\[Deuteronomy 10:14, Bible, NKJV\]](#)

20 For you to declare that I am not physically present within the territory of my Sovereign Lord to whom I have shifted my  
21 domicile and primary legal allegiance is to unlawfully:

- 22 1. Exceed your delegated authority.  
23 2. Establish or disestablish a religion.

24 *A problem common to both religion clauses of the First Amendment is the dilemma of*  
25 *defining religion. To define religion is in a sense to establish it--those beliefs that are*  
26 *included enjoy a preferred constitutional status. For those left out of the definition, the*  
27 *definition may prove coercive. Indeed, it is in this latter context, which roughly*  
28 *approximates the area covered by the free exercise clause, where the cases and*  
29 *discussion of the meaning of religion have primarily centered. Professor Kent*  
30 *Greenawalt challenges the effort, and all efforts, to define religion: "No specification of*  
31 *essential conditions will capture all and only the beliefs, practices, and organizations*  
32 *that are regarded as religious in modern culture and should be treated as such under the*  
33 *Constitution". Greenawalt, Religion As a Concept in Constitutional Law, 72 Cal. L.Rev.*  
34 *753 (1984)*  
35 *[First Amendment Law in a Nutshell, Second Edition, pp. 266-267, Jerome A Barron,*  
36 *West Group]*

- 37 3. Involve the courts and the government in religious and political matters, which it has no jurisdiction to do without  
38 violating the First Amendment and the separation of powers doctrine. See:

[Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers](#), Form #05.023  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 39 4. Interfere with the free exercise of my religion in violation of the First Amendment.  
40 5. Declare that God does not exist.  
41 6. Declare that God is not Sovereign, which is to make the state formally and officially an atheist state which I definitely  
42 have good cause to want to disassociate with.  
43 7. Contradict the Bible, which says that the earth belongs to the Lord, and NOT to any man or government. This deprives  
44 Him of the use and control of His private property.

45 With respect to my citizenship status, I declare all previous Affidavits, Declarations, etc., either made by me or in my name  
46 by another, which are in conflict with this document to be null and void ab initio.

1 I further Declare that it is a fact that I pledge my complete allegiance to Christ Jesus, my King, and I am an Ambassador for  
2 Christ as per [2nd Corinthians 5:20](#) of the Holy Scriptures. Hence, I have entered into the jurisdiction of the Lord's  
3 Kingdom as a Citizen thereof in fulfillment of the following Scriptures:

4 *"It is better to trust in the Lord*  
5 *Than to put confidence in man*  
6 *It is better to trust in the Lord*  
7 *Than to put confidence in princes [or government, or bureaucrats, or judges, or*  
8 *lawyers]."*  
9 *[[Psalm 118:8-9](#), Bible, NKJV]*  
10

11  
12 *"I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.*  
13 *You shall have no other gods [or a government or materialism or love of money or*  
14 *earthly laws] before Me. You shall not make for yourself a carved image...you shall not*  
15 *bow down to them nor serve them [including your government, because you are the*  
16 *sovereign, not the government]. For I, the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the*  
17 *iniquity of the fathers upon the children of the third and fourth generations of those who*  
18 *hate Me, but showing mercy to thousands to those who love me and keep my*  
19 *commandments."*  
20 *[[Exodus 20:2-6](#), Bible, NKJV]*

21 I likewise declare that it is a fact that I pledge my secondary allegiance (below that of God but above that of any other  
22 ephemeral nation or state) to the United States *of America* and to the *REPUBLIC [based on individual rights and freedom]*,  
23 *for which it stands one nation, under GOD, indivisible, with liberty, and justice and freedom for all.* God bless America!

24 In keeping with the content of this section, I have terminated any state driver's license and revoked registration to vote,  
25 both of which create a "presumption" of domicile within a state which now is "foreign" with respect to a "transient  
26 foreigner" and "stateless person" such as myself.

27 I remind you that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that as an American National, it is my right to be "left alone", and  
28 especially by the government. This right is the most comprehensive of rights recognized but not created by the  
29 Constitution. The Constitution, likewise, is law for YOU and not for me, and it attaches not to me or my status, but to the  
30 LAND I stand on.

31 *"It is locality that is determinative of the application of the Constitution, in such matters*  
32 *as judicial procedure, and not the status of the people who live in it."*  
33 *[Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 (1922)]*

34 Changing or at least correctly and unambiguously describing my municipal domicile so as to "divorce the state" is the most  
35 effective and expedient way I know of to accomplish that end.

36 *"The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit*  
37 *of happiness. They recognized the significance of man's spiritual nature, of his feelings*  
38 *and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of*  
39 *life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs,*  
40 *their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the*  
41 *Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right*  
42 *most valued by civilized men."*  
43 *[Olmstead v. United States, [277 U.S. 438, 478](#) (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also*  
44 *Washington v. Harper, [494 U.S. 210](#) (1990)]*

45 I also remind the recipient of this notice that it costs NOTHING for them to leave me alone, and that the exercise of rights  
46 cannot be taxed or regulated. Therefore, it is entirely inappropriate to attempt to induct me into any kind of "scheme" to  
47 assert any liability to pay taxes for "protection" that I don't want and don't need and actually regard as harmful to my  
48 interests. You are OFFICIALLY AND PERMANENTLY FIRED as my "protector". You are inefficient, wasteful,  
49 disobedient to the law, and not only don't protect me but INJURE me.

1 "Similarly, when a person is prevented from leaving his domicile by circumstances not  
2 of his doing and beyond his control, he may be relieved of the consequences attendant  
3 on domicile at that place. In *Roboz* (USDC D.C. 1963) [*Roboz v. Kennedy*, 219 F.Supp.  
4 892 (D.D.C. 1963), p. 24], a federal statute was involved which precluded the return of  
5 an alien's property if he was found to be domiciled in Hungary prior to a certain date. It  
6 was found that Hungary was Nazi-controlled at the time in question and that the persons  
7 involved would have left Hungary (and lost domicile there) had they been able to. Since  
8 they had been precluded from leaving because of the political privations imposed by the  
9 very government they wanted to escape (the father was in prison there), the court would  
10 not hold them to have lost their property based on a domicile that circumstances beyond  
11 their control forced them to retain."  
12 [*Conflicts in a Nutshell*, David D. Siegel and Patrick J. Borchers, West Publishing, p. 24]

13 Of those politicians, lawyers, and judges who would attempt to ridicule, penalize, or interfere with the exercise of religious  
14 rights protected by the First Amendment, our first President and most revered founding father, George Washington, said the  
15 following:

16 *"Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, Religion and*  
17 *morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of*  
18 *Patriotism who should labour to subvert these great Pillars of human happiness, these*  
19 *firmest props of the duties of Men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the*  
20 *pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their*  
21 *connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, "where is the security*  
22 *for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths*  
23 *which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice?" And let us with caution*  
24 *indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may*  
25 *be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason*  
26 *and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of*  
27 *religious principle."*  
28 [*George Washington, Farewell Address*]

29 Along the above lines, our Second President of the United States said the following:

30 *"We have no government armed with the power capable of contending with human*  
31 *passions unbridled by morality and religion. Avarice [greed], ambition, revenge, or*  
32 *gallantry [debauchery], would break the strongest cords of our Constitution as a whale*  
33 *goes through a net. Our Constitution was made only for a moral and religious [and a*  
34 *well educated and self-governing] people. It is wholly inadequate to the government of*  
35 *any other."*  
36 [*John Adams, 2nd President*]

37 May the judgment of God be upon you for your sins if you attempt to illegally penalize me using an unconstitutional Bill of  
38 Attainder in violation of Article 1 Section 10 of the Constitution, remove my citizenship, or otherwise terrorize me for the  
39 free exercise of my religious rights protected by the [First Amendment](#) as documented in this correspondence:

40 *"It is an unconstitutional deprivation of due process for the government to penalize a*  
41 *person merely because he has exercised a protected statutory or constitutional right.*  
42 *United States v. Goodwin, [457 U.S. 368](#), 372, 102 S.Ct. 2485, 2488, 73 L.Ed.2d. 74*  
43 *(1982)."*  
44 [*People of Territory of Guam v. Fegurgur*, 800 F.2d. 1470 (9th Cir. 1986)]

45 *"A judgment rendered in violation of due process is void in the rendering State and is not*  
46 *entitled to full faith and credit elsewhere.*  
47 [*Pennoyer v. Neff*, [95 U.S. 714](#), 732-733 (1878)]

48 *"Due process of law is violated when the government vindictively attempts to penalize a*  
49 *person for exercising a protected statutory or constitutional right."*  
50 [*United States v. Conkins*, 9 F.3d. 1377, 1382 (9th Cir. 1993)]

## 4. CONTRACTUAL AND COMMERCIAL DIVORCE FROM THE STATE AND UNITED STATES

### 4.1 Constraints upon my right to contract

From the date of my birth to my death, I declare and give “reasonable notice” to all interested parties in the government that I cannot and will not be bound by any exercise of my right to contract that:

1. Is between me and any government, including any state government or the national government.

1.1. The Declaration of Independence, which is the organic law of this country, asserts unequivocally that our rights are “unalienable” in relation to the government, which means that they cannot be bargained away through any commercial process, including a franchise agreement or government “benefit” program.

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, -“  
[Declaration of Independence]*

*“Unalienable. Inalienable; incapable of being aliened, that is, sold and transferred.”  
[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693]*

Therefore, the only people who can bargain away rights under civil law are those domiciled on federal territory not protected by the Constitution and therefore where such rights DO NOT exist. I am NOT such a person:

*“Indeed, the practical interpretation put by Congress upon the Constitution has been long continued and uniform to the effect [182 U.S. 244, 279] that the Constitution is applicable to territories acquired by purchase or conquest, only when and so far as Congress shall so direct. Notwithstanding its duty to 'guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government' (art. 4, 4), by which we understand, according to the definition of Webster, 'a government in which the supreme power resides in the whole body of the people, and is exercised by representatives elected by them,' Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of the territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of government bearing a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican state of America, and to vest the legislative power either in a governor and council, or a governor and judges, to be appointed by the President. It was not until they had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a legislature by vote of the people. In all these cases, as well as in territories subsequently organized west of the Mississippi, Congress thought it necessary either to extend to Constitution and laws of the United States over them, or to declare that the inhabitants should be entitled to enjoy the right of trial by jury, of bail, and of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, as well as other privileges of the bill of rights.”  
[Downes v. Bidwell, [182 U.S. 244](#) (1901)]*

1.2. The Founding Fathers assert that we should not enter into any contracts or alliances with foreign powers, which includes the foreign jurisdiction of federal territory. This is the legislative intent of all founding documents, including the Constitution, and I intend to give full force and effect to that legislative intent:

*“My ardent desire is, and my aim has been...to comply strictly with all our engagements foreign and domestic; but to keep the United States free from political connections with every other Country. To see that they may be independent of all, and under the influence of none. In a word, I want an American character, that the powers of Europe may be convinced we act for ourselves and not for others [as “public officers”]; this, in my judgment, is the only way to be respected abroad and happy at home.”*



[George Washington, (letter to Patrick Henry, 9 October 1775);  
Reference: The Writings of George Washington, Fitzpatrick, ed., vol. 34 (335)]

*“About to enter, fellow citizens, on the exercise of duties which comprehend everything dear and valuable to you, it is proper that you should understand what I deem the essential principles of our government, and consequently those which ought to shape its administration. I will compress them within the narrowest compass they will bear, stating the general principle, but not all its limitations. Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations – entangling alliances [contracts, treaties, franchises] with none;”*

[Thomas Jefferson, First Inaugural Address, March 4, 1801]

- 1.3. The Bible forbids me to contract with any government and I am acting as a fiduciary, public officer, and trustee of the God under the terms of the Bible trust indenture 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. I take my sincerely held religious faith and practice very seriously.

*“You shall have no other gods [including political rulers, judges, governments, or earthly laws] before Me [or My commandments].”*  
[[Exodus 20:3](#), Bible, NKJV]

*“Do not walk in the statutes of your fathers [the heathens], nor observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their idols. I am the LORD your God: Walk in My statutes, keep My judgments, and do them; hallow My Sabbaths, and they will be a sign between Me and you, that you may know that I am the LORD your God.”*  
[[Ezekial 20:10-20](#), Bible, NKJV]

*“Take heed to yourself, lest you make a covenant or mutual agreement [contract, franchise agreement] with the inhabitants of the land to which you go, lest it become a snare in the midst of you.”*  
[Exodus 34:12, Bible, Amplified version]

*“You shall make no covenant [contract or franchise] with them [foreigners, pagans], nor with their [pagan government] gods [laws or judges]. They shall not dwell in your land [and you shall not dwell in theirs by becoming a “resident” in the process of contracting with them], lest they make you sin against Me [God]. For if you serve their gods [under contract or agreement or franchise], it will surely be a snare to you.”*  
[[Exodus 23:32-33](#), Bible, NKJV]

See also:

[Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007](#)  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2. Does not contain the signature of all parties to whom the rights are surrendered. For instance, no government form signed by other than a contracting officer of the government can convey any rights to the government over my life, liberty, property whatsoever. You will note that no tax forms are signed by any representative or contracting officer of the government, and therefore convey no rights to the government nor establish any valid contract or enforceable right. You also do not have my consent to treat any such forms as negotiable securities which create any right for any third party either. It is also worthy of noting that the only parties who can contract on behalf of the government serve in the Legislative and not Executive Branch of the government. To wit:

*“But the short answer to this contention is that since no official of the government could have rendered it liable for this work by an express contract, none can by his acts or omissions create a valid contract implied in fact. The limitation upon the authority to impose contract obligations upon the United States is as applicable to contracts by implication as it is to those expressly made.”*  
[Sutton v. U.S., [256 U.S. 575](#) (1921)]

3. Is not expressed solely in writing. The U.S. Government in the act of June 2, 1862, 12 Stat. 411 passed a law requiring that all contracts MUST be expressed in writing and are of no force and effect if they are not. In our system of government, all powers of the government derive from the sovereign people and are delegated from and by them to the government. If the government can pass such an act, I too can demand the same in all my interactions with any and all governments. This is a requirement of equal protection of the laws mandated by the [Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1](#). For details on this exercise of government power, see *Clark v. United States*, 94 U.S. 539 (1877):

*"Every man is supposed to know the law. A party who makes a contract with an officer [of the government] without having it reduced to writing is knowingly accessory to a violation of duty on his part. Such a party aids in the violation of the law."*  
[*Clark v. United States*, 95 U.S. 539 (1877)]

4. Does not both contain and completely describe ALL of the obligations arising out of it directly within the document itself. No obligation arising out of any transaction made with the government may be *implied* or *assumed*, but must instead be *expressly stated* in the application or form itself which creates said obligation. Any obligation alleged to arise out of signing a government document *must* be completely described directly in the document itself or it shall be presumed to *not* exist. For such a circumstance, it is not and shall not be enough for the government or any court of law to simply claim "every citizen of the United States is supposed to know the law" and use this as a justification for the method by which the person signing the document received the requisite "reasonable notice" of the terms he would be bound by. Since the enforcement of private rights created by private contracts requires full disclosure of all rights conveyed, the government can claim no less of an obligation in relation to me, the Sovereign whom it exists and was created exclusively to serve and protect. This will prevent attempts by the government to engage in the equivalent of "invisible contracts" and it is the only way to ensure that surrenders of Constitutional rights are knowing, voluntary, fully-informed, explicit acts of the citizen who is allegedly surrendering his or her rights:

*"There is an element of fiction in the presumption that every citizen is charged with a responsibility to know what the law is. But the array of government executives, judges, and legislators who have been accused, and convicted, of mail fraud under the well-settled construction of the statute that the Court renounces today are people who unquestionably knew that their conduct was unlawful. Cf. Nash v. United States, 229 U.S. 373, 377 (1913)."*  
[*Mcnelly v. United States*, 483 U.S. 350 (1987)]

*"Waivers of Constitutional rights not only must be voluntary, but must be knowing, intelligent acts done with sufficient awareness of the relevant circumstances and likely consequences."*  
[*Brady v. U.S.*, 397 U.S. 742 (1970)]

*"The question of a waiver of a federally guaranteed constitutional right is, of course, a federal question controlled by federal law. There is a presumption against the waiver of constitutional rights, see, e.g. Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60, 70-71, 86 L.Ed. 680, 699, 62 S.Ct. 457, and for a waiver to be effective it must be clearly established that there was "an intentional relinquishment or abandonment of a known right or privilege." Johnson v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458, 464, 82 L.Ed. 1461, 1466; 58 S.Ct. 1019, 146 A.L.R. 357."*  
[*Brookhart v. Janis*, 384 U.S. 1; 86 S.Ct. 1245, 16 L.Ed.2d. 314 (1966)]

*"Where rights secured by the Constitution there can be no rule making or legislation [or government forms] which would abrogate them."*  
[*Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966)]

*"Where administrative action may result in loss of both property and life, or of all that makes life worth living, any doubt as to the extent of power delegated to administrative officials is to be resolved in citizen's favor, and court must be especially sensitive to the citizen's rights where proceeding is non-judicial."*  
[*United States v. Minker*, 350 U.S. 179, 76 S.Ct. 281 (1956)]

1 If the government believes that there exists any contractual obligations or agreements towards it on my part which are *not*  
2 specifically invalidated by this document, it is specifically demanded to produce court-admissible evidence of same within  
3 30 days of receipt of this notice or forever be estopped from asserting any future civil claims against me, the Submitter.

## 4 **4.2 Reservation of rights**

5 Pursuant to U.C.C. §1-207 and its successor, U.C.C. §1-308, I reserve ALL my inalienable constitutional and natural rights  
6 at all times in the context of any interactions with any man-made government of any state of the Union or the federal  
7 government. I also demand, pursuant to UCC 3-§308, that the government present the signed contract:

8 *Uniform Commercial Code*

9 [§ 3-308. PROOF OF SIGNATURES AND STATUS AS HOLDER IN DUE COURSE.](#)

10 (a) In an action with respect to an [instrument](#), the authenticity of, and authority to make,  
11 each signature on the instrument is admitted unless specifically denied in the pleadings.  
12 **If the validity of a signature is denied in the pleadings, the burden of establishing**  
13 **validity is on the person claiming validity,** but the signature is presumed to be authentic  
14 and authorized unless the action is to enforce the liability of the purported signer and the  
15 signer is dead or incompetent at the time of trial of the [issue](#) of validity of the signature.  
16 If an action to enforce the instrument is brought against a person as the undisclosed  
17 principal of a person who signed the instrument as a [party](#) to the instrument, **the plaintiff**  
18 **has the burden of establishing that the defendant is liable on the instrument as a**  
19 **represented person under Section 3-402(a).**

20 (b) If the validity of signatures is admitted or [proved](#) and there is compliance with  
21 subsection (a), a plaintiff producing the [instrument](#) is entitled to payment if the plaintiff  
22 proves entitlement to enforce the instrument under Section [3-301](#), unless the defendant  
23 proves a defense or claim in recoupment. If a defense or claim in recoupment is proved,  
24 the right to payment of the plaintiff is subject to the defense or claim, except to the extent  
25 the plaintiff proves that the plaintiff has rights of a [holder in due course](#) which are not  
26 subject to the defense or claim.

## 27 **4.3 Perpetual abandonment of all statutory “employment”, agency, or “public office” on** 28 **behalf of the U.S. government or any State government**

29 I declare that it is a fact that from my date of birth to the present day, and for all perpetuity, I, the Submitter, do hereby  
30 withdraw my consent to act on behalf of or as an agent for the United States and any of its agents, such as the United States  
31 corporate agents presiding over its federal enclaves within the states of the Union, heretofore known as “State of\_\_\_\_\_”  
32 under the auspices of the Buck Act of 1940, codified in [4 U.S.C. §106](#) and [5 U.S.C. §5517](#). You will note that all “public  
33 offices” are voluntary employments from which anyone may resign. Anyone who has not resigned from said office may  
34 reserve the right not to engage in such an office within the context of any aspect of their private employment or private  
35 lives, as confirmed by numerous prior rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court, to wit:

36 *“Every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and*  
37 **no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits, and appropriate them**  
38 **against his will...”**

39 *[The Antelope, [23 U.S. 66](#); 10 Wheat 66; 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825)]*

40 I declare that it is a fact that I do not now and never have consented to act as a “public officer” engaged in a “trade or  
41 business” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#), and I do not now nor have I ever been voluntarily engaged in a “trade or  
42 business” as heretofore defined. Receipt by you of any evidence contrary to the facts and evidence contained in this  
43 document and the attachments hereto shall constitute evidence of unlawful activity by my public servants or their pretended  
44 agents and the existence of duress directed against the Submitter. For all such instances of duress and unlawful activity, I  
45 demand that the submitter of said false documents be investigated and prosecuted by the government, pursuant to [26 U.S.C.](#)  
46 [§7434](#) and [18 U.S.C. §872](#). Such evidence of duress is reflected in, for example, the following IRS documents:

47 1. Information returns submitted under the authority of [26 U.S.C. §6041](#), including but not limited to:



- 1.1. IRS Form K-1
- 1.2. IRS Form W-2
- 1.3. IRS Form W-4
- 1.4. IRS Form 1098
- 1.5. IRS Form 1099
- 1.6. IRS Form 1042-S

See the following for evidence why the above forms are filled out illegally and falsely in the vast majority of cases:

<http://sedm.org/Forms/Tax/DmdVerEvOfTradeOrBusiness-IR.pdf>

2. IRS Form 8300 Currency Transaction Reports, which may only lawfully be filled out for those engaged in a “trade or business”, which the submitter is NOT. See the following:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/Tax/DmdVerEvOfTradeOrBusiness-CTR.pdf>
3. Federal tax returns, including any variant of the 1040, such as 1040, 1040-EZ, 1040A, 104NR, 1040NR-EZ.
4. State income tax returns of any kind.
5. Penalty and tax assessments, such as Substitute For Returns conducted under the alleged authority of [26 U.S.C. §6020\(b\)](#). All such assessments are ILLEGAL against me, who is not the “person” defined in 26 U.S.C. §6671(b) or 26 U.S.C. §7343. See the following for proof:
  - 5.1. Why the Government Can’t Lawfully Assess Human Beings With an Income Tax Liability Without Their Consent, Form #05.011:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
  - 5.2. Why Penalties are Illegal for Anything But Federal Employees, Contractors, and Agents, Form #05.010:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
6. Use by the government of any federally issued identifying numbers against me, a private person, including Social Security Numbers and Taxpayer Identification Numbers. See section 8.5 later for all presumptions established in this document about the illegal use of such numbers against me.

I similarly declare that it is a fact that according to God’s Laws and prior U.S. Supreme Court decisions, it is to no avail on your part and an act of criminal fraud, extortion, and breach of fiduciary duty as a “public official” for you to try to abuse the word “includes” found within the definition of “trade or business” or any other term used in the Internal Revenue Code or other statute within the U.S. Code as a means to unlawfully enlarge federal jurisdiction beyond the clear bounds established in the Constitution. All such activities simply prove the depths of corruption within your organization and the government in general and the lengths to which you will go to defend and protect the fundamentally criminal nature of your unscrupulous love for other people’s money.

*“For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil, for which some have strayed from the faith in their greediness, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows.”*  
*[1 Tim. 6:10, Bible, NKJV]*

*“Getting treasures by a lying tongue Is the fleeting fantasy of those who seek death. The violence of the wicked will destroy them, Because they refuse to do justice.”*  
*[Prov. 21:6-7, Bible, NKJV]*

Such futile efforts on your part serve no purpose other than to prove that you are engaging in a criminal conspiracy against my Constitutional rights in violation of [18 U.S.C. §241](#), and intending to destroy the separation of powers that is at the heart of the United States Constitution. This type of abuse of the rules of statutory construction on your part, for selfish economic reasons is exhaustively briefed and described in the following resources, which I demand that you rebut the evidence and admissions at the end within 30 days or forever thereafter admit the truthfulness of:

1. Meaning of the Words “includes” and “including”, Form #05.014:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3. Requirement for Reasonable Notice, Form #05.022: Proves that laws which do not give reasonable notice of EVERYTHING that is included or which compel presumption on the part of the reader violate due process.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

In addition to the above conclusive legal treatises on this subject, the U.S. Supreme Court has unequivocally stated the following:

1           *"It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings of that*  
2 *term. Colautti v. Franklin, [439 U.S. 379](#), 392, and n. 10 (1979). Congress' use of the*  
3 *term "propaganda" in this statute, as indeed in other legislation, has no pejorative*  
4 *connotation.{19} As judges, it is our duty to [481 U.S. 485] construe legislation as it is*  
5 *written, not as it might be read by a layman, or as it might be understood by someone*  
6 *who has not even read it."*  
7 *[Meese v. Keene, [481 U.S. 465](#), 484 (1987)]*

8  
9           **"When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if it**  
10 **varies from that term's ordinary meaning.** *Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485*  
11 *(1987) ("It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated*  
12 *meanings of that term"); Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 ("As a rule, 'a*  
13 *definition which declares what a term "means" . . . excludes any meaning that is not*  
14 *stated"); Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945); Fox v.*  
15 *Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935) (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer,*  
16 *Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed.*  
17 *1992) (collecting cases). That is to say, the statute, read "as a whole," post at 998 [530*  
18 *U.S. 943] (THOMAS, J., dissenting), leads the reader to a definition. That definition does*  
19 *not include the Attorney General's restriction -- "the child up to the head." Its words,*  
20 *"substantial portion," indicate the contrary."*  
21 *[Stenberg v. Carhart, [530 U.S. 914](#) (2000)]*

22 For additional information about the deceptive use of the word "trade or business" within IRS and Treasury publications,  
23 laws, and forms, see the following and rebut the admissions and evidence at the end if you disagree within 30 days or  
24 forever be estopped from challenging it later:

*The "Trade or Business" Scam, Form #05.001*  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

25 I declare that it is a fact that I am, always have been, and always will be a "nonresident alien" who:

- 26 1. Is NOT an "individual" as that term is currently defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(B) and  
27 2. Who is not, never has been, and never will be involved in a "trade or business" as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) or  
28 a public office in any government.  
29 3. Has no "gross income" pursuant to 26 CFR §1.872-2(f).

30 Since I am and always have been a "nonresident alien" and a "national" pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1101](#)(a)(21) but not a  
31 statutory "citizen" pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1401](#), then the proper tax form for me to file, if any, has always been only the  
32 1040NR or 1040NR-EZ if I have "gross income" or if my private sector employer incorrectly withheld monies from my  
33 remuneration. I have not voluntarily ever made an election pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6013](#)(g) or (h), or [26 U.S.C.](#)  
34 [§7701](#)(b)(4)(B) as a "nonresident alien" to be treated as a "resident". Any evidence you might now have or which you will  
35 receive in the future of such an election is simply evidence that I am under unlawful duress, for which I demand that you  
36 investigate and prosecute those responsible for the duress and unlawful extortion. If you disagree, rebut the evidence and  
37 admissions contained in Enclosure (6) within 30 days or forever be estopped from challenging it in the future.

38 The only reason any other form such as the IRS Form 1040 may have been submitted in the past, is because of unlawful  
39 enforcement activities by the IRS and deception and false information found in the IRS publications and IRS phone  
40 support, which the IRS conspicuously disavows any responsibility for but should be prosecuted and enjoined for like every  
41 other promoter of tax fraud schemes:

42           *"IRS Publications, issued by the National Office, explain the law in plain language for*  
43 *taxpayers and their advisors... While a good source of general information, publications*  
44 *should not be cited to sustain a position."*  
45 *[IRM 4.10.7.2.8 (05-14-1999)]*

1 The fact that the Courts hypocritically refuse to hold the IRS just as responsible for its publications as they hold those  
2 engaged in tax shelters dispensing false information pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6700](#) is simply proof that the IRS and Courts  
3 and the government in general are corrupt beyond belief, completely unaccountable and that the judges have a conflict of  
4 interest as “taxpayers” who are just as terrorized by the illegal operations of the IRS as the rest of us, in violation of [18](#)  
5 [U.S.C. §872](#), [18 U.S.C. §208](#), and [28 U.S.C. §455](#).

6 *“He [including judges] who justifies the wicked, and he who condemns the just, both of*  
7 *them alike are an abomination to the Lord.”*

8 [[Prov. 17:15](#), Bible, NKJV]

9 *“If a ruler pays attention to lies, All his servants become wicked.”*

10 [[Prov. 29:12](#), Bible, NKJV]

11 *“And you shalt take no bribe, for a bribe blinds the discerning and perverts the words of*  
12 *the righteous.”*

13 [[Exodus 23:8](#), Bible, NKJV]

14 *“Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also*  
15 *a prison.”*

16 [[Henry David Thoreau](#)]

17 For a truly remarkable expose on the full extent of the corruption within the U.S. government and especially the federal  
18 courts, I encourage you to read the following:

[What Happened to Justice?](#), Form #06.012

<http://sedm.org/ItemInfo/Ebooks/WhatHappJustice/WhatHappJustice.htm>

19 If you refuse to take responsibility for the consequences of injuries arising from your own corruption as documented here, I  
20 reserve the right to show the jury assembled to prosecute you for your corruption all 5,900+ pages of hard core evidence of  
21 government fraud and conspiracy against rights included with the CD version of the above book, should you force me to  
22 end up in court to litigate this matter to hold you accountable for your crimes against Americans and humanity documented  
23 therein. My religious beliefs forbid me from participating in, associating with, subsidize, or condoning ALL activities of the  
24 present unlawful, de facto, criminal government that presently rules because of the corruption that has infected and  
25 contaminated it.

26 *“Come out from among them*  
27 *And be separate, says the Lord.*

28 *Do not touch what is unclean,*

29 *And I will receive you.”*

30 [[2 Cor. 6:17](#), Bible, NKJV]

31 *And I heard another voice from heaven saying, “Come out of her [the Totalitarian,*  
32 *Socialist Legislative Democracy that is a Corporation instead of a government], my*  
33 *people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive of her plagues. For her sins have*  
34 *reached to heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities. Render to her just as she*  
35 *rendered to you, and repay her double according to her works; in the cup which she has*  
36 *mixed, mix double for her. In the measure that she glorified herself and lived luxuriously,*  
37 *in the same measure give her torment and sorrow; for she says in her heart, ‘I sit as*  
38 *queen, and am no widow, and will not see sorrow.’ Therefore her plagues will come in*  
39 *one day—death and mourning and famine. And she will be utterly burned with fire, for*  
40 *strong is the Lord God who judges her.*

41 [[Rev. 18:4-8](#), Bible, NKJV]

#### 4.4 Perpetual Abandonment of all “benefits”, privileges, and “public rights” arising under Titles 26 and 42 of the United States Code

*Mr. Logan: "...Natural laws cannot be created, repealed, or modified by legislation. Congress should know there are many things which it cannot do..."*

*"It is now proposed to make the Federal Government the guardian of its citizens. If that should be done, the Nation soon must perish. There can only be a free nation when the people themselves are free and administer the government which they have set up to protect their rights. Where the general government must provide work, and incidentally food and clothing for its citizens, freedom and individuality will be destroyed and eventually the citizens will become serfs to the general government..."*

*[[Congressional Record-Senate, Volume 77- Part 4, June 10, 1933, Page 12522](#)]*

This document also constitutes an abandonment of all right, title, and benefit originating from any of the following federal “social insurance” programs:

1. [Social Security, Title 42, Chapter 7.](#)
2. [Unemployment Compensation, Title 42, Chapter 7, Subchapter III.](#)
3. [Medicare, Title 42, Chapter 7, Subchapter XVIII.](#)
4. Every other type of federal insurance.

I am not now, never have been, and never will be eligible to receive benefits under any of the above programs of federal insurance. In fact, most of those who participate do so illegally because they do not meet the requirements if they do not reside in the “State” as defined in the Social Security Act, which says:

##### ORIGINAL 1935 ACT DEFINITION:

*“The term State (except when used in section 531) includes Alaska, Hawaii [only when they were territories] and the District of Columbia.”*

##### CURRENT DEFINITION: [42 U.S.C. §1301\(a\)\(1\)](#)

*“(1) The term ‘State’, except where otherwise provided, includes the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and when used in titles IV, V, VII, XI, XIX, and XXI includes the Virgin Islands and Guam. Such term when used in titles III, IX, and XII also includes the Virgin Islands. Such term when used in title v. and in part B of this title also includes American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Such term when used in titles XIX and XXI also includes the Northern Mariana Islands and American Samoa. In the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam, titles I, X, and XIV, and title XVI (as in effect without regard to the amendment made by section 301 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972<sup>[31]</sup>) shall continue to apply, and the term ‘State’ when used in such titles (but not in title XVI as in effect pursuant to such amendment after December 31, 1973) includes Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. Such term when used in title XX also includes the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Such term when used in title IV also includes American Samoa.”*

Based upon, in part, the written evidence contained in [42 U.S.C. §1301\(a\)\(1\)](#), the Social Security Administration can only lawfully administer the program by offering benefits and participation to those who live in federal territories, possessions, and federal enclaves and not within states of the Union, which are collectively called the “federal zone”. In practice, SSA and other federal agencies routinely violate these requirements of the law all the time, and should be fired or prosecuted for this by the Dept. of Justice. Their decision to accept new applicants must be based on where the applicants ACTUALLY LIVE and not where they SAY they live. The ignorance about the law that is manufactured by the government in public schools is the reason why Americans are deceived into basically committing perjury under penalty of perjury on most of the federal government forms they filled out is the only reason this type of fraud and destruction of the separation of powers between state and federal government continues. The fact that agencies flagrantly and tacitly “look the other way”,

acquiesce to, tolerate, and condone such violations of written law makes most federal employees who administer these programs into accessories after the fact to the making of false claims to the U.S. Government in violation of the False Claims Act, [31 U.S.C. §3729](#). Such fraudulent acts cannot lawfully give rise to any rights, benefits, or liabilities against those who unlawfully participate in the program but who do not meet the residency requirements.

If you disagree with any part of the foregoing analysis, I challenge you to rebut any part of the research or facts that it is based on, as found at:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

In the absence of a serious written rebuttal within 30 days containing nothing but evidence admissible in a court of law under the [Federal Rules of Evidence](#), signed under penalty of perjury and submitted by a person with demonstrated delegated authority to do so, you agree to everything stated in this document and are permanently estopped from later challenging it.

## **5. EFFECT ON MY CITIZENSHIP AND LEGAL STATUS**

*"The rights of the individuals are restricted only to the extent that they have been voluntarily surrendered by the [choice of ] citizenship to the agencies of government."  
[City of Dallas v. Mitchell, 245 S.W. 944]*

As a consequence of this amendment to government documentation describing legal domicile and allegiance documented in this affidavit, my citizenship is significantly affected, and this change must be reflected in all of your government records. This section will document all the changes so that you may properly reflect my status in all of your records. If you want further details on the basis for these changes, see Ref. (1).

As a result of this abandonment of domicile and change in allegiance to make allegiance to the state "secondary" to allegiance to God, my status is now described as follows:

1. I am and always have been:
  - 1.1. A Fourteenth Amendment, Constitutional Citizen.
  - 1.2. A "national" pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#).
  - 1.3. A "nonresident alien" as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#).
  - 1.4. A person not engaged in a "trade or business" as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) and who earns no "gross income" as defined in 26 CFR §1.872-2(f) (except those who work or have worked as "public officials" for the federal government).
2. I am NOT and never have been:
  - 2.1. An "individual" as defined in [5 U.S.C. §552a\(a\)\(2\)](#). All "individuals" who the government can keep records about and legislate for in their "codes" and "statutes" are public employees and public officials, *not* private citizens. You will note that Title 5 of the U.S. code is "Government Organization and Employees" and that it contains no definition for any term that refers to "private individuals". The ability to legislate for private citizens is, according to the U.S. Supreme Court, "repugnant to the Constitution" and therefore forbidden:

*"The power to "legislate generally upon" life, liberty, and property, as opposed to the "power to provide modes of redress" against offensive state action, was "repugnant" to the Constitution. Id., at 15. See also United States v. Reese, 92 U.S. 214, 218 (1876); United States v. Harris, 106 U.S. 629, 639 (1883); James v. Bowman, 190 U.S. 127, 139 (1903). Although the specific holdings of these early cases might have been superseded or modified, see, e.g., Heart of Atlanta Motel, Inc. v. United States, 379 U.S. 241 (1964); United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745 (1966), their treatment of Congress' §5 power as corrective or preventive, not definitional, has not been questioned."  
[City of Boerne v. Flores, Archbishop of San Antonio, 521 U.S. 507 (1997)]*

- 2.2. A "U.S. national" as defined in [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(22\)\(B\)](#) and [8 U.S.C. §1408](#).
- 2.3. A statutory "citizen and national of the United States" as described in [8 U.S.C. §1401](#).
- 2.4. A "resident" as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#).



2.5. A “U.S. person” as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#).

Since my status is that of a “national” as defined in [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#), a “nonresident alien” defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#), but not an “alien” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#), then I am not required to be registered as an “alien” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1302](#) or to have a “green card”. I am a “transient foreigner” because I do not politically or legally associate with the people here, but I am not an “alien” because I was born in this country.

If you attempt to interfere with or prevent this change in my domicile and try to compel me to maintain domicile within any man-made state, then the federal courts say that you must relieve me of all the obligations arising from that choice of domicile because it is compelled:

***“Similarly, when a person is prevented from [politically, legally, and commercially] leaving his domicile by circumstances not of his doing and beyond his control, he may be relieved of the consequences attendant on domicile at that place. In Roboz (USDC D.C. 1963) [Roboz v. Kennedy, 219 F.Supp. 892 (D.D.C. 1963), p. 24], a federal statute was involved which precluded the return of an alien's property if he was found to be domiciled in Hungary prior to a certain date. It was found that Hungary was Nazi-controlled at the time in question and that the persons involved would have left Hungary (and lost domicile there) had they been able to. Since they had been precluded from leaving because of the political privations imposed by the very government they wanted to escape (the father was in prison there), the court would not hold them to have lost their property based on a domicile that circumstances beyond their control forced them to retain.”***  
*[Conflicts in a Nutshell, David D. Siegel and Patrick J. Borchers, West Publishing, p. 24]*

My correct citizenship status is that of an “American National.” and *not* a statutory “U.S. citizen” under [8 U.S.C. §1401](#). An American National is:

*“a sovereign human being, not to be confused with the term ‘person’ as used anywhere in the Internal Revenue Code, who under the Constitution and the laws of the united States or of a particular state, is entitled to the enjoyment of full civil rights. The rights are those as enumerated in the Bill of Rights to the Constitution for the united States of America and because of these rights this man is not subject to the exclusive or sovereign jurisdiction of the U.S. government at birth under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution.”*

The rights guaranteed by the Constitution are absolute and natural rights derived from *birth*, and they cannot and should not, by operation of law, be turned into a taxable government privilege by coercing me into becoming a type of citizen that I do not choose to be or by coercing me and conspiring to trick me to participate in an illegal and unethical state or federal income tax system, in clear violation of my God-given inalienable rights found in the Declaration of Independence, which reads in pertinent part:

*“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that **they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights**, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.—“*

Notice it didn’t say “*by their government*” or “*by their citizenship*”, or “*by operation of law*” but rather “*by their Creator*”? Here is what the author of the above, Thomas Jefferson, said privately about this subject:

*“A free people [claim] their rights as derived from the laws of nature, and not as the gift of their chief magistrate.”*  
*[Thomas Jefferson: Rights of British America, 1774. ME 1:209, Papers 1:134 ]*

*“Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are of the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath?”*  
*[Thomas Jefferson: Notes on Virginia Q.XVIII, 1782. ME 2:227 ]*

Additional justification and authority for this change in your records of my citizenship status derives in part from [26 CFR §301.6109-1\(g\)](#):

[26 CFR §301.6109-1\(g\)](#)

(g) Special rules for taxpayer identifying numbers issued to foreign persons—

(1) General rule—

(i) Social security number.

*A social security number is generally identified in the records and database of the Internal Revenue Service as a number belonging to a U.S. citizen or resident alien individual. A person may establish a different status for the number by providing proof of foreign status with the Internal Revenue Service under such procedures as the Internal Revenue Service shall prescribe, including the use of a form as the Internal Revenue Service may specify. Upon accepting an individual as a nonresident alien individual, the Internal Revenue Service will assign this status to the individual's social security number.*

The U.S. Supreme Court has declared in the case of *Hooven and Allison v. Evatt*, [324 U.S. 652](#) (1945) that:

*The term 'United States' may be used in any one of several senses. It may be merely*

*[1] the name of a sovereign occupying the position analogous to that of other sovereigns in the family of nations [hereafter referred to as "U.S.\*"].*

*[2] It may designate the territory over which the sovereignty of the United States extends [\[324 U.S. 652, 672\]](#), [hereafter referred to as "U.S.\*\*"] or*

*[3] it may be the collective name of the states which are united by and under the Constitution. [hereafter referred to as "U.S.\*\*\*"]*

Be advised that I am **not** disassociating with the "United States\*" the country (the first definition), nor with "United States\*\*\*", the collective name of the states which are united under the constitution (third definition) but simply the municipal corporation (U.S.\*\*\*) located in the District of Columbia and federal territories only, which is the second definition identified above and whose citizenship derives from [8 U.S.C. §1401](#) and NOT section 1 of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment, which states:

*Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.*

To remove all doubt, the municipal corporation to which I am disassociating with is described below:

*United States Code  
TITLE 28 - JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE  
PART VI - PARTICULAR PROCEEDINGS  
CHAPTER 176 - FEDERAL DEBT COLLECTION PROCEDURE  
SUBCHAPTER A - DEFINITIONS AND GENERAL PROVISIONS*

[Sec. 3002. Definitions](#)

(15) **"United States" means** -

(A) **a Federal corporation;**

(B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or

(C) an instrumentality of the United States.



Be advised that in all future interaction with the government, if the term “U.S. CITIZEN” appears in all capital letters on any form or application, such as, for example voter registration form, driver’s license application, etc, then the meaning attributed to such ambiguity (given the three definitions of “United States” above) by me and by implication also you, shall be NOT that of statutory “citizen” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1401](#), or a “U.S.\*\* citizen”, but a “non-citizen National” or “American National” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1452](#) and a “citizen of the United States” pursuant to the [14<sup>th</sup> Amendment](#) until or unless a contrary intent is clearly expressed by the government to remove all ambiguity created by the use of all capital letters. This also applies retroactively to any government forms I may have completed in the past. Thus, I will not be jeopardizing the citizenship status established in this document by any interaction with the government either in the past or in the future. The government is chargeable with a full knowledge of this reality in all its dealings with me as an American National. Such a play on words is not unlike the chicanery found throughout the Internal Revenue Code, which is rife with deceit and should have been declared “void for vagueness” a long time ago.

I have provided Enclosure (3): Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status, which is incorporated by reference and mandatorily attached and inseparable from any and every government form I have ever filled out or will fill out. It documents all the details of the status described in this section. Government forms or correspondence that become the subject of legal discovery MUST be accompanied by this form, and especially those dealing with a tax liability.

Even though I am not and never have been a statutory “U.S. citizen” or “citizen of the United States” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1401](#), on the assumption that your records reflect this incorrect status, you will note that in accordance with [8 U.S.C. §1101](#)(a)(22), statutory “citizens of the United States” are also “nationals”. Furthermore, pursuant to *Afroyim v. Rusk*, 387 U.S. 254 (1967), the government may not remove any aspect of my citizenship or nationality without my consent and voluntary and willful participation, which I now give in the case only of any alleged status as a statutory but not constitutional “citizen of the United States” or “U.S. citizen” but not “national” status.

*“In our country the people are sovereign and the Government cannot sever its relationship to the people by taking away their citizenship. Our Constitution governs us and we must never forget that our Constitution limits the Government to those powers specifically granted or those that are necessary and proper to carry out the specifically granted ones. The Constitution, of course, grants Congress no express power to strip people of their citizenship, whether in the exercise of the implied power to regulate foreign affairs or in the exercise of any specifically granted power.*

[...]

*“The entire legislative history of the 1868 Act makes it abundantly clear that there was a strong feeling in the Congress that the only way the citizenship it conferred could be lost was by the voluntary renunciation or abandonment by the citizen himself. And this was the unequivocal statement of the Court in the case of United States v. Wong Kim Ark, [169 U.S. 649](#).”*  
[*Afroyim v. Rusk*, [387 U.S. 253](#); 87 S.Ct. 1660 (1967)]

## **6. EFFECT ON FEDERAL JURISDICTION**

[Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17](#)(b) states that the law to be used in any civil case is the law deriving from the domicile of the party.

*Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*  
[IV. PARTIES](#) > Rule 17.  
[Rule 17. Parties Plaintiff and Defendant: Capacity](#)

*(b) Capacity to Sue or be Sued.*

*Capacity to sue or be sued is determined as follows:*

*(1) for an individual who is not acting in a representative capacity, by the law of the individual's domicile;*

*(2) for a corporation[the “United States”, in this case, or its officers on official duty representing the corporation], by the law under which it was organized; and*

*(3) for all other parties, by the law of the state where the court is located, except that:*

(A) a partnership or other unincorporated association with no such capacity under that state's law may sue or be sued in its common name to enforce a substantive right existing under the United States Constitution or laws; and  
(B) [28 U.S.C. §§754](#) and [959\(a\)](#) govern the capacity of a receiver appointed by a United States court to sue or be sued in a United States court.  
[SOURCE: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/rules/frcp/Rule17.htm>]

It should also be pointed out that even if the government tries to declare that I am on its territory, which is a lie because God owns and controls the earth pursuant to Psalm 47:7 and Deut. 10:14, I still retain the First Amendment right to act FULL TIME, 24 hours a day, as a fiduciary for my God and the corporate Kingdom of God, in which case the only law that can apply is the laws where the incorporation occurred, which is the Holy Bible and Heaven. To declare otherwise is to again violate my First Amendment right of freedom to associate ALL of my time, effort, and labor to the service of a Sovereign being higher than any man or government. Since the government makes me a "taxpayer" by compelling me into a fiduciary role as a "public official" engaged in a "trade or business" and its "agent", then it is denying me equal protection of the law if it attempts to interfere with my right to choose to be an agent and fiduciary of another party other than it, and to associate and devote all of my time, labor, and property to that competing cause.

***"He who has [understands and learns] My commandments [laws in the Bible] and keeps [obeys] them, it is he who loves Me. And he who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and manifest Myself [in, through, and] to him [as My fiduciary]."***  
*[[John 14:21](#), Bible, NKJV]*

***"And we have known and believed the love that God has for us. **God is love, and he who abides in love [obedience to God's Laws] abides in [and is a FIDUCIARY of] God, and God in him."*****  
*[[1 John 4:16](#), Bible, NKJV]*

Since my new domicile is the Kingdom of God/Heaven on Earth, and not within the jurisdiction of any man-made government, the only civil laws which apply to any litigation in federal court are those of the Holy Bible, which is the only law that I choose or volunteer to be subject to. The method of providing notice that these laws apply is documented in Fed.R.Civ.P. 44.1, which notice I now give. These foreign laws are exhaustively summarized below:

<i>Laws of the Bible</i> , Form #13.001 <a href="http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm">http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</a>
--

As a human being with no domicile within the "United States" or any federal territory, federal possession, or federal area within any state of the Union, I am not subject to federal law. I am a "transient foreigner" in relation to these jurisdictions, in fact. To wit:

***"Transient foreigner. One who visits the country, without the intention of remaining."***  
*[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1498]*

I am also a "stateless person" who is not subject to federal law and may not become subject because I do not meet any of the criteria established in [28 U.S.C. §1332](#) for a diversity of citizenship action. I am not "stateless" for the purposes of Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution, because the "State" referred to there is a state of the Union, which is mutually exclusive to the "State" referenced in [28 U.S.C. §1332\(d\)](#). Since there are no Article III Courts, then there is no federal court which could have jurisdiction over a diversity case documented in Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution, which puts me outside of the jurisdiction of every federal circuit and district court. To wit:

***In order to be a citizen of a State within the meaning of the diversity statute, a natural person must both be a citizen of the United States and be domiciled within the State. See Robertson v. Cease, 97 U.S. 646, 648-649 (1878); Brown v. Keene, 8 Pet. 112, 115 (1834). The problem in this case is that Bettison, although a United States citizen, has no domicile in any State. He is therefore "stateless" for purposes of § 1332(a)(3). Subsection 1332(a)(2), which confers jurisdiction in the District Court when a citizen of a State sues aliens only, also could not be satisfied because Bettison is a United States citizen. [490 U.S. 829]***

1 When a plaintiff sues more than one defendant in a diversity action, the plaintiff must  
2 meet the requirements of the diversity statute for each defendant or face dismissal.  
3 *Strawbridge v. Curtiss*, 3 Cranch 267 (1806).{1} Here, Bettison's "stateless" status  
4 destroyed complete diversity under § 1332(a)(3), and his United States citizenship  
5 destroyed complete diversity under § 1332(a)(2). Instead of dismissing the case,  
6 however, the Court of Appeals panel granted Newman-Green's motion, which it had  
7 invited, to amend the complaint to drop Bettison as a party, thereby producing complete  
8 diversity under § 1332(a)(2). 832 F.2d. 417 (1987). The panel, in an opinion by Judge  
9 Easterbrook, relied both on 28 U.S.C. § 1653 and on Rule 21 of the Federal Rules of  
10 Civil Procedure as sources of its authority to grant this motion. The panel noted that,  
11 because the guarantors are jointly and severally liable, Bettison is not an indispensable  
12 party, and dismissing him would not prejudice the remaining guarantors. 832 F.2d. at  
13 420, citing *Fed.Rule Civ.Proc.* 19(b). The panel then proceeded to the merits of the case,  
14 ruling in Newman-Green's favor in large part, but remanding to allow the District Court  
15 to quantify damages and to resolve certain minor issues.{2}  
16 [*Newman-Green v. Alfonso Larrain*, 490 U.S. 826 (1989)]

17 The only other method for asserting jurisdiction is under the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. §1605\(a\)\(2\)](#).

18 [TITLE 28 > PART IV > CHAPTER 97 > § 1605](#)  
19 [§ 1605. General exceptions to the jurisdictional immunity of a foreign state](#)

20 (a) A foreign state shall not be immune from the jurisdiction of courts of the United States  
21 or of the States in any case—

22 [. . .]

23 (2) in which the action is based upon a commercial activity carried on in the United  
24 States by the foreign state; or upon an act performed in the United States in connection  
25 with a commercial activity of the foreign state elsewhere; or upon an act outside the  
26 territory of the United States in connection with a commercial activity of the foreign state  
27 elsewhere and that act causes a direct effect in the United States;

28 Since I have formally, officially, and repeatedly abandoned all actual and presumed commercial ties with the federal  
29 government and its agents earlier in section 4 and in several earlier correspondences sent to the state and federal  
30 governments, then that method of establishing jurisdiction may not be asserted by the government in my case. It is also  
31 insufficient to say that I am not authorized to abandon all such ties. You will note that the U.S. Supreme Court said that the  
32 social security system is not “coercive”.

33 “Even though it be assumed that the exercise of a sovereign power by a state, in other  
34 respects valid, may be rendered invalid because of the coercive effect of a federal statute  
35 enacted in the exercise of a power granted to the national government, such coercion  
36 is lacking here. It is unnecessary to repeat now those considerations which have L.Ed. to our  
37 decision in the *Chas. C. Steward Machine Co. Case*, that the Social Security Act has  
38 no such coercive effect. As the Social Security Act is not coercive in its operation, the  
39 Unemployment Compensation Act cannot be set aside as an unconstitutional product of  
40 coercion.”

41 [*Carmichael v. Southern Coal and Coke Co.*, 301 U.S. 495 (1937)]

42 The only way the Social Security Act cannot be coercive is if it is not contractual AND those who joined not only this  
43 program, but any other federal program, can quit at any time. This is especially true if their consent was procured or  
44 presumed to have been procured before they reached adulthood or if that consent was procured through fraud.

45 “... railroad benefits, like social security benefits, are not contractual and may be altered  
46 or even eliminated at any time.”

47 [*United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz*, [449 U.S. 166](#) (1980); See also  
48 *Hisquierdo v. Hisquierdo*, [439 U.S. 572, 575](#) (1979); *Flemming v. Nestor*, [363 U.S. 603,](#)  
49 [608](#)-611 (1960)]

1 Should the government decide to proceed against me, then it must therefore do so under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities  
2 Act, and in so doing, must satisfy all of the criteria that are part of the Minimum Contacts Doctrine elucidated by the Ninth  
3 Circuit Court of Federal Appeals, when it held the following:<sup>17</sup>

4 *In International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945), the Supreme Court held  
5 that a court may exercise personal jurisdiction over a defendant consistent with due  
6 process only if he or she has "certain minimum contacts" with the relevant forum "such  
7 that the maintenance of the suit does not offend 'traditional notions of fair play and  
8 substantial justice.'" *Id.* at 316 (quoting *Milliken v. Meyer*, 311 U.S. 457, 463 (1940)).  
9 Unless a defendant's contacts with a forum are so substantial, continuous, and systematic  
10 that the defendant can be deemed to be "present" in that forum for all purposes, a forum  
11 may exercise only "specific" jurisdiction - that is, jurisdiction based on the relationship  
12 between the defendant's forum contacts and the plaintiff's claim. The parties agree that  
13 only specific jurisdiction is at issue in this case.

14 *In this circuit, we analyze specific jurisdiction according to a three-prong test:*

15 *(1) The non-resident defendant must purposefully direct his activities or consummate*  
16 *some transaction with the forum or resident thereof; or perform some act by which he*  
17 *purposefully avails himself of the privilege of conducting activities in the forum, thereby*  
18 *invoking the benefits and protections of its laws;*

19 *(2) the claim must be one which arises out of or relates to the defendant's forum-related*  
20 *activities; and*

21 *(3) the exercise of jurisdiction must comport with fair play and substantial justice, i.e. it*  
22 *must be reasonable.*

23 *Schwarzenegger v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 374 F.3d. 797, 802 (9th Cir. 2004) (quoting  
24 *Lake v. Lake*, 817 F.2d. 1416, 1421 (9th Cir. 1987)). The first prong is determinative in  
25 this case. We have sometimes referred to it, in shorthand fashion, as the "purposeful  
26 availment" prong. *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 802. Despite its label, this prong  
27 includes both purposeful availment and purposeful direction. It may be satisfied by  
28 purposeful availment of the privilege of doing business in the forum; by purposeful  
29 direction of activities at the forum; or by some combination thereof.

30 We have typically treated "purposeful availment" somewhat differently in tort and  
31 contract cases. In tort cases, we typically inquire whether a defendant "purposefully  
32 direct[s] his activities" at the forum state, applying an "effects" test that focuses on the  
33 forum in which the defendant's actions were felt, whether or not the actions themselves  
34 occurred within the forum. See *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 803 (citing *Calder v. Jones*,  
35 465 U.S. 783, 789-90 (1984)). By contrast, in contract cases, we typically inquire  
36 whether a defendant "purposefully avails itself of the privilege of conducting activities"  
37 or "consummate[s] [a] transaction" in the forum, focusing on activities such as  
38 delivering goods or executing a contract. See *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 802.  
39 However, this case is neither a tort nor a contract case. Rather, it is a case in which  
40 Yahoo! argues, based on the **First Amendment**, that the French court's interim orders are  
41 unenforceable by an American court.

42 *LICRA and UEJF contend that we must base our analysis on the so-called "effects" test*  
43 *of Calder v. Jones*, 465 U.S. 783 (1984), which is normally employed in purposeful  
44 direction cases. See, e.g., *CE Distrib., LLC v. New Sensor Corp.*, 380 F.3d. 1107, 1111  
45 (9th Cir. 2004); *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 803; *Dole Food Co. v. Watts*, 303 F.3d.  
46 1104, 1111 (9th Cir. 2002). In *Calder*, a California-based entertainer sued the *National*  
47 *Enquirer* and various individual defendants for an allegedly defamatory article published  
48 in the *Enquirer*. The article had been written and edited in Florida, and the defendants

<sup>17</sup> NOTE: The approach of other circuits is similar, though not necessarily identical.

1 had few contacts with California. The Court nonetheless upheld the exercise of personal  
2 jurisdiction in California because the defendants knew that the article would have an  
3 effect in that state. In the words of the Court, the defendants had not engaged in "mere  
4 untargeted negligence"; rather, their "intentional, and allegedly tortious, actions were  
5 expressly aimed at California." 465 U.S. at 789.

6 In this circuit, we construe *Calder* to impose three requirements: "the defendant allegedly  
7 [must] have

8 (1) committed an intentional act,  
9 (2) expressly aimed at the forum state,  
10 (3) causing harm that the defendant knows is likely to be suffered in the forum state."  
11 *Schwarzenegger*, 374 F.3d. at 803 (quoting *Dole Food*, 303 F.3d. at 1111).

12 In some of our cases, we have employed a slightly different formulation of the third  
13 requirement, specifying that the act must have "caused harm, the brunt of which is  
14 suffered and which the defendant knows is likely to be suffered in the forum state."  
15 *Bancroft & Masters, Inc. v. Augusta Nat'l Inc.*, 223 F.3d. 1082, 1087 (9th Cir. 2000)  
16 (emphasis added). The "brunt" of the harm formulation originated in the principal  
17 opinion in *Core-Vent Corp. v. Nobel Indus. AB*, 11 F.3d. 1482 (9th Cir. 1993). That  
18 opinion required that the "brunt" of the harm be suffered in the forum state; based on  
19 that requirement, it concluded that there was no purposeful availment by the defendant.  
20 *Id.* at 1486. A dissenting judge would have found purposeful availment. Relying on the  
21 Supreme Court's opinion in *Keeton v. Hustler Magazine*, 465 U.S. 770 (1984), he  
22 specifically disavowed the "brunt" of the harm formulation. *Core-Vent*, 11 F.3d. at 1492  
23 (Wallace, C.J., dissenting) ("[T]he Supreme Court has already rejected the proposition  
24 that the brunt of the harm must be suffered in the forum."). Without discussing the  
25 disputed "brunt" of the harm formulation, a concurring judge agreed with the dissenter  
26 that purposeful availment could be found. *Id.* at 1491 (Fernandez, J., concurring) ("I  
27 agree with Chief Judge Wallace that purposeful availment can be found in this case.").  
28 Later opinions picked up the "brunt" of the harm formulation of the principal opinion in  
29 *Core-Vent* without noting that at least one, and possibly two, of the judges on the panel  
30 disagreed with it. See, e.g., *Bancroft & Masters*, 223 F.3d. at 1087; *Panavision*, 141  
31 F.3d. at 1321; *Caruth v. Int'l Psychoanalytical Ass'n*, 59 F.3d. 126, 128 (9th Cir. 1995).

32 We take this opportunity to clarify our law and to state that the "brunt" of the harm need  
33 not be suffered in the forum state. If a jurisdictionally sufficient amount of harm is  
34 suffered in the forum state, it does not matter that even more harm might have been  
35 suffered in another state. In so stating we are following *Keeton*, decided the same day as  
36 *Calder*, in which the Court sustained the exercise of personal jurisdiction in New  
37 Hampshire even though "[i]t is undoubtedly true that the bulk of the harm done to  
38 petitioner occurred outside New Hampshire." 465 U.S. at 780.  
39 [\[Yahoo! Inc. v. La Ligue Contre Le Racisme Et L'Antisemitisme, 433 F.3d. 1199 \(9th Cir. 01/12/2006\)\]](#)  
40

## 41 **7. EFFECT ON STATE JURISDICTION**

42 The effect on state jurisdiction of this action to terminate domicile with the government having jurisdiction where I am  
43 temporarily present includes the following:

- 44 1. Anyone who sues me in a state Court is suing a "nonresident defendant" and as such:  
45 1.1. Must treat me as a "foreign sovereign" and satisfy the requirements of the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28](#)  
46 [U.S.C. §1602](#) et seq., or the Minimum Contacts Doctrine in order to bring me within the jurisdiction of the Court:

47 ***The Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment limits the power of a state***  
48 ***court to render a valid personal judgment against a nonresident defendant. *Kulko v.****  
49 ***California Superior Court*, 436 U.S. 84, 91 (1978). A judgment rendered in violation of**  
50 ***due process is void in the rendering State and is not entitled to full faith and credit***



1 elsewhere. *Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 U.S. 714, 732 -733 (1878). Due process requires that  
2 the defendant be given adequate notice of the suit, *Mullane v. Central Hanover Trust Co.*,  
3 339 U.S. 306, 313 -314 (1950), and be subject to the personal jurisdiction of the court,  
4 *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, 326 U.S. 310 (1945). In the present case, it is not  
5 contended that notice was inadequate; the only question is whether these particular  
6 petitioners were subject to the jurisdiction of the Oklahoma courts.

7 As has long been settled, and as we reaffirm today, a state court may exercise personal  
8 jurisdiction over a nonresident defendant only so long as there exist "minimum  
9 contacts" between the defendant and the forum State. *International Shoe Co. v.*  
10 *Washington*, supra, at 316. The concept of minimum contacts, in turn, can be seen to  
11 perform two related, but [444 U.S. 286, 292] distinguishable, functions. It protects the  
12 defendant against the burdens of litigating in a distant or inconvenient forum. And it  
13 acts to ensure that the States, through their courts, do not reach out beyond the limits  
14 imposed on them by their status as coequal sovereigns in a federal system.

15 The protection against inconvenient litigation is typically described in terms of  
16 "reasonableness" or "fairness." We have said that the defendant's contacts with the forum  
17 State must be such that maintenance of the suit "does not offend `traditional notions of  
18 fair play and substantial justice.'" *International Shoe Co. v. Washington*, supra, at 316,  
19 quoting *Milliken v. Meyer*, 311 U.S. 457, 463 (1940). The relationship between the  
20 defendant and the forum must be such that it is "reasonable . . . to require the  
21 corporation to defend the particular suit which is brought there." 326 U.S., at 317 .  
22 Implicit in this emphasis on reasonableness is the understanding that the burden on the  
23 defendant, while always a primary concern, will in an appropriate case be considered in  
24 light of other relevant factors, including the forum State's interest in adjudicating the  
25 dispute, see *McGee v. International Life Ins. Co.*, 355 U.S. 220, 223 (1957); the plaintiff's  
26 interest in obtaining convenient and effective relief, see *Kulko v. California Superior*  
27 *Court*, supra, at 92, at least when that interest is not adequately protected by the  
28 plaintiff's power to choose the forum, cf. *Shaffer v. Heitner*, 433 U.S. 186, 211 , n. 37  
29 (1977); the interstate judicial system's interest in obtaining the most efficient resolution  
30 of controversies; and the shared interest of the several States in furthering fundamental  
31 substantive social policies, see *Kulko v. California Superior Court*, supra, at 93, 98.  
32 [*World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson*, 444 U.S. 286 (1980)]

- 33 1.2. May not cite anything but the law from my chosen domicile, which is the Holy Bible, in resolving the dispute.  
34 This is consistent with Federal Rule of Civil Proc. 17(b), which says that the law from the person's domicile or  
35 the law of the "state" to which he is a member, both of which are synonymous in the case of a citizen and  
36 domiciliary of the Kingdom of God, govern the choice of law in the trial.
- 37 2. The state Family Courts no longer have any in personam jurisdiction over me or my property in the context of marriage  
38 or divorce. All family law, like most civil law, is based on domicile, also called "residence", and no court can have  
39 jurisdiction over a non-domiciled person.

40 Under our system of law, judicial power to grant a divorce -- jurisdiction, strictly  
41 speaking -- is founded on domicil. *Bell v. Bell*, 181 U.S. 175; *Andrews v. Andrews*, 188  
42 U.S. 14. The framers of the Constitution were familiar with this jurisdictional  
43 prerequisite, and, since 1789, neither this Court nor any other court in the English-  
44 speaking world has questioned it. Domicil implies a nexus between person and place of  
45 such permanence as to control the creation of legal relations and responsibilities of the  
46 utmost significance. The domicil of one spouse within a State gives power to that State,  
47 we have held, to dissolve [325 U.S. 230] a marriage wheresover contracted. In view of  
48 *Williams v. North Carolina*, supra, the jurisdictional requirement of domicil is freed from  
49 confusing refinements about "matrimonial domicil," see *Davis v. Davis*, 305 U.S. 32, 41,  
50 and the like. Divorce, like marriage, is of concern not merely to the immediate parties. It  
51 affects personal rights of the deepest significance. It also touches basic interests of  
52 society. Since divorce, like marriage, creates a new status, every consideration of policy  
53 makes it desirable that the effect should be the same wherever the question arises.

[...]

*If a finding by the court of one State that domicil in another State has been abandoned were conclusive upon the old domiciliary State, the policy of each State in matters of most intimate concern could be subverted by the policy of every other State. This Court has long ago denied the existence of such destructive power. The issue has a far reach.*

**For domicil is the foundation of probate jurisdiction, precisely as it is that of divorce.**

**[Williams v. North Carolina, 325 U.S. 226 (1945)]**

3. I am no longer eligible to obtain or hold a driver's license in any state of the Union because domicile in the "State" is a prerequisite to being issued one. Therefore, this correspondence shall also constitute a formal request to rescind my state driver's license, if any and purge all records of same. Every state of the Union:
- 3.1. Requires a "residence" or "domicile" in order to issue a driver's license.
  - 3.2. Cannot lawfully issue driver's licenses to non-domiciled persons.
  - 3.3. Cannot enforce the vehicle code against non-domiciled persons.
  - 3.4. Requires everyone being issued a state driver's license to surrender all other driver's licenses before being issued a new one, because a person can only have domicile in ONE place at a time.

*California Vehicle Code*

*12805. The department shall not issue a driver's license to, or renew a driver's license of, any person:*

[...]

*(f) Who holds a valid driver's license issued by a foreign jurisdiction unless the license has been surrendered to the department, or is lost or destroyed.*

**[<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=5072529233+0+0+0&WAIAction=retrieve>]**

*"A person may have more than one residence but only one domicile. "*  
*[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 485 under "domicile"]*

By way of example, California requires domicile or "residence" as a prerequisite to issuing a driver's license:

*California Vehicle Code*

*12505. (a) (1) For purposes of this division only and notwithstanding Section 516, **residency shall be determined as a person's state of domicile. "State of domicile" means the state where a person has his or her true, fixed, and permanent home and principal residence and to which he or she has manifested the intention of returning whenever he or she is absent.***

**Prima facie evidence of residency for driver's licensing purposes includes, but is not limited to, the following:**

**(A) Address where registered to vote.**

**(B) Payment of resident tuition at a public institution of higher education.**

**(C) Filing a homeowner's property tax exemption.**

**(D) Other acts, occurrences, or events that indicate presence in the state is more than temporary or transient.**

**(2) California residency is required of a person in order to be issued a commercial driver's license under this code.**

**(b) The presumption of residency in this state may be rebutted by satisfactory evidence that the licensee's primary residence is in another state.**



(c) Any person entitled to an exemption under Section 12502, 12503, or 12504 may operate a motor vehicle in this state for not to exceed 10 days from the date he or she establishes residence in this state, except that **he or she shall obtain a license from the department upon becoming a resident** [domiciliary] before being employed for compensation by another for the purpose of driving a motor vehicle on the highways.  
[<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=49860512592+2+0+0&WAIAction=retrieve>]

The “State” they are talking about in the California Vehicle Code above, incidentally, is a “federal State” or federal area within the exterior limits of the Republic of California. This is the only area within that state not protected by the Constitution and in which the government may therefore license or make into a privilege the exercise of a Constitutional right to travel. In that sense, the entire state vehicle code is “private law” that applies only to those who, through exercising their private right to contract, place their “res” or legal identity in a virtual place not protected by the Bill of Rights. Other states of the Union implement their vehicle codes by EXACTLY the same mechanisms.

## **8. FACTS AND PRESUMPTIONS ESTABLISHED BY THIS LEGAL NOTICE**

The only legitimate use of any kind of presumption is the protection of Constitutionally guaranteed rights. Examples of why this is an absolute requirement of American Jurisprudence are described below:

1. The presumption in criminal jurisprudence that a criminal defendant is innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.

*The presumption of innocence plays a unique role in criminal proceedings. As Chief Justice Burger explained in his opinion for the Court in Estelle v. Williams, 425 U.S. 501 (1976): [507 U.S. 284]*

*The presumption of innocence, although not articulated in the Constitution, is a basic component of a fair trial under our system of criminal justice. Long ago this Court stated:*

*The principle that there is a presumption of innocence in favor of the accused is the undoubted law, axiomatic and elementary, and its enforcement lies at the foundation of the administration of our criminal law.*

*Coffin v. United States, 156 U.S. 432, 453 (1895).  
[[Delo v. Lashely, 507 U.S. 272 \(1993\)](#)]*

2. The rule that conclusive presumptions which injure constitutionally protected rights are impermissible.

*(1) [8:4993] Conclusive presumptions affecting protected interests:*

*A conclusive presumption may be defeated where its application would impair a party's constitutionally-protected liberty or property interests. In such cases, conclusive presumptions have been held to violate a party's due process and equal protection rights. [Vlandis v. Kline (1973) [412 U.S. 441](#), 449, 93 S.Ct. 2230, 2235; Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) [414 U.S. 632](#), 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215-presumption under Illinois law that unmarried fathers are unfit violates process] [[Rutter Group Practice Guide-Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, paragraph 8:4993, page 8K-34](#)]*

3. The presumption that only laws which specifically identify the conduct that is prohibited unambiguously are enforceable. This is called the “void for vagueness” doctrine.

*"Law fails to meet requirements of due process clause if it is so vague and standardless that it leaves public uncertain as to conduct it prohibits or leaves judges and jurors free*

1           to decide, without any legally fixed standards, what is prohibited and what is not in each  
2           particular case."

3           [Giaccio v. State of Pennsylvania, [382 U.S. 399](#); 86 S.Ct. 518 (1966)]

4       4. The fact that presumption may not be used as a substitute for evidence in any legal proceeding.

5           *A presumption is an assumption of fact that the law requires to be made from another*  
6           *fact or group of facts found or otherwise established in the action. A presumption is not*  
7           *evidence. A presumption is either conclusive or rebuttable. Every rebuttable*  
8           *presumption is either (a) a presumption affecting the burden of producing evidence or (b)*  
9           *a presumption affecting the burden of proof. Calif.Evid.Code, §600.*  
10          *[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1185]*

11       The following subsections and this document in general will therefore create presumptions about my status and my  
12       intentions which shall: 1. Protect my Constitutional rights; 2. Form a basis in all legal proceedings between me, the  
13       sovereign human being, and the government. If you would like to know more about why presumptions which do anything  
14       but protect constitutional rights are impermissible in any court of law, see:

<p>Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017 <a href="http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm">http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</a></p>
--

## 15       **8.1 Privacy Act Warning, License Agreement, and "Shrink Wrap" License applying to all** 16       **correspondence sent to government**

17       The content of this section establishes every submission to the government as licensed, privileged, copyrighted, and  
18       protected information.

- 19       1. The information contained in all such submissions is protected by the [Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a](#).  
20       2. [5 U.S.C. §552a](#)(b) indicates that the government MUST have my consent to use or transmit or store any information  
21       about me and I DO NOT give said consent.  
22       3. Recipient is warned that the Submitter **DOES NOT GIVE** his consent to store, use, or transmit any of the information  
23       contained herein in electronic form, and especially is not authorized to share any of this information with any other  
24       federal or state agency, bureau, instrumentality of any description. All form or information submissions to the  
25       government are licensed and copyrighted and may not be used for ANY commercial or governmental purpose.  
26       4. Any unauthorized use of information pertaining to the Submitter and contained on any submission to the government,  
27       any attached form, or previously submitted to the government is subject to a \$100,000 penalty per incident plus any tax  
28       or penalty liability that might result from the unauthorized use of said information.

## 29       **8.2 Penalty of Perjury and jurat statements on government forms submitted**

30       The perjury statement appearing on all government forms to which this form is attached is not materially modified in  
31       symbolic form, but regardless of what it says, the following meaning is intended and is the ONLY meaning that may be  
32       enforced or admitted as evidence in any court of law.

33           *"Under penalties of perjury from without the United States and from within the United*  
34           *States of America pursuant to [28 U.S.C. §1746](#)(1), I declare that the attached*  
35           *correspondence, facts, and statements are true, correct, and complete to the best of my*  
36           *knowledge and ability. This perjury statement may only be enforced in a court of a state*  
37           *of the Union where neither the judge nor any member of the jury is a "taxpayer" or in*  
38           *receipt of any pecuniary benefit which derives from Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue*  
39           *Code in order to ensure that there is no conflict of interest which might violate [18 U.S.C.](#)*  
40           *[§208](#) or [28 U.S.C. §455](#)."All alleged "taxes" paid UNDER PROTEST presumptions*

## 41       **8.3 All alleged "taxes" paid UNDER PROTEST presumptions**

42       Treasury Decision 3445 establishes that taxes which are voluntarily paid are nonrefundable and may not be recouped. Here  
43       is the text:

**The principle that taxes voluntarily paid cannot be recovered back is thoroughly established.** It has been so declared in the following cases in the Supreme Court: *United States v. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co.* ([200 U. S. 488](#), 493, 494); *Chesebrough v. United States* ([192 U. S. 253](#)); *Little v. Bowers* ([134 U. S. 547](#), 554); *Wright v. Blakeslee* ([101 U. S. 174](#), 178); *Railroad Co. v. Commissioner* ([98 U. S. 541](#), 543); *Lamborn v. County Commissioners* ([97 U. S. 181](#)); *Elliott v. Swartwout* (10 Pet. 137). And there are numerous like cases in other Federal courts: *Procter & Gamble Co. v. United States* (281 Fed. 1014); *Vaughan v. Riordan* (280 Fed. 742, 745); *Beer v. Moffatt* (192 Fed. 984, affirmed 209 Fed. 779); *Newhall v. Jordan* (160 Fed. 661); *Christie Street Commission Co. v. United States* (126 Fed. 991); *Kentucky Bank v. Stone* (88 Fed. 383); *Corkie v. Maxwell* (7 Fed. Cas. 3231).

**And the rule of the Federal courts is not at all peculiar to them. It is the settled general rule of the State courts as well that no matter what may be the ground of the objection to the tax or assessment if it has been paid voluntarily and without compulsion it cannot be recovered back in an action at law, unless there is some constitutional or statutory provision which gives to one so paying such a right notwithstanding the payment was made without compulsion.**--*Adams v. New Bedford* (155 Mass. 317); *McCue v. Monroe County* (162 N.Y. 235); *Taylor v. Philadelphia Board of Health* (31 P.St. 73); *Williams v. Merritt* (152 Mich. 621); *Gould v. Hennepin County* (76 Minn. 379); *Martin v. Kearney County* (62 Minn. 538); *Gar v. Hurd* (92 Ills. 315); *Slimmer v. Chickasaw County* (140 Iowa, 448); *Warren v. San Francisco* (150 Calif. 167); *State v. Chicago & C. R. Co.* (165 No. 597).

And it has been many times held, in the absence of a statute on the subject, that mere payment under protest does not save a payment from being voluntary, in the sense which forbids a recovery back of the tax paid, if it was not made under any duress, compulsion, or threats, or under the pressure of process immediately available for the forcible collection of the tax.--*Dexter v. Boston* (176 Mass. 247); *Flower v. Lance* (59 N.Y. 603); *Williams v. Merritt* (152 Mich. 621); *Oakland Cemetery Association v. Ramsey County* (98 Minn. 404); *Robins v. Latham* (134 No. 466); *Whitbeck v. Minch* (48 Ohio St. 210); *Peebles v. Pittsburgh*. (101 Pa.St. 304); *Montgomery v. Cowlitz County* (14 Wash. 230); *Cincinnati & C. R. Co. v. Hamilton County* (120 Tenn. 1).

**The principle that a tax or an assessment voluntarily paid cannot be recovered back is an ancient one in the common law and is of general application. See Cooley on Taxation (vol. 2, 3d ed. p. 1495).** That eminent authority also points out that every man is supposed to know the law, and if he voluntarily makes a payment which the law would not compel him to make he cannot afterwards assign his ignorance of the law as a reason why the State should furnish him with legal remedies to recover it back. And he adds:

*Especially is this the case when the officer receiving the money, who is chargeable with no more knowledge of the law than the party making payment, is not put on his guard by any warning or protest, and the money is over to the use of the public in apparent acquiescence in the justice of the exaction. Mistake of fact can scarcely exist in such a case except in connection with negligence; as the illegalities which render such a demand a nullity must appear from the records, and the taxpayer is just as much bound to inform himself what the records show, or do not show, as are the public authorities. The rule of law is a rule of sound public policy also; it is a rule of quiet as well as of good faith, and precludes the courts being occupied in undoing the arrangements of parties which they have voluntarily made, and into which they have not been drawn by fraud or accident, or by any excusable ignorance of their legal rights and liabilities.*

*But the question presented must be decided upon the language of section 252 hereinbefore set forth in this opinion. In the cases within the purview of the section the right of the taxpayer to so much of the tax as he has paid in excess of that properly due is not made to depend upon whether it was paid under protest. The nature of the section must be regarded, as in the case of the statute before the court in *United States v. Hvoslef**

([237 U.S. 1](#), 12), and so regarded it negatives any intent that a protest should be necessary. In this case as in that the right of repayment is established by the express terms of the statute itself.

The section is intended to give the Commissioner of Internal Revenue power to credit or refund overpayments when no claim for a refund is filed by the taxpayer. Prior to that enactment the commissioner had no authority to credit or refund overpayments of taxes unless appeal was duly made to him in the manner prescribed by section 3220 of the Revised Statutes.

Section 252 of the act of 1918 has nothing whatever to do with the collector of internal revenue or with an action against him. The power or duty to make refunds under the section is vested not in the collector but in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The commissioner, prior to the enactment of section 252, had no authority to credit or refund overpayments of taxes unless appeal was duly made to him in the manner prescribed by section 3220 of the Revised Statutes, which read: "The Commissioner of Internal Revenue \* \* \* is authorized, on appeal to him made, to remit, refund, and pay back all taxes erroneously or illegally assessed or collected \* \* \*." And the appeal had to be made within two years after the cause of action accrued, as required by section 3228.

That being the condition of the law Congress enacted section 252 of the act of 1918. The primary purpose of that enactment was to permit the commissioner of his own volition upon discovery of any overpayment to credit or refund the same notwithstanding the provision of section 3228 of the Revised Statutes, and to limit the time within which he could make such credit or refund to "five years from the date the return was made. The section does not in express terms purport to give the taxpayer a right to sue for the recovery of the excess in the tax paid. It simply defines the powers and duties of the commissioner in correcting overpayments which he finds have been made. It was intended to protect the commissioner in making refunds which ought to be made prescribed by section 3228 had expired. .

Taxes erroneously paid or illegally exacted may be recovered-

1. From the Commissioner of Internal Revenue under section 3220 of the Revised Statutes heretofore referred to.

2. Through an action at law brought against the United States. This is by virtue of the so-called Tucker Act (Judicial Code, sec. 24, par. 20, ch. 397, 24 Stat. 635).being held that a suit may be maintained directly against the United States for the recovery of taxes wrongfully assessed and collected.-Emery, Bird, Thayer, Realty Co. v. United States (198 Fed. 242, 249); Christie Street Commission Co. v. United States (136 Fed. 326).

3. Through an action against a collector who wrongfully exacted the tax and who may be sued for such money as he is not entitled to retain.--Smietanka v. Indiana Steel Co. ([257 U. S. 1](#)); Sage v. United States ([250 U. S. 33](#)).

But in Elliott v. Swartwout (10 Pet. 137), the court held that the collector was not liable in an action to recover the excess duties mistakenly collected unless protest was made at the time of payment or notice was given to him not to pay the money over to the Treasury. The principle applied was the one applied to agents in private transactions- that a voluntary payment to an agent without notice of objection would not subject the agent to liability he having paid it over to his principal, but that payment with notice or with a protest might make the agent liable if in despite of the notice or protest he paid the money over to his principal. But after an act of Congress required collectors to pay over much moneys it has held that the personal liability was gone.- Cary v. Curtis (3 How. 236). But later statutes, as pointed out in Smietanka v. Indiana Steel Co., supra, recognize suits against collectors in such cases.

In our opinion section 252 of the act of 1918 was apparently designed to counteract the effect of section 3228 of the Revised Statutes which limited refunds to a period of two years after the tax had been paid, and it relates to the matter of obtaining a credit or a refund from the commissioner. If it impliedly gives a cause of action, about which we are not now called upon to express an opinion, it is a cause of action against the United States. It does not confer a right to bring an action against the collector in cam in which no Liability otherwise existed.

[Treasury Decision 3445, February 27, 1923;

SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/Voluntary-TD3445.pdf>]

This correspondence establishes the inferences that may be drawn from my behavior in the context of all monies paid to the U.S. government under the auspices of any statute within the Internal Revenue Code. The following presumptions are hereby established:

1. That all PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE monies paid to the U.S. government and any state of the Union by me:
  - 1.1. Are paid UNDER PROTEST and duress, and NOT voluntarily.

*“An agreement [consent] obtained by duress, coercion, or intimidation is invalid, since the party coerced is not exercising his free will, and the test is not so much the means by which the party is compelled to execute the agreement as the state of mind induced.<sup>18</sup> Duress, like fraud, rarely becomes material, except where a contract or conveyance has been made which the maker wishes to avoid. As a general rule, duress renders the contract or conveyance voidable, not void, at the option of the person coerced,<sup>19</sup> and it is susceptible of ratification. Like other voidable contracts, it is valid until it is avoided by the person entitled to avoid it.<sup>20</sup> However, duress in the form of physical compulsion, in which a party is caused to appear to assent when he has no intention of doing so, is generally deemed to render the resulting purported contract void.<sup>21</sup>”*

*[American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, Section 21]*

- 1.2. Are NOT “gifts” as defined in [31 U.S.C. §3113](#).
- 1.3. Are withheld or paid “under color but without actual authority” of law and therefore constitute a FRAUDULENT transaction or payment or conveyance and an illegal bribe to the public officials who will expend them in violation of [18 U.S.C. §201](#).
- 1.4. Constitute FRAUD, because they do not represent or indicate the fact that they were not paid voluntarily. The existence of the duress indicated later is why they willfully do NOT indicate the duress that is the cause of them being paid.

*American Jurisprudence, 2d [legal encyclopedia]  
Fraud and Deceit  
§8 Effect*

**Fraud vitiates every transaction and all contracts.**<sup>22</sup> *Indeed, the principle is often stated, in broad and sweeping language, that fraud destroys the validity of everything into which it enters, and that it vitiates the most solemn contracts, documents, and even*

<sup>18</sup> Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall 205, 19 L.Ed. 134

<sup>19</sup> Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326 (holding that acts induced by duress which operate solely on the mind, and fall short of actual physical compulsion, are not void at law, but are voidable only, at the election of him whose acts were induced by it); Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)) 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962); Carroll v. Fetty, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521, cert den 308 U.S. 571, 84 L.Ed. 479, 60 S.Ct. 85.

<sup>20</sup> Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; Heider v. Unicume, 142 or 416, 20 P.2d. 384; Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)) 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962)

<sup>21</sup> Restatement 2d, Contracts § 174, stating that if conduct that appears to be a manifestation of assent by a party who does not intend to engage in that conduct is physically compelled by duress, the conduct is not effective as a manifestation of assent.

<sup>22</sup> Jackson v. State, 210 App.Div. 115, 205 N.Y.S. 658, affd 241 N.Y. 563, 150 N.E. 556; Trowbridge v. Oehmsen, 207 App.Div. 740, 202 N.Y.S. 833, affd 241 N.Y. 564, 150 N.E. 556.



1 judgments.<sup>23</sup> Fraud, as it is sometimes said, vitiates every act, which statement embodies  
2 a thoroughly sound doctrine when it is properly applied to the subject matter in  
3 controversy and to the parties thereto and in a proper forum.<sup>24</sup> As a general rule, fraud  
4 will vitiate a contract notwithstanding that it contains a provision to the effect that no  
5 representations have been made as an inducement to enter into it, or that either party  
6 shall be bound by any representation not contained therein, or a similar provision  
7 attempting to nullify extraneous representations. Such provisions do not, in most  
8 jurisdictions, preclude a charge of fraud based on oral representations.<sup>25</sup>

9 **It is a general rule in the law of contracts, however, that an agreement induced by**  
10 **fraud is voidable<sup>26</sup> and not void,<sup>27</sup> although the rule laid down in some cases is that**  
11 **fraud in the factum or execution renders the agreement void, whereas fraud in the treaty**  
12 **or inducement renders it merely voidable.<sup>28</sup> Fraudulent representations, to avoid a**  
13 **contract, need not be such as would sustain an indictment for false pretenses.<sup>29</sup> In**  
14 **preventing actual consent, fraud may be as effectual as mistake or a want of capacity;**  
15 **and where such is the fact in dealing with ordinary contracts, its effect is to vitiate and**  
16 **invalidate them.<sup>30</sup> Ordinarily, however, a contract induced by fraud is voidable at the**  
17 **option of the person defrauded, who must take affirmative action for relief.<sup>31</sup> Generally**  
18 **speaking, the right to avoid a contract induced by fraud must be exercised before the**  
19 **rights of third parties have intervened.<sup>32</sup>**

20 *Fraudulent misrepresentations may operate as an estoppel in pais, whereby the*  
21 *fraudulent person is precluded from denying a statement which another has relied upon*  
22 *to his injury.<sup>33</sup> As respects fraud in law, that is, constructive fraud as*  
23 *contradistinguished from fraud in fact, or actual fraud, where that which is valid can be*  
24 *separated from that which is invalid without defeating the general intent, the maxim,*  
25 *"void in part, void in toto," does not necessarily apply, and the transaction may be*  
26 *sustained notwithstanding the invalidity of a particular provision. If an original*  
27 *transaction is valid, it cannot be rendered fraudulent by subsequent events, as by the*  
28 *mere nonperformance of a contract,<sup>34</sup> unless, under the rule in force in the majority of*  
29 *jurisdictions, there is a coexisting intention not to perform.<sup>35</sup> In the event of a*  
30 *controversy between the parties regarding fraud in the contract, a "valid" contract is*  
31 *what a court acting with jurisdiction says it is.<sup>36</sup>*

<sup>23</sup> Johnson v. Waters, 111 U.S. 640, 28 L.Ed. 547, 4 S.Ct. 619; United States v. Throckmorton, 98 U.S. 61, 25 L.Ed. 93; Nudd v. Burrows, 91 U.S. 426, 23 L.Ed. 286; Stoddard v. Chambers, 2 How (US) 284, 11 L.Ed. 269; United States v. The Amistad, 15 Pet (US) 518, 10 L.Ed. 826; 99 Pratt Street Corp. v. Stand Realty Corp., 27 Conn Supp 101, 230 A.2d. 613; Rathbun v. Baumel, 196 Iowa 1233, 191 N.W. 297, 30 A.L.R. 216; Taylor v. State, 73 Md. 208, 20 A. 914; Aspinwall v. Sabin, 22 Neb. 73, 34 N.W. 72; Berry v. Stevens, 168 Okla. 124, 31 P.2d. 950; Alder v. Crosier, 50 Utah 437, 168 P. 83; Re Ernst, 179 Wis. 646, 192 N.W. 65, 30 A.L.R. 681; Baylies v. Vanden Boom, 40 Wyo. 411, 278 P. 551, 70 A.L.R. 924.

<sup>24</sup> Field v. Seabury, 19 How (US) 323, 15 L.Ed. 650; Re Ernst, 179 Wis. 646, 192 N.W. 65, 30 A.L.R. 681.

<sup>25</sup> See 17 Am Jur 2d, Contracts § 191.

<sup>26</sup> Joseph Martinelli & Co. v. Simon Siegel Co. (CA1 Mass) 176 F.2d. 98, 13 A.L.R.2d. 1243; Manly v. Ohio Shoe Co. (CA4), 25 F.2d. 384, 59 A.L.R. 413; Pocatello Secur. Trust Co. v. Henry, 35 Idaho 321, 206 P. 175, 27 A.L.R. 337; Commissioner of Banks v. Cosmopolitan Trust Co., 253 Mass. 205, 148 N.E. 609, 41 A.L.R. 658; Salter v. Aviation Salvage Co. 129 Miss 217, 91 So 340, 26 A.L.R. 987.

<sup>27</sup> Commissioner of Banks v. Cosmopolitan Trust Co., 253 Mass. 205, 148 N.E. 609, 41 A.L.R. 658; Ettlinger v. National Surety Co., 221 N.Y. 467, 117 N.E. 945, 3 A.L.R. 865.

<sup>28</sup> See 17 Am Jur 2d, Contracts § 151.

<sup>29</sup> Nichols v. Michael, 23 N.Y. 264; McNair v. Southern States Finance Co., 191 N.C. 710, 133 S.E. 85.

<sup>30</sup> Brown v. Scott, 140 Md. 258, 117 A. 114, 22 A.L.R. 810.

<sup>31</sup> Ettlinger v. National Surety Co., 221 N.Y. 467, 117 N.E. 945, 3 A.L.R. 865; Adams v. Gillig, 199 N.Y. 314, 92 N.E. 670.

<sup>32</sup> See 17 Am Jur 2d, Contracts § 509.

<sup>33</sup> Block v. Block, 165 Ohio.St. 365, 60 Ohio.Ops. 1, 135 N.E.2d. 857; McAfferty v. Conover, 7 Ohio.St. 99.

<sup>34</sup> Crane v. Conklin, 1 N.J.Eq. 346.

<sup>35</sup> §§ 68 et seq., infra.

<sup>36</sup> Angelina v. Euclid Concrete Corp. 280 App.Div. 405, 113 N.Y.S.2d. 537, affd 306 N.Y. 606, 115 N.E.2d. 831.

A person does not, by attempting to defraud another, forfeit his property to the latter.<sup>37</sup>  
[37 Am.Jur.2d, Fraud and Deceit, Section 8]

- 1.5. Constitute STOLEN PROPERTY for which this document constitutes a formal ADVANCED CRIMINAL COMPLAINT against the payer or withholder, who shall be regarded as the THIEF or EXTORTIONER, if he is not me, the submitter.
- 1.6. That the receiving government is willfully acting as a money launderer for the STOLEN money or property for the period during which it is acting as bailee over it. It may not lawfully possess, spend, or use such proceeds for any public purpose absent my consent, which I do not, never have, and never will give. Money laundering is a criminal violation of [18 U.S.C. §1956](#).
- 1.7. That I demand the IMMEDIATE RETURN of all monies paid, withheld, or otherwise extorted from me or any of the business entities of which I am a part.

*“A claim against the United States is a right to demand money from the United States.”<sup>38</sup>  
Such claims are sometimes spoken of as gratuitous in that they cannot be enforced by suit without statutory consent.<sup>39</sup> The general rule of non-liability of the United States does not mean that a citizen cannot be protected against the wrongful governmental acts that affect the citizen or his or her property.<sup>40</sup> If, for example, money or property of an innocent person goes into the federal treasury by fraud to which a government agent was a party, the United States cannot hold the money or property against the claim of the injured party.<sup>41”</sup>  
[American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45]*

2. That all monies paid to the government do not constitute “taxes” as legally defined, but a temporary loan whereby the government is the BAILEE but not OWNER in TEMPORARY custody. Consequently, it cannot lawfully assert sovereign immunity or deny its consent to return said STOLEN property in order to preserve its illegal custody of said laundered funds or property.
3. That the duress was instituted against me by the following sources:
  - 3.1. My private employer, who either threatened to fire or to not hire me if I did not submit an IRS Form W-4 authorizing INVOLUNTARY withholding.
  - 3.2. False Information Returns, such as IRS Forms W-2, 1098, 1099, etc, were filed against my earnings. These information returns connected me to a “trade or business” and a “public office” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6041](#) and [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) which I was NOT, in fact, engaged in.
  - 3.3. The above FALSE information Returns constituted a criminal infraction against [26 U.S.C. §7207](#) and FALSE claims against the United States cognizable under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §3729, as well as a civil tort pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7434](#), and that the U.S. Dept of Justice practiced prejudicial and injurious “selective enforcement” by willfully and criminally refusing to prosecute the submitters criminally and civilly for these infractions.
4. That the above sources of duress against me, the Submitter caused all withholdings and payments to be involuntary.
5. That I reserve all rights over all monies, alleged “taxes”, and other payment made by me or on my behalf in the context of any financial arrangement I may have with any third party, pursuant to U.C.C. 1-207 and its successor, U.C.C. 1-308.
6. That should the government receive any monies from me, they constitute a temporary loan at 20% interest compounded annually and payable on a pro-rata basis when the monies are returned.

<sup>37</sup> Blue v. Blue, 38 Ill 9.

<sup>38</sup> United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 A.F.T.R. 4628 (holding that a claim against the Secretary of State for money awarded under a treaty is a claim against the United States); Hobbs v. McLean, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870; Manning v. Leighton, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A. 258, motion dismd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A. 630 and (disapproved on other grounds by Button's Estate v. Anderson, 112 Vt 531, 28 A.2d. 404, 143 A.L.R. 195).

As to the False Claims Act, see 32 Am Jur 2d, False Pretenses §§ 88-96.

As to the jurisdiction of the United States Court of Federal Claims, see 32B Am Jur 2d, Federal Courts §§ 2266 et seq.

<sup>39</sup> Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.

<sup>40</sup> Wilson v. Shaw, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233.

<sup>41</sup> Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 U.S.T.C. ¶ 9346, 15 A.F.T.R. 1069; United States v. State Bank, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.



7. That acceptance of all withholdings and payments from my pay or financial assets by the U.S. government constitutes an implied contract for which the United States waives sovereign immunity pursuant to the Tucker Act, [28 U.S.C. §1491](#), and agrees to be responsible to honor the terms of this document.

*CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE*  
*DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS*  
*PART 2. CONTRACTS*  
*CHAPTER 3. CONSENT*  
[Section 1589](#)

*1589. A voluntary acceptance of the benefit of a [government benefit] transaction is equivalent to a consent to all the obligations [and legal liabilities] arising from it, so far as the facts are known, or ought to be known, to the person accepting.*

The “benefit” referred to above which gives rise to the “constructive consent” is the temporary use of STOLEN property and the authority to act as temporary bailee over said property until it is returned to its rightful owner, which is me, subject to the payment of interest at the rates indicated above for the period of bailment. The government may not on the one hand ASSUME that I consented to be bound by the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code by virtue of using the “benefits” of it, such as the SSN, without applying the SAME rules to itself in reverse. To do otherwise is a denial of equal protection of the law and hypocrisy.

8. I remind the recipient that the First Amendment gives me a right not only to communicate or not communicate with the federal government, but to define the legal significance of all of my words, actions, and behaviors so that they are understood in the light that I wish them to be understood. To do otherwise is to violate my First Amendment rights. We can’t have a First Amendment right to communicate, if we can’t even define the meaning and significance of our words and actions and what we intend for them to convey to the government.

#### **8.4 Presumptions Against the existence of Federal Jurisdiction in States of the Union**

This document shall create a presumption AGAINST the existence of any kind of legislative jurisdiction of the federal government and its municipal laws within any state of the Union. The authorities for this presumption are as follows:

1. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 54(c ), prior to year 2002 asserted that all Acts of Congress are applicable in the District of Columbia and federal territory only. Removing the rule and making it unrecognizable during the revision process hides that fact but STILL does not change that jurisdictional fact.

*Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(c ), prior to Dec. 2002*

*"Act of Congress" includes any act of Congress locally applicable to and in force in the District of Columbia, in Puerto Rico, in a territory or in an insular possession."*

2. The Internal Revenue Code defines and limits the term “United States” to include only the District of Columbia and nowhere expands the term to include any state of the Union. Consequently, states of the Union are not included.

[TITLE 26](#) > [Subtitle F](#) > [CHAPTER 79](#) > *Sec. 7701.*  
[Sec. 7701. - Definitions](#)

*(a) When used in this title, where not otherwise distinctly expressed or manifestly incompatible with the intent thereof—*

*(9) United States*

*The term "United States" when used in a geographical sense includes only the [States](#) and the District of Columbia.*

[\(10\) State](#)

The term "State" shall be construed to include the District of Columbia, where such construction is necessary to carry out provisions of this title.

3. [Article 1](#), Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution expressly limits the territorial jurisdiction of the federal government to the ten square mile area known as the District of Columbia. Extensions to this jurisdiction arose at the signing of the Treaty of Peace between the King of Spain and the United States in Paris France, which granted to the United States new territories such as Guam, Cuba, the Philippines, etc.
4. [4 U.S.C. §72](#) limits the exercise of all "public offices" and the application of their laws to the District of Columbia and NOT elsewhere except as expressly provided by Congress.

[TITLE 4 > CHAPTER 3 > § 72](#)  
[§72. Public offices; at seat of Government](#)

*All offices attached to the seat of government shall be exercised in the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere, except as otherwise expressly provided by law.*

5. The Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A places the income tax primarily upon a "trade or business". The U.S. Supreme Court expressly stated that Congress may not establish a "trade or business" in a state of the Union and tax it.

*"Congress cannot authorize a **trade or business** within a State in order to tax it."*  
*[License Tax Cases, [72 U.S. 462](#), 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)]*

6. A "trade or business" is defined as the "functions of a public office" in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#). Pursuant to [4 U.S.C. §72](#) above, all "public offices", all of which may by law *only* be exercised within the District of Columbia and not elsewhere except as "expressly" provided by an enactment of Congress. See:

*The "Trade or Business" Scam*, Form #05.001  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

7. [48 U.S.C. §1612](#) expressly extends the enforcement of the criminal provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to the Virgin Islands and is the only enactment of Congress that extends enforcement of any part of the Internal Revenue Code to any place outside the District of Columbia.
8. There is no provision of law which expressly extends the enforcement of Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code to any state of the Union. Therefore, jurisdiction does not exist there.

*"**Expressio unius est exclusio alterius.** A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that **the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another.** *Burgin v. Forbes*, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325; *Newblock v. Bowles*, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. **When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be inferred.** Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded."*  
*[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581]*

9. [26 U.S.C. §7601](#) authorizes enforcement of the Internal Revenue Code and discovery related to the enforcement *only* within the bounds of internal revenue districts.
10. [Treasury Order 150-02](#) abolished all internal revenue districts *except* that of the District of Columbia.
11. [26 U.S.C. §7621](#) authorizes the President of the United States to define the boundaries of all internal revenue districts. He delegated that authority to the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to Executive Order 10289. The President may NOT establish internal revenue districts outside of the United States, which is then defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#) and (a)(10), [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(39\)](#), and [26 U.S.C. §7408\(c\)](#) to mean ONLY the District of Columbia.
12. IRS is delegate of the Secretary in insular possessions, as "delegate" is defined at [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(12\)\(B\)](#), but NOT in states of the Union.
13. The U.S. Supreme Court commonly refers to states of the Union as "foreign states". To wit:

*We have held, upon full consideration, that although under existing statutes a circuit court of the United States has jurisdiction upon habeas corpus to discharge from the custody of **state officers** or tribunals one restrained of his liberty in violation of the Constitution of the United States, it is not required in every case to exercise its power to*

that end immediately upon application being made for the writ. 'We cannot suppose,' this court has said, 'that Congress intended to compel those courts, by such means, to draw to themselves, in the first instance, the control of all criminal prosecutions commenced in state courts exercising authority within the same territorial limits, where the accused claims that he is held in custody in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The injunction to hear the case summarily, and thereupon 'to dispose of the party as law and justice require' [R. S. 761], does not deprive the court of discretion as to the time and mode in which it will exert the powers conferred upon it. That discretion should be exercised in the light of the relations existing, under our system of government, between the judicial tribunals of the Union and of the states, and in recognition of the fact that the public good requires that those relations be not disturbed by unnecessary conflict between courts equally bound to guard and protect rights secured by the Constitution. When the petitioner is in custody by state authority for an act done or omitted to be done in pursuance of a law of the United States, or of an order, process, or decree of a court or judge thereof; or where, being a subject or citizen of a foreign state, and domiciled therein, he is in custody, under like authority, for an act done or omitted under any alleged right, title, authority, privilege, protection, or exemption claimed under the commission, or order, or sanction of any foreign state, or under color thereof, the validity and effect whereof depend upon the law of nations; in such and like cases of urgency, involving the authority and operations of the general government, or the obligations of this country to, or its relations with, foreign nations, [180 U.S. 499, 502] the courts of the United States have frequently interposed by writs of habeas corpus and discharged prisoners who were held in custody under state authority. So, also, when they are in the custody of a state officer, it may be necessary, by use of the writ, to bring them into a court of the United States to testify as witnesses.' Ex parte Royall, [117 U.S. 241, 250](#), 29 S.L.Ed. 868, 871, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 734; Ex parte Fonda, [117 U.S. 516, 518](#), 29 S.L.Ed. 994, 6 Sup.Ct.Rep. 848; Re Duncan, [139 U.S. 449](#), 454, sub nom. Duncan v. McCall, 35 L.Ed. 219, 222, 11 Sup.Ct.Rep. 573; Re Wood, [140 U.S. 278](#), 289, Sub nom. Wood v. Bursh, 35 L.Ed. 505, 509, 11 Sup.Ct.Rep. 738; McElvaine v. Brush, [142 U.S. 155, 160](#), 35 S.L.Ed. 971, 973, 12 Sup.Ct.Rep. 156; Cook v. Hart, [146 U.S. 183, 194](#), 36 S.L.Ed. 934, 939, 13 Sup.Ct.Rep. 40; Re Frederick, [149 U.S. 70, 75](#), 37 S.L.Ed. 653, 656, 13 Sup.Ct.Rep. 793; New York v. Eno, [155 U.S. 89, 96](#), 39 S.L.Ed. 80, 83, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 30; Pepke v. Cronan, [155 U.S. 100](#), 39 L.Ed. 84, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 34; Re Chapman, [156 U.S. 211, 216](#), 39 S.L.Ed. 401, 402, 15 Sup.Ct.Rep. 331; Whitten v. Tomlinson, [160 U.S. 231, 242](#), 40 S.L.Ed. 406, 412, 16 Sup.Ct.Rep. 297; Lasigi v. Van De Carr, [166 U.S. 391, 395](#), 41 S.L.Ed. 1045, 1049, 17 Sup.Ct.Rep. 595; Baker v. Grice, [169 U.S. 284, 290](#), 42 S.L.Ed. 748, 750, 18 Sup.Ct.Rep. 323; Tinsley v. Anderson, [171 U.S. 101, 105](#), 43 S.L.Ed. 91, 96, 18 Sup.Ct.Rep. 805; Fitts v. McGhee, [172 U.S. 516, 533](#), 43 S.L.Ed. 535, 543, 19 Sup.Ct.Rep. 269; Markuson v. Boucher, [175 U.S. 184](#), 44 L.Ed. 124, 20 Sup.Ct.Rep. 76. [[State of Minnesota v. Brundage, 180 U.S. 499 \(1901\)](#)]

14. The U.S. Supreme Court has stated repeatedly that the United States federal government is without ANY legislative jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of a sovereign state of the Union:

"The difficulties arising out of our dual form of government and the opportunities for differing opinions concerning the relative rights of state and national governments are many; but for a very long time this court has steadfastly adhered to the doctrine that the taxing power of Congress does not extend to the states or their political subdivisions. The same basic reasoning which leads to that conclusion, we think, requires like limitation upon the power which springs from the bankruptcy clause. United States v. Butler, supra."  
[Ashton v. Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 1, 298 U.S. 513, 56 S.Ct. 892 (1936)]

"It is no longer open to question that the general government, unlike the states, Hammer v. Dagenhart, [247 U.S. 251, 275](#), 38 S.Ct. 529, 3 A.L.R. 649, Ann.Cas.1918E

724, possesses no inherent power in respect of the internal affairs of the states; and emphatically not with regard to legislation.“  
[Carter v. Carter Coal Co., 298 U.S. 238, 56 S.Ct. 855 (1936)]

15. The Uniform Commercial Code defines the term “United States” as the District of Columbia:

*Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.)*  
§ 9-307. LOCATION OF DEBTOR.

(h) [Location of United States.]

*The United States is located in the District of Columbia.*

[SOURCE:

[http://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/search/display.html?terms=district%20of%20columbia&url=/ucc/9/article9.htm#s9-307\]](http://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/search/display.html?terms=district%20of%20columbia&url=/ucc/9/article9.htm#s9-307)

Based on all the above authorities, there is no basis to believe that any part of the federal government enjoys any legislative jurisdiction within any state of the Union, including in its capacity as a lawmaker for the general government. This was confirmed by one attorney who devoted his life to the study of Constitutional law below:

“§79. [ . . . ] There cannot be two separate and independent sovereignties within the same limits or jurisdiction; nor can there be two distinct and separate sources of sovereign authority within the same jurisdiction. The right of commanding in the last resort can be possessed only by one body of people inhabiting the same territory,' and can be executed only by those intrusted with the execution of such authority.”

[Treatise on Government, Joel Tiffany, p. 49, Section 78;

SOURCE:

[http://famguardian.org/Publications/TreatiseOnGovernment/TreatOnGovt.pdf\]](http://famguardian.org/Publications/TreatiseOnGovernment/TreatOnGovt.pdf)

## 8.5 Federal Identifying Number Presumptions

In all past and future correspondence to or from the government, any use of any identifying numbers in the context of me shall be governed by the following presumptions:

1. The terms “Social Security Number”, “SSN”, “Employer Identification Number”, “EIN”, “Taxpayer Identification Number”, or “TIN” as used on all attached government forms means “Nontaxpayer Identification Number (NIN)”, signifying that the Submitter is a “nontaxpayer” who does not meet the definition of “taxpayer” found in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14), who is not subject to any provision within the Internal Revenue Code, who is a “nonresident alien” not engaged in a “trade or business” as described in 26 CFR §1.871-1(b)(1)(i), who is Not an “individual” as legally defined because not domiciled on federal territory, and who has no earnings from within the “United States” as described in 26 U.S.C. §871.

2. The term “Social Security Number” or “SSN” as used on the attached government forms ***IS NOT*** the number issued under the authority of 20 CFR §422.104, which can only lawfully be issued to federal employees, agents, and benefit recipients, none of which describe the Submitter. See and rebut the following if you disagree:

Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. The term “Employer Identification Number” or “EIN” as used on the attached government forms ***IS NOT*** the number issued under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6109 or any other Act of Congress. Instead, it means a “Nontaxpayer Identification Number” or “NIN” as defined above.

4. The term “Taxpayer Identification Number” or “TIN” as used on the attached government form ***IS NOT*** the number issued under the authority of either 26 U.S.C. §6109 or any other Act of Congress. Instead it means a “Nontaxpayer Identification Number” or “NIN” as defined above.

5. All “Nontaxpayer Identification Numbers” or “NINs”, or any other synonym described in items 2 through 4 of this section and included in any form or attachment included herein or submitted on any previous government form are the exclusive, licensed, copyrighted intellectual property of the Submitter. They are protected by the Copyright Act codified in Title 17 of the U.S. Code and this license agreement. Any use by the government of this property for any commercial or government purpose, including tax collection, is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Each unauthorized use is

punishable by a penalty of \$100,000 per incident plus any tax or penalty assessment associated with the unauthorized use.

6. The presumption is established by the ACTA Agreements between the Secretary of the Treasury and the states of the Union, by [4 U.S.C. §106](#), and 5 U.S.C. §5517 that those who use a Social Security Number are identified in the IRS records and databases as instrumentalities of the Federal government. See 26 CFR §301.6109-1(g). In the context of me, who by this document establishes he or she is not a federal instrumentality, these presumptions are inapplicable.

7. Any federal identifying number provided, regardless of what it is identified as, shall **NOT** be a Social Security Number or the number issued under the authority of 20 CFR §422.104 because:

7.1. All Social Security Numbers belong and are the public property of the Social Security Administration (SSA) pursuant to 20 CFR §422.103(d) and therefore could not lawfully belong to me unless I am a federal instrumentality, agent, or employee, which section 4.3 earlier makes a statutory and legal impossibility.

7.2. It is illegal to use “public property” such as Social Security Numbers for a private use, and since I am a “private person” and not a “public employee” or federal agent or instrumentality, then I would be committing embezzlement to have or to use such numbers and would also be falsely impersonating a federal employee in violation of the following:

7.2.1. [18 U.S.C. §641](#): Embezzlement of public money, property, or records. Punishment is ten years in jail.

7.2.2. [18 U.S.C. §912](#): Impersonating an officer or employee of the United States. Punishment is three years in jail.

Any attempt on your part to facilitate the above crimes makes you an accessory after the fact and guilty of misprision of felony in violation of [18 U.S.C. §§3](#) and [4](#) respectively.

7.3. The fact that Social Security Numbers (SSNs) are the property of the U.S. government that can only be used or employed in the context of a public purpose means that they cannot lawfully be used by a person such as myself, who has explicitly and carefully and clearly, as in this document, cited the legal and statutory boundaries that separate his/her private life and actions from the highly limited jurisdiction of the federal government over public property, offices, and territory.

7.4. I have sent correspondence to the Social Security Administration evidencing duress in the context of any alleged participation in Social Security Scam pursuant to the following:

*Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee*, Form #06.002  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

8. The Identifying Number is *not* a Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) assigned pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6109](#). All such numbers can only lawfully be assigned to statutory “aliens” pursuant to the following and it is therefore ILLEGAL to assign a TIN to a person who is a “nonresident alien” but not an “individual” and who has made no elections to be a “resident” and it is evidence of duress if the IRS does so.:

8.1. 26 CFR §1.1441-1(c)(3) defines an “individual” as either an “alien” or “nonresident alien”.

8.2. 26 CFR §301.6109-1(d)(3) and 26 CFR §1.1-1(a)(2)(ii) says that IRS individual Taxpayer Identification Numbers may only lawfully be assigned to “aliens”.

8.3. 26 CFR §1.1-1(a)(2)(ii) defines a “married individual” and an “unmarried individual” as an alien engaged in a “trade or business”.

8.4. The definitions of “nonresident alien” in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#) and “alien” in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#) overlap but are not equivalent. A person such as myself who is a “nonresident alien” and a “national” but not a “citizen” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) and 8 U.S.C. §1452 can be a “nonresident alien” without also being an “alien”.

8.5. I do not choose at any time in the future nor have I ever voluntarily or knowingly made an election in the past as a “nonresident alien” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6013\(g\)](#) and (h) or [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(4\)\(B\)](#) to be treated as a “resident alien” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#).

9. The presumption is also established in 20 CFR §422.103(d) that the only persons who can have or use Social Security Numbers are federal employees. You will note, for instance, that 20 CFR is entitled “employee benefits” and that the only type of employee activity which may be regulated under federal law is that of federal employees. This document shall establish the OPPOSITE presumption, which is that I am not, never have been, and never will be a federal statutory “employee”, “public officer”, or instrumentality.

10. 26 CFR §301.6109-1(g) also establishes that a person who uses a Social Security Number is a “U.S. person” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#). It identifies the holder as either a statutory U.S. citizen pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401 or a statutory “resident” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#). This document establishes the OPPOSITE presumption, which is that I am neither a “U.S. person” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#), a statutory “U.S. citizen” pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1401](#) or a statutory “U.S. resident” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#).

11. There is a common de facto presumption created by political and social custom that everyone is required to have and to use a Social Security Number or other federal identifying number. This document establishes the presumption that there is no such law and places the burden of proof upon the government to produce such a law which has generally



applicability and legal effect within states of the Union. It also establishes that the Social Security Administration has admitted repeatedly to all who ask that there is no law requiring one to obtain or use federal identifying numbers. See:

*Letter from Social Security Administration*, Exhibit #07.004

<http://sedm.org/Exhibits/ExhibitIndex.htm>

12. Regardless of the label or name assigned by the government to such a number on any government form or correspondence, all such numbers shall constitute ONLY a “Nontaxpayer Identification Numbers” (NIN). A NIN identifies a nonresident alien not engaged in a trade or business as described in 26 CFR §1.871-1(b)(1)(i), who is NOT an “individual” as defined in 26 CFR §1.1441-1(c)(3), and whose estate is a “foreign estate” as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(31\)](#).

## 8.6 Presumptions about Meaning of words in all correspondence to or from the government

*Other than the words defined in the following subsections, all words used in all my communications shall have only the common meaning ascribed to them and shall NOT be construed in any way to have the legal meaning found in any federal or state law.* The only exceptions to this rule are those found in the following subsections or when a word is surrounded in quotation marks and preceded or succeeded by an indication of the legal definition upon which it is based, then and only then will it assume the legal definition. Submitter wishes to exercise his right of freedom from compelled association with all federal law in order to restore and protect his sovereignty. The legal definitions for words used, in turn, shall be based entirely upon the following:

*Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Cites By Topic

<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr-Cites.htm>

The purpose of the above requirements is to eliminate ALL presumptions from any legal proceeding about what I might write or say so that such false and unauthorized presumptions *cannot* be used to discredit or slander us or prejudice our rights or sovereignty. For instance, here are two examples:

**Table 1: Example terms**

<i>Statement from this website</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
Wages are not taxable	Earnings from labor of a human being that <i>do not</i> fit the description of "wages" defined in <a href="#">26 U.S.C. §3401(a)</a> and <a href="#">26 CFR §31.3401(a)-3</a> are not taxable without the consent of the subject.
"Wages" are taxable	Wages as defined in <a href="#">26 U.S.C. §3401(a)</a> and <a href="#">26 CFR §31.3401(a)-3</a> ARE taxable because they fit the legal description of " <a href="#">wages</a> ".

Any federal forms submitted by me or sent to me by the government:

1. Are considered untrustworthy and unreliable, pursuant to the rulings of the federal courts. See section 4 of the document below:

*Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability*, Form #05.007:

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

2. Shall *not* be made factual or trustworthy or actionable in any manner even by a signature of me under penalty of perjury. An affidavit of the truthfulness or reliability of any tax form that the IRS itself positively refuses to vouch for the accuracy of shall *not* make it any more accurate or truthful than a blank form. Holding me any more accountable for my statements than employees of the government is a violation of the equal protection of the laws. The implication of this is that any perjury statement appearing on any federal form pursuant to [28 U.S.C. §1746](#) shall not be actionable and shall create no obligation on my part unless I specifically state otherwise.

### 8.6.1 Specific terms

#### 8.6.1.1 “taxpayer”

The term “taxpayer” on all government forms and submissions to or from the government shall be defined as a human being and NOT a statutory “person” under any government code or law who is:



1. NOT the entity described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(14\)](#) or [26 U.S.C. §1313](#).
2. NOT subject to any provision of the Internal Revenue Code, which is “foreign law”.
3. A “nonresident alien” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#) not engaged in a “trade or business” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) and whose entire estate is a “foreign estate” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(31\)](#).

#### **8.6.1.2     “benefit”**

“Benefit: Advantage; profit; fruit; gain; interest associated with a specific transaction which conveys a right or property interest which:

1. Is not dispensed by an administrative agency of any state or federal government, but by a private individual.
2. Does not require the recipient to be an officer, agent, employee, or “personnel” within any government.
3. Is not called a “tax” or collected by the Internal Revenue Service, but is clearly identified as “private business activity beyond the core purposes of government”.
4. Does not confer upon the grantor any form of sovereign, official, or judicial immunity.
5. Is legally enforceable in OTHER than a franchise court or administrative agency. That is, may be heard in equity within a true, Article III constitutional court and NOT a legislative franchise court.
6. True constitutional courts are provided in which to litigate disputes arising under the benefit and those with said disputes are not required to exhaust administrative remedies with an executive branch agency BEFORE they may litigate. These constitutional courts are required to produce evidence that they are constitutional courts with OTHER than strictly legislative franchise powers when challenged by the recipients of said benefits.
7. The specific value of the consideration can be quantified at any time.
8. Monies paid in by the recipient to subsidize the program are entirely refundable if the benefits they pay for have not been received or employed either partially or in full.
9. A person who dies and never collects a benefit is refunded ALL of the monies they paid in.
10. Participation in the program is not also attached to any other government program. For instance, being a recipient of “social insurance” does not also make the recipient liable for unrelated or other federal taxes.
11. The term “benefit” must be defined in the franchise agreement that dispenses it, and its definition may not be left to the subjective whims of any judge or jury.
12. If the “benefit” is financial, then it is paid in lawful money rather than Federal Reserve Notes, which are non interest bearing promissory notes that are not lawful money and are backed by nothing.
13. The franchise must expressly state that participation is voluntary and that no one can be prosecuted or punished for failure to participate.
14. The identifying numbers, if any, that administer the program may not be used for identification and may not be shared with or used by any nongovernmental entity other than the recipient him or her self.
15. May not be heard by any judge, jurist, or prosecutor who is a recipient or beneficiary of the same benefit, because this would cause a conflict of interest in violation of 18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §144, and 28 U.S.C. §455, 18 U.S.C. §597, and 18 U.S.C. §201.
16. During any litigation involving the “benefit”, both the grantor and the grantee share equal obligation to prove that equally valuable consideration was provided to the other party. Note that Federal Reserve Notes do not constitute lawful money or therefore consideration.

Anything offered by the government that does not meet ALL of the above criteria is herein defined as an INJURY and a TORT. Compelled participation is stipulated by both parties as being slavery in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §1583, 42 U.S.C. §1994, and the Thirteenth Amendment.

Receipt of the attached government application constitutes consent by the recipient of the application to use the above definition of “benefit” in any disputes that might arise over this transaction. Government recipient and its agents, employees, and assigns forfeit their right as private individuals acting in any government office to define the term “benefit” and agree to use ONLY the above definition.

#### **8.6.1.3     “dollar”**

**“dollar”**: 1/20<sup>th</sup> of an ounce of gold. There is no statutory definition of “dollar” that equates a Federal Reserve Note with a dollar and the legal definition of “money” found in Black’s Law Dictionary specifically excludes “notes” from the definition of “money”. See:

#### 8.6.1.4 “nontaxpayer”

Same definition as “taxpayer” in section 8.6.1.1 earlier.

#### 8.6.1.5 “frivolous”

The word “frivolous” as used in all documents and communications that refer to any of the writings or statement of me in the past, present, or future shall mean “correct” and “truthful”. Any attempts to call anything I say incorrect or untruthful must be accompanied by authoritative, court-admissible evidence to support such a conclusion or shall be presumed by the reader to be untrustworthy and untruthful. That evidence must satisfy the rules of evidence found in the following:

1. Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. Government Burden of Proof, Form #05.025:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

#### 8.6.1.6 “meritless”

“meritless”: See “frivolous” above.

#### 8.6.1.7 “Federal income tax”

The term “federal income tax”, in the context of all correspondence, means the revenue scheme described in Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code, which is Title 26 of the United States Code, as applied specifically and only to natural persons and not to businesses.

#### 8.6.1.8 “individual”

“individual”: Defined as follows:

1. Excludes the “individual” defined in 26 CFR §1.1441-1(c)(3).
2. Excludes “aliens” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#) and “nonresident aliens” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#).
3. Excludes the definition found in [5 U.S.C. §552a\(a\)\(2\)](#), who are all “domiciliaries” of the “United States”.
4. Excludes the statutory “citizens and nationals of the United States” defined in [8 U.S.C. §1401](#).
5. Includes persons who are nonresident aliens not engaged in a “trade or business” as defined in 26 CFR §1.871-1(b)(1)(i) who have no earnings from the “United States” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#) and (a)(10) and whose estate is a “foreign estate” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(31\)](#).

#### 8.6.1.9 “employee”

“employee”: Defined as:

1. A human being and NOT a statutory “person” under any government statutory, code, or law who works for a “private employer” and not a “public employer” or any state or federal government, who is NOT engaged in a “trade or business” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#), and who has no liability to deduct, withhold, or pay any tax described in 26 U.S.C. Subtitles A, B, or C.
2. NOT the entity described in [26 U.S.C. §3401\(c\)](#) or 26 CFR §31.3401(c)-1 or any other statute or regulation published by the United States federal government.

#### 8.6.1.10 “employer”

“employer”: A non-statutory, private business entity who has “employees” as defined in the previous section.

### 8.6.1.11 “exempt”

#### “exempt”: Means

1. Not subject to any provision within the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A or C.
2. Not an “individual” (26 CFR §1.1441-1(c)(3)) or “person” ([26 U.S.C. §7701\(c\)](#)) or “taxpayer” ([26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(14\)](#)) within the Internal Revenue Code.
3. Entire estate is a “foreign estate” pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(31\)](#).
4. Not the entity described in 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(5) as an “exempt individual”, because not the “individual” defined in 26 CFR §1.1441-1(c)(3) or any other state or federal statute, code, or law.

### 8.6.1.12 “resident”

“resident”: Means an alien with a legal domicile or “residence” in the “[United States](#)”, which includes the territories and possessions of the “United States” and excludes states constitutional of the Union.

### 8.6.1.13 “wage” or “wages”

“wage” or “wages”: The term defined in [26 U.S.C. §3401\(a\)](#). Excludes earnings of persons who are not engaged in a “public office” and who have not made an “election” to associate their earnings with a “public office” by voluntarily submitting an “agreement” pursuant to 26 CFR §31.3401(a)-3(a), and 26 CFR §31.3402(p)-1. Consequently, anyone who does not submit an IRS Form W-4 and who is not otherwise engaged in a “public office” earns no reportable “wages” or “gross income” in connection with their labor pursuant to 26 CFR §31.3401(a)-3(a), and 26 CFR §31.3402(p)-1.

### 8.6.1.14 “trade or business”

“trade or business”: Defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as “the functions of a public office”. Excludes anything or class of things not expressly described somewhere in the Internal Revenue Code. See:

*The “Trade or Business” Scam*, Form #05.001  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

### 8.6.1.15 “gross income”

“gross income”: Profit originating from within the United States government corporation and earned by a federal instrumentality. Pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §871](#), said profit must either originate from the District of Columbia or abroad pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §911](#) but may not originate within any state of the Union.

### 8.6.1.16 “beneficial owner”

“beneficial owner”: Defined as a human being and not a statutory “person” who is:

1. NOT the entity described 26 CFR §1.1441-1(c)(6).
2. A “nonresident alien” not engaged in a “trade or business” who is a “nontaxpayer” not subject to any provision of Internal Revenue Code Subtitles A, B, or C.

### 8.6.1.17 “U.S. person”

“U.S. person”: Defined as:

1. NOT the entity described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#) or any other statute or regulation published by the United States federal government.
2. A person domiciled in either a state of the Union or a foreign country on land not under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States Federal Government as documented in [40 U.S.C. §3112](#).

### 8.6.1.18 “permanent address”

“permanent address”: Defined as one’s legal domicile. See:

*Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent*, Form #05.002  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

### 8.6.1.19 “personal services”

“personal services”: Defined as services which:

1. Are NOT connected with a “trade or business” or a “public office” within any government or any other government “franchise”.
2. Are NOT the term defined in 26 CFR §1.469-9(b)(4).
3. Are NOT defined or referenced anywhere within any statute or regulation published by the United States federal government and therefore entirely beyond the jurisdiction of the government to regulate.
4. Are connected with labor of a human being that is not subject to withholding, attachment, or taxation of any kind:

*“Every man has a natural right to the fruits of his own labor, is generally admitted; and  
no other person can rightfully deprive him of those fruits, and appropriate them  
against his will...”*  
*[The Antelope, 23 U.S. 66, 10 Wheat 66, 6 L.Ed. 268 (1825)]*

### 8.6.1.20 “protection”

“protection”: In relation to any government, defined as:

1. The right to be left alone by the United States government and every state government in the context of ALL CIVIL ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.

*“The makers of our Constitution undertook to secure conditions favorable to the pursuit of happiness. They recognized the significance of man’s spiritual nature, of his feelings and of his intellect. They knew that only a part of the pain, pleasure and satisfactions of life are to be found in material things. They sought to protect Americans in their beliefs, their thoughts, their emotions and their sensations. They conferred, as against the Government, the right to be let alone - the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men.”*  
*[Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 478 (1928) (Brandeis, J., dissenting); see also Washington v. Harper, 494 U.S. 210 (1990)]*

2. The right to be a “nonresident” and a foreign sovereign in relation to both state and federal governments protected by the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA), 28 U.S.C., Chapter 97.
3. The right to be able to approach any state government or the U.S. government *in equity* in a court of law and:
  - 3.1. If it is a franchise court, such as a Family Court, Tax Court, or Traffic Court, to have the case dismissed for lack of jurisdiction because I am not a franchisee and have no delegated authority to consent to any franchise.
  - 3.2. For the government to be compelled by the judge to produce a express waiver of sovereign immunity in writing signed by me in accordance with this document prior to attempting to enforce any civil liability against me. This is the same requirement that those suing the government must abide by: meet the burden of proving that the government waived sovereign immunity.
4. For the state and federal governments to actively and criminally prosecute anyone who insists that I must provide a government identifying number or participate in any government franchise in order to do business with them.
5. The right to NOT have any government civil statute or franchise enforced against me, including but not limited to the following types of statutes:
  - 5.1. The vehicle code.
  - 5.2. The family code.
  - 5.3. Internal Revenue Code.
  - 5.4. State revenue code.
  - 5.5. Social Security Act.
6. The right to receive an administrative redress for correction and nullification of all information returns that connect me with any of the above franchises, such as IRS Forms W-2, K-1, 1042-S, 1098, 1099, etc. Since I have no delegated

1 authority to participate in franchises, all such reports MUST be presumed to be false and fraudulent and must be  
2 nullified administratively without the need to litigate. No government may ignore correspondence originating from me  
3 intended to correct these false reports and becomes the ultimate and substitute liable party of it omits to  
4 administratively correct all such reports associated with my name.

5 My motto is: No one deserves to be hired as my protector who won't even protect me from itself. A failure to observe all  
6 the requirements of this section by any specific government shall make that respective government a "terrorist government"  
7 in my book, because it won't respect the requirement for consent and equality that is the foundation of ALL freedom in this  
8 country.

9 *No language is more worthy of frequent and thoughtful consideration than these words of*  
10 *Mr. Justice Matthews, speaking for this court, in Yick Wo v. Hopkins, [118 U.S. 356, 369](#),*  
11 *6 S. Sup. Ct. 1064, 1071: 'When we consider the nature and the theory of our institutions*  
12 *of government, the principles upon which they are supposed to rest, and review the*  
13 *history of their development, we are constrained to conclude that they do not mean to*  
14 *leave room for the play and action of purely personal and arbitrary power.' The first*  
15 *official action of this nation declared the foundation of government in these words: 'We*  
16 *hold these truths to be self-evident, [165 U.S. 150, 160] that all men are created equal,*  
17 *that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these*  
18 *are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' While such declaration of principles may*  
19 *not have the force of organic law, or be made the basis of judicial decision as to the*  
20 *limits of right and duty, and while in all cases reference must be had to the organic law*  
21 *of the nation for such limits, yet the latter is but the body and the letter of which the*  
22 *former is the thought and the spirit, and it is always safe to read the letter of the*  
23 *constitution in the spirit of the Declaration of Independence. No duty rests more*  
24 *imperatively upon the courts than the enforcement of those constitutional provisions*  
25 *intended to secure that equality of rights which is the foundation of free government.*"  
26 [*Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis, [165 U.S. 150](#) (1897) ]*

## 27 **8.6.2 Capitalization within Statutes and Regulations**

28 Whenever you are reading a particular law, including the [U.S. Constitution](#), or a statute, the Sovereign referenced in that  
29 law, who is usually the author of the law, is referenced in the law with the first letter of its name capitalized. For instance,  
30 in the U.S. Constitution the phrase "We the People", "State", and "Citizen" are all capitalized, because these were the  
31 sovereign entities who were writing the document residing in the States. This document formed the federal government  
32 and gave it its authority. Subsequently, the federal government wrote statutes to implement the intent of the Constitution,  
33 and it became the Sovereign, but only in the context of those territories and lands ceded to it by the union states. When that  
34 federal government then refers in statutes to federal "States", for instance in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(10\)](#) or [4 U.S.C. §110\(d\)](#),  
35 then these federal "States" are Sovereigns because they are part of the territory controlled by the Sovereign who wrote the  
36 statute, so they are capitalized. Foreign states referenced in the federal statutes then must be in lower case. The sovereign  
37 50 union states, for example, must be in lower case in federal statutes because of this convention because they are foreign  
38 states. *Capitalization is therefore always relative to who is writing the document, which is usually the Sovereign and is*  
39 *therefore capitalized.* The exact same convention is used in the Bible, where all appellations of God are capitalized because  
40 they are sovereigns: "Jesus" ", "God", "Him", "His", "Father". These words aren't capitalized because they are proper  
41 names, but because the entity described is a sovereign or an agent or part of the sovereign. The only exception to this  
42 capitalization rule is in state revenue laws, where the state legislators use the same capitalization as the Internal Revenue  
43 Code for "State" in referring to federal enclaves within their territory because they want to scam money out of you. In state  
44 revenue laws, for instance in the California Revenue and Taxation Code (R&TC) sections 17018 and 6017, "State" means a  
45 federal State within the boundaries of California and described as part of the Buck Act of 1940 found in [4 U.S.C. §§105-](#)  
46 [113](#). See the following URL to see what we mean:

47 <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=rtc&group=17001-18000&file=17001-17039.1>

## 48 **8.6.3 Terms in quotation marks**

49 Whenever a term appears in quotation marks, we are using the statutory or regulatory definition of the term *instead* of the  
50 layman's or dictionary definition. We do this to clarify which definition we mean and to avoid creating the kind of  
51 confusion with definitions that the federal government and the unethical lawyers who work in it are famous for. For

instance, when we use say “employee”, we mean the statutory definition of that term found in [26 U.S.C. §3401\(c\)](#) and [26 CFR §31.3401\(c\)-1](#) rather than the common definition everyone uses, which means anyone who receives compensation for their labor. “Employees” are much more narrowly defined in the Internal Revenue Code to mean elected or appointed officers of the U.S. government only. We also put terms in quotation marks if they are new or we just introduced the term, to emphasize that we are trying to explain what the word means.

#### 8.6.4 Geographical terms

The following geographical definitions apply in the reading of all law.

Law	Federal constitution	Federal statutes	Federal regulations	State constitutions	State statutes	State regulations
Author	Union States/ “We The People”	Federal Government		“We The People”	State Government	
“state”	Foreign country	Union state	Union state	Other Union state or federal government	Other Union state or federal government	Other Union state or federal government
“State”	Union state	Federal state	Federal state	Union state	Union state	Union state
“in this State” or “in the State” <sup>42</sup>	NA	NA	NA	NA	Federal enclave within state	Federal enclave within state
“State” <sup>43</sup> (State Revenue and taxation code only)	NA	NA	NA	NA	Federal enclave within state	Federal enclave within state
“several States”	Union states collectively <sup>44</sup>	Federal “States” collectively	Federal “States” collectively	Federal “States” collectively	Federal “States” collectively	Federal “States” collectively
“United States”	states of the Union collectively	Federal United States**	Federal United States**	United States* the country	Federal United States**	Federal United States**

What the above table clearly shows is that the word “State” in the context of federal statutes and regulations means (not includes!) federal States only under [Title 48 of the U.S. Code](#)<sup>45</sup>, and these areas do not include any of the 50 Union States. This is true in most cases and especially in the Internal Revenue Code. The lower case word “state” in the context of federal statutes and regulations means one of the 50 union states, which are “foreign states”, and “foreign countries” with respect to the federal government as clearly explained in section 5.2.11 of the [Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302](#) book. In the context of the above, a “Union State” means one of the 50 Union states of the United States\* (the country, not the federal United States\*\*) mentioned in the Constitution for the United States of America.

#### 8.7 Facts about Penalties for submission of this form

Penalties may only lawfully be instituted against federal employees, instrumentalities, agents, and benefit recipients, all of whom are involved in federal franchises of one kind or another. For Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A, the franchise described therein is a “trade or business”, which is defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as “the functions of a public office”. Those who are not involved in said franchises:

1. If they are penalized in connection with the submission of this form, are being subjected to illegal witness tampering in violation of [18 U.S.C. §1512\(b\)](#) punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment for up to ten years.
2. Are protected by the Constitutional prohibition against “[Bills of Attainder](#)” found in [Article 1, Section 10](#).
3. Are protected against administrative penalties of all kinds, which constitute “[Bills of Attainder](#)” in the case of persons who are not franchisees.

<sup>42</sup> See California Revenue and Taxation Code, section 6017 at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=rtc&group=06001-07000&file=6001-6024>

<sup>43</sup> See California Revenue and Taxation Code, section 17018 at <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=rtc&group=17001-18000&file=17001-17039.1>

<sup>44</sup> See, for instance, U.S. Constitution Article IV, Section 2.

<sup>45</sup> See <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/48/>



4. May not lawfully have any provision of federal statutory law cited against them without enforcement implementing regulations published in the Federal Register which allow or permit enforcement against persons who are not in receipt of federal franchises. This requirement is found in 26 CFR §601.702(a)(2)(ii) and [5 U.S.C. §552](#)(a). See and rebut the questions at the end of the following if you disagree or forever be estopped from challenging later:

*Federal Enforcement Authority in States of the Union*, Form #05.032

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

5. Any Recipient of this form who attempts to institute or successfully institutes a penalty for use of this form is demanded to answer the following Admissions in the correspondence or penalty notice they send in response to this correspondence. Failure to answer the question shall constitute a default of “Admit” in response to every question. Recipient waives his right to contradict his answers beyond 30 days from mailing of this notice.
- 5.1. Admit that a person who is NOT “resident” or present within the “United States” as legally defined, according to [28 U.S.C. §1746](#), cannot sign any variation of the following perjury statement without either committing perjury under penalty of perjury or electing to be treated as a resident:

***“Under penalties of perjury, I declare that I have examined this return and accompanying schedules and statements, and to the best of my knowledge and belief, they are true, correct, and complete. Declaration of preparer (other than taxpayer) is based on all information of which preparer has any knowledge.”***  
*[IRS Forms 1040 and 1040NR jurat/perjury statement]*

- 5.2. Admit that a person who is not a “taxpayer” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701](#)(a)(14) and instead who is a “nontaxpayer” not subject to any part of the Internal Revenue Code cannot sign the above perjury statement without committing perjury under penalty of perjury.
- 5.3. Admit that the IRS Mission Statement found in IRM 1.1.1.1 says the IRS serves ONLY “taxpayers” and that the word “nontaxpayers” are nowhere identified as being entitled to anything from the IRS.

*Internal Revenue Manual, Section [1.1.1.1 \(02-26-1999\)](#)  
IRS Mission and Basic Organization*

*1. The IRS Mission: Provide America’s [taxpayers](#) [not “nontaxpayers”] top quality service by helping them understand and meet their tax responsibilities and by applying the tax law with integrity and fairness to all [taxpayers only].*

- 5.4. Admit that the Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A describes a franchise agreement that pertains to persons either engaged in a “public office” which is described in [26 U.S.C. §7701](#)(a)(26) as a “[trade or business](#)”, or those in receipt of payment from or on behalf of the U.S. government pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §871](#).

*“The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws...”*  
*[[Long v. Rasmussen, 281 F. 236 \(1922\)](#)]*

*“Revenue Laws relate to taxpayers [instrumentalities, officers, employees, and elected officials of the Federal Government] and not to non-taxpayers [American Citizens/American Nationals not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government]. The latter are without their scope. No procedures are prescribed for non-taxpayers and no attempt is made to annul any of their Rights or Remedies in due course of law. With them[non-taxpayers] Congress does not assume to deal and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of federal revenue laws.”*  
*[[Economy Plumbing & Heating v. U.S., 470 F.2d. 585 \(1972\)](#)]*

- 5.5. Admit that no provision of the I.R.C. may lawfully be cited against persons who are “nontaxpayers”.
- 5.6. Admit that no federal court ruling involving a “[taxpayer](#)” may lawfully be cited as authority against a person who is a “nontaxpayer”.
- 5.7. Admit that the IRS [Internal Revenue Manual, Section 4.10.7.2.9.8](#) says that no ruling below the U.S. Supreme Court may be cited against anyone other than the individual “taxpayer” who was party to the suit.

1 “Decisions made at various levels of the court system are considered to be interpretations of tax laws and may be used by either examiners or taxpayers to support a position.

2. Certain court cases lend more weight to a position than others. **A case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court becomes the law of the land and takes precedence over decisions of lower courts. The Internal Revenue Service must follow Supreme Court decisions. For examiners, Supreme Court decisions have the same weight as the Code.**

3. **Decisions made by lower courts, such as Tax Court, District Courts, or Claims Court, are binding on the Service only for the particular taxpayer and the years litigated.** Adverse decisions of lower courts do not require the Service to alter its position for other taxpayers.”

5.8. Admit that the reason for the above section of the IRS Internal Revenue Manual is that there is no federal common law within states of the Union.

*"There is no Federal Common Law, and Congress has no power to declare substantive rules of Common Law applicable in a state. Whether they be local or general in their nature, be they commercial law or a part of the Law of Torts"*  
[*Erie Railroad v. Tompkins*, [304 U.S. 64](#) (1938) ]

6. Any Recipient of this form who attempts to institute or successfully institutes a penalty for use of this form is demanded to answer the following open-ended interrogatories in the correspondence or penalty notice they send in response to this correspondence. Recipient waives his right to contradict his answers beyond 30 days from mailing of this notice.
- 6.1. Please describe which government or IRS Forms would be suitable for use by “nontaxpayers” as a substitute for the standard government forms you received, in order to avoid perjuring myself in signing the perjury statement consistent with the entire content of this form and all attachments.
- 6.2. The [First Amendment](#) gives me a right to communicate, to NOT communicate, and to define the significance OF said communication when interacting with the government. How can you order me to say something to the government that I know is clearly inconsistent with the truth without violating the [First Amendment](#)?
- 6.3. Please show me the statute and implementing regulation published in the Federal Register that prohibits alteration of forms.
- 6.4. How can a person who does not reside in the “United States” and instead who is located in the “United States of America” sign a perjury statement consistent with [28 U.S.C. §1746\(2\)](#) without committing perjury under penalty of perjury?
- 6.5. How can a person who is a “nontaxpayer” not subject to any provision of the Internal Revenue Code sign any government form which uses the word “taxpayer” and is signed under penalties of perjury without committing perjury under penalty of perjury?
- 6.6. Will the IRS accept a form with the portion “signature of taxpayer” crossed off?
- 6.7. How can a person who has no “Social Security Number” and who never personally or lawfully applied for one be required to accept all the obligations and disabilities associated with participation in the Social Security Program without violating the prohibition against involuntary servitude found in the [Thirteenth Amendment](#), [42 U.S.C. §1994](#), and [18 U.S.C. §1589](#)?
- 6.8. Will the IRS accept a form with the words “of taxpayer” struck thru? [in other words leaving just the word “Signature” showing.]
- 6.9. Will the IRS accept a form with the portion signature of taxpayer replaced with “signature of non-taxpayer”?
- 6.10. Will the IRS accept a form with the portion “signature of taxpayer” replaced with “signature of non-filer”? [The term non-filer is a permitted designation by the IRS]
- 6.11. Will the IRS accept a form with a separate declaration printed on the bottom attesting to non-taxpayer or non-filer status?
- 6.12. Will the IRS accept a form with an attachment and the statement in the signature block, “invalid without attachment”..?

- 6.13. Please provide court-admissible evidence under penalty of perjury that I am the “person” defined in [26 U.S.C. §6671\(b\)](#) as “an officer or employee of a corporation or partnership”, which is the only person against whom IRS penalties may be instituted.
- 6.14. You may allege that the IRS prohibits alteration of forms. Please explain how can I fill in ANYTHING on the form prior to submission without altering it? Do you want me to send you ONLY blank forms with no information added to them?
- 6.15. How can I submit the attached government forms and omit this form WITHOUT committing subornation of perjury? The exclusion of the information contained on this form renders the remaining information the incomplete truth which is susceptible to misinterpretation because it uses terms that are nowhere defined in the law and even if they were defined on the IRS website or in an IRS publication, that definition would be untrustworthy pursuant to [IRM 4.10.7.2.8](#):

*[Internal Revenue Manual, Section 4.10.7.2.8 \(01-01-2006\)](#)  
IRS Publications*

*1. IRS Publications explain the law in plain language for taxpayers and their advisors. They typically highlight changes in the law, provide examples illustrating Service positions, and include worksheets. Publications are nonbinding on the Service and do not necessarily cover all positions for a given issue. While a good source of general information, publications should not be cited to sustain a position.*

- 6.16. Explain why any sane, rational American in their right mind would want to sign a form under penalty of perjury that the IRS itself DEFIANTLY REFUSES to guarantee the accuracy and completeness of similarly under penalty of perjury as required by [26 U.S.C. §6065](#)? See [IRM 4.10.7.2.8](#) above.

## **8.8 Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA) Presumptions**

In the context of any attempt to assert any financial liability by the federal government or its agents pursuant to the [Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Title 15, Chapter 41, Subchapter V](#), the following constraints shall apply to all past, present, and future interactions:

1. All such debts are automatically disputed by me.
2. I demand ahead of time, pursuant to [15 U.S.C. §1692g](#) that the disputed debt collection presentment shall and MUST be accompanied by the original debt instrument in each such presentment. When challenged, you are required by law to produce evidence of the alleged debt within 20 days.
3. The original debt instrument provided must contain my original signature as required by [15 U.S.C. §1692g\(b\)](#). In other words, you must prove that it was a debt which I consented to explicitly.
4. If the alleged debt is a tax debt, the collection notice:
  - 4.1. Must be accompanied by all the original assessment documents signed by an Assessment Officer under penalty of perjury per 26 U.S.C. §6065 and who agrees to take full legal and personal responsibility for the accuracy of his assessment and its compliance with the law.
  - 4.2. Must identify me and only me as the debtor. Aggregated assessments of multiple “taxpayers” are unacceptable and do not constitute proof of consent or lawful assessment. All such aggregated assessments, such as IRS Form RACS006 report, are simply a means to evade liability for false assessment by the Assessment Officer.
  - 4.3. Must contain answers/rebuttals to all the admissions found at the end of forms 05.001 through 05.028 below. These documents clearly establish that the government has no authority to collect income taxes under Subtitle A of the I.R.C. within the 50 states of the Union:  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Any debt collection communication with me by the government which fails to comply completely with all the above requirements shall constitute a binding admission by the sender of the debt collection correspondence that:

5. There is no actual debt.
6. The collection is fraudulent and illegal.
7. The sender of the fraudulent notice agrees to assume all liabilities it falsely attributes to me.
8. The sender agrees to compensate me for my personal time in responding to and litigating the cessation of false notices and collection actions at the billable rate of \$1,000 per hour.

9. The answers to all the Memorandums of Law, Forms 05.001 through 05.099 at the address below is stipulated by both parties as "Admit" in the context of any litigation arising out the debt collection and the parties furthermore stipulate to admit these memorandums as evidence in any litigation between them pursuant to Fed.Rule.Civ.Proc. 29.  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

## 8.9 Federal Court Litigation Presumptions

For the purposes of all litigation in which the Submitter of this document is involved, the following presumptions shall be established:

1. Submitter reserves all rights without prejudice in relation to all federal tribunals pursuant to U.C.C. 1-207 and its successor, [U.C.C. 1-308](#).
2. Submitter does not submit to the jurisdiction of the court and all instances in which he physically shows up in the court building constitute "special visitations" and not "appearances" as legally defined:

**appearance.** *A coming into court as a party to a suit, either in person or by attorney, whether as plaintiff or defendant. The formal proceeding by which a defendant submits himself to the jurisdiction of the court. The **voluntary submission** to a court's jurisdiction.*

*In civil actions the parties do not normally actually appear in person, but rather through their attorneys (who enter their appearance by filing written pleadings, or a formal written entry of appearance). Also, at many stages of criminal proceedings, particularly involving minor offenses, the defendant's attorney appears on his behalf. See e.g., Fed.R.Crim.P. 43.*

*An appearance may be either **general** or **special**; the former is a simple and unqualified or unrestricted submission to the jurisdiction of the court, the latter is a submission to the jurisdiction for some specific purpose only, not for all the purposes of the suit. A special appearance is for the purpose of testing or objecting to the sufficiency of service or the jurisdiction of the court over defendant without submitting to such jurisdiction; a general appearance is made where the defendant waives defects of service and submits to the jurisdiction of court. Insurance Co. of North America v. Kunin, 175 Neb. 260, 121 N.W.2d. 372, 375, 376.*

*[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 97]*

3. If a plea is demanded from a federal court in connection with a criminal matter, Submitter enters no plea because federal criminal law only applies within federal territory and Submitter does not maintain a domicile or abode on federal territory and did not commit any of the alleged acts on federal territory:

**"Territory:** *A part of a country separated from the rest, and subject to a particular jurisdiction. Geographical area under the jurisdiction of another country or sovereign power.*

**A portion of the United States not within the limits of any state, which has not yet been admitted as a state of the Union, but is organized with a separate legislature, and with executive and judicial powers appointed by the President."**

*[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1473]*

*"Territories' or 'territory' as including 'state' or 'states.'" While the term 'territories of the' [United States](#) may, under certain circumstances, include the states of the Union, as used in the federal Constitution and in ordinary acts of congress "territory" does not include a [foreign state](#).*

*[Corpus Juris Secundum (C.J.S.), Territories, Section 1]*

The criminal provisions of the Internal Revenue Code are not exception to the above.

4. Submitter DOES NOT, under any circumstances, consent to the jurisdiction of any Magistrate Judge.

- 4.1. Federal Magistrates only preside by mutual consent of BOTH parties, pursuant to [28 U.S.C. §636\(b\)\(2\)](#).
- 4.2. Pursuant to [Fed.Rul.Civ.Proc. 72\(b\)](#), this document shall constitute formal notice to the government that Submitter hereby disputes any and all rulings of any Magistrate on any and all dispositive issues.
5. All submissions to the court relating to motions shall constitute protected First Amendment petitions for redress of grievances and NOT “motions”. One can only “motion” a court by making an appearance and submitting to the jurisdiction of said court.
6. The terms and conditions appearing on the Federal Pleading Attachment apply to every past, present, or future petition or pleading of the Submitter before any federal court. This document is available below:

[Federal Petition/Pleading/Motion Attachment](#), Litigation Tool #01.002  
<http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>

## 8.10 **NONConsent to an extension of time to file presumptions**

This document shall constitute proof that I *do not consent* to any extension of time to file or to perform an assessment pursuant to IRS Form 4868, which is indicated in the IRS Individual Master File (IMF) as Transaction Code (TC) 460. Any entries in the Individual Master File (IMF) which indicate my consent to an extension of the time for filing absent the ORIGINAL, SIGNED IRS Form 4868 constitute *criminal computer fraud* in violation of [18 U.S.C. §1030](#). The reason for this presumption is the following language relating to the admissibility of “public records” pursuant to F.R.E. 803(8)(A):

*(1) Records of public agency’s own activities (FRE 803(8)(A)): Subsection (A) allows admissibility of a public office’s records to prove its own activities in either civil or criminal litigation. [See FRE 803(8)(A)]*

*(a) Application:*

*[. . .]*

- Printout of IRS database pertaining to Taxpayer’s account containing a code signifying receipt of Taxpayer’s consent to an extension of the statute of limitations was sufficient to prove such consent had been given. [Malkin v. United States (2nd Cir.2001), 243 F.3d. 120, 124]*

*[SOURCE: Rutter Group Practice Guide, Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, Sections 8:2786-8:2799.1, Year 2007, pp. 8G-118-8G-119]*

## 9. **AFFIDAVIT OF DURESS**

It is a fact that government, financial institutions, and private employers within your jurisdiction universally require ID of some kind in order to authenticate those they do business with. There is nothing fundamentally wrong with this general practice in and of itself. HOWEVER, this practice has been unlawfully perverted and abused by state and federal governments alike to criminally promote their financial gain to the extreme, unlawful, and unconstitutional detriment of those in the public they are supposed to be protecting by the following methods:

1. You have transformed the process of issuance of state ID into a privilege and a franchise that causes not only a surrender of rights, but of ALL rights, as a precondition of being able to conduct commerce within your jurisdiction, such as banking, private employment, etc.

*"It has long been established that a State may not impose a penalty upon those who exercise a right guaranteed by the Constitution." Frost & Frost Trucking Co. v. Railroad Comm'n of California, 271 U.S. 583. "Constitutional rights would be of little value if they could be indirectly denied," Smith v. Allwright, 321 U.S. 649, 644, or manipulated out of existence,' Gomillion v. Lightfoot, 364 U.S. 339, 345."*  
*[Harman v. Forssenius, 380 U.S 528 at 540, 85 S.Ct. 1177, 1185 (1965)]*

This is done by:

- 1.1. Compelling the use of Social Security Numbers and/or Taxpayer Identification Numbers as a precondition of obtaining ID. These number make the holder into a public officer and a federal instrumentality on official



business and engaged in a federal franchise. People domiciled in a state of the Union are NOT eligible for these numbers. See:

1.1.1. Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

1.1.2. Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a "Taxpayer Identification Number", Form #04.205

<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 1.2. Requiring those applying and who are domiciled in the exclusive jurisdiction of a Constitutional but not Statutory "State" to falsely admit that they are statutory "U.S. citizens" (8 U.S.C. §1401) or "U.S. residents" (aliens pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A)) with a domicile on federal territory and therefore not protected by the Constitution. Those domiciled on federal territory have NO rights.

*"Indeed, the practical interpretation put by Congress upon the Constitution has been long continued and uniform to the effect [182 U.S. 244, 279] that the Constitution is applicable to territories acquired by purchase or conquest, only when and so far as Congress shall so direct. Notwithstanding its duty to 'guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government' (art. 4, 4), by which we understand, according to the definition of Webster, 'a government in which the supreme power resides in the whole body of the people, and is exercised by representatives elected by them,' Congress did not hesitate, in the original organization of the territories of Louisiana, Florida, the Northwest Territory, and its subdivisions of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin and still more recently in the case of Alaska, to establish a form of government bearing a much greater analogy to a British Crown colony than a republican state of America, and to vest the legislative power either in a governor and council, or a governor and judges, to be appointed by the President. It was not until they had attained a certain population that power was given them to organize a legislature by vote of the people. In all these cases, as well as in territories subsequently organized west of the Mississippi, Congress thought it necessary either to extend to Constitution and laws of the United States over them, or to declare that the inhabitants should be entitled to enjoy the right of trial by jury, of bail, and of the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, as well as other privileges of the bill of rights."*  
[Downes v. Bidwell, [182 U.S. 244](#) (1901)]

- 1.3. Refusing to issue state ID to those who claim to be "nonresidents" in relation to the following, in violation of the equal protection of the law, whereby the Constitution itself is the law in question that I am being protected by.
- 1.3.1. Federal territory.
- 1.3.2. The "United States" as defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10).and who instead are domiciled in the de jure state that has no jurisdiction over federal territory,
- 1.4. Making all those applying for state driver's licenses into "residents" (aliens), meaning privileged aliens with a domicile on federal territory not protected by the Constitution.
2. You have tried to conceal and protect the illegal and criminal acts associated with the government ID and identity theft scam by:
- 2.1. Not providing definitions of the word "resident" in the vehicle code so that it can conveniently and wrongfully be confused with a "resident" in the revenue code.

*"The truth about the income tax is so precious to the government that it must be surrounded by a bodyguard of lies."*  
[Unknown]

- 2.2. Confusing a "resident" within the vehicle code with a "resident" in the state or federal revenue code. The two are NOT the same. A "resident" in the revenue code is, in fact, a resident alien and NOT a statutory "U.S. citizen" pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401 or a constitutional "citizen of the United States" as described in Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment.
- 2.3. Interfering with or prosecuting efforts such as this to remove the duress described in this section.
- 2.4. Harassing those domiciled within a de jure state of the Union who lawfully apply for USA passports as "nationals" but not "citizens" pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) and 8 U.S.C. §1452 by impeding issuance without explanation and demanding further information that is not authorized by law and using that information to engage in "selective enforcement" against those who demand their rights. See:



3. You have abused and continue to willfully abuse private institutions that are not part of the government but who are acting as “public officers” under your jurisdiction as a recruitment vehicle for non-consensually converting private human beings into “public officers” engaged in federal franchises. Such methods include, but are not limited to the following methods directed against those not in possession of government ID that falsely portrays their status as domiciliaries of the federal zone called statutory “U.S. citizens” (8 U.S.C. §1401) or “U.S. residents” (aliens with a domicile on federal territory pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A)):
  - 3.1. Private institutions basically boycotting and refusing to provide private service for those without fraudulent government ID. They are doing so in the alleged capacity as “withholding agents” pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16), and therefore are subject to the constitutional constraints applying to all government instrumentalities.
  - 3.2. State and federal governments refusing to publish or enforce standards for the issuance of lawful PRIVATE ID by PRIVATE PARTIES not directly associated with the government or with government franchises.
  - 3.3. State and federal governments refusing to prosecute financial institutions and employers who discriminate against or deny service to those who form their own government and issue their own private ID, or who have “foreign ID” that they don’t want to recognize.

The end result of the illegal and unconstitutional government ID scam documented above is that people you are supposed to be protecting the sovereignty and constitutional rights of are extorted and threatened with removal of all ability to participate in commercial transactions and to support themselves and their families unless they:

1. Commit fraud on a government form by describing themselves as statutory “U.S. citizens” (8 U.S.C. §1401) or “U.S. residents” (8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3) and 26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A))
2. Conspire to defraud the U.S. government in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §371 by signing up for franchises that they are not eligible for as nonresidents domiciled in a foreign state and not subject to the federal franchises. 20 CFR §422.104 says that only statutory but not constitutional “U.S. citizens” (8 U.S.C. §1401) and “permanent residents” are eligible to participate, and those citizens and residents are domiciliaries of federal territory that is no part of any state of the Union.
3. Subjecting themselves to involuntary servitude by donating everything they own to a public use, public purpose, and public office by connecting it with government property (20 CFR §422.103(d)) in the form of a TIN or SSN.
4. Aiding and abetting the state and federal governments to unconstitutionally break down the separation of powers between them. This compels me to serve two masters who are part of one monolithic “U.S. Inc.” corporation that isn’t even a government, but a private corporation. See:
  - 4.1. Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
  - 4.2. Corporatization and Privatization of the Government, Form #05.024  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Such an approach and conspiracy against my Constitutional rights is:

1. Anathema to the whole notion of a free society.
2. Creates an unconstitutional “title of nobility” in public servants and the creation of a privileged class.

*United States Constitution  
Article I, Section 9, Clause 8*

**No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.**

3. Transforms a government based on individual rights and personal sovereignty into a “dulocracy”, whereby public servants have so much license and privilege that they domineer over people that they are supposed to be serving and protecting:

**“Dulocracy.** A government where servants and slaves have so much license and privilege that they domineer.”

4. Compels sovereign Americans into becoming government public officers and instrumentalities without their consent and without compensation.
5. Illegally and under threat and extortion compels the average American to contract with the government. All franchises such as Social Security and the income tax are contracts between the grantor and the grantee.

*As a rule, **franchises spring from contracts between the sovereign power and private citizens**, made upon valuable considerations, for purposes of individual advantage as well as public benefit,<sup>46</sup> and thus a franchise partakes of a double nature and character. **So far as it affects or concerns the public, it is publici juris and is subject to governmental control. The legislature may prescribe the manner of granting it, to whom it may be granted, the conditions and terms upon which it may be held, and the duty of the grantee to the public in exercising it, and may also provide for its forfeiture upon the failure of the grantee to perform that duty. But when granted, it becomes the property of the grantee, and is a private right, subject only to the governmental control growing out of its other nature as publici juris.**<sup>47</sup>*  
[Am.Jur.2d, Franchises, §4: Generally]

For further details, see:

- 5.1. *The "Trade or Business" Scam*, Form #05.001  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 5.2. *Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee*, Form #06.002  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
6. Causes identity theft whereby the legal identity of those domiciled in states of the Union is effectively kidnapped from the protections of the Constitution and transported to a foreign jurisdiction and federal territory not protected by the Constitution pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7408(d) and 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(39). THIS is a very serious crime if the party who is the victim, such as me, does not consent to the theft. Statutes making identity theft a criminal infraction and which you are subject to include:
  - 6.1. 18 U.S.C. §912: Impersonating a public officer.
  - 6.2. [42 U.S.C. §405\(c\)\(2\)\(C\)\(i\)](#): Evidence, Procedure, and Certification for payments
  - 6.3. [42 U.S.C. §408\(a\)\(7\)](#): Penalties
  - 6.4. [18 U.S.C. §1028\(a\)\(7\)](#): Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information
  - 6.5. [18 U.S.C. §1028A](#): Aggravated Identity Theft
  - 6.6. [18 U.S.C. §654](#): Anyone who uses a public number in connection with your private property without your consent is guilty of conversion.

To make things even worse, the Dept. of Homeland Security labels all those who are aware of the Government ID Scam described herein as "terrorists" and "extremists", as though knowledge of your unlawful efforts to compel association, compel contracting, and compel fraudulent participation in your franchise is an illegal activity. What a SICK JOKE. The real terrorists are any state and federal government that compels me to lie on a government form about my status in order to procure the benefits of a franchise that I don't want, don't need, and which is actually harmful and not protective of me.

*(U) sovereign citizen movement : (U//FOUO)*

*A rightwing extremist movement composed of groups or individuals who reject the notion of U.S. citizenship. They claim to follow only what they believe to be God's law or common law and the original 10 amendments (Bill of Rights) to the U.S. Constitution. They believe they are emancipated from all other responsibilities associated with being a U.S. citizen, such as paying taxes, possessing a driver's license and motor vehicle registration, or holding a social security number. They generally do not recognize federal or state government authority or laws. **Several sovereign citizen groups in the United***

<sup>46</sup> Georgia R. & Power Co. v. Atlanta, 154 Ga. 731, 115 S.E. 263; Lippencott v. Allander, 27 Iowa 460; State ex rel. Hutton v. Baton Rouge, 217 La 857, 47 So.2d. 665; Tower v. Tower & S. Street R. Co., 68 Minn 500, 71 N.W. 691.

<sup>47</sup> Georgia R. & Power Co. v. Atlanta, 154 Ga. 731, 115 S.E. 263; Lippencott v. Allander, 27 Iowa 460; State ex rel. Hutton v. Baton Rouge, 217 La 857, 47 So.2d. 665; Tower v. Tower & S. Street R. Co., 68 Minn 500, 71 N.W. 691.

States produce fraudulent documents for their members in lieu of legitimate government-issued forms of identification. Members have been known to advocate or engage in criminal activity and plot acts of violence and terrorism in an attempt to advance their extremist goals. They often target government officials and law enforcement. (also: state citizens, freemen, preamble citizens, common law citizens) [Domestic Extremism Lexicon, Dept. of Homeland Security Document #IA-0233-09, p. 9; SOURCE: <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Crime/Terrorism/DomeExtrLexicon.pdf>]

The reason the groups mentioned would even feel the need to produce their own ID's is because you have made it impossible to procure ID or to engage in commerce to support themselves without committing fraud about their domicile or status on a government form, and without signing up for government franchise in the process.

This section therefore constitutes an affidavit of duress against the unlawful and criminal forms of duress described herein. The existence of such duress renders void and of no legal effect all evidence of consent or status derived from said consent, including any and all government IDs in conflict with the status stated herein or implying a citizenship or domicile different or inconsistent with that described herein.

“An agreement [including a franchise, because all franchises are contracts] obtained by duress, coercion, or intimidation is invalid, since the party coerced is not exercising his free will, and the test is not so much the means by which the party is compelled to execute the agreement as the state of mind induced.”<sup>48</sup> Duress, like fraud, rarely becomes material, except where a contract or conveyance has been made which the maker wishes to avoid. As a general rule, duress renders the contract or conveyance voidable, not void, at the option of the person coerced,<sup>49</sup> and it is susceptible of ratification. Like other voidable contracts, it is valid until it is avoided by the person entitled to avoid it.<sup>50</sup> However, duress in the form of physical compulsion, in which a party is caused to appear to assent when he has no intention of doing so, is generally deemed to render the resulting purported contract void.<sup>51</sup>” [American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, Section 21]

I remind the recipient that any use of government ID, driver's licenses, and driver's license applications as proof of domicile, because the product of the crimes documented herein, is not admissible as evidence pursuant to the fruit of a poisonous tree doctrine. You cannot use the fruit of YOUR crime in kidnapping my identity and as evidence against me in any civil or criminal proceeding.

If you as the recipient would like to investigate the Government ID Scam further and prosecute the perpetrators, see Ref. (1), Sections 14 thru 14.5.

Lastly, the following affidavit of duress is hereby incorporated by reference into this document.

Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Tax Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

<sup>48</sup> Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall 205, 19 L.Ed. 134

<sup>49</sup> Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326 (holding that acts induced by duress which operate solely on the mind, and fall short of actual physical compulsion, are not void at law, but are voidable only, at the election of him whose acts were induced by it); Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)) 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962); Carroll v. Fetty, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521, cert den 308 U.S. 571, 84 L.Ed. 479, 60 S.Ct. 85.

<sup>50</sup> Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; Heider v. Unicum, 142 or 416, 20 P.2d. 384; Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)) 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962)

<sup>51</sup> Restatement 2d, Contracts § 174, stating that if conduct that appears to be a manifestation of assent by a party who does not intend to engage in that conduct is physically compelled by duress, the conduct is not effective as a manifestation of assent.

## **10. ACTIONS REQUESTED OF YOU AND YOUR RESPONSE**

The following subsections document specific actions requested of you to ensure that your records are not inaccurate, false, or fraudulent and to thereby prevent the crimes documented in section 11 that result from a FAILURE to take the actions indicated.

### **10.1 Secretary of State of United States and Secretary of State of a state of the Union Must Apostille both copies of this document they receive, return one copy, and record the other copy**

If the recipient of this notice is either the Dept. of State of the United States or the Dept. of State of a State of the Union, then pursuant to Volume 2 of the U.S. Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM), Section 1292.1 (2 FAM 1292.1), I request that both of the two copies you received of the Certificate of Service for this document be apostilled by you and then:

1. One of them be returned to me promptly.
2. The second copy you received be recorded in your system of records.

You can find a copy of Volume 2 of the U.S. Dept. of State Foreign Affairs Manual (FAM) at the address below, if you don't have your own copy:

U.S. Department of State Website, Foreign Affairs Manual  
<http://foia.state.gov/REGS/Search.asp>

I have enclosed the requisite fees, if any, which I determined in advance prior to sending this notice.

### **10.2 AMEND PAST and FUTURE USA Passport applications by appending Enclosure (7)**

Enclosure (7) is provided as a mandatory attachment to all PAST and FUTURE USA Passport applications. A USA Passport application, Dept of State form DS-11 is NOT included because this exhibit modifies and is included by reference in any and all PAST, PRESENT, and FUTURE applications submitted independently of this correspondence.

I certify that any DS-11 passport applications you receive are both FALSE and FRAUDULENT without this mandatory attachment included by reference. A refusal on your part to amend these applications shall constitute the following crimes:

1. Impersonating a statutory U.S. citizen: 18 U.S.C. §911.
2. Perjury: 18 U.S.C. §1001, 18 U.S.C. §1542, 18 U.S.C. §1621.
3. Fraud: 18 U.S.C. §§1001, 1002, 1028, 1028A, 1029, 1039.
4. Misprision of felony: 18 U.S.C. §3.
5. Accessory after the fact: 18 U.S.C. §4.

### **10.3 Certificate of Non-Citizen National Status Pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1452**

I am herein the person in compliance with the provisions of [8 U.S.C. §1452\(b\)\(1\)](#) and (2), and I hereby apply for a *Certificate of Non-Citizen National Status* from the Secretary of State pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1452\(b\)\(1\)](#) and (2). Any record of my being a statutory "U.S. citizen" per [8 U.S.C. §1401](#) is in error that must be corrected promptly by you pursuant to the Privacy Act, [5 U.S.C. §552a\(d\)\(2\)](#), Freedom of Information Act [5 U.S.C. 552\(a\)\(2\)](#), Federal Tort Claims Act, [28 U.S.C. §1346](#), 2671-2680 and the Administrative Procedures Act, [5 U.S.C. §§551-559](#).

I hereby request a certificate of Non-Citizen National Status pursuant to **8 U.S.C. §1452(b)(1)&(2) and for a Non-Citizen National Passport**. Your authority to issue such certificate is:

[8 U.S.C. §1452\(b\)\(1\)&\(2\)](#)  
*Section 1452. Certificates of citizenship or U.S. non-citizen national status; procedure*

*\* (b); proof; oath of allegiance*

A person who claims to be a national, but not a citizen, of the United States may apply to the Secretary of State for a certificate of non-citizen national status. Upon - (1) proof to the satisfaction of the Secretary of State that the applicant is a national, but not a citizen, of the United States

And:

Public Law 99-396 Section 16(c)

Certificates Of Non-Citizen National Status; \$35 Limit On Fees For Processing Applications

Section 16(c) of Pub. L. 99-396 provided that: "The Secretary of State may not impose a fee exceeding \$35 for the processing of an application for a certificate of non-citizen national status under section 341(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1452(b))....."

Documents required in order to obtain the Certificate of non-citizen National Status pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1452](#) are included as Enclosures (1) and (2) attached.

I remind you that the above statute REQUIRES your agency to issue said certificates and that it is unlawful for your agency to refuse to obey or implement this positive law statute. Any government employee offering such a refusal is acting entirely in their personal capacity, by substituting their personal prejudice for the actual law, and thereby creates a cause of action against themselves personally. It is also unlawful to set or maintain any agency policy or procedure which is in conflict with this requirement of law. There is also no other method for satisfying this requirement of law, because:

1. The passport agencies positively refuse to put such an endorsement within anyone's passport.
2. The legal department of the Dept of State (e.g. Sharon Palmer-Royston) positively refuses their legal duty to abide by the requirements of law documented in Enclosure (6). They refuse to explain why I as a person either domiciled in a state of the Union on land not under plenary or general federal jurisdiction or in the Kingdom of Heaven am not qualified to receive such a certificate consistent with the requirements of law clearly documented in that enclosure.
3. The result of the malicious refusal of the Dept of State in the past to recognize my sovereignty in this way as an American National who is not a statutory "U.S. citizen" (as described in [8 U.S.C. §1401](#)) has interfered with the protection and enforcement of my Constitutionally protected rights.
4. This malicious refusal to help me protect my Constitutional rights by obtaining from your agency legally admissible evidence proving my sovereign status is in direct conflict with the oath of office that you took as a public officer to protect and defend not only the Constitution of the United States of America, but to protect me as a participant in the sovereignty which is party to it, being "We the People". I remind you that your job was created to serve "We the People" and not yourself, and THESE people are the "state" and the government while you are only the servant of said government. Deliberately refusing to enforce or "selectively enforcing" this aspect of law, and thereby PERSONALLY denying the petitioner the benefit of official confirmation of his/her true status as required by law, puts you in willful defiance of that fiduciary duty you owe to the public as a "public officer":

*"As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer."*<sup>52</sup> **Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts.**<sup>53</sup> **That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or**

<sup>52</sup> State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321; Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.

<sup>53</sup> Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524. A public official is held in public trust. Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697, app gr 117 Ill.Dec. 226, 520 N.E.2d. 387 and revd on other grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145, 538 N.E.2d. 520.



*she serves.<sup>54</sup> and owes a fiduciary duty to the public.<sup>55</sup> It has been said that the fiduciary responsibilities of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official which tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual rights is against public policy.<sup>57</sup>”*  
[63C Am.Jur.2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247]

In the event that you refuse to comply with this request to provide said “Certificate of non-citizen national status” upon this demand within 30 days of receipt of this notice, the event of your default and/or failure to respond shall make my original copy of this notice into said certificate. If you want to claim that I have no authority to obligate the U.S. government, then you will also have to admit that every government form I have ever submitted to the government similarly does not obligate not only the government, but me either. This includes IRS Forms W-4, 1040, 1042-S, 1098, 1099, W-2, and SSA Forms SS-4 and SS-5. This is a requirement of the equal protection of the laws. Please notify all appropriate government agencies and personnel within your jurisdiction of this change in my lawful citizenship status.

Let me emphasize that I AM NOT interested in agency “policy”. The U.S. Supreme Court said in Marbury v. Madison, [5 U.S. 137](#) (1803) that we are “a society of law and not men”. A “society of men” is a society of the “policy” of men. The only thing I can or will accept from you in response to this correspondence is positive law and legally admissible evidence signed under penalty of perjury by a responsible person with demonstrated delegated authority justifying what gives you the authority to violate the law on this subject. Failure to provide said evidence of your authority or the substituting of “policy” for “law” in your response shall constitute an admission that you are a CRIMINAL who deserves to be prosecuted for violating the law and sued for a tort in connection with your failure to obey the law.

#### **10.4 Update NUMIDENT status with the Social Security Administration**

Citizenship is recorded Social Security NUMIDENT records within the CSP field. This information is shared with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Those who are statutory “nationals and citizens of the United States” per 8 U.S.C. §1401 are identified with a value of “A” for the CSP field.

Please update the SSA NUMIDENT record to reflect OTHER than “A” and to correctly reflect my status as:

1. A non-citizen national per 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) and 8 U.S.C. §1452.
2. NOT a “national and citizen of the United States” per 8 U.S.C. §1401, 26 U.S.C. §3121(e), and 26 CFR §1.1-1(c ).

This request SUPERCEDES and is CONTROLLING over any past, present, or future government form or communication you receive from either myself or any third party that might be in conflict. If you receive any government form, including the above forms, in conflict with this request, then this request shall supersede it for the subjects it covers.

#### **10.5 Update all SS-5, IRS Form W-8, DOS Form I-9, and E-Verify applications on file**

Please update my citizenship status on any and every one of the following government forms:

1. Social Security Form SS-5.
2. IRS Form W-8.

<sup>54</sup> Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181, appeal after remand (1st Dist) 107 Ill.App.3d. 222, 63 Ill.Dec. 134, 437 N.E.2d. 783.

<sup>55</sup> United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed. 2d 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7 Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343, cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed. 2d 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds by United States v. Osser (CA3 Pa) 864 F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in United States v. Little (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among conflicting authorities on other grounds noted in United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223).

<sup>56</sup> Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452, later proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434 N.E.2d. 325.

<sup>57</sup> Indiana State Ethics Comm’n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App) 659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28, 1996).



- 1 3. Department of State Form I-9.  
2 4. E-Verify application.

3 The status I want indicated is that reflected in Item #3.1 in the table on the following page. This request SUPERCEDES  
4 and is CONTROLLING over any past, present, or future government form or communication you receive from either myself  
5 or any third party that might be in conflict. If you receive any government form, including the above forms, in conflict with  
6 this request, then this request shall supersede it for the subjects it covers.

**Table 2: Tabular Summary of Citizenship Status on Government Forms**

#	Citizenship status	Place of birth	Domicile	Defined in	Social Security NUMIDENT Status	Status on Specific Government Forms			
						<a href="#">Social Security SS-5</a>	<a href="#">IRS Form W-8 Block 3</a>	<a href="#">Department of State I-9</a>	<a href="#">E-Verify System</a>
1	"U.S. citizen" or "Statutory U.S. citizen"	Anywhere in America	District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands	8 U.S.C. §1401; 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(A)	CSP=A	Block 5="U.S. Citizen"	Can't use Form W-8	Section 1="A citizen of the United States"	See Note 1.
2	"U.S. national"	Anywhere in America	American Samoa; Swains Island; or abroad to U.S. national parents under 8 U.S.C. §1408(2)	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(B); 8 U.S.C. §1408; 8 U.S.C. §1452		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A noncitizen national of the United States"	See Note 1.
3.1	"national" or "state national" or "Constitutional but not statutory citizen"	Anywhere in America	State of the Union	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 8 U.S.C. §1452; 14 <sup>th</sup> Amend., Sect. 1		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A noncitizen national of the United States)" OR "An alien authorized to work (statutory)"	See Note 1.
3.2	"national" or "state national" or "Constitutional but not statutory citizen"	Anywhere in America	Foreign country	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 8 U.S.C. §1452; 14 <sup>th</sup> Amend., Sect. 1		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A noncitizen national of the United States)" OR "An alien authorized to work (statutory)"	See Note 1.
3.3	"national" or "state national" or "Constitutional but not statutory citizen"	Anywhere in America	Foreign country	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21); 8 U.S.C. §1452; 14 <sup>th</sup> Amend., Sect. 1		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A noncitizen national of the United States)" OR "An alien authorized to work (statutory)"	See Note 1.
4.1	"alien" or "Foreign national"	Foreign country	Puerto Rico, Guam, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3)		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A lawful permanent resident" OR "An alien authorized to work"	See Note 1.
4.2	"alien" or "Foreign national"	Foreign country	State of the Union	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3)		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A lawful permanent resident" OR "An alien authorized to work"	See Note 1.
4.3	"alien" or "Foreign national"	Foreign country	State of the Union	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3)		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A lawful permanent resident" OR "An alien authorized to work"	See Note 1.
4.4	"alien" or "Foreign national"	Foreign country	Foreign country	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3)		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A lawful permanent resident" OR "An alien authorized to work"	See Note 1.
4.5	"alien" or "Foreign national"	Foreign country	Foreign country	8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(3)		Block 5="Legal alien authorized to work. (statutory)"	"Nonresident NON-Individual Nontaxpayer"	Section 1="A lawful permanent resident" OR "An alien authorized to work"	See Note 1.

## 10.6 Update of all existing government records describing me

Pursuant to 26 CFR §301.6109-1(g)(1)(i), please change my status to that of a nonresident alien but NOT a “nonresident alien INDIVIDUAL” not engaged in a “trade or business” as defined in 26 CFR §1.871-1(b)(1)(i). Then remove my information from all electronic systems as indicated in the next section.

Should you find this affidavit or the enclosures deficient or insufficient in any way to accomplish the changes in your documentation necessary to correctly reflect my citizenship as a “National but not citizen”, **please promptly inform me within 10 days** of receipt of this Legal Notice of this condition and I will gladly provide to you any additional documentation you might require to satisfy the requirements of applicable law and regulations. *Otherwise, under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), Section 1-205, your failure to respond shall constitute an affirmative act of approval of and compliance with the wishes expressed by me in this affidavit.* Should you respond with a request for additional information, please:

1. Include your full legal name, mailing address, phone number, position, organization, title, and email address.
2. Include a reference to the enacted positive law and corresponding implementing regulation that requires any additional information or forms you might request.
3. Use an OMB-approved document which complies with the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) by stating whether disclosing the information is “mandatory” or “voluntary”, the code or regulation requiring disclosure if mandatory, and by providing an OMB control number and expiration date clearly visible on the form.

## 10.7 Removal of all information about me in all government records

After you have accomplished the request in the previous section, you are requested to remove my name and all personal information about me from all government electronic information system. That information is copyrighted, privileged, and licensed information copyrighted by me and also protected from disclosure or use by the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a. Pursuant to the enacted positive law codified in the [Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. §552a\(b\)](#):

1. You do not have my consent to store any information about me contained herein or already existing in your computer systems in any electronic information system or share it with anyone outside of the immediate government you work for. This means that if you work for the federal government, you may not share this information with any state of the Union without my prior written consent.
2. You may not disclose or provide any information about me, either on this form or existing within your computer system, to any foreign government.
3. You may not use or store any identifying number described as either a Social Security Number or Taxpayer Identifying Number, in any electronic information system and are demanded to destroy and discontinue using any such number. Use of such numbers violates my religious beliefs, and they may NOT be used without my consent pursuant to [5 U.S.C. §552a\(b\)](#).

## 10.8 Legal Requirements Imposed Upon Your Response

Pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act, [5 U.S.C. §556\(d\)](#) and [26 U.S.C. §7491](#), you as the moving party asserting a position contrary to the law documented here have the burden of showing the facts and statements made are false, and you must satisfy the following requirements of evidence in your challenge:

1. Must conform completely with the conclusions contained in:

*Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability*, Form #05.007  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. Must be admissible, non-prima facie evidence.
  - 2.1. The 1939 code upon which the present internal revenue code was based has been REPEALED. See [53 Stat 1, Section 4](#). Not only did it repeal itself, but it also repealed all prior revenue laws from the Statutes at large. Therefore, nothing from the Statutes at large prior to 1939 can be cited as positive law.
  - 2.2. [1 U.S.C. §204](#) legislative notes, the GPO website (<http://www.gpoaccess.gov/uscode/about.html>), and the House of Representatives websites (<http://uscode.house.gov/about/info.shtml>) all say that the Internal Revenue Code was not presently enacted into positive law. Therefore, if your evidence consists of cites from the I.R.C., you must

1 prove that every section of the code you cite is individually a [positive law](#), which is the only type of admissible,  
2 non-presumptive evidence having to do with written law. The way to prove that is to cite a section of the Statutes  
3 at Large AFTER 1939 which was enacted into positive law. We remind you that it is a religious sin for Christians  
4 (see [Numbers 15:30](#)) and a violation of due process to "presume" or "assume" anything, and therefore the  
5 government cannot compel us to "presume" that a section of the I.R.C. is enacted positive law without proving it.

- 6 3. If your evidence is from a witness, then the witness must agree on a notarized affidavit to be financially liable for  
7 making a false statement and an address where that person may be served with legal process must be provided in case  
8 litigation becomes necessary because of his or her misrepresentations.
- 9 4. Your evidence may not come from any IRS publication, because the IRS [Internal Revenue Manual says in section](#)  
10 [4.10.7.2.8](#) that IRS publications may not be cited to sustain a position. See the link below for further details on this  
11 scam:  
12 <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Articles/IRSNotResponsible.htm>
- 13 5. If the evidence relates to the liability of a person who does not reside on federal property, then any court cites must  
14 come from a state court, because:
  - 15 5.1. The Supreme Court said in *Erie Railroad v. Tompkins*, [304 U.S. 64](#) (1938) that there is no federal common law in  
16 a state of the Union.
  - 17 5.2. The Rules of Decision Act, [28 U.S.C. §1652](#) says that the law to be applied in the courts is state law and not  
18 federal law, and especially when the domicile of the Defendant is on state property and not on federal property.
  - 19 5.3. The IRS [Internal Revenue Manual, Section 4.10.7.2.9.8](#) says that courts below the Supreme Court may only be  
20 cited as precedent for the particular person involved in the proceeding.
  - 21 5.4. [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17](#)(b) states that the capacity to sue or be sued is based on the domicile of the  
22 Defendant. If that domicile is in a state and not on land ceded to the federal government or under general federal  
23 jurisdiction, then no federal statute or no federal judicial precedent may be cited as authority in the case.
- 24 6. Your answer may not include or consist of either the IRS "[The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments](#)" or the  
25 Congressional Research Report 97-59A entitled "[Frequently Asked Questions About the Federal Income Tax](#)". The  
26 reasons for this are many, not the least of which consist of:
  - 27 6.1. The IRS document doesn't identify the IRS or anyone in the IRS as a source and is not signed or authenticated.  
28 Under the [Federal Rules of Evidence](#), nothing can be used as evidence without at least the identity of the author  
29 being known and the author being sworn under oath and held just as accountable as those who relied on his  
30 statements.
  - 31 6.2. The Office of the Chief Counsel of the IRS (202-622-3300) positively refuses to either sign or take personal  
32 responsibility in writing for publication of this document and thereby be held legally liable for false statements  
33 contained therein, even though his administrative help indicated on the telephone that he was the author. How  
34 ironic it is that anyone from the government would insist on calling anything "truth" that absolutely no one  
35 conspicuously will claim legal responsibility for. How ironic also is it that the IRS would base all of its positions  
36 against allegedly "frivolous" positions that it can't and won't take personal and legal responsibility for, even  
37 though the people who argue against their unofficial position can and are held legally responsible for making  
38 "frivolous" arguments by courts that demonstrably don't even have any jurisdiction. Therefore, both of these  
39 publications for similar reasons are simply hearsay evidence that is excludible under the Hearsay Rule  
40 ([Fed.R.Evid. 802](#)) and also amount essentially to "political propaganda" and "[false commercial speech](#)" unless  
41 and until they are authenticated and the authors are identified and held liable for their dubious and deliberately  
42 vague and deceptive statements therein.
  - 43 6.3. Federal courts have repeatedly said that one may not rely upon the statements of public servants in forming a  
44 reasonable belief. See the link below:  
45 <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Articles/reliance.htm>

## 46 **10.9 Significance of behaviors and responses to this correspondence**

47 I ask that you conform to the legal constraints imposed on your response which are documented in this section. The First  
48 Amendment notices you of my right to communicate with the government as I see fit. Included within that right is the right  
49 to define the meaning and significance of certain words and actions, which are "symbols" that communicate an intention on  
50 your part. Therefore, for the purposes of your response:

- 51 1. Any use of the words "frivolous" in your response shall mean "correct, truthful". We have a [First Amendment](#) right to  
52 communicate with the government as we see fit. This means you must communicate with me in a language I  
53 understand and define. If people who speak Spanish are entitled to interpreters in court, I am entitled to a similar  
54 "interpreter". My "language" does not include the word "frivolous" or any variation thereof as commonly used by the  
55 legal profession. Those who want to identify anything that I say as incorrect must specify exactly what is incorrect and

do so under the rules of evidence established above using only legally admissible evidence consistent with that identified in the list above.

2. Any issue raised in this correspondence that you remain silent on or do not explicitly rebut with evidence consistent with the Federal Rules of Evidence shall constitute an admission and estoppel in pais for all future litigation on this subject. This is a requirement of [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8\(b\)\(6\)](#), which says that failure to deny (with evidence rather than just opinion) shall constitute an admission. Federal Courts have also said that when a criminal, which is you, is confronted with evidence of his wrongdoing, and either responds with silence or claims the Fifth Amendment, that shall constitute an admission and a negative inference against them to a jury or fact finder.

*"It is well established that in a criminal trial a judge or prosecutor may not suggest that the jury draw an adverse inference from a defendant's failure to testify." United States v. Solano-Godines, 120 F.3d. 957, 962 (9th Cir. 1997). However, in civil proceedings adverse inferences can be drawn from a party's invocation of this Fifth Amendment right. See SEC v. Colello, 139 F.3d. 674, 677 (9th Cir. 1998). The seminal case in this area is [Baxter v. Palmigiano, 425 U.S. 308 \(1976\)](#). In Baxter, the Supreme Court was confronted with a prison inmate who had been brought before a prison disciplinary board on charges of inciting a disturbance. When informed that state criminal charges might be brought against him arising out of his conduct while in prison, the inmate was advised that he could remain silent before the board, but that his silence would be used against him. See *id.* at 312. During the hearing, the inmate was confronted with incriminating evidence, remained completely silent, and as a consequence was given further punishment under the assumption that he perpetrated the acts for which he was being questioned. See *id.* at 313, 317. The Supreme Court held that the drawing of the adverse inference from the inmate's silence was proper when incriminating evidence had also been presented, and therefore no Fifth Amendment violation had taken place. See *id.* at 317-18.*

The Baxter holding is not a blanket rule that allows adverse inferences to be drawn from invocations of the privilege against self-incrimination under all circumstances in the civil context. Rather, lower courts interpreting Baxter have been uniform in suggesting that the key to the Baxter holding is that such adverse inference can only be drawn when independent evidence exists of the fact to which the party refuses to answer. See, e.g., [LaSalle Bank Lake View v. Seguban, 54 F.3d. 387, 391 \(7th Cir. 1995\)](#); [Peiffer v. Lebanon Sch. Dist., 848 F.2d. 44, 46 \(3d Cir. 1988\)](#). Thus, an adverse inference can be drawn when silence is countered by independent evidence of the fact being questioned, but that same inference cannot be drawn when, for example, silence is the answer to an allegation contained in a complaint. See *Nat'l Acceptance Co. v. Bathalter*, 705 F.2d. 924, 930 (7th Cir. 1983). In such instances, when there is no corroborating evidence to support the fact under inquiry, the proponent of the fact must come forward with evidence to support the allegation, otherwise no negative inference will be permitted. See *LaSalle Bank*, 54 F.3d. at 391. [\[Doe v. Glanzer, 232 F.3d. 1258, 232 F.3d. 1258 \(9th Cir. 11/17/2000\)\]](#)

3. If you provide a general answer rather than specifically address the issues raised herein about your coercive and illegal conduct, then this shall constitute fraud, based on the following maxims of law:

*"Fraus latet in generalibus. Fraud lies hid in general expressions."*

*"Fraus est celare fraudem. It is a fraud to conceal a fraud. 1 Vern. 270."*

*"Lata culpa dolo aequiparatur. Gross negligence is equal to fraud."*

[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856; SOURCE:

<http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

4. The expression of an personal or agency opinion rather than providing legal evidence under penalty of perjury supporting your position shall constitute an admission of the truthfulness of everything not rebutted with such evidence. I am not interested in opinions, rhetoric, agency "propaganda", or agency "policy", but only facts and law

1 that are relevant and admissible in a legal proceeding involving the issues raised herein. The U.S. Supreme Court has  
2 declared that we are a “society of law and not men”.

3 **“The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of**  
4 **laws, and not of men.** *It will certainly cease to deserve that high appellation, if the laws*  
5 *furnish no remedy [against a public official such as yourself] for the violation of a vested*  
6 *legal right.”*  
7 *[Marbury v. Madison, [5 U.S. 137](#); 1 Cranch 137, 2 L.Ed. 60 (1803)]*

8 Therefore, I am not interested in what “men” such as you have to say, but what the law, the courts, and the legally  
9 admissible evidence signed under penalty of perjury by someone in authority with personal knowledge and who agrees  
10 to take legal responsibility in court for their statements. An opinion that is not legally “actionable” from a person who  
11 is not responsible for what they say is meaningless and makes a very poor basis for belief. Whenever I communicate  
12 with you on a government form, it usually must be under penalty of perjury. That is exactly what I expect from you,  
13 because the [Fourteenth Amendment, Section 1](#) and [42 U.S.C. §1981](#) both say that I am legally entitled to the same  
14 “equal protection”. Any expression of policy rather than legally admissible, specific evidence of authority shall  
15 constitute an off-point non-response and will also serve as an admission on your part that we are not a society of law,  
16 but of men and the policies of men, and that we live in a totalitarian democracy based not on individual sovereignty  
17 and rights, but on the totalitarian will of the socialist “collective” and those such as yourself who claim but cannot  
18 prove that they have lawful authority to “represent” that socialist collective.

## 19 **11. CRIMINAL COMPLAINT**

20 This document constitutes a formal criminal complaint for the violations indicated in the following subsections.

### 21 **11.1 Request to criminally and civilly prosecute violations of law by Social Security and other** 22 **government personnel**

23 Pursuant to the massive instances of fraud and false claims filed with the U.S. Government documented in section 4.4  
24 earlier, I respectfully demand that the Dept. of Justice investigate the violations of law indicated and prosecute all those  
25 federal employees and public officials who condone, tolerate, or participate in it under the [False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C.](#)  
26 [§3729](#), for THREE TIMES the amount of fraud perpetrated against the United States government. If you do not, I am  
27 contemplating initiating a qui tam action on your behalf to recover said damages.

### 28 **11.2 Criminal Complaint against those engaged in the Government ID Scam documented in** 29 **section 9**

30 Recipient of this legal notice is hereby formally requested to criminally prosecute all those in the state government, federal  
31 government, financial institutions, and employers who have instituted, protected, sanctioned, or condoned the duress  
32 documented in section 9 earlier against me personally under the following authorities relating to compelled participation in  
33 government franchises and identity theft:

#### 34 1. Compelled Participation in Government Franchises:

- 35 1.1. Thirteenth Amendment: Prohibition against involuntary Servitude. I am being asked to represent a public office  
36 in the U.S. government as a franchisee, that I am not eligible to occupy, cannot lawfully occupy, and which I do  
37 not consent to occupy FOR ANY AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION.
- 38 1.2. 18 U.S.C. §912: Impersonating a public officer. A private person in possession, use, or control of public property  
39 and engaging in a “trade or business” (“public office” pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) is guilty of  
40 impersonating a public officer. Those who only offer government ID to public officers are indirectly compelling  
41 people to impersonate such officers.
- 42 1.3. 18 U.S.C. §654: Anyone who uses or compels the use of a public number in connection with your private property  
43 without your consent is guilty of conversion.

#### 44 1.4. 42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8): Penalties

- 45 2. Government ID Available Only to “U.S. persons” domiciled on federal territory: Includes driver’s licenses and state  
46 ID that connect me with domicile on federal territory and status as a statutory but not constitutional “U.S. citizen”.
- 47 2.1. 18 U.S.C. §911: Impersonating a statutory “U.S. citizen”. By compelling me to misrepresent my status as a  
48 statutory and not constitutional “U.S. citizen” pursuant to 8 U.S.C. §1401 in exchange for the Privilege of being  
49



able to conduct commerce using government ID, those responsible are compelling me illegally to impersonate a statutory but not constitutional "U.S. citizen".

- 2.2. [42 U.S.C. §405\(c\)\(2\)\(C\)\(i\): Evidence, Procedure, and Certification for payments.](#)
- 2.3. [18 U.S.C. §1028\(a\)\(7\): Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents, authentication features, and information](#)
- 2.4. [18 U.S.C. §1028A: Aggravated Identity Theft](#)
- 2.5. [18 U.S.C. §1201: Kidnapping.](#) Whether I am physically moved or my legal identity is moved to a foreign jurisdiction without my consent, the result is the same and it is a crime.

If you need legal authorities and memorandums of law useful in prosecuting the compelled participation in government franchises, the following should prove useful:

1. [Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises](#), Form #05.030  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. [Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security](#), Form #06.001  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
3. [Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a "Taxpayer Identification Number"](#), Form #04.205  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
4. [Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee](#), Form #06.002  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

For information on how to prosecute identity theft crimes described herein, please see:

1. [Property and Privacy Protection Page, Section 10: Identity Theft](#)  
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/PropertyPrivacy/PropertyPrivacy.htm>
2. [Prosecuting Social Security Number Misuse: Attacking Identity Theft at its Source](#), U.S. Attorney Bulletin, Vol. 53, No. 1
3. [Identity Theft Laws: State Penalties and Remedies and Pending Federal Bills, Congressional Research Service Report #RL34028 / 2007-08-06](#)

If you can't even protect me from your *own* usurpations, identity theft, and kidnapping, it would be ridiculous to hire you as my "protector" against other less injurious parties by becoming a customer of your "protection racket" called a "citizen", "resident", or "inhabitant". When you have demonstrated a sincere and ongoing desire to protect me from *your own extortion* and adhesion contracts/franchises, and to place me and my identity *back* on land protected by the Constitution instead of on federal territory devoid of rights and constitutional protections, then and only then will I consider politically and legally re-associating with you by becoming a "citizen" or a "resident".

*"In a free society, government protects citizens from threats against their persons and property. In a police state, government deploys its law enforcement assets to protect itself against the "threat" posed by its own subjects."*  
[W.N. Grigg]

Until you quit acting like a de facto corporation<sup>58</sup>, return us to lawful money, eliminate the Federal Reserve, and return to your station as the *servant* of the true sovereign, which is We the People and NOT the government who serves them, then:

1. The Declaration of Independence says you need my consent to "govern" and that if you don't have it, you are a tyrant and a terrorist. I remind you that you don't have my consent and therefore, the DHS ought to be protecting me against you, not third parties. There are only two types of governments: 1. Governments by consent; 2. Terrorist governments. Which one are you? The Declaration of Independence not only makes it my right, but my duty to provide "better safeguards for my future security" because you obviously can't and won't. Refusing to recognize my RIGHT and DUTY to do so by becoming a "foreign state" and an ambassador of the de jure constitutional republic would simply be an interference with that right and DUTY imposed by the organic law that is the foundation of ALL of your lawful authority.
2. I choose to be a "transient foreigner" and a "stateless person" in relation to the de facto state and federal corporations that have usurped and destroyed the original constitutional republic.

<sup>58</sup> See Corporatization and Privatization of the Government, Form #05.024; <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

- 1 3. All I want you to do is simply leave me alone, and not enforce your fraudulent Ponzi scheme franchises or civil law  
2 against me. Since it costs you nothing to be left alone, then it's ridiculous to say that I'm not "paying my fair share"  
3 for protection that I don't need, don't want, and which I regard as harmful and not protective. All that the present  
4 government seem to be inclined to do with the money people send them now is protect their own criminal "protection  
5 racket" enterprise.
- 6 4. My sincerely held constitutionally protected First Amendment religious convictions require me to separate from, not to  
7 fornicate with, not participate in, nor do commerce with you until you reform your ways. In that sense, I become a  
8 "church" and you become the "state", and the law must keep us separate.<sup>59</sup> The Bible in fact says my body is a temple,  
9 and I cannot pollute or corrupt that temple by engaging in government harlotry.

10 *"Do you not know that **you are the temple of God** and that the Spirit of God dwells in*  
11 *you? **If anyone defiles the temple of God, God will destroy him. For the temple of God***  
12 ***is holy, which temple you are.**"*  
13 *[[1 Cor. 3:16-17](#), Bible, NKJV]*

14 *And I heard another voice from heaven saying, **"Come out of her [the government***  
15 ***BEAST, Rev. 19:19], my people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive of her***  
16 ***plagues. For her sins have reached to heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities.***  
17 *Render to her just as she rendered to you [THEFT, LIES, TERRORISM, DECEIT, and*  
18 *KIDNAPPING], and repay her double according to her works; in the cup which she has*  
19 *mixed, mix double for her. In the measure that she glorified herself and lived luxuriously*  
20 *[on STOLEN loot taken from non-consenting "subjects"], in the same measure give her*  
21 *torment and sorrow; for she says in her heart, 'I sit as queen, and am no widow, and will*  
22 *not see sorrow.' Therefore her plagues will come in one day—death and mourning and*  
23 *famine. And she will be utterly burned with fire, for strong is the Lord God who judges*  
24 *her.*  
25 *[[Rev. 18:4-8](#), Bible, NKJV]*  
26

---

<sup>59</sup> See: *We Are the Church*: <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Spirituality/ChurchTaxation/WeAreTheChurch.htm>.

1  
2 **12. ADVANCE REBUTTAL OF GOVERNMENT LIES AND PROPAGANDA DESIGNED TO**  
3 **DISCREDIT THE SUBMITTER OR THIS COMMUNICATION**

4 This section shall provide references that rebut any and every publication and statement by the government that might be  
5 used or attempted to be used to discredit this communication or any portion thereof. The following list references all of the  
6 publications that rebut all such LIES and PROPAGANDA you might use to discredit me, this communication, or any  
7 portion therefore. You have 30 days to rebut all the documents on this list in a communication signed under penalty of  
8 perjury by you personally. If you do not, you shall be deemed to consent and agree that everything listed is truthful,  
9 accurate, consistent with prevailing law, and stipulated as admitted into evidence in any and every litigation that might arise  
10 from our relationship or this communication:

- 11 1. *Policy Document: Rebutted Arguments Against this Website*, Form #08.011  
12 DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/PolicyDocs/RebArgAgWebsite.pdf>  
13 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>  
14 2. *Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid*, Form #08.004  
15 DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/PolicyDocs/FlawedArgsToAvoid.pdf>  
16 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>  
17 3. *Rebutted Version of the IRS "The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments"*, Form #08.005  
18 DIRECT LINK: [http://sedm.org/Forms/PolicyDocs/friv\\_tax\\_rebuts.pdf](http://sedm.org/Forms/PolicyDocs/friv_tax_rebuts.pdf)  
19 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>  
20 4. *Rebutted Version of Congressional Research Service Report 97-59A: Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the*  
21 *Federal Income Tax*, Form #08.006  
22 DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/PolicyDocs/CRS-97-59A-rebuts.pdf>  
23 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>  
24 5. *Rebutted Version of "Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions"*, Form #08.007  
25 DIRECT LINK: <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/FalseRhetoric/TRFAQ/TRFAQ.htm>  
26 FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>  
27

1  
2 **13. AFFIRMATION**

3 In accordance with [28 U.S.C. §1746](#)(1), I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America  
4 that the foregoing and the entire contents of this correspondence and all attachments are true and correct.

5 I also affirm, under the Common Law of America, from without the "United States\*\*", that I am over 18 years of age and  
6 that the contents of this correspondence are a true, correct, and accurate reflection of my *voluntary will*, and that I am in no  
7 way under any kind of duress in signing this correspondence.

8 I now affix my own signature to all of the above affirmations WITH EXPLICIT RESERVATION OF ALL MY RIGHTS  
9 AND WITHOUT PREJUDICE U.C.C. 1-207 (UCCA 1207), and its successor, U.C.C. 1-308.

Full name	
Signature	
Signature of witness	
Date	

10  
11  
12 **NOTARY PUBLIC'S JURAT**

13 BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, a Notary Public, of the County of \_\_\_\_\_,  
14 Republic of \_\_\_\_\_(statename), this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_,  
15 \_\_\_\_\_, the Signator did personally appear and was identified by (check all that apply):

- 16 1. ☐ Passport  
17 2. ☐ Birth Certificate  
18 3. ☐ Military ID  
19 4. ☐ Other verified government id (e.g. notarized copy of picture and birth certificate with affidavit they belong to  
20 one and the same person)

21 ..and who, upon first being duly sworn and/or affirmed, deposes and says that the foregoing asseveration is true to the best  
22 of his/her knowledge and belief.

23 I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of \_\_\_\_\_ that the foregoing paragraph is  
24 true and correct.

25 WITNESS my hand and official seal.

26  
27  
28 /s/ \_\_\_\_\_ SEAL  
29 Notary Public

30  
31 My Commission Expires On:

1  
2

**14. ENCLOSURE (1): CERTIFIED COPY OF BIRTH or NATURALIZATION CERTIFICATE**





1 **15. ENCLOSURE (2): AFFIDAVIT AS OATH OF ALLEGIANCE PURSUANT TO 8 U.S.C.**  
2 **§1452(b)(2)**

3 An oath is required for those requesting Certificates of Non-citizen national status pursuant to [8 U.S.C. §1452\(b\)\(2\)](#) if they  
4 were born outside the statutorily defined “United States”. The purpose of the oath contained in this enclosure is to satisfy  
5 that requirement, because I was born outside the “United States”, as defined in [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(38\)](#), [8 U.S.C.](#)  
6 [§1101\(a\)\(36\)](#), and 8 CFR §215.1 on land under the exclusive jurisdiction of a state of the Union and not subject to federal  
7 jurisdiction. The “United States” as defined in these statutes and regulations, as I understand it, includes the District of  
8 Columbia, the territories and possessions of the United States, and federal enclaves within the states and excludes land  
9 under the exclusive jurisdiction of states of the Union. See and rebut Enclosure (6) for details on the statutory meaning of  
10 “United States” if you have further questions.

11 The undersigned, pursuant to my truly and sincerely held religious beliefs at Matthew 5:33-37 and James 5:12, is  
12 prohibited from taking oaths in the name of anyone. This constraint is an exercise of the religious rights protected by the  
13 establishment and free exercise clauses of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. See U.S. v. Seeger, [380](#)  
14 [U.S. 184](#), 85 S.Ct. 863 (1965) and 96 Stat. 1211.

15 *“Again you have heard that it was said to those of old, ‘You shall not swear falsely, but*  
16 *shall perform your oaths to the Lord.’ But I say to you, do not swear at all: neither by*  
17 *heaven, for it is God’s throne; nor by the earth, for it is His footstool; nor by Jerusalem,*  
18 *for it is the city of the great King. Nor shall you swear by your head, because you cannot*  
19 *make one hair white or black. But let your ‘Yes’ be ‘Yes,’ and your ‘No,’ ‘No.’ For*  
20 *whatever is more than these is from the evil one.”*  
21 *[Matt. 5:33-37, Bible, NKJV]*

22 *“But above all, my brethren, do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or with any other*  
23 *oath. But let your “Yes” be “Yes,” and your “No,” “No,” lest you fall into judgment.”*  
24 *[James 5:12, Bible, NKJV]*

25 Consequently, I shall provide the oath instead as an “affirmation”, whereby the word “oath” is defined as “affirmation”, in  
26 order to avoid violating God’s Laws above and my sincerely held religious beliefs in violation of the First Amendment.  
27 The U.S. Supreme Court said that taking an oath to a new sovereign is the strongest evidence of removing allegiance to all  
28 previous sovereigns, and I cannot and will not remove my allegiance to my only King, Lawgiver, and Judge, God almighty:

29 *“Yet, it is to be remembered, and that whether in its real origin, or in its artificial state,*  
30 *allegiance, as well as fealty, rests upon lands, and it is due to persons. Not so, with*  
31 *respect to Citizenship, which has arisen from the dissolution of the feudal system and is a*  
32 *substitute for allegiance, corresponding with the new order of things. Allegiance and*  
33 *citizenship, differ, indeed, in almost every characteristic. Citizenship is the effect of*  
34 *compact; allegiance [and oaths of allegiance] is the offspring of power and necessity.*  
35 *Citizenship is a political tie; allegiance is a territorial tenure. Citizenship is the charter*  
36 *of equality; allegiance is a badge of inferiority. Citizenship is constitutional; allegiance*  
37 *is personal. Citizenship is freedom; allegiance is servitude. Citizenship is*  
38 *communicable; allegiance is repulsive. Citizenship may be relinquished; allegiance is*  
39 *perpetual. With such essential differences, the doctrine of allegiance is inapplicable to*  
40 *a system of citizenship; which it can neither serve to controul, nor to elucidate.* And yet,  
41 *even among the nations, in which the law of allegiance is the most firmly established, the*  
42 *law most pertinaciously enforced, there are striking deviations that demonstrate the*  
43 *invincible power of truth, and the homage, which, under every modification of*  
44 *government, must be paid to the inherent rights of man.....The doctrine is, that*  
45 *allegiance cannot be due to two sovereigns; and taking an oath of allegiance to a new,*  
46 *is the strongest evidence of withdrawing allegiance from a previous, sovereign....”*  
47 *[Talbot v. Janson, 3 U.S. 133 (1795); From the syllabus but not the opinion; SOURCE:*  
48 *[http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/search/display.html?terms=choice%20or%20conflict%](http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/search/display.html?terms=choice%20or%20conflict%20and%20law&url=/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0003_0133_ZS.html)*  
49 *[20and%20law&url=/supct/html/historics/USSC\\_CR\\_0003\\_0133\\_ZS.html](http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/search/display.html?terms=choice%20or%20conflict%20and%20law&url=/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0003_0133_ZS.html)]*

Pursuant to the affirmation of allegiance for naturalization, I hereby stated with my right hand raised on federal "territory" before a witness the following:

*"I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty [other than the true and Living God, Jesus Christ], of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law; that I will perform noncombatant service in the armed forces of the United States when required by the law; that I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law; and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God."*

[SOURCE: [http://www.uscis.gov/files/pressrelease/Angel\\_Is\\_10\\_18\\_04.pdf](http://www.uscis.gov/files/pressrelease/Angel_Is_10_18_04.pdf)]

The location of the federal territory where the above affirmation was taken was: \_\_\_\_\_. It is my understanding that this land was federal territory within the "United States" as defined above within the exclusive jurisdiction of the "United States". I did so by going to the nearest post office or federal building and enunciating the above oath.

An "oath" can only lawfully be taken to a "sovereign". Public employees and public officers are NOT the "sovereign".

*"Whatever these Constitutions and laws validly determine to be property, it is the duty of the Federal Government, through the domain of jurisdiction merely Federal, to recognize to be property.*

*"And this principle follows from the structure of the respective Governments, State and Federal, and their reciprocal relations. **They are different agents and trustees of the people of the several States, appointed with different powers and with distinct purposes, but whose acts, within the scope of their respective jurisdictions, are mutually obligatory.**"*

[Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393 (1856)]

*"There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the government of the United States .... In this country sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it: All else is withheld."*

[Julliard v. Greenman: [110 U.S. 421](#), (1884)]

*"Since in common usage the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, statutes employing that term are ordinarily construed to exclude it."*

[U.S. v. Cooper, [312 U.S. 600](#), 604, 61 S.Ct. 742 (1941)]

*"While sovereign powers are delegated to ... the government, sovereignty itself remains with the people.."*

[Yick Wo v. Hopkins, [118 U.S. 356, 370](#) (1886)]

The above affirmation of allegiance is directed at the "state", consisting of the republics of the United States of America and NOT the private federal corporation that is violating its corporate charter, the U.S. Constitution, as described in 28 U.S.C. §3002(15)(A). This is confirmed by the definition of a "national" found in [8 U.S.C. §1101](#)(a)(21):

[TITLE 8 > CHAPTER 12 > SUBCHAPTER I > § 1101](#)  
[§ 1101. Definitions](#)

(21) The term "national" means a person **owing permanent allegiance to a state.**

Black's Law Dictionary defines the term "state" as all the people within these united republics and excludes from the definition anyone working in the government or acting in a representative capacity as a "public official" or federal "employees" pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b). To wit:

***"State. A people permanently occupying a fixed territory bound together by common-law habits and custom into one body politic exercising, through the medium of an organized government, independent sovereignty and control over all persons and things within its boundaries, capable of making war and peace and of entering into international relations with other communities of the globe. United States v. Kusche, D.C.Cal., 56 F.Supp. 201 207, 208. The organization of social life which exercises sovereign power in behalf of the people. Delany v. Moraltis, C.C.A.Md., 136 F.2d. 129, 130. In its largest sense, a "state" is a body politic or a society of men. Beagle v. Motor Vehicle Acc. Indemnification Corp., 44 Misc.2d. 636, 254 N.Y.S.2d. 763, 765. A body of people occupying a definite territory and politically organized under one government. State ex re. Maisano v. Mitchell, 155 Conn. 256, 231 A.2d. 539, 542. A territorial unit with a distinct general body of law. Restatement, Second, Conflicts, §3. Term may refer either to body politic of a nation (e.g. United States) or to an individual government unit of such nation (e.g. California).***

[...]

***The people of a state, in their collective capacity, considered as the party wronged by a criminal deed; the public; as in the title of a cause, "The State vs. A.B."***  
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1407]

In America, the sovereigns are "We the People" and not the government or anyone working in the government. This was confirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, when it said:

*"The ultimate authority...resides in the people alone..."*  
[James Madison, [Federalist Paper No. 46](#)]

*"Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts."*  
[Yick Wo v. Hopkins, [118 U.S. 356](#); 6 S.Ct. 1064 (1886)]

*"The people of this State, as the successors of its former sovereign, are entitled to all the rights which formerly belonged to the King by his prerogative. Through the medium of their Legislature they may exercise all the powers which previous to the Revolution could have been exercised either by the King alone, or by him in conjunction with his Parliament; subject only to those restrictions which have been imposed by the Constitution of this State or of the U.S."*  
[Lansing v. Smith, 21 D. 89, 4 Wendel 9 (1829) (New York)]

**"There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the government of the United States...In this country sovereignty resides in the people, and Congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it. All else is withheld."**  
[Juilliard v. Greenman, [110 U.S. 421](#) (1884)]

*"In Europe, the executive is synonymous with the sovereign power of a state...where it is too commonly acquired by force or fraud, or both...In America, however the case is widely different. Our government is founded upon compact [consent expressed in a written contract called a Constitution or in positive law]. Sovereignty was, and is, in the people."*  
[Glass v. The Sloop Betsy, 3 (U.S.) Dall 6]

"From the differences existing between feudal sovereignties and Government founded on compacts, it necessarily follows that their respective prerogatives must differ. Sovereignty is the right to govern; a nation or State-sovereign is the person or persons in whom that resides. In Europe the sovereignty is generally ascribed to the Prince; here it rests with the people; there, the sovereign actually administers the Government; here, never in a single instance; our Governors are the agents of the people, and at most stand in the same relation to their sovereign, in which regents in Europe stand to their sovereigns. Their Princes have personal powers, dignities, and pre-eminences, our rulers have none but official; nor do they partake in the sovereignty otherwise, or in any other capacity, than as private citizens."

[Chisholm, Ex'r. v. Georgia, [2 Dall. \(U.S.\) 419](#), 1 L.Ed. 454, 457, 471, 472 (1794)]

It would therefore be a gross distortion of the legislative intent of the Constitution, and represent a violation of the Constitution and the above oath for me to swear an oath to any government or man in government or "public servant" or political ruler. To do so would make the servant greater than his master, which is the American people. This was confirmed by the writers of the Federalist Papers, when they said:

"No legislative act contrary to the Constitution can be valid. To deny this would be to affirm that the deputy (agent) is greater than his principal; that the servant is above the master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people; that men, acting by virtue of powers may do not only what their powers do not authorize, but what they forbid...[text omitted] It is not otherwise to be supposed that the Constitution could intend to enable the representatives of the people to substitute their will to that of their constituents. It is far more rational to suppose, that the courts were designed to be an intermediate body between the people and the legislature, in order, among other things, to keep the latter within the limits assigned to their authority. The interpretation of the laws is the proper and peculiar province of the courts. A Constitution is, in fact, and must be regarded by judges, as fundamental law. If there should happen to be an irreconcilable variance between the two, the Constitution is to be preferred to the statute."

[Alexander Hamilton, [Federalist Paper # 78](#)]

An oath towards the government instead of the sovereign people would also glorify and exalt the servant and create a dulocracy, which would violate the Bible:

"Dulocracy. A government where servants and slaves have so much license and privilege that they domineer."

[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 501]

"Servants, be submissive to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the harsh. "

[[1 Peter 2:18](#), Bible, NKJV]

Therefore, the above oath is directed at the citizens of the republics united by and under the Constitution and excludes the following servants as the object of said allegiance:

1. The government.
2. Public officials.
3. Public employees.
4. Laws passed by any of the above which apply only on federal territory and not within a state of the Union where I am situated.

This oath or affirmation toward the "state", which is "We the People" and not their public servants, is also mandated by the Bible, which says that the second of two great commandments is to "love our neighbor". To wit:

*Then one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, perceiving that He had answered them well, asked Him, "Which is the first commandment of all?"*

1 Jesus answered him, "The first of all the commandments is: "Hear, O Israel, the LORD  
2 our God, the LORD is one. And you shall love the LORD your God with all your heart,  
3 with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength. This is the first  
4 commandment. And the second, like it, is this: "You shall love your neighbor as yourself.  
5 There is no other commandment greater than these."

6 So the scribe said to Him, "Well said, Teacher. You have spoken the truth, for there is one  
7 God, and there is no other but He. And to love Him with all the heart, with all the  
8 understanding, with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love one's neighbor as  
9 oneself, is more than all the whole burnt offerings and sacrifices."  
10 [[Mark 12:28-33](#), Bible, NKJV]  
11

12 For the commandments, "You shall not commit adultery," "You shall not murder," "You  
13 shall not steal," "You shall not bear false witness," "You shall not covet," and if there is  
14 any other commandment, are all summed up in this saying, namely, "You shall love your  
15 neighbor as yourself."

16 **Love does no harm to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law.**  
17 [[Romans 13:9-10](#), Bible, NKJV]  
18

19 "For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: 'You shall love your neighbor as  
20 yourself.'"  
21 [[Gal 5:14](#), Bible, NKJV]

22 The sovereign people in the republics who govern themselves and depend on their servants in government or their fellow  
23 men for NOTHING but the right to be left alone and to be protected from harm by others are my neighbors and I am  
24 commanded by my God to love them. You cannot love someone without wanting to come to their aid and protection by  
25 whatever means possible, including serving in the armed forces if necessary. It is biblical and completely consistent with  
26 God's Laws to have allegiance toward my neighbor. However, that allegiance does not extend to:

- 27 1. Putting any king, ruler, or potentate above the importance of God or any of His Laws found in the Holy Bible. The  
28 Bible says it is a SIN to have any king, ruler, or government above either me or above the God who I serve and act as a  
29 fiduciary for:

30 "The wicked shall be turned into hell,  
31 And all the nations that forget God."  
32 [[Psalm 9:17](#), Bible, NKJV]  
33

34 "Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel at Ramah, and said  
35 to him, 'Look, you are old, and your sons do not walk in your ways. **Now make us a king**  
36 **to judge us like all the nations** [and be OVER them]'.  
37

38 "But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, '**Give us a king to judge us.**' So  
39 Samuel prayed to the Lord. **And the Lord said to Samuel, 'Heed the voice of the people**  
40 **in all that they say to you; for they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them.**  
41 According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out  
42 of Egypt, even to this day—**with which they have forsaken Me and served other gods—**  
43 **so they are doing to you also** [government becoming idolatry]."  
44 [[1 Sam. 8:4-8](#), Bible, NKJV]

45 "And when you saw that Nahash king of the Ammonites came against you, you said to  
46 me, '**No, but a king shall reign over us,**' when the Lord your God was your king.



[. . .]

*And all the people said to Samuel, "Pray for your servants to the Lord your God, that we may not die; for **we have added to all our sins the evil of asking a king for ourselves.**"*  
*[1 Sam. 12:12-19, 19, Bible, NKJV]*

2. Having or choosing a domicile within any man-made government or "state" and thereby subjecting myself to any corrupted civil law. Instead, the only laws I consent to be subject to are the criminal laws, because their purpose is to prevent harm to the neighbors who I am commanded to love and protect. I am a "transient foreigner" and a "stateless person" while I am here and I am not allowed to elevate a political ruler above me to govern or rule my life except in fulfillment of the commandment to love my neighbor, which is satisfied through the criminal and not civil laws. See Enclosure (5) for details.
3. Condoning, protecting, aiding, or abetting activities that violate any of God's Laws found in the Bible.

***"He who has [understands and learns] My commandments [laws in the Bible] and keeps them, it is he who loves Me. And he who loves Me will be loved by My Father, and I will love him and manifest Myself to him."***  
*[John 14:21, Bible, NKJV]*

***"And we have known and believed the love that God has for us. **God is love, and he who abides in love [obedience to God's Laws] abides in [and is a FIDUCIARY of] God, and God in him."*****  
*[1 John 4:16, Bible, NKJV]*

*"Now by this we know that we know Him [God], if we **keep** His commandments. He who says, "I know Him," and does not **keep** His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. But whoever keeps His word, truly the love of God is perfected in him. By this we know that we are in Him [His fiduciaries]. He who says he abides in Him [as a fiduciary] ought himself also to walk just as He [Jesus] walked."*  
*[1 John 2:3-6, Bible, NKJV]*

4. Obeying an earthly law that conflicts with any one of God's Laws found in the Holy Bible.
5. Condoning or allowing the government to abuse its taxing powers to redistribute wealth or for "social engineering". This is socialism and it constitutes idolatry that makes government into a false god. See:  
*Socialism: The New American Civil Religion*, Form #05.016  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
6. Subsidizing the activities of political rulers who are oppressing, abusing, or hurting anyone within the "state". The Declaration of Independence says it is my *duty* to throw off such rulers and find new safeguards for my future security.
7. Obeying laws that do not apply to the jurisdiction where I am domiciled or physically present at the time. This would constitute idolatry towards government and the political rulers in courts who are intent on unlawfully enlarging their jurisdiction. It would also violate the first four commandments of the Ten Commandments and therefore compel me to violate my religious beliefs.
8. Voluntarily entering into any contracts or commercial relationships whatsoever with the government, such as Social Security, Medicare, FICA, or income taxation under Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code.

*"Come out from among them [the idolaters who make government a false god]  
And be separate, says the Lord.  
Do not touch what is unclean,  
And I will receive you."*  
*[2 Cor. 6:17, Bible, NKJV]*

---

*And I heard another voice from heaven saying, "Come out of her [the Totalitarian, Socialist Legislative Democracy that is a Corporation instead of a government], my people, lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive of her plagues. For her sins have reached to heaven, and God has remembered her iniquities. Render to her just as she rendered to you, and repay her double according to her works; in the cup which she has*



1                   *mixed, mix double for her. In the measure that she glorified herself and lived luxuriously,*  
2                   *in the same measure give her torment and sorrow; for she says in her heart, 'I sit as*  
3                   *queen, and am no widow, and will not see sorrow.' Therefore her plagues will come in*  
4                   *one day—death and mourning and famine. And she will be utterly burned with fire, for*  
5                   *strong is the Lord God who judges her.*  
6                   *[Rev. 18:4-8, Bible, NKJV]*

- 7   9.   Condoning, subsidizing, or participating in any usurpation of power by political rulers through “words of art” found in  
8       the written law, which are introduced to deceive people into unlawfully enlarging federal jurisdiction and destroying  
9       the separation of powers that is the foundation of the federal Constitution and was put there for the protection of our  
10      liberties. See:

*Meaning of the Words “includes” and “including”,* Form #05.014  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

1 **16. ENCLOSURE (3): AFFIDAVIT OF CITIZENSHIP, DOMICILE, AND TAX STATUS**

2 This attachment defines my citizenship, domicile, and tax status from the date of my birth to the date of my death. It shall  
3 be included automatically in any and every form I submit or have ever submitted to the government, even if not physically  
4 attached. It is also a mandatory part of any civil or criminal discovery that might affect or enforce any tax liability under  
5 the Internal Revenue Code or any state revenue code.

6



## 17. ENCLOSURE (4): DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INDEPENDENCE

This Declaration is addressed to you, individually, personally and collectively; the bankers, the bureaucrats, the agents, the administrators, the corporate entities, the officers, the officials, the commissioners, the politicians, the President, the speakers, the senators, the representatives, the congressman, the governors, the judges and the lawyers of, by, and for the present de facto corporate states of the United States and the de facto corporate United States who have usurped the Peoples' rightful American republican form of Constitutional government mandated by Article 4, section 4 of the Constitution.

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for People to dissolve the forced political bands which have connected them with others, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that I should declare the cause which impel me to separate from their insolvent, pretended government. I therefore must state the usurpation and seditious and tyrannical behavior of the present de facto system in each of the 50 states and the United States.

I have never willingly surrendered any of my constitutional rights up to this time, and yet, through chicanery and deceit and legal sophistry, you have abused my own ignorance of the law to deceive me into involuntary servitude of the present insolvent, corrupt, de facto administrators of the United States or the 50 American states. In the process, you have committed treason of the highest order and have violated your oath:

*"I swear that I will support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic."*

In fact, by operation of excessive greed and love of money, you have allowed the illegal enforcement of the income tax laws by a corrupt judiciary to trample our God-given rights found in the Bill of Rights.

*"The love of money is the root of all evil."  
[1 Tim. 6:10, Bible, NKJV]*

You have allowed tyrant judges, shameless lawyers, and a corrupt IRS to extort, harass, and terrorize law-abiding citizens who do not want to participate in or benefit from the income tax Social(ist) Security franchise. You have allowed idolatrous citizens to abuse their voting power for selfish gain in the process of allowing corrupt politicians to buy votes using money borrowed from their children's inheritance. You have turned this once great country into a debtor nation full of socialists that is hostile to liberty and freedom in every respect. In the process, you have sold our children into slavery to pay off debts accumulated by the sins of their parents in clear violation of 18 U.S.C. §1581. Treason! Thomas Jefferson, our founding father, warned of this evil:

*"Funding I consider as limited, rightfully, to a redemption of the debt within the lives of a majority of the generation contracting it; every generation coming equally, by the laws of the Creator of the world, to the free possession of the earth He made for their subsistence, unincumbered by their predecessors, who, like them, were but tenants for life."*

*[Thomas Jefferson to John Taylor, 1816. ME 15:18]*

*"[The natural right to be free of the debts of a previous generation is] a salutary curb on the spirit of war and indebtment, which, since the modern theory of the perpetuation of debt, has drenched the earth with blood, and crushed its inhabitants under burdens ever accumulating."*

*[Thomas Jefferson to John Wayles Eppes, 1813. ME 13:272]*

*"We believe--or we act as if we believed--that although an individual father cannot alienate the labor of his son, the aggregate body of fathers may alienate the labor of all their sons, of their posterity, in the aggregate, and oblige them to pay for all the enterprises, just or unjust, profitable or ruinous, into which our vices, our passions or our personal interests may lead us. But I trust that this proposition needs only to be looked at by an American to be seen in its true point of view, and that we shall all*

1           *consider ourselves unauthorized to saddle posterity with our debts, and morally bound to*  
2           *pay them ourselves; and consequently within what may be deemed the period of a*  
3           *generation, or the life of the majority."*  
4           *[Thomas Jefferson to John Wayles Eppes, 1813. ME 13:357]*

5           *"It is incumbent on every generation to pay its own debts as it goes. A principle which if*  
6           *acted on would save one-half the wars of the world."*  
7           *[Thomas Jefferson to A. L. C. Destutt de Tracy, 1820. FE 10:175 ]*

8           *To preserve [the] independence [of the people,] we must not let our rulers load us with*  
9           *perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion*  
10           *and servitude. If we run into such debts as that we must be taxed in our meat and in our*  
11           *drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and our amusements, for our*  
12           *callings and our creeds, as the people of England are, our people, like them, must come*  
13           *to labor sixteen hours in the twenty-four, give the earnings of fifteen of these to the*  
14           *government for their debts and daily expenses, and the sixteenth being insufficient to*  
15           *afford us bread, we must live, as they now do, on oatmeal and potatoes, have no time to*  
16           *think, no means of calling the mismanagers to account, but be glad to obtain subsistence*  
17           *by hiring ourselves to rivet their chains on the necks of our fellow-sufferers."*  
18           *[Thomas Jefferson to Samuel Kercheval, 1816. ME 15:39]*

19       You have violated the United States Constitution when creating interstate compacts with other States and foreign states,  
20       which fundamentally changed the form and substance of the Republican form of government to that of a totalitarian  
21       socialist democracy.

22       You have raped and debauched the specie by which governs the mode of the medium of money, and have bankrupted the  
23       Nation as a whole through conspiracy and sedition under treaty. The U.S. Constitution, under [Article I](#), Section 10 of the  
24       U.S. Constitution, which still reads:

25           *"No state shall...coin money, emit bills of credit, make any thing but gold and silver a*  
26           *tender in payment of debts..."*

27       Following the civil war, in 1868, you coerced legislators of the southern states to ratify the [14<sup>th</sup> Amendment](#) at gunpoint,  
28       which subsequently created a new class of U.S. citizenship originally meant only for slaves and which carried with it less  
29       than full constitutional rights. The cite below clarifies this from *Elk v. Wilkins*, [112 U.S. 94](#) (1884):

30           *"By the thirteenth amendment of the constitution slavery was prohibited. The main object*  
31           *of the opening sentence of the fourteenth amendment was to settle the question, upon*  
32           *which there had been a difference of opinion throughout the country and in this court, as*  
33           *to the citizenship of **free negroes**, (Scott v. Sandford, 19 How. 393;) and to put it beyond*  
34           *doubt that all persons, white or black, and whether formerly slaves or not, born or*  
35           *naturalized in the United States, and owing no allegiance to any alien power, should be*  
36           *citizens of the United States and of the state in which they reside. Slaughter-House Cases,*  
37           *16 Wall. 36, 73; Strauder v. West Virginia, [100 U.S. 303](#), 306. "*  
38           *[Elk v. Wilkins, [112 U.S. 94](#) (1884)]*

39       You then deceived everyone born in the nation into falsely believing that they were "U.S. citizens" with inferior rights, and  
40       thereby created a contractual nexus within equity law under Section 4 of the [14<sup>th</sup> Amendment](#) to violate the prohibitions  
41       against direct taxation found in [Article 1](#), Section 2, Clause 3 and [Article 1](#), Section 9, Clause 4 of the U.S. Constitution.  
42       I'm not a freed slave nor do I want to be treated as a second class citizen like the freed slaves were, with no Bill of Rights.  
43       May God's judgment be upon you for trying to use words of art in the law and deceptive government forms containing  
44       LIES to entice me into slavery to my government!

45           *"Single acts of tyranny may be ascribed to the accidental opinion of a day. But a series of*  
46           *oppressions, pursued unalterably through every change of ministers, too plainly proves a*  
47           *deliberate systematic plan of reducing us to slavery".*  
48           *[Thomas Jefferson]*

1 You allowed a corrupt, lame-duck secretary of state, Philander Knox, to fraudulently declare the 16<sup>th</sup> Amendment ratified in  
2 1913. When the Supreme Court would not authorize the direct tax you sought using the 16<sup>th</sup> Amendment, you obfuscated  
3 the tax code to fool law-abiding citizens with “words of art” such as a “trade or business” into thinking that they were liable  
4 for an excise/franchise tax they didn’t owe and are being unlawfully compelled to participate in. The product of this  
5 debauchery has been such a complicated tax code that few truthfully or completely understand today.

6 You subsequently sold your nation into debtor slavery by passing the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, which turned over  
7 control of our nation’s money supply to PRIVATE banking interests which you then refused to audit or oversee. This was  
8 one of the greatest acts of treason this country has ever seen and the judgment of God is upon you for that. In the process,  
9 you lawlessly and illegally delegated powers that you had no constitutional authority to delegate and which violated the  
10 public trust. Thomas Jefferson warned of this evil, when he said:

11 *"If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency*  
12 *first by inflation and then by deflation, the banks and corporations that will grow up*  
13 *around them will deprive the people of all property until their children will wake up*  
14 *homeless on the continent their fathers conquered".*  
15 *[Thomas Jefferson in 1802 in a letter to then Secretary of the Treasury, Albert Gallatin]*

16 In 1929, you allowed the Federal Reserve to manipulate the money supply so low as to create an induced national crisis and  
17 depression situation that then became the nexus to further illegally expand the powers of the national government. In that  
18 same year, on March 9, 1933, you passed the Trading with the Enemy Act to create a state of national emergency. You  
19 used this as an opportunity to plunder all the gold and silver from sovereign citizens and thereby coerce them to accept the  
20 paper money they didn’t want and which the Constitution did not authorize. That state of national emergency, still in  
21 existence today, illegally expanded the powers of the president and the national government under the guise of a  
22 government-induced national emergency. Hitler did the same thing when he passed Article 48, the German Emergency  
23 Power Law:

#### 24 *German Emergency Power Law*

25 *"If the public safety and order in the German Reich are seriously disturbed or*  
26 *endangered, the President of the Reich may...suspend in whole or in part the*  
27 *fundamental rights established [including] inviolability of person, inviolability of*  
28 *domicile, freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of assembly and association,*  
29 *secrecy in communication and inviolability of property."*

30 You then abused this crisis and through demagoguery and lies implemented the socialist security system that, like a cancer,  
31 began eating away at our liberties, one by one in the slow death of a republic. This began the relentless march of the  
32 totalitarian socialist democracy that we now find ourselves in, and which I will have no part of. You lied when you started  
33 the socialist security program by telling us that the number you gave us (spoken of unfavorably in the Bible, in Revelation  
34 13:16-18) would not be used for identification. Now, you have written all kinds of laws that make it nearly impossible to  
35 function in society without that number. Now everyone must violate their Christian beliefs and accept “the mark of the  
36 beast”, in full violation of the First Amendment.

37 *"And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a*  
38 *mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads:*

39 *And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or*  
40 *the number of his name.*

41 *Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is*  
42 *the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six."*  
43 *[[Revelation 13:16-18](#), the Bible]*

44 You then offered up the American States, and therefore the property of all the inhabitants, as collateral to pay the foreign  
45 organization, the International Monetary Fund and bank, in 1945. You authorized the private International Monetary Fund,  
46 via Federal Reserve Banks, to control the issue of our currency, by inflation and deflation and fiat de facto dollars, to the  
47 extent that people today are being deprived of all their property, driven homeless, and controlled by the very same banking



1 cartel that forced our forefathers to this country for refuge, all to pay your bankruptcy-not mine. Their manipulation of the  
2 money supply has introduced a new kind of invisible tax called inflation that amounts to about 3 percent per year, but  
3 which would not occur if you had followed the Constitution and only allowed gold or silver money.

4 You have created, by sophistry, a class of people known as United States citizens that has caused domestic unrest amongst  
5 those of us, who still call ourselves Americans by birth of Blood, Soil, and Crown (Crown meaning God, whence all rights  
6 come). We threw off all Kings over two hundred years ago, only to be enslaved by men of your despicable political ilk.

7 You have secretly entered compacts with foreign states, organizations and powers, which caused the bankrupt status of not  
8 only the 50 American State governments, but put all Americans into involuntary bankruptcy and forced me into slavery,  
9 peonage, and involuntary servitude, under a fraudulent, tyrannical, seditious foreign oligarchy.

10 These foreign powers, operating through the Fund and Bank under Bretton Woods Agreement Act, rule the governments of  
11 the separate States of America and United States, by compacts, pactum and the like, and have erected a dictatorship over  
12 the people of America, who are non-residents to such compact, thereby making it, as it applies to me, nadum pactum.

13 The Secretary of Treasury, as Governor of the Fund and Bank, and not an officer of the United states in the normal sense  
14 that people perceive, controls all aspects of forced pecuniary contributions (taxation). He is also the Receiver and Trustee  
15 in bankruptcy of the United states to collect and pay the Fund and Bank, all at the cost of my freedom under Foreign  
16 Constitutions, agreements, Piquancy, Confederations, Alliances, and under pretenses of emergency, March 9, 1933,  
17 December 16, 1950, March 23, 1970, and August 15, 1971, which you yourselves created.

18 As a bankrupt system, you commit a crime whenever you loan money, for under all principles of law and reason, bankrupt  
19 persons are forbidden to loan money, nor are they allowed to institute criminal mala prohibits actions against the people,  
20 and neither can the foreign principal.

21 Through the unconstitutional operation of our tax laws and the requirement to use Social Security Numbers, you have  
22 conspired to deprive Americans of their privacy by making it virtually impossible to conduct a financial transaction without  
23 incriminating oneself in violation of the Fifth Amendment.

24 The Secretary of Treasury, Secretary of State, and the Attorney General are foreign principals of the Fund and Bank under  
25 agreement. They are forbidden to be paid by the United States, under Title 22 of the United States Code and Bretton  
26 Woods Agreement, thereby holding a colorable law character of public office, while in reality being paid by the Fund and  
27 Bank and holding a Title of Nobility, extracting the wealth (labor) from me and other Americans who profess to be  
28 Nonresidents to this pretended de facto government (the System). Their foreign agents, revenue enforcers, are never  
29 registered so that we might know the true character of the agents when they bear false witness against us when destroying  
30 nonresident Americans through legal plunder.

31 You have forced me, by fraud, indirectly, into foreign contracts by application, i.e., Social Security, in order to live and  
32 exercise my God-given right to exist, in violation of your pretended constitutions. Because you have made it impossible for  
33 me to quit the Social Security Program, you have, in effect, virtually outlawed personal responsibility.

34 You have caused injustice when: taking away the forum of common courts for Americans; controlled the slavery of all  
35 judges making them dependent on your will and obligated to illegally pay an income tax that creates a conflict of interest in  
36 violation of 28 U.S.C. §144 and 18 U.S.C. §208:

37 *"In the general course of human nature, A POWER OVER A MAN'S SUBSISTENCE*  
38 *AMOUNTS TO A POWER OVER HIS WILL."*  
39 *[Alexander Hamilton, The [Federalist, No. 79](#)]*

40 You have overlooked the tyranny, debauchery, and transgressions of these courts and thereby transformed our nation into a  
41 government of men instead of laws. You have failed to correct injustice in the Supreme Court when it denied certiorari for  
42 cases which it clearly should have heard, especially as it relates to taxation and appeal from the circuit courts. The federal  
43 courts have thereby become an arm of the Executive branch, indicated by the Executive gold fringed flag and seal, and not  
44 the arm of independent justice under God's Law of Natural right; have hidden the true justice in the courts at law, as true  
45 despots do, so that a man of average or above average intelligence cannot find the true Courts: replaced the Courts with  
46 international vice-admiralty tribunals because of the compacts with foreign powers, to which, YOU, under the guise of

1 government, have become servant; this then makes the judges nothing more than civil affairs operatives under military  
2 power, and they too are not registered, in violation of the Foreign Registration Laws of this country.

3 You allow the National Conference Commissioners of State Law, being lawyers, judges and the law profession belonging  
4 to a private American Bar Association, exclusively to write the laws for America, then rubber stamp them under the guise  
5 of a representative Congress of the people in direct violation of your pretended constitutions and in violation of your oaths  
6 that you pretend to take.

7 You have assigned the exclusive power to litigate cases before your tribunals to the bar association, to which most of you  
8 belong. This is in violation of the Titles of Nobility Clauses of the pretended constitutions, which deprives me of a jury of  
9 my peers, and counsel of my choice, as no alien American can sit on your juries, for they are all shilling homage juries and  
10 shilling defense attorneys.

11 You have allowed an unconscionable contracting foreign agency (IRS), in concert with the Agency for International  
12 Development, to illegally collect your debt, to which I never agreed and consented, which eats out my substance, all in  
13 order to pay for your greed, in violation of your peonage laws (see [42 U.S.C. §1994](#) and [18 U.S.C. §1581](#)). This same IRS  
14 illegally enforces a Subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code outside the District of Columbia. I.R.C. Subtitle A describes  
15 an indirect excise tax upon a "trade or business", which is a "word of art" that is defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) to mean  
16 a "public office". [4 U.S.C. §72](#) requires that all public offices shall be exercised ONLY in the District of Columbia and not  
17 elsewhere, and there is no statutory authority for public offices elsewhere. Consequently, this tax may not lawfully be  
18 enforced outside the District of Columbia except as expressly provided by Congress. You have looked the other way while  
19 this agency and the federal courts raped and pillaged Americans in states of the Union, because you didn't have the decency  
20 to control your own lust for power and money and the debt that feeds it which must be paid off with extorted tax dollars.

21 You have twisted the definitions of words, as true sophisticators, to suit the means by which you enslave the masses, which  
22 deprives them of the right to: travel, work, farm, own property in allodium, free from taxation, as it should be, and to be let  
23 alone.

24 **"Woe to you lawyers! for you have taken away the keys of knowledge;**  
25 **you did not enter yourselves, and you hindered those who were**  
26 **entering."**

27 *[Luke 11:52 woe unto lawyers who write a law to deliberately be confusing or who use or*  
28 *interpret a law that is written in a confusing way to hide the truth or deceive people for*  
29 *their own selfish gain]*

30 You create Mala Prohibita crimes under foreign pactum, then coerce me to sign instruments containing perjury statements  
31 under this pactum, against my consent, or be fined or jailed, in order to live.

32 You are the biggest whoremongers of the people's liberty by being sophisticators, legalist, and miscreants of the highest  
33 order, in your legal plunder with the foreign organizations and powers that now control us. You have destroyed my  
34 freedoms and unalienable (nontransferable) rights given to men by my God (not your Mammon), by your arbitrary  
35 dominion over me and mine.

36 You have come full circle, and then some, in your absolute despotism when imprisoning and killing innocent Americans for  
37 exercising their God-given rights.

38 At every stage of these tyrannical oppressions I have petitioned for redress, only to be denied any semblance of true Justice;  
39 my repeated petitions have been ignored and then answered by repeated injury. You have destroyed my Peace, Welfare,  
40 Dignity, and Happiness, the damage to which have been higher than mere money can repay. According to Natural Law and  
41 reason, you should be hanged for your seditious behavior, odious actions and contrived emergencies that have never been  
42 legally declared over. You have been deaf to the voice of Justice and of consanguinity. Nor have you been wanting, for  
43 information has been conveyed to you from the American nonresidents of your arbitrary dominion and usurpation. The  
44 time for correction is now!

45 I must, therefore, denounce your way against me and other Americans so I can live under God's Laws which you  
46 proclaimed under P.L. 97-280, not the Noahide law you passed in P.L. 102-14, which destroys this Christian Nation and

1 which shows your pretended constitutions for that which they are. For God, the true Lawgiver (see Isaiah 33:22),  
2 acknowledged in the Preamble of each American State, said, "After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye dwelt, shall  
3 ye not do: and after the doings of the land of Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in the  
4 [government] ordinances. Ye shall do My judgments, and keep Mine ordinances, to walk therein: I am the Lord your God.  
5 Ye shall therefore keep My statutes, and My judgments: which if a man do, shall he live in them: I am the Lord." Leviticus  
6 16:3-5. "Thou shalt make no covenant with them [government] nor with their gods. They shall not dwell in thy land, least  
7 they make thee sin against me; for if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee." Exodus 23:32-33.

8 *"Behold, the nations are as a drop in the bucket, and are counted as the small dust on the*  
9 *scales."*

10 *[Isaiah 40:15, Bible, NKJV]*

11 *"All nations before Him are as nothing, and they are counted by Him less than nothing*  
12 *and worthless."*

13 *[Isaiah 40:17, Bible, NKJV]*

14 *"He brings the princes to nothing; He makes the judges of the earth useless."*

15 *[Isaiah 40:23, Bible, NKJV]*

16 *"Indeed they are all worthless; their works are nothing; their molded images are wind*  
17 *and confusion."*

18 *[Isaiah 41:29, Bible, NKJV]*

19 You have failed to live up to the true intent of Romans 13 of the Holy Bible. As usurping Miscreant Legislators of separate  
20 States of America and the United States you have failed. Your laws do not protect me, for you will not protect me from  
21 your foreign principal (You are no longer controlled by the people who GRANTED your power). Robin v. Hardaway, 1  
22 Jefferson 109 (1772) states:

23 *"A legislature must not obstruct our obedience to Him from whose punishment they*  
24 *cannot protect us."*

25 Therefore, we, as the people of America, who gave you the power you now enjoy, must revoke all your granted power, and  
26 reform or destroy the organization that has no place in America because of the evil and injustice you have institutionalized  
27 and fostered in the name of vanity, idolatry, greed and lust for power.

28 Upon finding of your fraud, I now declare total separation, retroactively to the very beginning of my life as it should have  
29 been, from your arbitrary dominion and seditious actions. My liberties are in imminent danger; they are imperative to my  
30 Natural Rights, Duties, Privileges, Immunities, Life, and Property, and that of my posterity. I declare my separate and  
31 equal and sovereign station, and exercise my right and duty to throw off and abolish the insolvent de facto, fraudulent,  
32 seditious state and United States from my life, for you can no longer truthfully call yourselves "government". When it  
33 comes to money, "mafia" has become a more appropriate term to describe your behavior.

34 *"But money demands of you the highest virtues, if you wish to make it or to keep it.*  
35 *Men who have no courage, pride, or self-esteem, men who have no moral sense of their*  
36 *right to their money and are not willing to defend it as they defend their life, men who*  
37 *apologize for being rich--will not remain rich for long. They are the natural bait for*  
38 *the swarms of looters that stay under rocks for centuries, but come crawling out at the*  
39 *first smell of a man who begs to be forgiven for the guilt of owning wealth. They will*  
40 *hasten to relieve him of the guilt--and of his life, as he deserves.*

41 *"Then you will see the rise of the double standard--the men who live by force [the*  
42 *government and the IRS and scumbag lawyers], yet count on those*  
43 *who live by trade to create the value of their looted money--the men who are the*  
44 *hitchhikers of virtue. In a moral society, these are the criminals,*  
45 *and the statutes are written to protect you against them. But*

1 *when a society establishes criminals-by-right and looters-by-law-*  
2 *men who use force to seize the wealth of DISARMED victims--*  
3 *then money becomes its creators' avenger. Such looters [IRS] believe it*  
4 *safe to rob defenseless [made ignorant of the law by sneaky lawyers and politicians*  
5 *who run the public education system, in this case] men, once they've passed a law to*  
6 *disarm them. But their loot becomes the magnet for other looters, who get it from them*  
7 *as they got it. Then the race goes, not to the ablest at production, but to those most*  
8 *ruthless at brutality. When force is the standard, the murderer wins*  
9 *over the pickpocket. And then that society vanishes, in a spread*  
10 *of ruins and slaughter.*

11 *"Do you wish to know whether that day is coming? Watch money. Money is the*  
12 *barometer of a society's virtue. When you see that trading is done, not by*  
13 *consent, but by compulsion--when you see that in order to produce, you need to obtain*  
14 *permission from men who produce nothing--when you see that money is flowing to*  
15 *those who deal, not in goods, but in favors--when you see that men get richer by graft*  
16 *and by pull than by work, and your laws don't protect you against them, but protect*  
17 *them against you--when you see corruption being rewarded and honesty becoming a*  
18 *self-sacrifice--you may know that your society is doomed. Money is so noble a medium*  
19 *that it does not compete with guns and it does not make terms with brutality. It will not*  
20 *permit a country to survive as half-property, half-loot.*

21 *"Whenever destroyers [the [IRS](#), the [Federal Reserve](#), and the [Dept of Justice](#)] appear*  
22 *among men, they start by destroying money, for **money is men's protection***  
23 ***and the base of a moral existence.** Destroyers seize gold and leave to its*  
24 *owners a counterfeit pile of paper. This kills all objective standards and delivers men*  
25 *into the arbitrary power of an arbitrary setter of values. Gold was an objective value,*  
26 *an equivalent of wealth produced. Paper is a mortgage on wealth that does not exist,*  
27 *backed by a gun aimed at those who are expected to produce it. **Paper is a check***  
28 ***drawn by legal looters upon an account which is not theirs:***  
29 ***upon the virtue of the victims.** Watch for the day when it becomes, marked:*  
30 *'Account overdrawn.'*

31 *"When you have made evil [government looting through fraud, obfuscation and*  
32 *complication of the tax laws, and through vote for sugar-daddies who promise loot] the*  
33 *means of survival, do not expect men to remain good. Do not expect them to stay moral*  
34 *and lose their lives for the purpose of becoming the fodder of the immoral. Do not*  
35 *expect them to produce, when production is punished and looting rewarded. Do not*  
36 *ask, 'Who is destroying the world?' You are."*  
37 *[Ayn Rand, Atlas Shrugged]*

38 It is stated in the Declaration of Independence:

39 *"That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men.... that whenever any*  
40 *form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter*  
41 *or abolish it..."*

42 It is recognized in every American State Preamble, that God gave me my natural Rights, NOT you. We are to transmit the  
43 same unimpaired to succeeding generations. YOU HAVE FAILED! For as that great principled Man, Patrick Henry  
44 Stated on June 5, 1788, and I ask all of You:

1           *"for where, Sir[s] is the responsibility? The yeas and nays will show you nothing, unless*  
2           *they be fools as well as knaves: For after having wickedly trampled on the rights of the*  
3           *people, they would act as fools indeed, were they [you] to publish and divulge [your]*  
4           *iniquity, when they [you] have it equally in their [your] power to suppress and conceal*  
5           *it."*

6           *"...Where is the responsibility-that leading principle in the British government? In that*  
7           *government a punishment, certain and inevitable, is provided: But in this, there is no real*  
8           *actual punishment for the grossest maladministration. They [you] may go without*  
9           *punishment, though they [and now you] commit the most outrageous violations on our*  
10           *immunities. That paper may tell me they [you] will be punished. I ask, by what law?*  
11           *They[you] must make the law -for there is no existing law to do it. What--will they [you]*  
12           *make a law to punish themselves [you haven't yet]? This, sir, is my great objection to the*  
13           *constitution, that there is no true responsibility--and that the preservation of our liberty*  
14           *depends on the single chance of men being virtuous enough to make laws to punish*  
15           *themselves,"*

16           *[Patrick Henry, Stated on June 5, 1788]*

17       You, the Lawmakers, the lawyers, and the judges, by your actions have long relinquished your trust and last ounce of  
18       virtue. Therefore, I, an American, declare I will regain my Sovereign status in my native country of America, under God's  
19       Law, and will keep it Independent from the United Nations World Order, or any other unlawful control. I will protect  
20       myself from your legal plunder and looting with whatever means necessary.

21           *"When governments fear the people there is freedom. When the people fear governments*  
22           *there is slavery."*

23           *[Thomas Jefferson]*

24       History has shown how tyrants have been punished. May He have Mercy on your souls, for the Americans dispensing your  
25       punishment will not.

26       This Sovereign American is servant only to my Lord, the Supreme Being, and not at the mercy of your pagan god, Baal.

27       The Declaration of Independence states the following:

28           *"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are*  
29           *endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life,*  
30           *liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are*  
31           *instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."*

32           *[Thomas Jefferson]*

33       Over the years, the United States government has wantonly and ever more blatantly disregarded the constitutional  
34       constraints on its power and usurped the power of the states in violation of the [Tenth Amendment](#) and has thus exceeded  
35       the authority delegated to it by the sovereign people in the Constitution. Most of the powers it exercises today are  
36       completely without legal authority or justification. Through its criminal agents in a corrupt federal judiciary, it has abused  
37       sovereign immunity and official immunity in order to make areas under its control within the "federal zone" into havens for  
38       financial terrorists at the IRS, who recklessly disregard my sacred property and constitutional rights for which the  
39       government was instituted to protect from the beginning. The only lawfully sanctioned protector of my rights has thus  
40       become its worst abuser and violator. In this regard, the "D.C." in the term "Washington, D.C." has come to mean for me  
41       "District of Criminals". Henceforth, the U.S. government no longer has my consent to exercise any authority beyond that  
42       needed to protect my life, liberty, property, and my Constitutional rights. Because I had a natural right to protect these God  
43       given endowments before there ever was a government, the exercise of these sovereign stewardship functions over my own  
44       person and property through participation in civil functions such as serving on jury duty, voting, and serving in the military,  
45       cannot and should not be turned into taxable or statutory privileges, and to do so is unconscionable treason. Henceforth,  
46       any jurisdiction the U.S. government might attempt to assert over this sovereign American beyond that needed by me to  
47       participate in the above civil functions is, by implication of the words of Thomas Jefferson in the [Declaration of](#)  
48       [Independence](#), nonconsensual and unjust, and in conflict with God's Laws and will be treated as the naked trespasses of a  
49       criminal terrorist organization known as the U.S. government.

---

***Declaration of Intention to Change Domicile/Citizenship, Divorce the U.S., and Criminal Complaint***

***17-8***

*Enclosure (4): Declaration of Personal Independence*

*Form 10.001, Rev. 02-25-2012*

- 1 There are many other corruptions of our de jure republic too numerous to list here which give rise to this firm decision of  
2 mine. You may read about these numerous usurpations below:

Highlights of American Legal and Political History CD, Form #11.202  
<http://sedm.org/ItemInfo/Disks/HOALPH/HOALPH.htm>



1 **18. ENCLOSURE (5): COPY OF LAST U.S. PASSPORT**

2 This enclosure is optional.

3



1 **19. ENCLOSURE (6): WHY YOU ARE A “NATIONAL”, “STATE NATIONAL”, AND**  
2 **CONSTITUTIONAL BUT NOT STATUTORY CITIZEN**

3 This memorandum of law may also be downloaded from the following address:

*Why You are a “national”, “state national”, and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen*, Form #05.006  
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>



1    **20. ENCLOSURE (7): USA PASSPORT APPLICATION ATTACHMENT**

2    This section modifies and is included by reference as an attachment to any and all PAST USA passport applications, Form  
3    DS-11 or DS-82, that you may now have on file and also serves as a mandatory attachment to any FUTURE USA passport  
4    applications that you may receive from me. These forms are false, fraudulent, and perjurious WITHOUT this attachment  
5    included in the records of all agencies who maintain such information.