

# JURISDICTION RESTORED



RECLAIMING THE SOVEREIGNTY  
OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



Jurisdiction Restored:

Reclaiming the  
Sovereignty of  
the American People



This binder was published on Sunday, November 30th, 2025.

Published in Auburn, Michigan, USA

To download a copy of this binder, please visit:  
**[www.ConstitutionalLawCoalition.com](http://www.ConstitutionalLawCoalition.com)**

---

*"I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."*

Together, we build unshakable strength; apart, we crumble under the weight of our own discord. Unity is our greatest shield, division our greatest threat.

UNITED WE STAND, DIVIDED WE FALL!

**God Bless America**





# Table of Contents

## Preface

Why this manual was written ..... 1

A warning and a promise: This information will challenge your beliefs but free your mind ..... 2

Explanation of lawful vs. legal, de jure vs. de facto ..... 3

---

## PART I: THE GREAT DECEPTION

Chapter 1: The Foundations of a Republic .....7

Chapter 2: The Civil War and Its Aftermath .....9

Chapter 3: The Act of 1871 — Birth of the Corporation .....13

Section: The Organic Constitution (1787) vs. the Corporate Constitution (Post-1871) .....17

Chapter 4: The 14th Amendment — Citizen Redefined .....20

---

## PART II: THE FALSE JURISDICTION — LAND OF THE SEA

The Web of Control — Statutory Law and Maritime Admiralty Jurisdiction .....25

Chapter 5: Maritime Admiralty Law in America .....30

The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) — The Hidden Framework of Commercial Control .....35

Chapter 6: The STRAWMAN: Your Legal Fiction .....41

Chapter 7: The Role of the BAR and Foreign Agent .....46

Summary of Interaction — From Roadside Encounter to Commercial Court .....50

---

## PART III: THE TRUE JURISDICTION — LAND OF THE LIVING

Chapter 8: Understanding Lawful Jurisdiction .....56

Chapter 9: Local Governance and Assemblies .....62

---

## **PART IV: TOOLS, REMEDIES, AND RESOURCES**

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Chapter 10: Key Supreme Court Cases and Precedents</b>   | <b>67</b> |
| <b>Chapter 11: Sample Affidavits and Legal Notices</b>      | <b>72</b> |
| <b>Chapter 12: Glossary of Terms</b>                        | <b>77</b> |
| <b>Chapter 13: Suggested Reading and Study Materials</b>    | <b>81</b> |
| 1. The Declaration of Independence (1776)                   | 86        |
| 2. The Articles of Confederation (1781)                     | 108       |
| 3. The Constitution for the united States of America (1787) | 112       |
| 4. The Bill of Rights (1791)                                | 116       |
| 5. The Reconstruction Acts (1867–1868)                      | 125       |
| 6. The District of Columbia Organic Act (1871)              | 129       |
| 7. The 14th Amendment (1868)                                | 136       |
| 8. The Trading with the Enemy Act (1917)                    | 137       |
| 9. House Joint Resolution 192 (1933)                        | 138       |
| 10. Key Supreme Court Case Excerpts                         | 140       |

---

## **Appendices**

- Reproduction of key historical documents
- Diagrams of jurisdictional structures (land vs. sea)
- Timeline from 1776 to present outlining major jurisdictional changes



## Why This Manual Was Written

I did not set out to write this manual for fame, fortune, or academic recognition. I am writing it because the truth has been hidden from the American people for far too long—and I, like many of you, have lived under a system that was never meant to be ours. We were born into a world that appeared free, but we were never taught the difference between *legal fiction* and *lawful authority*, between *citizen* and *sovereign*, or between *rights* and *privileges*. We've been deceived—cleverly, persistently—into surrendering our God-given sovereignty to a foreign-controlled corporate structure masquerading as our government.

This manual was not written as theory. It is a product of long nights, deep research, broken illusions, and divine revelation. It is for every man and woman who has ever felt the invisible chains of control without understanding who forged them—or why. It is for those who have asked why our courts no longer deliver justice, why our children are burdened by debt and indoctrination, and why we're taxed, regulated, and policed as if we were subjects, not free people.

Most importantly, this manual is written out of love—for the American people, for the land we call home, and for future generations who deserve to inherit liberty, not servitude. It is a guide to understanding what happened to our lawful Republic, how the corporate UNITED STATES came to replace our de jure government, and how we, as living and breathing men and women, can reclaim our rightful jurisdiction.

I believe the truth sets us free. But the truth also demands action. If you're holding this manual in your hands, or reading it with awakened eyes, then the responsibility now rests with you. May this be your beginning—not just of understanding, but of reclaiming. Reclaiming your status. Reclaiming your land. Reclaiming your Reign.

Let the record show: *We the People never consented to our enslavement. And now, we rise.*

The information in this manual consists mostly of what we were never taught in school—and what the deep state does not want us to know or learn—because learning this information will reveal the truth about how they have enslaved us for over 150 years. Gaining this knowledge will help awaken those who have eyes to see and ears to hear, those who have a deep hunger and thirst to know the unadulterated truth about what really took place in our country from 1861 to 1871.

## **A warning and a promise: This information will challenge your beliefs but free your mind**

Before you turn another page, understand this: what you are about to read will challenge the very foundations of what you've been taught to believe about America, government, law, freedom, and even your own identity. This manual is not for the faint of heart. It is for the courageous—for those willing to confront uncomfortable truths, tear down deeply rooted illusions, and take full responsibility for their own freedom.

You may find yourself angry. You may feel betrayed. That is expected. You may question everything—your education, your citizenship, your relationship to the law, and even the legitimacy of the institutions you've trusted all your life. That too is part of the journey. This is not a soft truth, nor a watered-down version of history. It is the raw, unfiltered reality of how the American Republic was overtaken—not by guns or foreign armies, but by “legal” slight-of-hand, commercial contracts, and silent jurisdictional conversions.

Yet with that admonition comes a promise.

If you persist—If you stay the course—if you read with discernment, verify the claims, and open your heart to Heaven's influence—you will begin to see. The fog will clear. The system that bewildered and enthralled you heretofore will begin to clarify. And most importantly, you will remember who you are: a living, breathing man or woman, created by the Creator, Elohim, endowed with unalienable rights, and not subject to the control of any man-made corporation.

The truth, once it enters, cannot be undone. It may bring discomfort—but it will also bring freedom. And that freedom is worth everything.

This is your warning. This is your promise.

Read on—awake, aware, and armed with the truth.

## Explanation of lawful vs. legal, de jure vs. de facto

One of the most powerful tools used to deceive and enslave the American people has been the subtle manipulation of language—especially legal language. Words you think you understand—like “citizen,” “law,” “government,” and “person”—have been redefined within legal dictionaries and used in courtrooms in ways that differ drastically from their plain meaning in everyday life.

To understand how jurisdiction was quietly changed beneath our feet, we must first understand two essential distinctions: **lawful vs. legal** and **de jure vs. de facto**. These terms form the cornerstone of the deception—and also the key to your remedy.

---

### Lawful vs. Legal

**Lawful** and **legal** are not synonymous, though most people use them interchangeably. The difference lies in the **source of authority** and **moral foundation** behind each.

#### Lawful

- *Derived from Natural Law, Common Law, and the Constitution.*
- Reflects what is **right, just, and morally sound**.
- Operates under the **law of the land** (Lex Terrae), which is tied to unalienable rights granted by the Creator.
- Lawful acts do **no harm, no fraud, and no trespass**.
- Enforced through **due process, jury trials, and public accountability**.
- Example: It is **lawful** for a man to travel freely without permission (license), so long as he harms no one.

**Lawful** refers to actions and principles rooted in Natural Law, Common Law, and the Constitution—standards that arise from what is right, just, and morally sound, not merely what is written in statutes. It reflects the ancient doctrine of *Lex Terrae*, the law of the land, which recognizes the unalienable rights bestowed by the Creator and holds that no legitimate authority may infringe upon them. Under this framework, lawful conduct is measured by the absence of harm, fraud, or trespass, and its enforcement rests on due process, trial by jury, and the transparency of public accountability. A lawful act, therefore, aligns with inherent rights rather than governmental privileges; for example, it is lawful for a man to travel freely without needing permission or a license, provided he causes no injury to another.

## Legal

- *Derived from statutes, codes, rules, regulations, and ordinances created by corporate governments.*
- Reflects what is **permitted by authority**, not necessarily what is morally right.
- Operates under **Maritime Admiralty Law**, the law of the sea (Lex Mercatoria).
- Created to regulate **commerce, contracts, and corporate entities**.
- Often enforced by administrative courts **without a jury**, and based on **presumed consent**.
- Example: It is **legal** for a corporation to fine someone for traveling without a driver's license—even *though no harm was done*.

**Legal** refers to rules, statutes, codes, and regulations created by corporate governments and administrative bodies, defining what is *permitted* by authority rather than what is inherently just or morally aligned with Natural Law. This system operates primarily under Maritime Admiralty principles—*Lex Mercatoria*, the law of the sea—designed to govern commerce, contracts, and the activities of corporate entities rather than the unalienable rights of living men and women. Legal frameworks often function through administrative courts that presume consent, lack jury oversight, and prioritize regulatory compliance over true due process. As a result, something may be “legal” while simultaneously violating Natural Law; for example, it is legal for a corporation or state agency to fine an individual for traveling without a driver's license, even when no harm, injury, damage, or trespass has occurred.

### In essence:

- “Lawful” is rooted in your status as a living man or woman with unalienable rights.
- “Legal” is tied to your status as a corporate fiction or “person” subject to statutes.

As Supreme Court Justice John Marshall once observed, *“The power to create a corporation is the power to control it.”* And if you unknowingly act in the role of a corporate person, you place yourself under that control—**under legal, not lawful, authority**.

---

## De Jure vs. De Facto

Another critical distinction is between **de jure** (by right, by law) and **de facto** (by fact, by force or assumption). This concept reveals how the original Republic was replaced—not lawfully, but functionally—by a corporate overlay posing as legitimate government.

### De Jure (Day-YOOR-ay)

- Latin for “**by right**” or “**lawful**.”
- Refers to governments or institutions that exist **legitimately, constitutionally**, and with **rightful authority**.
- A **de jure government** is grounded in the will of the People and subject to the rule of law (i.e., the Constitution).
- It respects natural rights, common law, and due process.

**De Jure** (*day-YOOR-ay*), meaning “by right” or “lawful,” refers to a government or institution that exists with legitimate, constitutional, and rightful authority, grounded in the will and consent of the People rather than imposed through force, fraud, or corporate statutes. A de jure government operates strictly under the rule of law—specifically the Constitution—and its purpose is to protect Natural Rights, uphold Common Law, and ensure due process for every living man and woman. Its power is limited, its actions accountable, and its legitimacy derived from adherence to lawful principles rather than administrative convenience or commercial governance.

### De Facto (Day-FAK-toh)

- Latin for “**in fact**” or “in practice.”
- Refers to governments or institutions that **function in power**, but **without lawful authority**.
- A **de facto government** is often imposed by **force, fraud, or emergency powers**.
- It may *look* official, have buildings, seals, and officers—but it **does not derive its legitimacy from the People or the Constitution**.

**De Facto** (*day-FAK-toh*), meaning “in fact” or “in practice,” refers to a government or institution that operates with real power but without lawful or constitutional authority, often arising through force, deception, corporate restructuring, or the invocation of emergency powers. Such a regime may possess all the outward signs of legitimacy—official buildings, seals, uniforms, agencies, and administrative courts—yet it does not derive its authority from the People nor from the constitutional framework that defines a lawful government. Instead, a de facto system functions by presuming consent, enforcing statutes as if they were supreme law, and maintaining power through commercial

regulations rather than Natural Law, Common Law, or true due process.

Following the Civil War, the original de jure republic (created in 1787) was placed into **dormancy** through a series of legislative, military, and corporate maneuvers—including the 14th Amendment and the Act of 1871. In its place rose a **de facto corporate entity** known as the **UNITED STATES**—not the organic united States of America, but a **municipal corporation headquartered in Washington, D.C.**, operating under international commercial law.

This corporation created a **parallel legal system**, replacing common law with admiralty law, replacing constitutional officers with corporate employees, and redefining the People as "citizens" (subjects) of the federal entity. The Constitution was not repealed, but it was **subverted**, and its jurisdictional boundaries were bypassed by administrative "legal" structures—*all under color of law*.

---

## Conclusion: Why This Matters

Understanding these distinctions is not just legal theory—it is **the heart of the problem**. Every unlawful tax, every unjust court ruling, every abuse of government power stems from the **presumption** that you are a **legal fiction** under the authority of a **de facto corporate system**.

- When you identify as a **person**, you operate in the **legal** world.
- When you reclaim your status as a **living man or woman**, you operate in the **lawful** world.
- When you submit to a **de facto regime**, you forfeit your rights in exchange for government privileges.
- When you stand in the **de jure republic**, you reclaim your sovereignty and your place under Natural Law.

The rest of this manual is dedicated to exposing how this jurisdictional switch was accomplished, how it affects you today, and how to lawfully return to your rightful standing. The moment you understand this, you begin the process of **jurisdictional reclamation**.

And the journey back to freedom begins.

---

# **PART I: THE GREAT DECEPTION**

## **Chapter 1: The Foundations of a Republic**

The United States of America, as originally conceived and constructed, was never intended to be a democracy nor a corporate state. It was established as a constitutional republic—a government rooted in law, bound by a written Constitution, and deriving its authority from the sovereignty of the people. The ratification of the U.S. Constitution in 1787 did not merely unify the colonies into a more cohesive national body; it codified the divine and natural rights of men into a structure of lawful self-governance, constrained by enumerated powers and safeguarded by checks and balances. Understanding the original framework of this republic is the first and most vital step to comprehending the legal deceptions that would later erode and replace it.

### **The Original Constitution (1787) and the Lawful Government It Created**

The Constitution of 1787 was the culmination of decades of philosophical and practical resistance to tyranny. It was not a product of monarchy or elite aristocracy, but rather a written compact among sovereign states—each with its own government, its own militia, and its own laws. These states, through their appointed delegates, came together not to dissolve their individuality, but to form “a more perfect Union.” This Union was to be a federal government with strictly limited and delegated powers, operating only within the jurisdictions expressly granted to it by the Constitution.

The Preamble itself reveals the intent: “We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity...” The government was to serve the People—not rule them. It was ordained and established by them. And more importantly, the Constitution that followed was written not to grant rights, but to restrict government.

The federal government was divided into three branches—Legislative (Article I), Executive (Article II), and Judicial (Article III)—each with clearly defined boundaries. The Tenth Amendment clarified that any power not expressly delegated to the United States was reserved to the States respectively, or to the People. This created a dual-sovereignty structure whereby the federal government had only limited authority, and the states retained broad internal control over their own affairs. This structure affirmed that the People were the original source of all political power, and that their liberties were unalienable—neither granted by government nor subject to its whim.

### **Sovereignty of the People and the States**

The doctrine of sovereignty—supreme power or authority—was embedded into the fabric of the American founding. Unlike monarchies, where sovereignty rested in the king, the American Revolution established a radically different concept: that sovereignty rested in the People themselves. As stated in the Declaration of Independence, “Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.” This means that all government power is derivative—not original. It must be granted by the People, and it must serve their rights and interests.

Each state entered the Union as a sovereign entity. They did not surrender their sovereignty to the federal government but joined as equal partners in a confederated republic. The Articles of Confederation, which preceded the Constitution, had already affirmed in Article II that “Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence.” Though the Constitution created a stronger central government, it never abolished this foundational principle. The Supreme Court has repeatedly affirmed that the states retain sovereignty in all matters not expressly transferred to the federal government (see *Texas v. White*, 74 U.S. 700 (1869); *Lane County v. Oregon*, 74 U.S. 71 (1869)).

State sovereignty meant that each state had the lawful authority to govern the internal affairs of its people, including laws related to commerce, contracts, marriage, crime, and property. More importantly, it meant that the People were not “citizens of the United States” in the corporate sense we know today, but *state nationals*—Citizens of their respective States, living under the jurisdiction of common law and enjoying their rights secured by both their state constitutions and the federal Constitution.

## **Common Law: The Law of the Land and of Natural Rights**

At the heart of the American Republic was the doctrine of *Common Law*—a legal system based on the customs, traditions, and judicial decisions that protected natural rights. Common law was brought to America from England, but it evolved into a uniquely American doctrine rooted in biblical morality, reason, and natural justice. It recognized man as a creation of God, endowed with unalienable rights such as life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness. These rights existed independent of government and could not be abridged without due process of law.

Article III of the Constitution references “law and equity,” and the Seventh Amendment preserves the right to trial by jury in “suits at common law.” This is significant. It means the Founders understood that *common law* was distinct from equity law (fairness) and from admiralty/maritime law (commercial/trade). Common law was the default jurisdiction for living men and women, where injuries required a harmed party, and justice was delivered by a jury of peers—not administrative judges or corporate statutes.

Under common law, the People were sovereign individuals. There were only three requirements: do no harm, do not breach contract, and do not infringe upon another’s rights. Everything else was governed by voluntary association and agreement. Unlike statutory law, which is based on regulations, codes, and enforcement by state agents, common law demanded accountability based on substance, not form. There were no victimless crimes. Law was not an instrument of control, but a shield for liberty.

When the Constitution referenced the “law of the land,” it was referring to this tradition. Article VI, known as the Supremacy Clause, states: “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof... shall be the supreme Law of the Land.” Importantly, laws not made “in Pursuance thereof” are *not* supreme. They are void. This principle has been affirmed in numerous cases, such as *Norton v. Shelby County*, 118 U.S. 425 (1886): “An unconstitutional act is not law... it is, in legal contemplation, as inoperative as though it had never been passed.”

In conclusion, the foundations of the American Republic were divinely inspired, lawfully grounded, and carefully constructed to safeguard the natural rights of living men and women through limited government, sovereign states, and the enduring principles of common law. The Constitution was never meant to be a living document, evolving at the whims of judges and legislatures. It was a compact, a contract, a *trust*—binding government to its servant role and empowering the People to live in liberty, not under tyranny. To reclaim this jurisdiction, we must first understand what was lost. And it all began with what was once rightfully ours.

---

## Chapter 2: The Civil War and Its Aftermath — The Seeds of Corporate Subjugation

The Civil War is remembered by most Americans as a tragic but necessary conflict over slavery and the preservation of the Union. However, few realize that it also served as the **legal and constitutional turning point** that laid the foundation for America's transformation from a constitutional republic to a centralized corporate empire. The period between 1861 and 1871 represents a crucial decade in which the original, de jure government of the People was suspended under **emergency war powers**, never fully restored, and ultimately replaced with a de facto corporate structure hidden in plain sight.

Understanding this transition is essential, not just for historical clarity, but for reclaiming our rightful status and jurisdiction as sovereign men and women under the law of the land. It all begins with **President Abraham Lincoln**, his invocation of emergency authority, and the permanent changes that followed under the guise of reconstruction and reunification.

---

### I. Lincoln's Emergency Powers and the Beginning of Martial Rule

When Abraham Lincoln assumed office in 1861, seven Southern states had already declared secession from the Union. Although the Constitution did not explicitly grant the federal government authority to prevent such secession, Lincoln took extraordinary actions to preserve the Union. He did so by invoking **emergency powers**—extra-constitutional, unilateral measures that would ultimately suspend many constitutional protections and introduce a new form of governance: **martial rule**.

**Martial law** is not law at all—it is the absence of civil law and the imposition of military authority over civilian populations. In the early days of the war, Lincoln:

- **Suspended habeas corpus**, allowing indefinite detention without charge.
- **Shut down newspapers** and arrested journalists.
- **Instituted military tribunals** to try civilians.

- **Increased the size and scope of the federal military** without Congressional approval.

In essence, the constitutional government of the republic was placed into **dormancy** and replaced with an emergency war-time structure governed by executive decree. These actions were not merely temporary war measures. They laid the foundation for **perpetual emergency powers**, which would be invoked again and again throughout American history to bypass constitutional limits.

Lincoln's actions may have preserved the Union geographically, but they shattered it **jurisdictionally**. The original, decentralized structure of state sovereignty was overridden by **centralized federal authority**, justified by war and emergency.

---

## II. The Introduction of Military Districts and the Reconstruction Acts

Following the official end of the Civil War in 1865, the Southern states were left devastated, not just economically, but also in terms of governance. Rather than being welcomed back into the Union under their original state constitutions, they were treated as **conquered territories**. This was a critical jurisdictional shift.

In 1867, Congress passed the **Reconstruction Acts**, a series of laws that:

- Divided the South into **five military districts**.
- Placed each district under the command of a Union general.
- Required Southern states to rewrite their constitutions under federal supervision.
- Required ratification of the **14th Amendment** as a condition of re-admittance.

This military occupation was not simply punitive—it was **transformative**. It redefined the relationship between the federal government and the states, placing the former in a position of ultimate authority and reducing the states to **federal administrative subdivisions**.

It also provided a testing ground for new legal doctrines that would later be applied nationwide. The military districts operated under **military law**, not constitutional law. Civilians were tried in **military tribunals**, not Article III courts. Governors and legislators were installed or removed by military order. In short, the Reconstruction Acts **replaced civil government with military occupation**, and that military authority never truly ended—it simply evolved.

The Southern states, upon re-entry into the Union, were no longer operating as sovereign republics under the original Constitution. They were **reconstructed political entities**, remade in the image of federal authority, and subject to a new commercial code-based jurisdiction that would soon be extended to the rest of the country.

---

### III. The Corporate Foundation Begins to Form

With the republic subdued, the states weakened, and emergency powers entrenched, the stage was set for the most profound transformation of all: the **conversion of the constitutional government into a corporate entity**. This transformation would not be completed until **1871**, but its roots began in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War.

There are several key elements of this transformation:

#### 1. The 14th Amendment – Corporate Citizenship

Passed in 1868, the **14th Amendment** created a new class of citizenship: **U.S. citizens**. Prior to this, Americans were **state nationals**, citizens of their respective states, and only secondarily part of the Union. The new 14th Amendment **redefined citizenship**, making all persons born or naturalized in the U.S. directly subject to federal authority.

However, this new citizenship was not based on the **organic Constitution**—it was based on a **corporate, commercial model**. The 14th Amendment did not secure unalienable rights. It granted **civil rights**—privileges bestowed by the state and subject to its revocation.

The term “**person**” used in the 14th Amendment refers not to a living man or woman, but to a **legal fiction**, a **commercial entity**. This marked the official separation of the **natural person** (under God and common law) from the **legal person** (under government and statutory law).

#### 2. Federal Incorporation – The Act of 1871 (Preview)

By 1871, the District of Columbia was officially reorganized under the **District of Columbia Organic Act**, creating a **municipal corporate government**. This was not merely an administrative change—it was the official **corporatization of the United States Government**. From that point forward, “UNITED STATES” would refer not to the organic union of states, but to a **for-profit corporate entity** operating under Roman Civil Law and international commercial codes.

This corporation could issue debt, sign contracts, sue and be sued, and regulate its property—and you. And it did so through the new 14th Amendment “citizens,” who had unwittingly become **assets** of the corporate state through birth registration, social security enrollment, and licensing.

#### 3. Birth of Administrative Law and Statutory Codes

To manage this new commercial system, the government created **statutory law**—a vast network of **codes, regulations, and ordinances** not rooted in constitutional authority, but in corporate rule-making. These codes would be enforced by **executive agencies**, not common law courts.

This was the foundation of the **de facto** system we live under today—a government that looks constitutional, but operates entirely in the commercial realm, enforcing **contractual obligations and administrative codes** instead of common law principles.

---

## Conclusion: From Republic to Corporation

The Civil War did not just change America's moral and political landscape—it changed its **legal structure**, its **constitutional identity**, and its **jurisdictional framework**. What began as a conflict over secession ended in the **total reconstruction of the American system of governance**:

- Emergency powers replaced constitutional order.
- Military rule replaced civil authority.
- Corporate citizenship replaced state nationalism.
- Commercial statutes replaced common law.
- And ultimately, a private corporate entity replaced the lawful Republic.

The de jure government still exists—but it is in **dormancy**. The Constitution still exists—but it is only enforced when it aligns with corporate interests. The People still have rights—but they are not recognized unless **reclaimed**.

The aftermath of the Civil War set into motion the machinery of deception that continues today. To reclaim our standing, we must first recognize this history not as tragedy—but as **transformation**. The next chapter will explore how this transformation was finalized through the **Act of 1871**, and how the UNITED STATES CORPORATION began its reign over what was once a free and sovereign People.

---

## Chapter 3: The Act of 1871 — The Birth of the Corporation

The history of the United States took a dramatic and largely concealed turn with the passage of the **District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871**. This act, though disguised as a routine administrative reorganization, effectively **dismantled the de jure constitutional republic** and **replaced it with a corporate municipal entity** operating under **Roman Civil Law**, not the common law of the land. The consequences of this transformation have reverberated through every institution of government, every courtroom, and every interaction between the People and the state ever since.

To understand how Americans became **subjects of a private corporate system**, we must dissect the events of 1871 in detail—particularly the establishment of the **UNITED STATES** as a **for-profit corporation**, and the creation of a **parallel legal structure** that bypasses the Constitution by presuming your consent to corporate jurisdiction.

---

### I. Washington, D.C. Becomes a Corporate Municipal Entity

Following the Civil War and the Reconstruction period, the federal government faced significant **financial instability** and **administrative complexity**. In response, Congress passed the **District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871**, which consolidated the City of Washington, Georgetown, and the unincorporated areas of the District of Columbia into a **single municipal entity**.

At face value, the Act appears to be a mere bureaucratic reorganization. But in truth, it established a **municipal corporation** to govern the federal territory of Washington, D.C.—distinct and separate from the united States of America as established under the Constitution of 1787.

“That the inhabitants of the District of Columbia shall continue to be a body corporate for municipal purposes, by the name of the 'District of Columbia'...”

— District of Columbia Organic Act, 1871

This means that the new **government of the District** was no longer operating as a constitutional body—but as a **corporation**, subject to commercial rules, and capable of acting as a **legal person**. Importantly, this municipal corporation became the **vehicle through which the federal government began exercising corporate authority over the People**, gradually expanding its reach beyond the ten-mile square originally set aside for federal jurisdiction.

---

### II. The UNITED STATES: A For-Profit Corporate Entity in ALL CAPS

The most profound shift came in the linguistic and legal identity of the federal government. After 1871, the term “**United States**” began to appear in legal and administrative documents as “**UNITED STATES**”—in all capital letters. This was not a stylistic change. In legal language, the use of **all caps** signifies a **corporate or artificial entity**, not a sovereign body or living man/woman.

The “UNITED STATES” (all caps) is a **privately-owned municipal corporation** domiciled in the District of Columbia. It operates in the same way any other corporation does:

- It can sue and be sued.
- It can own property.
- It can enter contracts.
- It can issue bonds and borrow money.

But most importantly: **it can create legal fictions**, which it does through the registration of birth certificates, the assignment of Social Security numbers, and the issuance of licenses. Through these mechanisms, it creates a **corporate STRAWMAN** for every living American—a parallel legal entity that the corporate UNITED STATES can tax, regulate, fine, and govern without violating the Constitution—because it's **not dealing with you**, the living soul. It is interacting with a **commercial vessel** that it created and presumes you have agreed to represent.

This is how the UNITED STATES bypasses the **restrictions of the Constitution**. The Constitution applies to the original, de jure government. But the corporate UNITED STATES operates under a **commercial jurisdiction**, using contracts and administrative codes.

---

### III. Legal Transformation Under Roman Civil Law

The newly formed corporation did not use the common law that had underpinned the republic. Instead, it adopted a system derived from **Roman Civil Law**, also known as **Municipal Law** or **Maritime/Admiralty Law**. Under this system:

- **The State is sovereign**, not the People.
- **Rights are granted**, not unalienable.
- **Law is commercial**, not moral or spiritual.
- **Contracts and obligations** govern behavior—not justice or equity.
- **All persons are vessels**—corporate fictions in commerce.

In this framework, your all-caps STRAWMAN becomes your legal identity. And unless you **rebut this presumption**, every court, officer, and administrative agency will treat you **not as a man or woman of God**, but as a **thing**, a **commercial instrument**, a **property of the State**.

Roman Civil Law was historically used to govern **slaves, debtors, and conquered peoples**. It was not based on free will, divine law, or natural rights. And this is precisely why it was adopted: because the goal of the corporate UNITED STATES was **not to preserve liberty**, but to **control commerce** and **maximize revenue**.

By replacing the common law with Roman Civil Law, the corporation created an environment where:

- Every action requires permission (license).
- Every privilege can be revoked.
- Every man or woman can be presumed **guilty until proven innocent**.
- Every court hearing is a **commercial arbitration**, not a constitutional trial.

Thus, the transformation was complete: the **republic of free men** became a **corporate colony of managed assets**.

---

#### IV. How This Transformation Is Hidden from the People

The most effective deceptions are those that go unnoticed. The Act of 1871, and the subsequent corporate legal structure, remain largely unknown to the public because:

1. **No formal announcement was made.** There was no referendum, no vote, no acknowledgment of a new form of government.
2. **The Constitution was never repealed—only bypassed.** The de jure government still exists, but it is dormant. The corporate overlay pretends to act in its name.
3. **The People are indoctrinated from birth.** From the moment your birth certificate is issued, the STRAWMAN is created, and you are gradually trained to act as its representative.
4. **The legal system enforces the illusion.** Courts operate under the presumption of consent. Silence is agreement. Appearance is acceptance.
5. **Law enforcement serves the corporation.** Police are corporate code enforcers. They do not protect common law rights—they enforce statutes on corporate persons.

Unless you **learn, assert, and reclaim your status**, you will continue to be treated as a **commercial entity**—subject to corporate regulation, forfeiture, taxation, and imprisonment.

---

## Conclusion: A Corporation in Republic's Clothing

The Act of 1871 marks the moment when the American government **ceased to be a servant of the People** and became **a corporate master**, operating for profit under commercial law. This corporation:

- Uses **Roman Civil Law** to enslave,
- Uses **capitalized names** to deceive,
- Uses **contracts and codes** to dominate,
- And does it all under the guise of constitutional authority.

Yet the original government, created by the Constitution of 1787, still exists. It is **not gone—only dormant**. The People can **reactivate** it at any time by withdrawing consent from the corporate structure and standing once again as **sovereigns under the law of the land**.

To do so, we must:

- Reclaim our jurisdiction as **living men and women**,
- Stop acting as sureties for our STRAWMAN,
- Challenge corporate jurisdiction at every turn,
- And restore the de jure institutions of our republic through local assemblies and common law courts.

The deception of 1871 is the foundation of our captivity. Exposing it is the first step toward **restoring the American Republic**.

---

## Section: The Organic Constitution (1787) vs. the Corporate Constitution (Post-1871)

One of the greatest deceptions ever perpetuated against the American people is the **manipulation and repurposing of the U.S. Constitution**. What began in 1787 as a foundational contract between sovereign states and the People—a charter *for* self-governance—was covertly supplanted by a commercial, corporate substitute following the **District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871**.

The difference between these two Constitutions—the **organic Constitution *for* the united States of America**, and the **corporate Constitution of the United States of America**—is not just grammatical. It is **jurisdictional, structural, and existential**. The former recognizes the sovereignty of the People. The latter subjugates them as corporate assets.

This chapter will explore in detail the **nature of the original Constitution**, how it was **covertly hijacked**, and how the **Corporate Constitution** that governs us today operates not as a charter of liberty, but as a charter of **control**.

---

### I. The Organic Constitution *for* the united States of America (1787)

The original Constitution, drafted in 1787 and ratified by the several states in 1789, was titled:

**“The Constitution *for* the united States of America”**

This phrase is significant. The lowercase “united” refers to the union of sovereign, independent republics. The preposition “for” indicates a document written **for their benefit**, as a **compact or trust** among equals. It was not a governing document over the People—but a contract *for* their protection, limiting the powers of the newly created federal government.

Key features of the organic Constitution include:

- A **limited federal government** with enumerated powers.
- Recognition of **state sovereignty** and jurisdiction.
- Emphasis on **natural rights** and **unalienable liberty**.
- Rule by the **consent of the governed**.
- A structure ensuring **checks and balances** between branches.
- The **Bill of Rights**, added in 1791, explicitly limited federal authority over the individual.

The Constitution was grounded in **common law principles**, inspired by biblical law, natural law, and the English common law tradition. Under it, the People were recognized as **sovereigns**, and the government as their **servant**.

The federal government had no lawful authority outside what was expressly delegated to it. Everything else remained with the states and the People. This is codified in the **Tenth Amendment**.

---

## II. The District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871 — Corporate Coup d'État

In 1871, Congress passed the **District of Columbia Organic Act**, which reorganized the government of the District of Columbia. Under this act, a **municipal corporation** was created called:

### “The UNITED STATES”

This entity was established to manage the debt and operations of the federal government after the Civil War. But this was more than a financial maneuver—it was a **jurisdictional shell game**.

The corporate charter created a **second government**, a **de facto corporate overlay**, operating within the physical ten miles square of D.C., but slowly and quietly assuming **national scope**. Over time, the authority of this corporation was extended beyond D.C., by presumption, into the fifty states and over the American people.

This **UNITED STATES** corporation began using a **revised and altered Constitution**—not the organic one *for* the People, but a corporate version tailored *to* the commercial entity. The Constitution used by the UNITED STATES today is:

### “The Constitution of the United States of America”

Note the shift from “*for*” to “*of*” and from “united States” to “United States of America.” This is not merely cosmetic. It denotes a **different entity** with **different jurisdictional intent**:

- The Constitution *for* the united States was a **trust document** between sovereigns.
- The Constitution *of* the United States is a **corporate charter** governing corporate persons.

The corporation retained the appearance of constitutional authority while **silently suspending the de jure republic** and operating under **commercial law (Roman Civil Law)** rather than **common law (law of the land)**.

---

## III. Two Constitutions, Two Jurisdictions, Two Realities

The result of the 1871 coup was the coexistence of two systems:

1. **The original republic**, governed by the **organic Constitution**, rooted in natural law and the sovereignty of the People.

2. **The corporate overlay**, governed by a **corporate constitution**, rooted in Roman Civil Law and commercial contract law.

| Feature           | Organic Constitution (1787)                          | Corporate Constitution (Post-1871)                     |
|-------------------|--|--|
| Title             | Constitution <i>for</i> the united States of America | Constitution <i>of</i> the United States of America    |
| Jurisdiction      | Common Law (Law of the Land)                         | Admiralty / Maritime (Law of the Sea)                  |
| Authority         | Sovereign People and States                          | Corporate United States in D.C.                        |
| Government Status | De jure (lawful, by right)                           | De facto (in fact, by force or presumption)            |
| Citizens          | State Nationals / Free Men and Women                 | 14th Amendment U.S. Citizens (federal persons)         |
| Law               | Unalienable rights                                   | Civil privileges, revocable by statute                 |
| Identification    | Proper name (John Doe)                               | STRAWMAN (JOHN DOE, all caps)                          |
| Legal Standing    | Living soul  | Legal fiction / commercial entity                      |
| Courts            | Article III constitutional courts                    | Article I administrative tribunals                     |
| Enforcement       | By the People and constitutional sheriffs            | By corporate law enforcement officers (code enforcers) |

## Chapter 4: The 14th Amendment — Citizen Redefined

The **14th Amendment**, ratified in 1868 in the wake of the Civil War, is perhaps one of the most misunderstood and consequential additions to the U.S. Constitution. While it is widely taught that the 14th Amendment was designed to grant citizenship and civil rights to freed slaves, its true effect was far broader and more insidious: it **redefined what it means to be a citizen**, created a **new class of legal person**, and subtly transferred the American People from their status as **state nationals with unalienable rights to federal citizens possessing mere civil privileges**—rights granted and revocable by the corporate government.

This redefinition marked the **jurisdictional shift** necessary for the enforcement of **statutory law and commercial governance** over the American population, paving the way for the enforcement of **Maritime Admiralty law, federal oversight**, and the use of the **STRAWMAN**—the legal fiction or corporate entity created by the state at birth. This chapter will expose how the 14th Amendment acted as the legal cornerstone for the transformation of the American People into property of the corporate UNITED STATES.

---

### I. From State Nationals to Federal Citizens

Before the Civil War and the ratification of the 14th Amendment, the primary political identity of an American was as a **Citizen of a sovereign state**. Under the original Constitution and early court decisions such as *Dred Scott v. Sandford* (1857), the federal government acknowledged that a person's **state citizenship** was paramount. A "**Citizen of one of the several states**" was understood to be sovereign, governed by the Constitution and common law, and only secondarily a member of the Union.

The United States, as a federal system, had **limited enumerated powers**. The Tenth Amendment made it clear that all powers not delegated to the federal government were **reserved to the States or the People**. This structure was designed to **protect individual sovereignty** by keeping the central authority in check.

The 14th Amendment changed all of that.

"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."

— **14th Amendment, Section 1**

This clause **created a new class of citizenship: "citizen of the United States"**, which did not exist prior to the Civil War. These **federal citizens** were no longer primarily state nationals; instead, they were **direct subjects of the federal government**, under its jurisdiction and regulation.

What appeared to be a protection for freed slaves was, in fact, a reclassification of all Americans into a subordinate legal status. The implications were vast:

- A **state Citizen** holds rights recognized as unalienable.
- A **federal citizen** holds **civil rights**, granted by the state and **revocable** at will.
- The federal citizen is **subject to the jurisdiction** of the corporate UNITED STATES.

This new status became **universal** by default, because birth certificates and other instruments of commerce began to **register all Americans into this federal jurisdiction**, whether they were aware of it or not.

---

## II. Legal Personhood and the Corporate Fiction (the STRAWMAN)

Along with the creation of federal citizenship, the 14th Amendment introduced the concept of the **"person"** as a **legal fiction**—a commercial entity recognized by the corporate state.

Under common law, only a **living man or woman** has rights. The law recognizes them as **sovereigns under the Creator**, accountable only for acts that cause harm, injury, or loss. Under the 14th Amendment, however, the term “person” refers to an **artificial entity**—a trust, corporation, or **STRAWMAN**.

This STRAWMAN is created via:

- The issuance of a **Birth Certificate**, which transforms a live birth event into a **registered legal entity**.
- The assignment of a **Social Security Number**, which tracks the commercial activity of that entity.
- The use of an **ALL CAPS name**, which represents the **corporate fiction** in all contracts, court documents, tax forms, and identification.

This STRAWMAN is **not you**—but the corporate government presumes **you are acting as the surety** for it. And unless you **rebut** this presumption, every interaction you have with the state, from a traffic ticket to a mortgage loan, is processed through the STRAWMAN.

The 14th Amendment made this possible by:

- Redefining citizenship to refer to the STRAWMAN.
- Establishing that all such “persons” are **subject to the jurisdiction** of the federal government.

- Ensuring that all rights possessed by the STRAWMAN are **civil privileges**, not God-given protections.

So when you appear in court, or receive a citation, the system is not dealing with the **man or woman made in God's image**. It is dealing with a **commercial vessel**, registered property of the UNITED STATES CORPORATION.

---

### III. The Loss of Unalienable Rights and the Shift to Civil Privileges

The original Constitution recognized that rights were **unalienable**—meaning they could not be taken, transferred, or infringed. These rights came not from government, but from **God**. Among them:

- The right to life, liberty, and property.
- The right to travel, speak, and worship freely.
- The right to be secure in one's person and possessions.
- The right to a trial by jury and due process of law.

These rights applied to **state Citizens** and **living men and women** under **common law jurisdiction**.

But under the 14th Amendment:

- Rights were redefined as “**civil rights**”—privileges granted by the government.
- These privileges are protected only if **not repugnant to public policy**.
- They can be **suspended** or **revoked** by legislation, emergency order, or court decree.
- You only hold them if you do not **violate the conditions** of your citizenship.

This is a **complete inversion** of the lawful American tradition. Under this model:

- **The government is sovereign**, not the people.
- **You are a subject**, not a sovereign.
- Your rights are no longer **inherent**—they are **earned** or **bestowed**.

This transformation is codified in various legal dictionaries and case law. For example:

“The privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States are those that are derived from the Constitution, not the natural rights of man.” NOTE:

— *U.S. v. Cruikshank*, 92 U.S. 542 (1876)

**NOTE:** In the case above, they are not referring to the organic Constitution **[for]** the united States of America (1787); rather, they are referencing the hijacked and manipulated Constitution **[of]** the united States of America, which was the result of the creation of the corporation through the District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871.

And:

“There is a distinction between citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a state.”

— *U.S. v. Anthony*, 24 Fed. Cas. 829 (1873)

In practical terms, the 14th Amendment transformed every American who did not object into:

- A **commercial entity**.
- A **ward of the federal government**.
- A **participant in the U.S. CORPORATION**, whether knowingly or not.

---

#### IV. The Role of Presumed Consent

It is crucial to understand that **the shift from state national to 14th Amendment citizen is presumed**—not forced. The system is built on **contract and assumption**:

- When you register your child’s birth, you **create the STRAWMAN**.
- When you apply for a Social Security card, you **connect to the system**.
- When you use the all-caps name, you **consent to representation**.
- When you accept government benefits, you **act in commerce**.
- When you stand in court and do not challenge jurisdiction, you **become the surety**.

This is how a **corporate system** enforces its rules without violating the Constitution—because it is not acting upon **you**, but upon a **fiction you are presumed to control**.

But that presumption **can be rebutted**. You can declare:

- That you are **not the STRAWMAN**.
- That you are a **living man or woman**, not a corporate entity.
- That you **reject 14th Amendment citizenship** and retain your standing as a **state national**.

This process of status correction is essential to reclaiming your unalienable rights. It requires **knowledge, paperwork, and public notice**, but it is the only lawful way to **reclaim your jurisdiction and standing**.

---

## **Conclusion: A Citizenship of Control**

The 14th Amendment, cloaked in the language of freedom and equality, did not elevate the People—it **redefined them**. It stripped them of their sovereign status and replaced their standing with a **corporate citizenship** built on contract, commerce, and control.

This amendment enabled:

- The rise of the STRAWMAN.
- The expansion of federal jurisdiction.
- The enforcement of statutory and maritime law.
- The transformation of rights into privileges.

To understand the 14th Amendment is to understand **why Americans today are no longer free**—not because their Constitution was repealed, but because **their status was changed without their knowledge**.

The solution begins with awareness—and continues with lawful reclamation. You were not born to be a subject. You were not created to be a legal fiction. You are a **living man or woman**, endowed by your Creator with **unalienable rights**.

The next chapter will examine how these legal mechanisms come to life in courtrooms and daily interactions through the use of **statutory and admiralty law**, and how the STRAWMAN is used as the interface between you and the system designed to exploit you.

---

# PART II: THE FALSE JURISDICTION — LAND OF THE SEA

## Introductory Section: The Web of Control — Statutory Law and Maritime Admiralty Jurisdiction

Beneath the surface of modern governance lies a meticulously designed **jurisdictional matrix**, one that masquerades as justice while systematically stripping the People of their inherent rights. This system does not operate in the open. It conceals itself behind official seals, formal language, courtrooms, uniforms, and contracts that appear harmless—but are in fact laced with silent consent mechanisms. Welcome to the **false jurisdiction**—the world of **statutory law and maritime admiralty jurisdiction**, also known as the **Land of the Sea**.

This chapter serves as the **thematic bridge** between the lawful jurisdiction once protected by the Constitution and common law, and the **foreign, commercial jurisdiction** now imposed upon the People through **presumptions, registration, and fraud**. To grasp how the system binds men and women without force, one must understand the legal, psychological, and contractual frameworks that have been quietly installed over generations.

### I. The Architecture of Control: From Lawful to Legal

The Constitution of 1787 established a **lawful government**, one that derived its limited authority from the consent of sovereign men and women. Its legal system was rooted in **common law**, which protected **unalienable rights**, demanded the presence of a harmed party to constitute a crime, and insisted that **due process** and **trial by jury** be sacrosanct.

But this lawful jurisdiction has since been overlaid with a **legal system** that no longer recognizes men and women as sovereigns. Instead, it classifies them as **commercial entities**, subject to codes, fines, and administrative enforcement. This shift is not merely linguistic—it is **jurisdictional**.

| Jurisdiction  | Based On          | Applies To                  | Requires Harm? | Rights or Privileges?   |
|---------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Common Law    | Natural Law       | Living Man/Woman            | Yes            | Unalienable Rights      |
| Statutory Law | Corporate Codes   | Legal Person / Citizen      | No             | Civil Privileges        |
| Admiralty Law | Maritime Commerce | Vessels / Trusts / STRAWMAN | No             | Contractual Obligations |

The false jurisdiction is enforced through **statutes**—laws created not by constitutional authority, but by corporate legislatures. These statutes are enforced through **administrative law**, not courts of record, and adjudicated through tribunals that rely on **presumed consent**, not lawful process. The People are not told this. They are conditioned to believe that “law” means any rule issued by government. But in truth, these “laws” are **commercial codes**, only binding if one consents to be governed by them.

---

## II. Maritime Admiralty Law Quietly Replaces Common Law

Historically, **admiralty law** governed ships, sailors, and the conduct of maritime commerce. It applied to **international waters**, foreign vessels, and commercial contracts related to shipping. It was never meant to apply to **domestic land-based affairs**, nor to living men and women acting in private capacity.

So how did admiralty law become the default jurisdiction in America’s courtrooms?

The answer lies in **legal trickery and systemic fraud**. After the corporate conversion of the U.S. government in 1871, and the creation of federal “citizenship” under the 14th Amendment, the government needed a way to **enforce corporate statutes** on the general population. The solution was to **redefine the People as vessels**—participants in commerce—and to do so at birth.

Through the **birth certificate**, the child is registered into commerce as a “**cargo**” or “**vessel**” birthed through the “waters” of the mother. This is no accident. In admiralty law:

- A birth is a “**berth**”
- The mother’s “water breaks” (a maritime act)
- The child is “delivered” (as cargo)
- The doctor signs a **certificate of delivery**

This language mirrors the **transfer of title**, not the celebration of life.

Once this registration occurs, the State creates a **STRAWMAN**—a corporate fiction in all capital letters (e.g., JOHN DOE). This entity is then assigned a **Social Security number**, tracked and taxed, and used in all commercial and legal dealings. From that point forward, the living man or woman is **presumed** to be the representative or surety for this corporate entity, and unless that presumption is rebutted, all legal actions are taken against the STRAWMAN—not the living soul.

This is how **Maritime Admiralty Law** is invoked:

- The court operates as a **ship in dry dock** (you “cross the bar” to enter).

- The judge acts as the **captain**, with full authority.
- The case is treated as a **contract dispute**, not a matter of justice.
- You are presumed to be a **vessel in commerce**, subject to corporate statutes.

The public believes these are courts of law. But in truth, they are **private commercial tribunals** enforcing **corporate policy** on **corporate fictions**.

---

### III. UCC, the STRAWMAN, and the Mechanics of Control

To administer this global commercial system, the UNITED STATES and all other nations adopted the **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)**—a set of standardized rules governing contracts and commerce.

The UCC does not apply to living men and women unless they **act in commerce** using the name of their STRAWMAN. Yet nearly every interaction with government is commercial:

- Applying for a **driver's license**.
- Using a **Social Security number**.
- Filing **tax returns** under a corporate name.
- Responding to **court summons** with no jurisdictional challenge.

The UCC treats all these acts as **voluntary entry into contract**, even though the People are never told they are contracting. Consent is presumed, and through it, jurisdiction is claimed.

The STRAWMAN acts as the **bridge** between the lawful man and the corporate world. It is a **trust or transmitting utility**, created by the state and used to:

- Receive mail (JOHN DOE)
- Receive fines
- Pay taxes
- Be charged in court
- Register vehicles, licenses, and property

Unless the man or woman formally separates from the STRAWMAN, the courts presume you are one and the same. This is why traffic courts, tax courts, and civil courts often seem to ignore constitutional rights—they are not operating under the Constitution. They are operating under **UCC**, **Admiralty**, and **presumed contract**.

---

#### IV. Psychological and Legal Traps of Presumed Jurisdiction

The effectiveness of this system lies in its **invisibility**. It is not imposed by tanks or soldiers—but by words, paperwork, habits, and **psychological conditioning**. It relies entirely on **ignorance and compliance**.

Here are the traps:

1. **Name Confusion** – People believe the all-caps name is their name. It's not.
2. **Registration** – By registering vehicles, births, and businesses, people unknowingly hand over title to the state.
3. **Licenses** – The use of a license converts a right into a state-granted privilege.
4. **Appearance in Court** – When you respond to a summons, you accept the jurisdiction unless you challenge it *on the record*.
5. **Failure to Challenge Jurisdiction** – Silence is consent. Every time.
6. **Belief in Statutes** – Most believe all statutes are “law.” They're not. They are corporate policy.
7. **Legal Representation** – Attorneys are officers of the court. When you hire one, you become “incompetent” and enter *their* jurisdiction.

Most importantly, the People are **not educated about any of this**. The schools teach nothing of jurisdiction, status, or contract law. This is not accidental—it is deliberate.

The true legal system—the one built on status, standing, and jurisdiction—is hidden. The false system—the one built on statutory codes, fines, and commercial penalties—is presented as the only option. This is the **false jurisdiction**—a land-based fiction ruled by the **law of the sea**.

---

## Conclusion: Exiting the Land of the Sea

To escape this matrix, one must begin by:

- **Recognizing the trap:** This is not lawful governance—it is commercial control.
- **Reclaiming your status:** You are a living man or woman, not a legal fiction.
- **Rejecting the STRAWMAN:** Separate your identity from the corporate entity created by the state.
- **Challenging jurisdiction:** In every court, every document, make your standing known.
- **Returning to common law:** Assemble with others, reestablish common law courts, and hold public officials accountable to their oaths.

This chapter sets the foundation for everything that follows. We will now dive deeper into the Uniform Commercial Code, the structure of administrative courts, and the specific tools used to exit commercial jurisdiction and re-enter the lawful realm of the republic—equipping you with the knowledge, strategies, and lawful standing necessary to reclaim your rights, correct your status, and navigate the modern legal landscape with clarity, confidence, and unassailable authority.

You were never meant to live as a vessel. You were never meant to be governed by the sea. Return to the land. Return to the law of your Creator—return to the soil of your birthright, the inheritance of your forefathers, the sacred ground where truth stands firm and sovereignty is restored, where the chains of commerce fall away, where the false identity dissolves, and where the living man or woman finally stands in the fullness of divine purpose, lawful authority, and unshakable freedom.

And as you continue forward, understand that this journey is not merely intellectual—it is transformational. To reclaim your standing as a living man or woman requires knowledge, intention, and the courage to withdraw your consent from systems that were never designed to honor your sovereignty. The path ahead will reveal how corporate jurisdictions capture your rights, how contracts bind you without your awareness, and how lawful remedies restore what was hidden in plain sight. You are stepping out of presumption and into authority, out of fiction and into reality. This is the moment where you stop drifting with the tide and plant your feet firmly upon the solid ground of your birthright.

When you walk this path with clarity, the illusion begins to dissolve: statutes lose their power, fear loses its grip, and the machinery of control can no longer operate against a man or woman who understands who they are and whom they serve. What once appeared overwhelming becomes simple, and what once felt immovable becomes subject to your command. This chapter is not just information—it is an invitation to rise, to remember, and to reclaim. The door back to the land has always been open; now you will learn how to walk through it with confidence, precision, and lawful dominion.

## Chapter 5: Maritime Admiralty Law in America

What most Americans call “the law” is, in reality, an elaborate system of **contractual regulations and commercial codes** administered under a foreign legal system known as **Maritime Admiralty Law**. This system, though largely invisible to the untrained eye, has overtaken the constitutional foundations of common law and due process. Today, nearly every court in America functions not as a constitutional tribunal, but as a **maritime commercial venue**, where living men and women are presumed to be **corporate vessels** engaging in commerce.

Understanding **how admiralty law came ashore**, how it was subtly embedded into every level of governance, and how it operates through terms like **contracts, licenses, summonses**, and **statutes**—is essential to freeing oneself from the false jurisdiction and reclaiming lawful standing.

---

### I. The Origins of Admiralty and Maritime Law

Maritime (or admiralty) law originated thousands of years ago in ancient maritime civilizations such as Babylon, Phoenicia, and Rome. These civilizations developed legal systems to manage **international trade and shipping**—areas that took place **beyond national boundaries**, on the **high seas**, where no single country had jurisdiction.

This body of law came to be known as **lex mercatoria** or **the law of merchants**, and later, as **admiralty law**. It governed:

- Contracts between traders and shipping companies
- Salvage rights
- Cargo and insurance disputes
- Piracy and mutiny
- Maritime liens and obligations

By the time of the British Empire, admiralty law had become a specialized, separate court system. The British Admiralty Court handled disputes **not in law, but in equity and commerce**, using **civil procedures** rather than trial by jury. It did **not recognize common law rights**, nor did it require an injured party. It handled **contractual obligations, debts**, and **commercial liability** between artificial entities.

When America was founded, admiralty courts still existed, but they were **strictly limited to matters of the sea**. The Constitution, in Article III, Section 2, gave the federal judiciary limited jurisdiction over “**all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction**.” These courts were meant to serve only shipping disputes, not govern the everyday affairs of American citizens on land.

Yet over the next two centuries—especially after the **Act of 1871**—this limited maritime jurisdiction was secretly expanded to cover **all persons engaged in commerce**, using the legal fiction of the **corporate STRAWMAN**.

---

## II. How Admiralty Law Came Ashore Through Commerce

The post-Civil War reconstruction period, the 14th Amendment, and the rise of federal citizenship created the foundation for a **jurisdictional shift** in American law. As we've seen, the People were redefined as **U.S. citizens**—a new class of subject under federal authority.

But this new federal government—operating as a **corporation (UNITED STATES)**—could only interact with other **legal fictions**, not living men and women. To govern the People commercially, it needed to:

- Convert their identities into **corporate entities (STRAWMEN)**
- Register all commerce and property through the State
- Impose statutes and codes enforceable only by **presumed contract**

To manage this, the U.S. joined the global commercial legal system by adopting the **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)** in the mid-20th century. The UCC standardized commercial law across all states and became the **dominant legal framework** used in both state and federal courts.

Under the UCC and maritime law:

- All **persons** are considered **vessels in commerce**
- Every transaction is presumed to be a **contract**
- The courts act as **commercial arbitration venues**
- The judge is not a neutral referee, but an **administrator**
- Statutory law is applied instead of constitutional or natural law

The key deception here is **presumption**. The system presumes that you are a:

- **Person** (not a man or woman)
- **Debtor** (not a sovereign)

- **Surety** for the STRAWMAN (not the principal)

Unless you **rebut these presumptions** on the record, the court proceeds under the authority of **Maritime Admiralty Law**, even if the courtroom looks like a constitutional venue.

---

### III. How Courts Today Operate Under the UCC

Today, almost every court in America—whether local, state, or federal—is an **administrative court** operating under **statutory codes** derived from the **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)**, not the Constitution.

Key characteristics of UCC-based courts:

- **No injured party is required.** Statutes can be violated without anyone being harmed.
- **You are presumed to be a corporate person.** The all-caps name (e.g., JOHN DOE) is listed on all documents.
- **Court procedures are based on contracts.** Failure to respond or object is treated as consent.
- **The judge is a magistrate or administrator.** They resolve the matter based on commercial remedy, not justice.
- **Plea bargains and settlements** are encouraged to resolve “disputes” quickly—because these are not criminal cases but **contractual claims**.

If you are charged with a traffic violation, failure to pay taxes, or regulatory infraction, you are not being accused of harming anyone. Instead, you are being brought before an administrative tribunal for failure to **perform under contract**—a contract you likely never knew you signed.

The UCC provides the framework, but it's **your silence and compliance** that gives the court its power. Every time you answer to the STRAWMAN name, show up without challenging jurisdiction, or accept legal representation, you enter the **jurisdiction of the sea**.

---

### IV. Key Legal Terms: Contracts, Licenses, Summonses, and Statutes vs. Laws

The modern legal system relies on **word games**—using terms that appear benign but carry specific, hidden legal meanings. To understand how Maritime Admiralty Law governs you, you must decode these terms:

## 1. Contract

- In Maritime Law, all interactions are presumed to be contractual.
- You are either **performing** your obligations or you are in **breach**.
- Consent can be **expressed (signed)** or **implied (inaction or silence)**.
- Your **birth certificate, driver's license, and court summons** are all contracts.

## 2. License

- A license is **permission to do something otherwise lawful**.
- It converts a **right** into a **privilege**—which can be **revoked**.
- Common examples: driver's license, marriage license, business license.
- When you use a license, you agree to operate within **commercial jurisdiction**.

## 3. Summons

- A summons is not an order—it is an **invitation to contract**.
- When you appear in court and **do not object to jurisdiction**, you **accept the contract**.
- Once you step “across the bar” into court, you enter **Maritime jurisdiction**.

## 4. Statutes vs. Laws

- **Law** refers to common law principles: do no harm, honor contracts, protect rights.
- **Statutes** are legislative **codes** passed by a corporate legislature.
- Statutes apply only to **persons**—not to men or women—unless they **consent**.
- Courts today enforce **statutes**, not **law**.

These terms form the skeleton of Maritime Admiralty jurisdiction. Once you understand them, you begin to see how **every point of contact with the legal system is built on consent and commercial presumption**.

## V. The Real Remedy: Reclaiming Jurisdiction and Status

Maritime law and UCC jurisdiction are not absolute—they are **voluntary**. The system only functions when you:

- **Answer to the STRAWMAN name**
- **Accept benefits and privileges**
- **Fail to rebut jurisdiction**

To escape it, you must:

1. **Declare your status** as a living man or woman.
2. **Separate yourself from the STRAWMAN** (commercial entity).
3. **Reject corporate contracts** when possible and **revoke presumed consent**.
4. **Reclaim common law jurisdiction** in all your dealings.
5. **Educate others**, organize local assemblies, and build lawful structures.

Every license, registration, and summons is an opportunity to either **submit to the sea** or **stand on the land**.

---

### Conclusion: A Legal Fiction Masquerading as Law

The system we live under is not lawful—it is **legal**. It does not respect unalienable rights—it manages **privileges**. It does not operate under the Constitution—it operates under **contractual commercial law**, imported from the high seas, and imposed by silent consent.

**Maritime Admiralty Law in America** is the invisible net cast over the People. It governs by fraud, enforces through ignorance, and is maintained by our own participation.

But the tide is turning. Men and women are awakening. They are learning the language, the traps, and the remedies. They are refusing to be vessels. They are returning to the land.

The sea has no power over those who know who they are.

---

# The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) — The Hidden Framework of Commercial Control

The **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)** is often misunderstood as a benign and technical body of commercial rules applicable only to merchants and businesses. But for those who have dared to investigate the foundations of jurisdiction and legal standing in the United States, the UCC is anything but harmless. It is, in fact, the **operational backbone** of the **modern corporate legal system**, used to quietly manage **persons, contracts, property**, and even **identity** through commercial presumptions. Understanding the UCC is critical to dismantling the invisible system that governs through adhesion contracts and silent consent.

This chapter will explain:

- The origin and structure of the UCC,
- Its key articles and functions,
- How it applies to YOU via the STRAWMAN,
- How courts leverage it to presume jurisdiction,
- And how sovereignty advocates use the UCC to reclaim status and rights.

---

## I. Origin and Purpose of the UCC

The **Uniform Commercial Code** was first published in **1952**, a joint creation of the **Uniform Law Commission (ULC)** and the **American Law Institute (ALI)**. Its stated intent was to:

- Create **consistency** in commercial laws across all 50 states.
- Make interstate business easier by standardizing terminology and procedures.
- Replace a chaotic web of conflicting state laws with a **harmonized commercial code**.

The UCC is **not federal law**. Instead, it's a **model code** adopted by each state legislature. While most states adopted it nearly word-for-word, each state retains the right to **alter** provisions. That means technically, each state has its own version of the UCC—but in practice, they are virtually identical in scope and effect.

Though it may appear to govern only **commercial transactions**, the UCC plays a much broader role in the modern legal system—especially when you understand how your identity has been **commercialized** through the STRAWMAN.

---

## II. Core Articles of the UCC

The UCC is divided into several **Articles**, each covering a different area of commercial activity. Here's a summary of the core Articles relevant to both businesses *and* sovereignty discussions:

| Article           | Subject  |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>Article 1</b>  | General Provisions — Definitions, scope, legal interpretation rules          |
| <b>Article 2</b>  | Sales of Goods — Contracts for the sale of movable goods                     |
| <b>Article 2A</b> | Leases — Commercial leasing of personal property                             |
| <b>Article 3</b>  | Negotiable Instruments — Checks, promissory notes, negotiable paper          |
| <b>Article 4</b>  | Bank Deposits and Collections — Commercial banking procedures                |
| <b>Article 4A</b> | Funds Transfers — Electronic transfer of funds                               |
| <b>Article 5</b>  | Letters of Credit — International and domestic trade credit facilities       |
| <b>Article 6</b>  | Bulk Sales/Transfers — Sales of business inventory outside the normal course |
| <b>Article 7</b>  | Warehouse Receipts, Bills of Lading — Logistics and shipping documentation   |
| <b>Article 8</b>  | Investment Securities — Stocks, bonds, and securities management             |
| <b>Article 9</b>  | Secured Transactions — Collateral, debt instruments, and liens               |

Of particular interest to sovereignty advocates is **Article 9**, which governs **secured transactions**—the legal relationships between a **debtor**, **creditor**, and **collateral**. This is the gateway to understanding **UCC-1 filings** and the concept of becoming a **Secured Party Creditor**.

---

### III. The UCC and the Legal Fiction: Presumed Jurisdiction Through Commerce

Most Americans are unaware that the government views them through the lens of a **commercial entity**, not as a living man or woman. From birth, through the issuance of a **birth certificate**, a **corporate fiction** is created—your **STRAWMAN**, rendered in ALL CAPS (e.g., JOHN DOE). This entity is used to:

- Register property,
- Apply for government benefits,
- Acquire a driver's license,
- File taxes,
- Be summoned to court.

From a UCC perspective, this all-caps entity is a **debtor in commerce**, and the real you—the living soul—is unknowingly acting as the **surety** for that commercial fiction.

Thus, when a **court sends a summons**, it is not summoning *you*, but the STRAWMAN. When you show up and **answer as the STRAWMAN**, you **enter contract** and **consent to jurisdiction**—under **UCC presumptions**.

**Key Insight:** The courts assume you are engaged in **commerce**, and therefore subject to the **UCC and statutory law**. If you do not **rebut** this presumption *on the record*, the court proceeds in **commercial jurisdiction** under Maritime Admiralty Law.

This is why sovereignty advocates emphasize **status, standing, and jurisdiction**. Under the UCC, *everything is a contract*. And most people are contracting with the government and courts **without realizing it**.

---

### IV. UCC-1 Filings and Secured Party Creditor Status

A **UCC-1 Financing Statement** is a legal document filed with a state's Secretary of State to:

- Establish a **public record** of a security interest.
- Identify the **Secured Party** (you) and the **Debtor** (the STRAWMAN).

- Claim legal title to **property, identity, and assets**.
- Assert **priority** in commercial proceedings.

Many sovereignty researchers file a **UCC-1** as part of their process of **reclaiming control** over their legal identity. Here's how it works:

### 1. UCC-1 Financing Statement

- Filed with the Secretary of State.
- Lists the **Debtor** as the ALL CAPS name (e.g., JOHN DOE).
- Lists the **Secured Party** as the proper name (e.g., John-Doe: of the House of Doe).
- May include a "Security Agreement" as an addendum.

### 2. Secured Party Creditor

- The **living man/woman** asserts ownership of the STRAWMAN.
- Claims **first-position** lien over any assets, future earnings, and identifiers of the legal fiction.
- Provides a legal shield against claims by the State, IRS, or corporate courts.

### 3. Commercial Affidavits and Notices

- Used to rebut presumptions, demand proofs, and establish private record.
- Can include "Notice of Status," "Notice of Trespass," "Conditional Acceptance," etc.

**Important:** While UCC filings are powerful tools for declaring **status and control**, they must be **used wisely and lawfully**. Misuse can result in **rejection, fraud accusations, or criminal charges**. The key is to understand that **commercial law recognizes only those who know how to assert their rights properly**.

---

## V. UCC vs. Common Law: A Jurisdictional Comparison

| Aspect                      | Common Law (Lawful)                  | UCC / Statutory Law (Legal)                            |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Jurisdiction</b>         | Law of the Land (Article III courts) | Law of the Sea / Commerce (Article I tribunals)        |
| <b>Applies To</b>           | Living men and women                 | Legal fictions / corporate persons                     |
| <b>Foundation</b>           | Natural law, due process             | Contract, presumed consent                             |
| <b>Consent</b>              | Explicit (no action = no consent)    | Implied (no objection = consent)                       |
| <b>Requirement for Harm</b> | Yes — injured party required         | No — statutory violation alone suffices                |
| <b>Standing</b>             | Sovereign individual                 | U.S. citizen / resident / person                       |
| <b>Remedy</b>               | Justice, equity, restoration         | Commercial settlement, penalties, forfeiture           |
| <b>Court Type</b>           | Courts of record, with jury          | Administrative courts, no jury, judge as administrator |

The entire commercial legal structure is built on the assumption that you are operating **in commerce**, using the **corporate persona** (STRAWMAN). Unless you **know who you are** and **how to rebut jurisdiction**, you will remain under their control.

---

### Conclusion: The UCC as the Operating System of Legal Slavery

The **Uniform Commercial Code** is the legal operating system that manages **every contract, license, summons, tax, and judgment** in modern America. But it is not lawful—it is **legal**. It does not govern people—it governs **persons**. It does not require violence—it uses **contracts, presumptions**, and **your silence** to bind you.

But the UCC also contains **remedies**, hidden in plain sight, for those who know how to use them. It acknowledges:

- The **difference between a man and a person**,
- The **power of contract**, and
- The **supremacy of private agreements** over public policy.

To reclaim your sovereignty, you must:

- Know the difference between lawful and legal.
- Separate from the STRAWMAN.
- Learn to speak the language of commerce.
- Assert your status on the public record.
- Stop contracting under presumed jurisdiction.

The UCC may be the matrix—but it also holds the keys to your exit.

---

## Chapter 6: The STRAWMAN — Your Legal Fiction

There exists within every governmental system a hidden duality—a bifurcation between **who you are as a living soul** and **what they recognize you as in law**. This split is central to understanding how control is exercised over free men and women. At the heart of this deception lies the **STRAWMAN**, a corporate entity—created without your informed consent—through which all modern legal, financial, and governmental systems interact with you.

This chapter will uncover:

- How your **birth certificate** created a legal trust and corporate persona,
  - How the **Social Security Number** tied you to the global commercial system,
  - The legal and spiritual divide between the **living man or woman** and their **legal fiction**, and
  - The tools used to reassert your **true jurisdiction and sovereignty**.
- 

### I. The Birth Certificate: Creation of a Trust and Legal Entity

At birth, a child exits the womb—a miraculous moment when a soul enters the world. But within days, the newborn is unwittingly inducted into a legal system that does not recognize life—it recognizes **legal fictions**. This begins with the **birth certificate**.

#### Birth vs. Berth: Maritime Legal Language

In **maritime admiralty law**, which governs **commerce and the sea**, the term "berth" refers to the docking of a ship. When a ship is berthed, it arrives at a port and its cargo is documented. The same linguistic pattern is applied to childbirth:

- A child is "**birthed**" through the mother's "**water breaking**"
- A **doctor (doc)** assists in delivery, like a **ship docking at a port**
- The newborn is "**delivered**" and **registered**—just like cargo
- A **certificate of birth** is issued—similar to a **bill of lading**

This certificate is not issued to **you**—it is issued to the **State**. The hospital forwards a record of the birth to the Bureau of Vital Statistics, which then issues a **BIRTH CERTIFICATE**. This document is

not merely for recordkeeping. It functions as a **financial instrument**, a **trust certificate**, and the **foundation of your STRAWMAN**.

### The Birth Certificate Trust

Here's how the process works:

1. The **State** creates a **corporate trust** named after the baby, in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS (e.g., JOHN DOE).
2. This name is filed with the **Department of Commerce** and linked to the U.S. Treasury.
3. A **trust account** is created—known to some as a **Cestui Que Vie Trust**.
4. This trust becomes **collateral** for national debt and is monetized through bonds.

You, the living man or woman, are never told that this trust was created. But all interactions with the legal system—from tax filings to court summonses—presume that you are the **trustee** or **surety** for this STRAWMAN.

This is why your name appears in ALL CAPS on:

- Government mail
- Legal documents
- Court dockets
- Driver's licenses
- Social Security cards

These documents **do not represent you**. They represent a **legal fiction**—a **vessel in commerce**—created by the State and owned by the government. This is the STRAWMAN.

You, the living man or woman, are never informed that this artificial trust—often called the STRAWMAN—was created in your name, yet every interaction with the modern legal system is built on the presumption that you are acting as the trustee, surety, or responsible party for this corporate fiction. This is why your name appears in ALL CAPITAL LETTERS on government correspondence, legal documents, court dockets, driver's licenses, Social Security cards, and virtually every commercial form: these instruments do not identify the living being but instead reference a separate legal entity, a vessel in commerce constructed by the State and held under its authority. This artificial persona is used to attach statutes, debts, fines, regulations, and administrative obligations that do not lawfully apply to a living man or woman standing under Natural Law. It is not you, but a corporate derivative of you—a legal fiction designed for commercial exploitation.

---

## II. The Social Security Number: Your Contract with the System

The **Social Security Number (SSN)** is marketed as a simple identification tool used to track earnings and provide retirement benefits. But in the world of commercial law, it is far more than that.

The SSN functions as:

- A **contract number** linking the STRAWMAN to government services
- A **federal employee identification number**
- An indicator that you have **voluntarily entered federal jurisdiction**
- A **tracking number** in the global commercial system

By applying for a Social Security Number, most people unwittingly:

1. **Accept the role** of trustee or debtor for the STRAWMAN
2. **Consent to be regulated** under statutory and admiralty law
3. **Surrender their natural rights** in exchange for state-granted privileges

The application for a Social Security card is often done by parents, who themselves were never told the truth. Once this number is assigned, every interaction you have with the state—banking, employment, taxation—is tied to this **commercial account**.

The IRS does not tax **living men and women**. It taxes **persons**—legal entities engaged in commerce. The STRAWMAN, operating through the SSN, is presumed to be such a person.

---

## III. Separation of the Living Man/Woman from the Corporate Entity

The most vital realization is this: **you are not the STRAWMAN**. You are a living, breathing, soul-endowed man or woman. The STRAWMAN is:

- A **construct**
- A **corporate persona**

- A **trust account**
- A **legal fiction** used to ensnare you into jurisdiction

But because the system **presumes** you are one and the same, **everything is done in your name** unless you rebut the presumption.

### The Duality of Identity

| Living Man/Woman               | STRAWMAN (ALL CAPS Name)                   |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Born of a mother               | Created by the State                       |
| Breathes, feels, lives         | Artificial legal construct                 |
| Protected by Common Law        | Governed by statutory/commercial law       |
| Has unalienable rights         | Has only privileges and obligations        |
| Not subject to corporate codes | Entirely subject to UCC and state statutes |

When you enter a courtroom and **identify yourself** as the STRAWMAN, you **voluntarily accept** the jurisdiction of commercial admiralty law. You become liable for taxes, fines, judgments, and enforcement **as if you are a corporate entity**.

### Reclaiming the Divide

To correct this fraud, one must:

- **Declare your status** as a living man or woman.
- **Distinguish your name** (John of the family Doe) from the ALL CAPS fiction (JOHN DOE).
- **Challenge jurisdiction** at every interaction.
- **Refuse adhesion contracts** unless properly informed and compensated.

- **Use affidavits and notices** to assert standing, status, and lawful claim.

The system only works when you are **ignorant and silent**. It collapses when you assert your rightful status.

---

#### IV. The Purpose and Use of the STRAWMAN

While the STRAWMAN was designed as a tool of control, it can be used **strategically** once properly understood. Like any corporate entity, the STRAWMAN:

- Can **own assets**
- Can **enter contracts**
- Can **be taxed**
- Can **be defended against liability**
- Can **be separated from the principal** (you)

Some sovereign individuals choose to **become the Secured Party Creditor** over the STRAWMAN, filing a **UCC-1 Financing Statement** to establish control. Others use **commercial affidavits and notices** to manage the STRAWMAN without being bound to it.

What matters most is that you understand:

- The STRAWMAN exists
  - You are **not** it
  - It is a **legal vehicle**, not your identity
  - You must **control it**, or the State will
- 

#### Conclusion: The Fiction that Binds You

The STRAWMAN is a masterstroke of legal deception—a silent substitution of identity that converts sovereign men and women into corporate entities governed by statutes, regulations, and commercial contracts. Through the **birth certificate**, the State creates a trust. Through the **Social Security**

**Number**, it binds the STRAWMAN into federal jurisdiction. Through **ignorance and consent**, it subjects the People to control.

But the STRAWMAN is not your enemy. It is a **tool**—one that can be used to interface with the system without compromising your sovereignty, **once you awaken to its existence**.

You were born free. The fiction is what binds you. And knowledge is what sets you free.

## Chapter 7: The Role of the BAR and Foreign Agents

In a system where law is supposed to serve the people, the gatekeepers of that system—**attorneys**—should be its guardians. But what if the legal profession, as it exists today, is not designed to uphold the rights of the People, but to **protect the interests of a foreign corporate system**? What if, far from being champions of justice, attorneys are **agents of control**, trained not in **lawful remedy**, but in **legal procedure** designed to entrap?

This chapter explores the origins and structure of the **BAR (British Accreditation Registry)**, the hidden foreign allegiance of attorneys, and the role of **corporate courts** in the suppression of true **common law remedy**. We will uncover how, through licensing, language manipulation, and court procedure, the BAR has entrenched itself as a **foreign agent** working within what appears to be the American legal system—but in fact operates **outside the constitutional republic** and **under the jurisdiction of commercial and maritime law**.

---

### I. What is the BAR? British Accreditation Registry

The **BAR Association**, as most Americans understand it, is assumed to be a domestic professional organization that licenses lawyers. However, the deeper truth reveals an **allegiance beyond America's shores**.

The term **BAR** is an abbreviation for **British Accreditation Registry**—a reference to the Crown Temple in London. Historically, the **Inns of Court**—namely Inner Temple, Middle Temple, Lincoln's Inn, and Gray's Inn—have operated as legal guilds under the authority of the British Monarchy and the Vatican. Attorneys and barristers trained within these institutions are considered **officers of the court**, owing **loyalty not to their client, but to the Crown**.

When American lawyers take their “oath,” they do not swear allegiance to the **Constitution for the united States of America** as originally written. Instead, they swear to:

- Uphold the laws of the **State BAR Association** (a private corporation)
- Conduct themselves as **officers of the court** (a commercial venue)
- Uphold the integrity of the **court system**, even when it conflicts with truth or justice

**Key Insight:** There is **no constitutional requirement** for a lawyer to be BAR-certified in order to practice law. In fact, requiring a license to represent someone is a **restriction of lawful advocacy**, contrary to the common law right of assistance of counsel.

The BAR operates as a **foreign agent**, administering law for a **foreign jurisdiction—statutory and admiralty law**, not **constitutional law**.

## II. Attorneys as Officers of the Corporate Court

When a licensed attorney enters a courtroom, they do not enter as your advocate—they enter as an **officer of the court**. Their primary obligation is **not to you**, the client, but to the **court system** itself. This is why:

- Your attorney may **refuse to raise jurisdictional challenges**
- They may **discourage** you from asserting your status as a living man or woman
- They may **coerce you** into accepting plea deals, settlements, or commercial judgments
- They may **ignore** or **downplay** constitutional arguments, calling them “frivolous”

This is not legal incompetence—it is deliberate containment. The attorney’s job is to keep you **within the system, within the fiction**, and **within the corporate court's jurisdiction**.

### Corporate Courts vs. Lawful Courts

| Aspect            | Corporate Court (Legal / Maritime) | Lawful Court (Common Law / De Jure) |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Presiding Officer | Judge (Administrator)              | Jury of Peers                       |
| Jurisdiction      | Statutory / Admiralty / UCC        | Article III Common Law              |
| Language          | Legalese (redefined words)         | Plain English, Truth                |
| Participants      | Legal Fictions (Persons)           | Living Men and Women                |

|                      |  |                                       |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Remedy</b>        | Commercial Penalties / Fines / Probation | Justice / Restitution / Trial by Jury |
| <b>Attorney Role</b> | Officer of the court                     | Lawful Assistance (by consent)        |

An attorney's license binds them to these rules. They are **licensed practitioners**, not **independent agents**, and their role is to ensure the client submits to the authority of the court, rather than escape it.

---

### III. Hidden Remedies and Forbidden Knowledge

Why does the average American not know about their **lawful rights**, the **common law**, or the difference between **lawful** and **legal**?

The answer: **They are not supposed to.**

The legal system—dominated by BAR attorneys—has created a **closed circuit of knowledge**, where only those trained and licensed by the BAR are permitted to speak, file, or argue in court. As a result:

- **Common law is no longer taught in law schools**
- **Judges refuse to acknowledge lawful claims without a licensed attorney**
- **Clerks reject filings that do not conform to statutory formatting**
- **Pro se litigants are treated as nuisances or legal “infants”**

This monopoly of knowledge means that the **true remedy**—the ability to challenge jurisdiction, assert standing, and reject commercial contracts—is **obscured**, **mocked**, or even **punished**.

Attorneys are **trained to ignore**:

- The **constitutional limits** of government
- The **fraudulent nature** of the STRAWMAN system
- The **remedy available through private administrative process**

- The **inherent sovereignty** of the People

Instead, they are trained to:

- Enforce statutes
- Process contracts
- Negotiate settlements
- Avoid confrontation with the court

Their training ensures that the **lawful path to freedom** remains **buried under legal jargon, courtroom ritual, and institutional arrogance**.

---

#### IV. The BAR as a Foreign Agent Operating in the Republic

It is crucial to understand that BAR members operate in a **dual capacity**:

1. As agents within a **private, foreign corporate structure**
2. As **gatekeepers** of jurisdiction and legal interpretation

When the 1871 **District of Columbia Organic Act** created the **UNITED STATES** as a **municipal corporation**, it adopted **Roman Civil Law, Maritime Law**, and **statutory commercial law** as its jurisdictional basis. The newly structured courts were **corporate venues**, and the legal practitioners within them were not officers of the republic, but agents of the corporation.

Every licensed BAR attorney is part of this system. Their **authority** does not stem from the People. It stems from:

- The **State BAR Association** (a corporate subsidiary)
- The **corporate courts**
- The **statutory codes** of a de facto government

This makes the modern legal profession, as structured, a **subversion of constitutional law** and an extension of foreign control over the American People.

---

## V. Reclaiming Lawful Counsel and Legal Sovereignty

Despite the overwhelming dominance of the BAR, remedies still exist—but **only outside the statutory system**.

You have the right to:

- **Defend yourself** in court (pro se)
- **Choose a lawful representative**, not bound by BAR restrictions
- **Assert jurisdiction and challenge presumptions**
- **Declare your status** as a living man or woman, not a corporate fiction

However, doing so requires **knowledge, preparation, and courage**. You will be mocked, threatened, and often denied—but if you persist, you will begin to see cracks in the system. You will see that **judges can be stripped of power, attorneys can be held accountable, and statutory courts can be rebutted**.

And when enough People reclaim that knowledge, the system will no longer be able to sustain its illusion.

---

### Conclusion: The Legal Priesthood of the Corporate Empire

The BAR Association is not just a professional guild—it is a **priesthood of legal sorcery**, converting men and women into persons, rights into privileges, and truth into process. Its allegiance is not to the Constitution or the People, but to a **corporate Crown system**, foreign in origin and tyrannical in practice.

Attorneys, whether knowingly or not, serve as the enforcers of this deception. They are not guardians of justice—they are **agents of administration**, ensuring that no one escapes the maze without paying a price.

But truth does not require a license. Justice does not wear robes. And the law of the land still exists—for those who know how to stand on it.

---

### Summary of Interaction — From Roadside Encounter to Commercial Court

The modern “legal” system in the United States is structured to **appear legitimate**, yet operates almost entirely outside the scope of the Constitution. In this chapter, we walk step-by-step through a seemingly ordinary experience: a routine traffic stop. But as you’ll see, this interaction is neither

simple nor benign—it is a meticulously orchestrated process by which a **living man or woman** is **converted into a commercial entity**, governed not by law, but by **contract and commerce** under **statutory and maritime admiralty jurisdictions**.

Each stage in this journey is based on **presumptions**. The system functions only if you, the man or woman, do not object. Your silence, your signature, and your mere appearance are construed as **consent** to being treated as a “person” (legal fiction) under corporate jurisdiction. What follows is the full breakdown.

---

### Step 1: Traffic Stop by Officer (Statutory Code Enforcement)

The process begins on the street, with the flashing lights of a patrol car in your rearview mirror. When you pull over, you're not being stopped for a “crime” in the constitutional sense. You're being stopped for a **code violation**—a breach of a statutory rule created by a **corporate legislature** acting under **de facto authority**.

The officer is not acting as a servant of constitutional justice. He is a **code enforcement agent**, empowered by state or municipal statutes, which are **administrative in nature** and apply only to individuals who have **contracted into the system**—namely, **licensed drivers** operating **registered vehicles**.

These laws do **not** require a harmed party. There is no victim. The enforcement of these statutes is **commercial**, not criminal. And you are being treated as a **regulated user of corporate property**, not a sovereign man or woman exercising the unalienable right to travel.

---

### Step 2: Officer Requests ID, License, Registration (Consent Presumed via Contract)

Immediately upon stopping you, the officer demands **proof of identification**, a **driver's license**, and **vehicle registration**. Each of these documents plays a role in tethering you to the **corporate statutory system**.

- Your **driver's license** is evidence of a **contractual relationship** with the state. It's not a simple form of ID—it is a **commercial permit**, issued by a corporate entity, granting you the **privilege** (not the right) to operate a motor vehicle (a commercial term) on public roads (corporate-controlled infrastructure).
- Your **vehicle registration** shows that the car is not owned in absolute title by you. Instead, **equitable title** is held by the state. The car has been entered into the **Department of Motor Vehicles' commercial registry**, subjecting it to regulation and seizure.
- Your **insurance card** further evidences that you are a participant in the commercial regulation of state-licensed operations.

Every time you hand these over, you **consent**—even if unknowingly—to being treated as a **person in commerce**, not a living being traveling freely. This is how the system converts your **traveling** into **driving**, your **property** into a **registered vehicle**, and your **freedom** into a **regulated privilege**.

---

### Step 3: Citation Issued to STRAWMAN (All Caps Name = Legal Fiction)

When the officer writes a ticket, it will be issued to your **all-capital-letters name**—for example, **JOHN DOE**. This is not a mere typographical choice. In legal terms, your **ALL CAPS NAME** represents a **commercial construct**, a **trust account**, or **legal fiction** created when your **birth certificate** was registered with the Department of Commerce.

That entity—your STRAWMAN—is a **corporate vessel** under the U.S. Corporation, and every court, ticket, tax bill, and financial document addresses it, not you. The ticket is **not served upon the living man or woman**, but on the STRAWMAN, under the presumption that **you will act as its surety**—meaning you'll step into court and assume liability for its debts and obligations.

This is why the ticket often doesn't even require a signature. Your failure to object or correct the status of the addressee is enough to **trigger the next phase of the process**.

---

### Step 4: Notice to Appear in Court (Contractual Obligation Assumed)

The citation typically includes a **notice to appear** in court. This notice is not a constitutional summons—it is a **contractual offer**, presented as a command. Most people assume they *must* appear, without understanding the difference between a **lawful order** and a **commercial invitation**.

When you appear in court without objection, you **accept the terms of the contract**. Your voluntary appearance is taken as **proof of consent** to be governed by the rules of the tribunal. If you fail to appear, the court may issue a bench warrant—not because you committed a crime, but because you **failed to perform on a commercial obligation**. The court acts like a collections agency—not a court of justice.

---

### Step 5: Entry into Courtroom (Maritime Admiralty Jurisdiction Presumed)

Once inside the courtroom, the entire setting is symbolic of **admiralty law**, not constitutional law.

- The **judge** sits on a **bench** (from “banca,” meaning bank).

- The **bar** (the rail dividing the gallery from the court) represents the division between **land and sea**.
- You are called to “appear,” which legally means to present the STRAWMAN.

Unless you **affirmatively rebut the jurisdiction**, the court will presume that you are a **vessel in commerce**, a party to a **contract**, and subject to its administrative procedures. You are no longer in the land jurisdiction. You have been brought into a **commercial port**, where the rules of **contract and commerce** dominate.

---

### Step 6: Judge Interacts with STRAWMAN (Not the Living Man/Woman)

The judge does not speak to you. He addresses the **STRAWMAN**. “Is JOHN DOE present?” When you respond “Yes,” you have now **merged yourself with the fiction**, and become **the surety** for its debts.

You are not treated as a man or woman. You are treated as the **representative** of a corporate person. At this point, everything you say is on behalf of that entity. Your rights as a living soul are suspended, and your remedies under the Constitution are irrelevant.

The court will only address:

- Performance of obligations
- Failure to perform
- Commercial remedy (usually monetary)

There is **no injured party**, no jury of peers, and no lawful justice.

---

### Step 7: Administrative Adjudication (Settlement of Commercial Matter)

This process is not a **trial**. It is an **administrative hearing**—more akin to a debt collection meeting than a legal proceeding. The goal is **remedy**, not justice.

- The judge may offer you a **plea bargain**, which is merely an **offer to settle a debt** at a reduced rate.
- If you plead “guilty,” you confirm the debt.

- If you plead “not guilty,” the system proceeds to a **dispute resolution process**, often ending with a conviction through lack of lawful defense or misapplied procedure.

The judge acts as an **administrator**, not as a referee. The prosecutor is not proving guilt, but asserting a **claim of default** against the STRAWMAN. The process is rigged, and unless you rebut jurisdiction and challenge the standing of the court, the outcome is almost always **commercial loss**.

---

## Step 8: Fine/Payment/Bond Forfeiture (Not Justice, but Commercial Remedy)

Once adjudicated, the outcome is **never about justice**. It is always about **collection**.

- You may pay a **fine**—essentially settling the debt.
- You may forfeit a **bond**—serving as a surety.
- In some cases, you may serve **jail time**, not as punishment for a crime, but as **bond collateral** for non-performance.

There is no real victory in these courts—only transactions. The STRAWMAN was the defendant. You, as the living man or woman, stood in as the surety. Your energy, your labor, and your money paid the debt. The court and the state profited.

---

## Conclusion: Understanding the Presumed Jurisdiction

Each step in this process operates on one central fraud: the **presumption of jurisdiction over your STRAWMAN**, and your **failure to rebut that presumption**.

| Step              | Jurisdictional Mechanism       |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Traffic Stop      | Statutory Enforcement          |
| Ticket Issued     | Contract Offer to STRAWMAN     |
| Court Notice      | Commercial Summons             |
| Courtroom Entry   | Admiralty Jurisdiction Assumed |
| Judge Interaction | Legal Fiction Acknowledged     |
| Judgment          | Commercial Remedy Imposed      |

| Outcome | Financial Penalty or Bond Seizure |
|---------|-----------------------------------|
|---------|-----------------------------------|

To stop this cycle, you must:

- **Reclaim your status** as a living man or woman.
- **Refuse to act as the surety** for the STRAWMAN.
- **Challenge jurisdiction at the outset.**
- **Learn the proper language and process** to remain in the **lawful de jure** jurisdiction.

The greatest weapon they have is **your ignorance**. But the moment you understand the process, the moment you stop consenting, and the moment you start asserting your standing, the entire scheme begins to unravel.

This is your first step in reclaiming not just your rights—but your freedom.

To stop this cycle, you must first reclaim your true status as a living man or woman, a being endowed with unalienable rights and standing under Natural Law—not a corporate persona governed by statutes written for fictional entities. This requires consciously refusing to act as the surety for the STRAWMAN, the artificial legal construct that administrative courts and government agencies rely upon to impose obligations, penalties, and regulatory control. When you recognize that the legal system speaks to the fiction, not the living soul, you begin to understand why so much of modern governance is built on presumption: they assume you are the trustee, unless you declare otherwise. Reclaiming your status is not merely symbolic—it is a lawful, strategic act of self-determination that shifts the entire foundation of your relationship with the corporate state.

Challenging jurisdiction is the critical second step, and it must occur immediately in any interaction with courts, agencies, or officers of the state. Jurisdiction is everything: without it, no court, judge, or administrative body has authority over you. Most people lose before they ever begin, not because they are wrong, but because they unknowingly agree to step into the wrong jurisdiction—Maritime Admiralty, the realm of commerce, contracts, and corporate regulation. To remain in the lawful de jure jurisdiction, you must learn the precise language, procedures, and remedies that keep you grounded on the land and prevent you from drifting into the sea of commercial law where presumptions replace rights. This knowledge empowers you to assert your standing, challenge false authority, and neutralize attempts to convert you into a corporate actor.

Ignorance is their greatest weapon, and consent—often silent, implied, or coerced—is their greatest tool. But the moment you understand the process, the moment you stop consenting, and the moment you stand firmly as a living man or woman, the entire scheme begins to unravel. They cannot proceed without your participation; they cannot enforce without jurisdiction; they cannot bind you without your agreement. This chapter marks your first step in reclaiming not only your rights, but your freedom—and with each step forward in knowledge and confidence, you withdraw your power from

the commercial system and reestablish your place within the lawful republic where sovereignty is not granted, but recognized.

---

## PART III: THE TRUE JURISDICTION — LAND OF THE LIVING

### Chapter 8: Understanding Lawful Jurisdiction

At the heart of every legal dispute, trial, or enforcement action lies a question most people never ask: **"What jurisdiction is this court operating under?"** The answer to that question determines not only what laws apply but whether your **rights as a living man or woman** are recognized—or **converted into regulated privileges**. To understand how the People have been gradually stripped of their sovereignty, one must first comprehend the concept of **lawful jurisdiction**.

This chapter explores:

- The **fundamental difference** between **Common Law**, **Statutory Law**, and **Admiralty/Maritime Law**
  - The **true function** of **Article III courts** and **Courts of Record**
  - The **inalienable rights** of the sovereign individual under **God's Law** and **Natural Law**
  - How the deception of jurisdiction has enabled mass subjugation through legal fiction
- 

#### I. Common Law vs. Statutory and Admiralty Law

To the uninformed, "law is law." But this is not the case. There are multiple jurisdictions at play in the United States today, and **not all of them recognize your unalienable rights**.

##### 1. Common Law (Lawful / De Jure Jurisdiction)

- Rooted in **Natural Law**, **God's Law**, and **custom**
- Derived from **English Common Law**, brought to America by early colonists
- Recognizes the **sovereign individual** as the **highest authority**, beneath only the Creator
- Requires an **injured party** to bring a valid claim
- All crimes must have a **corpus delicti** (body of the crime)
- Remedy is based on **justice**, **truth**, and **trial by jury**

#### **Examples:**

- Theft, assault, trespass, fraud (actual harm must occur)
- Property disputes, breach of contract, negligence—where a damaged party exists

Common Law is the **only jurisdiction** recognized by the original **Constitution for the united States of America** and the **Bill of Rights**. It is lawful, not merely legal.

## **2. Statutory Law (Legal / De Facto Jurisdiction)**

- Created by **legislatures**, enforced by **executive branches**, and interpreted by **judges**
- Based on **codes**, **regulations**, and **acts**
- Assumes jurisdiction over the **person** (a legal fiction)
- Allows prosecution without a damaged party
- Operates under **assumed consent** and **civil contracts**

#### **Examples:**

- Traffic violations
- Building code infractions
- Tax violations

- Licensing penalties

Statutory Law applies to the **STRAWMAN**—the **corporate legal entity** (YOUR NAME IN ALL CAPS)—not the living man or woman, unless jurisdiction is **unrebutted**.

### 3. Admiralty / Maritime Law (Commercial / Law of the Sea)

- Governs **international trade, shipping, and commercial contracts**
- Applies to **vessels, cargo, and commerce across borders**
- Enforced domestically via **maritime contracts**, such as driver's licenses, social security numbers, and tax filings
- Presumes you are operating in commerce as a **vessel on the sea**

#### Examples:

- Court cases involving your STRAWMAN
- Debt enforcement, fines, and tax liens
- Traffic and licensing violations

**Key Insight:** Most modern courts operate under **admiralty jurisdiction**—not by lawful authority, but through your **unquestioning submission** and **contractual consent**.

---

## II. Article III Courts and Courts of Record

The U.S. Constitution provides for only **one kind of court** with true **judicial power**: an **Article III court**, which exists under the **judicial branch** and not under corporate or administrative control.

### Article III, Section 1:

"The judicial power of the United States, shall be vested in one supreme Court, and in such inferior Courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish..."

True Article III courts:

- Are **courts of record**
- Feature a **jury of peers**

- Must operate in **law**, not equity
- Cannot compel performance without due process
- Acknowledge the sovereignty of the people

A **Court of Record** is a **common law venue**. It is distinguished by five characteristics:

1. A **judge** sits as a **magistrate**, not as a tribunal
2. The **court has a seal**
3. Proceedings are recorded in a permanent archive
4. The **judicial authority is exercised by the tribunal (jury)**, not the judge
5. The **law is the common law**, not statutes or codes

Today, **true Article III courts are almost extinct** in daily use. Most local, state, and federal courts are **Article I or Article IV administrative tribunals**, which function under **legislative and territorial authority**, not judicial power.

---

### III. The Rights of the Sovereign Individual Under God and Natural Law

The **Declaration of Independence** acknowledges that:

"...all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights..."

These rights are **not granted** by government—they are **inherent**. Governments exist to **protect** these rights, not to **regulate** them. Under Natural Law, the individual:

- Has the right to **life, liberty, and property**
- May **travel freely** without license
- Is not bound by **contracts not entered knowingly and voluntarily**
- May **seek remedy** through common law proceedings
- Is **not a subject**, but a sovereign

Under lawful jurisdiction, no one—not even the President, Congress, or police—can violate these rights **without just cause, due process, and a jury of peers**.

But under statutory and admiralty law:

- Rights are converted into **privileges**
- Freedom of movement becomes a **licensed activity**
- Property is taxed and regulated
- Speech and religion are “permitted” within legal limits

The transition from **sovereignty to servitude** happens the moment a man or woman **contracts into the system**, usually through ignorance.

---

#### IV. The Architecture of Jurisdictional Deception

The shift from **lawful** to **legal** was gradual and deliberate. It occurred via:

- The **Act of 1871** (corporatization of government)
- The **14th Amendment** (creation of a secondary “citizen” status)
- The **Birth Certificate/STRAWMAN** system
- The enforcement of **admiralty jurisdiction** in domestic courts
- The requirement of **licenses, permits, and registrations** (voluntary contracts)
- The legal assumption that **silence = consent**

When you walk into court:

- The judge sees a **corporate entity** (not you)
- You are presumed to be in **commerce**
- Your actions are governed by **contract law**, not constitutional protections

- Unless you **object to jurisdiction**, you are considered a **party to the contract**

The deception is **so complete** that even attorneys, judges, and public officials are unaware of the trap they participate in daily.

---

## Conclusion: Reclaiming Lawful Jurisdiction

Understanding lawful jurisdiction is the first step toward reclaiming your **status, rights, and freedom**. The system does not hide its rules—it simply buries them under mountains of **legal procedure, statutory code, and BAR-certified doctrine**.

To reassert your standing as a **living man or woman**, you must:

1. Learn the difference between **lawful** and **legal**
2. Assert your status as **one of the people**, not a **person**
3. Challenge **jurisdiction** in every interaction
4. Use **affidavits, notices, and declarations** to establish the record
5. Demand trial by **common law jury**
6. Avoid contracting with the STATE through licenses, registrations, and benefits

Jurisdiction is everything. It determines who you are in the eyes of the court. And if you don't claim your sovereignty, the system will presume you've waived it.

**The lawful path is narrow—but it is the only path to true liberty.**

Reclaiming lawful jurisdiction begins with understanding that the modern legal system operates on two parallel tracks: one grounded in Natural Law and Common Law—the true law of the land—and the other built from statutes, codes, and corporate policies that govern fictional entities. The system does not openly conceal this duality; instead, it drowns the truth under layers of procedure, legal jargon, and doctrines taught exclusively to BAR-certified attorneys. Most individuals unknowingly step into the commercial track because they have never been taught the difference between lawful and legal, nor how to assert their standing as a living man or woman under the Constitution and Natural Law. By learning these distinctions, you begin to lift the veil and see how jurisdiction functions as the keystone of control.

To reassert your standing, you must actively declare who you are and who you are not. This requires asserting that you are “one of the people”—a sovereign beneficiary of the Constitution—rather than a “person,” which is a legal term referring to an artificial entity subject to regulation. In any interaction

with courts or government agencies, your first responsibility is to challenge jurisdiction, because if you fail to do so, you are presumed to have consented to their authority. Affidavits, notices, and declarations become your tools for establishing the public record, setting your terms, and forcing the system to acknowledge your lawful status. These instruments are powerful because unrebutted affidavits stand as truth, and government actors must respond or risk admitting they have no authority over you.

Reclaiming jurisdiction also means insisting on lawful processes that protect your rights, such as demanding trial by a common law jury rather than submitting to administrative hearings, tribunals, or summary judgments that operate under Maritime Admiralty or statutory jurisdiction. At the same time, you must avoid contractual entanglements—licenses, registrations, permits, and benefits—that bind you to the STATE as a commercial actor. Each of these instruments creates a legal nexus that pulls you deeper into corporate jurisdiction. By recognizing and rejecting these traps, you reclaim the path back to the land, where your rights are unalienable, your standing is inherent, and your freedom is not granted by the government but recognized as your birthright.

---

## Chapter 9: Local Governance and Assemblies

### Restoring the Republic from the Ground Up

The restoration of the American Republic does not begin in Washington, D.C. It does not begin in state capitals or in congressional halls. It begins at the **county level**, among **the people**, under the authority of **common law** and **natural rights**. The rebirth of our constitutional government must take root in the **soil of local governance**—through **county assemblies**, **common law grand juries**, and the lawful reawakening of **constitutional sheriffs**.

This chapter explores:

- Why county assemblies are the foundation of de jure self-governance
  - How **common law grand juries** re-establish local justice
  - The role of the **constitutional sheriff** in defending the rights of the people
  - How to **organize your community** under lawful governance
  - How to lawfully challenge illegitimate corporate governance at the local level
-

## I. Why County Assemblies Matter

The Constitution created a **federation of sovereign states**, each composed of **sovereign people**. At the heart of this structure was the **local county**—the most accessible and representative unit of governance. When this republic functioned properly, each county:

- Had its own local assembly of the people
- Convened its own **common law grand jury**
- Was policed by a **sheriff elected by the people**, not controlled by the state or federal government
- Operated as a **self-governing jurisdiction** under natural law and the Constitution

However, beginning in 1871 with the incorporation of Washington, D.C., and through further erosion by the **14th Amendment**, **federal bureaucracy**, and **corporate statutes**, these county structures were **hijacked or dissolved**. In their place, the UNITED STATES CORPORATION, through its agents, began to administer **corporate governance** via **municipal charters**, **statutory codes**, and **administrative courts**.

Reclaiming freedom means **reestablishing the original form of governance—bottom-up** rather than **top-down**.

### Key Features of a Lawful County Assembly:

| Feature            | De Jure Assembly                     | De Facto Government (Corporation)         |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Basis of Authority | Consent of the governed (Common Law) | Corporate charter under statutory law     |
| Jurisdiction       | Article III / Law of the Land        | Article I / Maritime Commercial Codes     |
| Members            | Living men and women                 | “Residents” or “persons” (legal fictions) |

|                 |                                  |   |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Enforcement     | Constitutional sheriff           | Corporate police department               |
| Legal Framework | Natural law and the Constitution | Ordinances, statutes, administrative code |

By forming your **local county assembly**, you step outside the commercial, statutory system and reclaim your **status** as one of **We the People**, not a “person” subject to municipal codes.

---

## II. The Role of the Common Law Grand Jury

The **common law grand jury** is one of the most powerful yet suppressed instruments of liberty in America. Unlike modern statutory grand juries—which are often manipulated by prosecutors and operate in secrecy—the **common law grand jury belongs to the people**, not the courts.

### Key Powers of the Common Law Grand Jury:

- Investigates public officials for malfeasance or corruption
- Brings **indictments** based on true injuries to people or property
- Issues **presentments** independent of a prosecutor
- Can **convene itself** without court approval
- Operates outside statutory control under the authority of the **Seventh Amendment** and **natural law**

The U.S. Supreme Court has acknowledged:

“The grand jury is an institution separate from the courts, over whose functioning the courts do not preside.”

—**United States v. Williams**, 504 U.S. 36 (1992)

This means the common law grand jury is **independent of the judicial branch**, and its authority arises **from the people** directly—not from any statute or court.

A properly organized grand jury can:

- Hold rogue officials accountable
- Investigate judicial misconduct
- Protect whistleblowers

- Restore justice where statutory courts have failed
- 

### III. The Constitutional Sheriff: Guardian of the People

The **county sheriff**, when operating under constitutional authority, is the **highest law enforcement officer** in the land **within their jurisdiction**. No federal agent, state trooper, or bureaucrat has lawful superiority over a **duly elected constitutional sheriff**.

#### The Sheriff's Constitutional Duties:

- Uphold and defend the **Constitution** and **Bill of Rights**
- Protect the lives, liberty, and property of the people in the county
- Refuse unlawful orders or enforcement of unconstitutional statutes
- Work with local assemblies and grand juries to **enforce lawful judgment**
- Interpose between tyrannical government actions and the people

However, most sheriffs today operate under **corporate oath**, enforced by statutory compliance, funding contracts, and state-controlled certifications. These sheriffs may unknowingly act as agents of the **de facto system** rather than defenders of the **republic**.

To restore their rightful power:

- Sheriffs must **be educated** on their constitutional authority
- The people must **hold them accountable** to the true oath of office
- County assemblies must **support** their lawful enforcement efforts

Organizations like the **Constitutional Sheriffs and Peace Officers Association (CSPOA)** have begun training sheriffs to reclaim their authority under natural law and defend their counties against unconstitutional overreach.

---

### IV. Organizing Your Community Under Lawful Governance

**Building a lawful community begins with truth, communication, and lawful structure.** It is not enough to simply reject tyranny; we must **replace it** with something better, lawful, and sustainable.

#### Steps to Form a County Assembly:

1. **Educate yourself and others** on lawful jurisdiction and the Constitution
2. **Declare your status** as a living man or woman (not a corporate person)
3. **Connect with others** in your county who seek lawful self-governance
4. **Form a core body** of dedicated individuals to draft an Assembly Charter
5. **Publicly post notices** asserting the reestablishment of your county's de jure assembly
6. **Hold regular meetings** to discuss matters of local concern
7. **Elect officers and recordkeepers** to maintain structure
8. **Form a Grand Jury committee** for future lawful indictments
9. **Engage your sheriff** and educate them on their constitutional role
10. **Document everything**, maintain public notices, and record decisions in permanent records

Over time, your assembly becomes:

- A **lawful body politic**
- A **watchdog over local corruption**
- A **beacon of hope** for neighboring counties

This is how the Republic is restored—**one county at a time**.

---

## V. Lawful vs. Legal Local Governance

### What You Must Reject:

- City councils acting under **municipal corporate charters**
- School boards enforcing **federal social policies**
- Police departments funded by **federal grants tied to surveillance**
- Code enforcement operating without **jury oversight**

- Local taxes imposed without **consent of the governed**

### What You Must Establish:

- Local authority resting in the **hands of the People**
  - Transparent deliberation under **natural and common law**
  - Protection of life, liberty, and property as the **primary purpose**
  - Local sovereignty aligned with **constitutional and spiritual truth**
- 

## Conclusion: The Republic is Local

America will not be saved from the top down. It will be saved from the **grassroots up**—by courageous men and women who restore their **assemblies, sheriffs, and grand juries** in line with **God’s Law, Natural Law, and Common Law**.

It’s time to remember:

“All political power is inherent in the people.” — State Constitutions across the Republic

Your county is not a subdivision of the State—it is the **foundation of the Republic**. Your assembly is not a club—it is a **governing body**. Your sheriff is not a code enforcer—he or she is your **shield against tyranny**.

The time is now. **Gather. Declare. Assemble. Enforce.**

This is how freedom returns.

---

## PART IV: TOOLS, REMEDIES, AND RESOURCES

### Chapter 10: Key Supreme Court Cases and Precedents

#### Affirming Sovereignty and Exposing the Limits of Corporate Governance

Though the machinery of de facto governance operates through intimidation, illusion, and consent, the true legal structure of the United States has, in various moments of clarity, been defined and defended by the **Supreme Court of the United States**. Though often ignored or misapplied in modern corporate courts, these rulings form an **undeniable body of lawful precedent**—affirming the sovereignty of the individual, the limits of government power, and the superiority of constitutional law over corporate regulation.

This chapter explores key Supreme Court cases, including **Ex parte Milligan (1866)** and **Hale v. Henkel (1906)**, and offers a guided analysis of how these decisions support:

- The inherent **sovereignty of the individual**
- The **limitations** placed upon government and corporations
- The supremacy of the **Constitution and common law**
- The boundaries of **lawful vs. legal jurisdiction**
- The role of the court in defending liberty, not commercial interests

These cases are **bedrock affirmations** that must be understood and invoked by every American seeking to reclaim their **status** and operate in **lawful jurisdiction**.

---

## I. Ex parte Milligan (1866) – Limits of Martial Law and Civil Liberty

### Background

During the Civil War, President Lincoln suspended habeas corpus, and military tribunals were used to try civilians accused of disloyalty. **Lambdin P. Milligan**, a civilian in Indiana, was arrested, tried by military commission, and sentenced to death—even though civil courts were open and functioning.

Milligan petitioned the Supreme Court, arguing that he was entitled to a **trial by jury** and that the military tribunal was unconstitutional.

### Decision

The Court ruled in favor of Milligan, holding:

“The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace... no doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government.”

### Key Principles:

- Martial law **cannot override constitutional protections** when civil courts are available.
- The use of military tribunals against civilians is unconstitutional unless absolutely necessary.
- The **rights of the People** are not suspended even in times of emergency.

#### Modern Implication:

Ex parte Milligan affirms that **emergency powers**, like those invoked after 1871 or during national crises, do **not justify suspension of constitutional law**. This directly contradicts the practice of applying **statutory or martial enforcement** in peacetime governance.

---

## II. Hale v. Henkel (1906) – The Individual vs. the Corporate Entity

### Background

This case involved **Edward Hale**, a corporate officer of the MacAndrews & Forbes Company, who was subpoenaed and ordered to provide business records in a federal investigation into antitrust violations. Hale refused, citing the **Fourth and Fifth Amendments**.

The Court ruled **partially** in favor of Hale, making one of the most significant distinctions in legal history: the difference between the **individual** and the **corporate fiction**.

### Key Excerpts from the Decision:

“The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way... He owes no duty to the state or to his neighbors to divulge his business or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him...”

“Upon the other hand, the corporation is a creature of the state. It is presumed to be incorporated for the benefit of the public... It receives certain special privileges and franchises and holds them subject to the laws of the state.”

### Key Principles:

- **Individuals possess unalienable constitutional rights**; corporations do not.
- A man or woman cannot be **compelled** to become a witness against themselves under the Fifth Amendment.
- A corporation has **no right to privacy** under the Fourth Amendment when acting in a commercial capacity.

## Modern Implication:

This case clearly distinguishes between the **sovereign living man or woman** and the **legal fiction** (e.g., the STRAWMAN). The state's power is over the **corporate entity**, not the **living individual**. This is the cornerstone of understanding the **difference between lawful and legal jurisdiction**.

---

## III. Additional Cases Supporting Sovereignty and Jurisdictional Limits

### Crandall v. Nevada (1875)

“For a citizen of one state to travel into or through another state, and to carry his effects with him, is a right given by the Constitution...”

This case affirms the **right to travel freely** without license or restriction. This contradicts the system of driver's licenses and commercial regulation imposed on private transportation under **presumed maritime jurisdiction**.

---

### Miranda v. Arizona (1966)

While best known for the “Miranda Rights,” this case upheld the necessity of **informed consent** in legal proceedings:

“Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.”

This ruling supports the principle that **constitutional rights cannot be legislated away by statutory codes**—a central issue in lawful vs. legal jurisdiction.

---

### Bond v. United States (2011)

In this case, the Court confirmed that **individuals can challenge federal statutes** as violations of **state sovereignty and personal liberty**:

“Federalism secures to citizens the liberties that derive from the diffusion of sovereign power.”

This case provides a tool for challenging **federal overreach**, including laws imposed through **U.S. citizen status under the 14th Amendment**.

---

## IV. The Supremacy of the Constitution

## Under **Article VI of the Constitution**:

“This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof... shall be the supreme Law of the Land.”

Only laws that are made **in pursuance of the Constitution** are valid. Laws that conflict with it—no matter how popular or long-standing—are **null and void**.

This has been affirmed in:

- **Marbury v. Madison (1803):**

“All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void.”

This principle has been powerfully affirmed in *Marbury v. Madison* (1803), one of the most foundational Supreme Court cases in American history, where the Court declared unequivocally that **“All laws which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void.”** This ruling established the doctrine of constitutional supremacy, confirming that no statute, regulation, policy, or government action can override the supreme law of the land. It also reinforced the truth that the Constitution is not merely a guideline but a binding legal restraint on all branches of government. When any law conflicts with the Constitution, it is not merely defective—it is legally nonexistent, carrying no authority, no enforceability, and no lawful weight. This landmark decision stands as a permanent reminder that the People, through the Constitution, hold the highest authority, and that any government action attempting to exceed those limits collapses under its own illegitimacy.

- **Norton v. Shelby County (1886):**

“An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties.”

This truth is further reinforced in *Norton v. Shelby County* (1886), where the Supreme Court declared that **“An unconstitutional act is not law; it confers no rights; it imposes no duties.”** In this landmark ruling, the Court clarified that any statute, ordinance, or government action that violates the Constitution is void from the moment of its creation—not voidable, not questionable, but absolutely without legal effect. Such acts cannot bind the People, cannot create obligations, and cannot be enforced under any legitimate claim of authority. This decision underscores the foundational principle that governmental power is strictly limited, and when officials step outside those boundaries, their actions carry no lawful force whatsoever. By reaffirming that unconstitutional measures are legal nullities, the Court reasserted that true authority flows from the Constitution and the People it protects—not from the whims of officials, agencies, or corporate governments attempting to operate beyond their lawful jurisdiction.

## V. Reclaiming Sovereignty Through Precedent

These rulings, though centuries old in some cases, **have not been overturned**. They are still binding precedent—but **only if the people invoke them**. Courts will not apply them unless **you declare your standing, rebut presumptions, and assert your lawful jurisdiction**.

### How to Use These Cases:

1. **Cite them** in affidavits and court documents
  2. Include them in your **notices of status** and declarations
  3. Share and teach them within your **county assembly**
  4. Use them to challenge the **presumption of jurisdiction**
  5. Combine them with the **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)** to distinguish yourself from your STRAWMAN
- 

## Conclusion: The Law Still Stands — If You Stand On It

The Supreme Court has spoken—not once, but many times—on the **sovereignty of the individual**, the **limits of government power**, and the **unlawful transformation of rights into privileges**. These rulings form the **foundation of your lawful defense** against tyranny, overreach, and corporate deception.

But if you remain silent, the system will presume your consent. If you act as a legal fiction, the courts will treat you as one. And if you fail to invoke these precedents, **they will remain buried in books, rather than brought to bear in battle**.

**Reclaiming the Republic** is not about rebellion. It is about **reviving the rule of law**—the true law. These cases are the **weapons of truth**, forged by those who came before us. Use them. Stand upon them. And never let them be forgotten.

---

## Chapter 11: Sample Affidavits and Legal Notices

### Reclaiming Your Status Through Lawful Declaration and Due Notice

The “legal” system—especially in its current de facto corporate form—**thrives on presumption**. If you do not rebut the system’s assumptions about your identity, jurisdiction, and consent, it proceeds under the belief that you are a **willing participant**, subject to statutory jurisdiction, commercial contracts, and administrative rulings. **Silence is taken as consent**. This is the primary mechanism by which nearly all Americans are unknowingly bound to the **Maritime Admiralty system** of corporate governance.

The remedy begins with your **word**—written, sworn, and served with clarity. This chapter presents sample templates and a deep explanation for three foundational lawful declarations:

1. **Declaration of Status**
2. **Notice of Understanding and Intent**
3. **Refusal of Consent to Contract**

These documents do not rely on corporate processes. Instead, they invoke your **unalienable rights**, rooted in **common law**, **natural law**, and the **Constitutional Republic**. Each affidavit functions as a **lawful record**, declaring your standing, rebutting presumptions, and asserting your God-given jurisdiction as a **living man or woman**.

---

## I. Declaration of Status

The Declaration of Status is a foundational document that **removes presumption** that you are a 14th Amendment “U.S. citizen,” “person,” or “resident” under the UNITED STATES corporation. Instead, it clearly affirms your identity as a **living, breathing, sovereign man or woman**, a member of the **Posterity** referenced in the **Preamble of the Constitution for the united States of America (1787)**.

### Key Elements to Include:

- Name in Proper Case (e.g., John-David: of the House Smith)
- Distinction from ALL CAPS legal fiction
- Statement of natural birth and physical location (e.g., born on the land known as Michigan)
- Affirmation of allegiance to Natural Law, not corporate statutes
- Statement of non-participation in voluntary adhesion contracts (e.g., social security, licensing)

- Signature and thumbprint under penalty of perjury

**Sample Text:**

**DECLARATION OF STATUS**

I, John-David: of the House Smith, a living man born on the land commonly known as Michigan, do hereby declare:

1. That I am a living, breathing, sentient man created by the Divine Creator, and I am not, nor have I ever knowingly or willingly consented to be, a citizen or subject of the corporate entity known as the UNITED STATES, its franchises, subsidiaries, or agents.
2. That I am not a “person,” “resident,” “U.S. citizen,” or “legal entity” as those terms are defined in federal statutory codes, but rather a member of the sovereign People, as referenced in the Preamble to the Constitution for the united States of America (1787).
3. That the corporate entity JOHN DAVID SMITH, spelled in all capital letters, is a legal fiction/trust created without my full knowledge or consent and does not represent the living man.
4. That I retain all rights, titles, and interests in and to my body, mind, labor, property, and estate, free of any foreign jurisdiction, trust, lien, or encumbrance.
5. That I do not consent to any statutory jurisdiction unless such jurisdiction is proven with verified contract, full disclosure, and mutual agreement.

This Declaration is made in good faith, without malice, under the authority of my Creator and the Law of the Land. Let it be recorded and honored accordingly.

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

Autograph: \_\_\_\_\_

(Living Man/Woman, not a person)

Witnesses: \_\_\_\_\_

Thumbprint Seal (red ink): \_\_\_\_\_

---

## **II. Notice of Understanding and Intent**

This document is a **notice of communication and contract principle**. Under Maxims of Law and Commercial Equity, “He who fails to object, consents.” This notice explicitly:

- States your **understanding** of a situation
- Declares your **intentions** in law
- **Rebuts presumptions** of consent or agreement

This document is essential when dealing with **police officers, court summons, tax notices**, or any other **governmental agent** attempting to bind you into their system.

**Sample Text:**

**NOTICE OF UNDERSTANDING AND INTENT**

To all agents, officers, agencies, courts, or individuals acting under color of law:

I, Sarah-Elizabeth: of the House Johnson, a living woman on the land, issue this notice in good faith:

1. That I understand that most interactions by state or federal agents operate under **assumed consent** and **statutory jurisdiction**, which require **rebuttal** to avoid presumption.
2. That I do not consent to any contract, license, or regulation unless entered into knowingly, willingly, and voluntarily, with full disclosure and lawful consideration.
3. That I understand that I have the right to travel freely, to speak freely, and to be secure in my person, papers, and effects, and these rights are **unalienable**.
4. That I do not grant authority to any corporate or statutory entity to interpret my silence or cooperation as agreement.
5. That my intent is to live in peace, under the Law of the Land, and to retain my lawful standing as a non-combatant, non-resident, non-person, and sovereign child of the Creator.

Should any party wish to challenge this understanding or intent, let them do so in writing, signed under full commercial and lawful liability, within 21 days of receipt of this notice.

Failure to respond constitutes agreement with the above declarations.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Autograph: \_\_\_\_\_

Without prejudice, UCC 1-308

Witnesses: \_\_\_\_\_

Notary (optional): \_\_\_\_\_

---

### III. Refusal of Consent to Contract

Statutory enforcement is built upon **tacit agreement** and **contractual interaction**. This document is designed to declare, in no uncertain terms, that:

- You are **not contracting**
- You **refuse all adhesion contracts**
- You reject all **unconscionable presumptions** of legal authority over you

This notice can be used during traffic stops, court proceedings, or interactions with revenue agents.

#### Sample Text:

##### NOTICE OF REFUSAL OF CONSENT TO CONTRACT

I, Matthew: of the family Bennett, a living man of lawful standing, hereby issue this notice under the protections of natural and common law:

1. I do not consent to contract with any agency, officer, court, or corporate entity of the UNITED STATES or any of its subsidiaries.
2. I refuse any and all offers of contract which are not entered knowingly, voluntarily, and without coercion.
3. I reject all legal presumptions arising from documents such as the Birth Certificate, Social Security Number, Driver's License, or other state-issued identifiers, and I deny that these constitute consent or agreement.
4. I retain all rights at all times and under all circumstances, and I do not consent to any diminution of my rights under the guise of policy, emergency, or color of law.
5. This Notice serves as lawful rebuttal to all current or future presumptions of jurisdiction, contract, or liability not specifically agreed to in writing and under lawful capacity.

Let it be known that any continued attempts to force or presume contract in spite of this notice shall constitute unlawful coercion, fraud, or duress.

Autograph: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

Without prejudice, UCC 1-308

Witnesses: \_\_\_\_\_

Thumbprint Seal (Red Ink): \_\_\_\_\_

---

#### IV. Notes on Usage and Enforcement

- All notices and affidavits must be **signed with proper intent**: using the living being's name, not the legal fiction.
  - Include the phrase "**Without prejudice, UCC 1-308**" to preserve your rights.
  - Use **notarization or witness signatures** to establish **credibility and legal standing**.
  - Always retain multiple **originals** and **send copies via registered mail** with proof of delivery.
  - Keep an archive of **affidavits sent, responses received, and legal interactions**.
  - If no rebuttal is received, record the notice in the public via your **county assembly** or **common law court of record**.
- 

#### Conclusion: Lawful Standing Must Be Declared

In the modern administrative system, failure to assert your status allows the machinery of statutory law to roll forward **unopposed**. The only way to interrupt its momentum is by invoking your standing as a **living sovereign**, rebutting presumption, and **declaring your intent in law**.

Affidavits and lawful notices, when properly written and served, become **evidence of truth in commerce**. They are not magic bullets, but lawful shields—**your word made record**, standing in honor, backed by truth.

If enough Americans follow suit—speaking the truth in law, on the record—the system of silent subjugation will collapse. The Republic will rise—not from the courts or Congress—but from the pens, mouths, and acts of the People.

---

## Chapter 12: Glossary of Terms

### Understanding Legalese vs. Plain English and the Redefinition of Words in Commercial Jurisdiction

The greatest weapon of control used by the de facto system is not force—but language. Through the manipulation and redefinition of common terms, the corporate legal system has deceived an entire population into believing that **they are something they are not** and that **statutory laws apply when they lawfully do not**.

This deception operates through a specialized language called **Legalese**—a dialect of English used by the legal profession and embedded within statutes, regulations, and contracts. Words in Legalese often **look identical to plain English**, but carry **radically different meanings**—especially within the context of **Maritime Admiralty (Commercial) Jurisdiction**.

In this chapter, we will expose the deceptive power of Legalese by:

- Comparing **plain English definitions** with **legal dictionary definitions**
- Identifying **terms of art** that entrap the unwary into contracts
- Clarifying the **distinction between lawful and legal meanings**
- Reclaiming the power of **words used in affidavits, courtrooms, and contracts**

Understanding this glossary is not optional—it is essential. Without knowledge of how terms have been redefined, one walks into a courtroom or legal interaction as a **contracting party, presumed to be in commerce**, and therefore **governed by private policy masquerading as public law**.

---

## I. The Nature of Legalese: Law by Deception

Legalese is built upon the principle that **you won't ask what the words mean**. It is filled with what are called **terms of art**—words that carry specific, non-obvious meanings in law, particularly within codes and statutes.

A simple example:

- **Plain English:** “I am a person.”
- **Legalese (Blacks Law Dictionary):** “Person” = “A human being (natural person) or an entity (such as a corporation) that is recognized by law as having rights and duties.”

Thus, by calling yourself a “person” in court, you may have just agreed to be a **corporate entity subject to commercial regulation**, rather than a **living man or woman under natural law**.

This subtle substitution of meaning is how **consent is manufactured** without full disclosure. As the maxim of law states:

“He who does not understand the words, is ensnared by them.”

## II. Glossary of Critical Terms: Legalese vs. Plain English

### CONSTITUTIONAL JURISDICTION

#### Main Jurisdictions Under the Constitution

| COMMON LAW                              | EQUITY LAW                            | ADMIRALTY LAW                                   | STATUTORY LAW                            |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Type                                    | Type                                  | Type  | Type                                     |
| Law of the Land                         | Law of Fairness                       | Law of the Sea                                  | Law of Corporations                      |
| Scope                                   | Scope                                 | Scope   | Scope                                    |
| Natural rights, property, life, liberty | Trusts, contracts, equitable remedies | Commerce, shipping, international trade         | Codes, licenses, regulations, governance |
| Source                                  | Source                                | Source  | Source                                   |
| English Common Law, Scripture, Reason   | Chancery Court Doctrine               | International Maritime Law                      | U.S. Code, State Statutes                |
| Court                                   | Court                                 | Court   | Court                                    |
| Jury of Peers                           | Judge (no jury)                       | U.S. District Court (non-jury unless specified) | Administrative or Article I Court        |

## III. Terms That Redefine Your Identity

The transformation from sovereign to subject began with the **redefinition of what you are**. The U.S. legal system systematically **substituted corporate fictions** for living men and women.

### ➤ U.S. Citizen (14th Amendment)

- Not the same as a **state citizen** or **original sovereign**.
- A status created after the Civil War to bind freed slaves and all Americans under **federal corporate jurisdiction**.
- U.S. Citizens are governed by **federal statutes**, not the Constitution alone.

### ➤ Resident / Inhabitant

- Legally, not a permanent domicile; the term implies **foreign status** in the land.

- Residents are **commercial tenants** with obligations to the host entity (the STATE).

➤ **Person / Individual / Defendant**

- These are legal terms of **commerce**.
- Once identified as a “person,” you are treated as a **corporate vessel** operating under maritime jurisdiction.

---

## **IV. The Power of Correct Terminology**

When writing affidavits, engaging in court, or filing lawful documents, always use **terms that affirm your standing** and **refute legal fictions**.

Use:

- “Living man” or “Living woman”
- “On the land known as [State]”
- “Without the U.S.” or “non-resident non-person”
- “One of We the People”
- “Sovereign by birthright”
- “By special appearance only” (to avoid general jurisdiction)

Avoid:

- “Person,” “citizen,” “resident,” “driver,” “individual,” or “defendant”
- Signing in cursive next to “signature” lines without qualifiers
- Responding without clarifying your **status and intent**

---

## **V. Legal Maxims to Remember**

Maxims of Law are foundational truths of legal logic. A few that apply directly to Legalese include:

- “He who fails to assert his rights has none.”
  - “Consent makes the law.”
  - “Let him who would be deceived, be deceived.”
  - “To know the law and live outside of it is to be free; to ignore it is to be enslaved.”
- 

## VI. Conclusion: Language Is the Battlefield

The war for your freedom begins and ends with **language**. To reclaim your status, you must stop speaking in the language of the system that enslaves you.

Your power is in your words—your declarations, your understanding, your lawful position. When you know who you are, and say who you are, the system cannot lawfully deny you **without committing fraud, coercion, or treason**.

Study these terms. Speak with precision. Write with authority. And never again let your words become **your chains**.

---

## Chapter 13: Suggested Reading and Study Materials

### Foundational Works for Lawful Understanding, Sovereignty, and Redemption

To restore what has been lost, we must **return to the source**. The foundational principles of law, liberty, and sovereignty are **not hidden**—they are preserved in the writings of wise men, the structure of the original Constitution, and the Commentaries that shaped Anglo-American common law for centuries. What is hidden is **our awareness** of these truths. This chapter presents a curated and structured list of texts, documents, resources, and study materials necessary for anyone seeking to **reclaim their lawful status**, understand true jurisdiction, and resist the encroachment of **statutory commercial tyranny**.

It is not enough to know **that** something is wrong. One must know **why**, and more importantly, **how to respond**. These resources are the compass and toolkit for that journey.

---

### I. Foundational Texts of Lawful Jurisdiction

These are **must-read original works** that anchor every aspect of common law, due process, natural rights, and sovereignty.

◆ **Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England (1765–1769)**

- **Author:** Sir William Blackstone
- **Importance:** The single most influential work on the structure of English common law.
- **Relevance:** The Framers of the U.S. Constitution studied Blackstone extensively. His commentaries define the law of the land—**not statutes, not corporate codes, but universal principles of justice**.
- **Recommended Editions:** The 4-volume original edition; “The Heart of Blackstone” by Nanette B. Paul for a simplified breakdown.
- **Key Concepts:**
  - Rights of persons and property
  - Due process and the jury system
  - Sovereignty of the individual
  - The distinction between law and force

◆ **The Constitution for the united States of America (1787)**

- **Document:** The **organic Constitution** ratified by the original states, binding the federal government under natural law.
- **Key Aspects:**
  - Creates a **trust** for the People (We the People)
  - Limits government to **enumerated powers**
  - Recognizes rights as **unalienable**, not granted
  - **Superseded** by the 1871 corporate charter in practice, but not in law
- **Why Study It?:** Understanding the original Constitution exposes the fraud of the **Constitution “of” the United States**—a corporate bylaw of the UNITED STATES corporation.

### ♦ The Declaration of Independence (1776)

- **Purpose:** Serves as a **lawful declaration of separation** from tyranny, asserting the universal laws of nature and of nature's God.
  - **Key Statement:** "...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..."
  - **Why Study It?:** It defines the **principle of self-governance**, and provides the legal philosophy for **lawful rebellion against unlawful authority**.
- 

## II. Essential Modern Resources on Sovereignty, Status, and Redemption

While original sources provide the foundation, the following books and study guides provide the **bridge** to understanding how the original principles have been **co-opted, commercialized, and weaponized** against the People.

### ♦ The UCC Connection – by Howard Freeman

- **Summary:** A short, yet powerful introduction to how **Maritime Admiralty law** and the **Uniform Commercial Code** are used to convert common law courts into **commercial tribunals**.
- **Key Concepts:**
  - Consent through contract
  - The fiction of the STRAWMAN
  - How to reserve rights using UCC 1-308

### ♦ Cracking the Code – by Peter Eric Hendrickson

- **Focus:** Detailed analysis of the **Internal Revenue Code**, exposing the limits of federal tax jurisdiction.
- **Relevance:** Helps separate **voluntary consent** from presumed obligation.

### ♦ The Red Amendment – by David Clarence & Family Guardian

- **Purpose:** Deep investigation into the **14th Amendment**, how it enslaved the people through **federal citizenship**, and how to rebut it.
  - **Includes:**
    - Processes for declaring non-citizen national status
    - Affidavits and law citations to restore sovereignty
  - ◆ **The Sovereign's Handbook – by Johnny Liberty**
    - **Scope:** Covers citizenship, commercial contracts, natural rights, and remedy in both private and public interactions.
    - **Key Features:**
      - Glossary of Legalese
      - Step-by-step breakdowns of lawful processes
      - Resources for private trusts and asset protection
  - ◆ **The Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)**
    - **Where to Start:** UCC Article 1 and Article 9
    - **Why:** These articles govern all commercial transactions in the U.S., including presumed contracts. Sovereign men and women use UCC filings (e.g., UCC-1 Financing Statement) to **reclaim control over their STRAWMAN and estate.**
- 

### III. Study Sites, Document Archives, and Free Courses

- ◆ **Michigan General Jural Assembly (MGJA)**
    - Example of a functioning lawful assembly organized under common law jurisdiction.
    - Maintains records with international bodies.
-

## IV. Topics for Ongoing Study

To become fully competent in restoring and exercising your lawful status, study the following areas deeply:

### ♦ Common Law

- Law of the land
- Grand juries and trial by jury
- Affidavits, notices, and declarations

### ♦ Natural Law

- Unalienable rights from the Creator
- Hierarchy of law: God > Man > Government > Corporations

### ♦ UCC & Redemption

- STRAWMAN vs. living man/woman
- Secured Party Creditor process
- Commercial liens, negotiable instruments

### ♦ Trust Law

- Revocable vs. irrevocable trusts
- Private administration of property and estate
- Avoiding probate and unlawful taxation

### ♦ Lawful Documentation

- How to write affidavits
- Refusing jurisdiction
- Using maxims of law and Supreme Court precedent

## VI. Conclusion: Truth Is in the Books—But You Must Open Them

It is written: “My people perish for lack of knowledge.” The power to reclaim your freedom is not in slogans, protests, or violence—it is in **comprehending the law**, then standing on it with honor.

Reading alone won’t save you—but reading with **intentional application**, **civic action**, and **lawful standing** will. Let these materials be your compass. Let the truth anchor your soul. And let knowledge become your sword in the peaceful, lawful revolution ahead.

---

## Appendices

### Appendix: Reproduction of Key Historical Documents

#### Preserving the Original Foundations of Lawful Government

In the pursuit of truth and the restoration of lawful governance, we must not rely solely on secondary interpretations, but instead anchor our understanding in the very documents that **established, defined, and safeguarded liberty**. This appendix presents a reproduction and contextual annotation of several foundational documents essential to understanding **American sovereignty, lawful authority**, and the shift from a **Constitutional Republic to a corporate democracy** under foreign jurisdiction.

These documents—when understood in their historical and lawful context—become **evidence of the original trust**, the **delegated authority of government**, and the **sovereignty of the People**. Each one serves as a **legal and moral witness** against the deception, usurpation, and substitution that followed, particularly after the Civil War, the Act of 1871, and the adoption of the 14th Amendment.

This appendix includes:

1. **The Declaration of Independence (1776)**
2. **The Articles of Confederation (1781)**
3. **The Constitution for the united States of America (1787) – Organic**
4. **The Bill of Rights (1791) – The First Ten Amendments**
5. **The Reconstruction Acts (1867–1868)**
6. **The District of Columbia Organic Act (1871)**
7. **The 14th Amendment (1868) – As Ratified**

## 8. The Trading with the Enemy Act (1917)

## 9. House Joint Resolution 192 (1933)

## 10. Ex parte Milligan (1866) and Hale v. Henkel (1906) – Key Excerpts

Each reproduction is followed by a summary of its **relevance**, **legal effect**, and **misuse or manipulation** in the present day.

---

# 1. The Declaration of Independence (1776)

## A Covenant of Natural Law, Sovereignty, and the People's Right to Reclaim Government

---

### Introduction: A Declaration That Changed the World

When the fifty-six delegates of the Second Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence on **July 4, 1776**, they did more than merely sever political ties with Great Britain. They issued a **foundational legal, spiritual, and moral proclamation** grounded in the eternal truths of **Natural Law**, declaring that the rights of man come not from kings, parliaments, or charters—but from the **Creator Himself**. This document stands not just as a revolutionary war cry but as a **perpetual trust instrument**—a statement of the **People's authority to form, control, and when necessary, dissolve governments** that violate their sacred liberties.

The Declaration is often remembered for its poetic opening or historical consequences, but in truth, it is the **original title deed of American sovereignty**. It lays out a philosophical and legal framework rooted in **self-evident truth, natural rights, and lawful rebellion against tyranny**. It is the **cornerstone of de jure government**, and its authority transcends time, statute, and even the Constitution itself.

---

### Full Text of the Declaration of Independence (1776)

**IN CONGRESS, July 4, 1776.**

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America,

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, 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 they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

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,—That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.—Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government.

The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States...

**Below are the 27 specific grievances against King George III**

## Grievance 1

---

***"He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good."***

"The Colonial Assemblies, from time to time, made enactments touching their commercial operations, the emission of a colonial currency, and concerning representatives in the imperial Parliament, but the assent of the sovereign to these laws was withheld. After the Stamp-Act excitements, Secretary Conway informed the Americans that the tumults should be overlooked, provided the Assemblies would make provision for full compensation for all public property which had been destroyed. In complying with this demand, the Assembly of Massachusetts stated it would be 'wholesome and necessary for the public good' to grant free pardon to all who had been engaged in the disturbances, and passed an act accordingly. It would have produced quiet and good feeling; but the royal assent was refused."

Self-governance was at the heart of the Founding Fathers' concerns, and each time George III refused to ratify Colonial legislation, he intensified that concern.

Each rejected act reminded the colonists that a distant monarch claimed greater authority over their daily lives than their own elected representatives, making it clear that the struggle for independence was not merely political rebellion, but a necessary defense of their right to govern themselves.

## Grievance 2

---

***"He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them."***

This is an indictment of the King's appointed governors in the colonies, who had refused to endorse laws colonists viewed as conducive to the public good. The Massachusetts Assembly passed a law in 1770 for taxing Government officers in that colony, but the King ordered the governor to withhold his assent. Thus, the King violated the colonial charter and showed the little power of the colonies.

"Neglect" is one of two reasons mentioned by John Locke as a valid reason for a dissolved government.

This pattern of obstruction was not a mere political inconvenience—it was a direct breach of the foundational contract between the governed and the governing. By refusing to allow the colonies to pass laws essential to their own welfare, the Crown demonstrated that it no longer recognized the people's inherent authority to secure their lives, liberties, and property. Under Locke's framework, such persistent neglect was not only a justification for resistance but a signal that the sovereign had forfeited legitimacy. In the eyes of the colonists, a government that could arbitrarily block self-preserving measures had already dissolved itself, leaving the people with both the right and the duty to establish new safeguards for their freedom.

## Grievance 3

---

***"He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only."***

Chapter 19 of Two Treatises of Government notes that "when such a single person, or prince, sets up his own arbitrary will, in place of the laws, which are the will of the society, declared by the legislative, then the legislative is changed." Locke lists changing the legislature without the people's knowledge or consent as another situation that justifies reform of government.

Such unilateral overreach signaled that the ruler no longer operated as a guardian of the people's collective will, but as a usurper acting in defiance of it. When the legislative power is altered without authorization, the social contract itself is fractured, for the people never consented to be ruled by an authority acting outside its lawful bounds. Locke makes clear that this breach is not a minor constitutional irregularity but a fundamental injury to political society, dissolving the very trust on which government rests. In such circumstances, the people retain not only the right but the obligation to reclaim and reconstitute their governing structures in accordance with their original and natural authority.

## Grievance 4

---

***"He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, and also uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their Public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures."***

On May 20, 1774, Parliament passed the Massachusetts Government Act, which nullified the Massachusetts Charter of 1691 and allowed governor Thomas Gage to dissolve the local provincial assembly and force them to meet in Salem instead of Boston.

This act was viewed by the colonists as an unmistakable declaration that their traditional rights, granted and secured for generations, could be erased at the whim of imperial power. By stripping Massachusetts of its chartered autonomy, Parliament signaled that no colony was safe from total subjugation under centralized rule. The forced relocation of the assembly was not simply an administrative inconvenience—it was a calculated move to break the political will of the people by severing them from their own seat of government. Rather than pacifying the colonies, this heavy-handed assault on self-government unified them in resistance and further convinced Americans that the British ministry intended to rule them by coercion rather than consent.

## Grievance 5

---

***"He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people."***

The Massachusetts Assembly issued a circular to other Assemblies in 1768 urging mutual co-operation in asserting the principle that Great Britain had no right to tax the colonists without their consent. The King then demanded that the Assembly rescind the resolutions expressed in the circular, and he ordered the governor to dissolve the Massachusetts Assembly immediately if they refused. Other assemblies were warned by the Government not to imitate Massachusetts, and the King dissolved any that refused to yield to their royally appointed governors. The North Carolina General Assembly and Virginia General Assembly were dissolved for denying the right of the King to tax the colonies or to extradite Americans from the colonies to stand trial. Several assemblies

discussed forming a general Congress with delegates from all the colonies in 1774, and the King dissolved nearly all those that entertained the idea.<sup>[3]</sup> The Virginia House of Burgesses had implemented five resolutions, however, attempted to rescind the fifth on the 31st of May, 1765. As the papers had already printed their implementation, Royal Governor Francis Fauquier dissolved the House for adopting the resolutions.

## Grievance 6

---

***"He has refused for a long time, after such Dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative Powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining, in the meantime, exposed to all the Dangers of Invasion from without, and convulsions within."***

The New York Restraining Act 1767 which suspended the Assembly's legislative authority. John Dickinson discusses the suspension of New York's assembly in *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania*.

The Assembly of Massachusetts was dissolved in July 1768, and was not permitted to meet again until the last Wednesday of May 1769; even then, they found a military guard surrounding their meeting location with cannons pointed directly at it.

Such deliberate suppression of legislative bodies revealed a systematic strategy to break colonial resistance by dismantling the very institutions through which the people expressed their will. Dickinson warned that once a government begins suspending assemblies and coercing legislatures, it effectively declares that rights exist only at the pleasure of power, not by inherent principle. The presence of armed troops and cannons outside a lawful assembly hall transformed what should have been a deliberative civic space into a scene of intimidation, proving the Crown's intent to govern through fear rather than dialogue. These affronts convinced many colonists that the British government no longer viewed them as free subjects entitled to self-rule, but as a population to be subdued—and that only united resistance could preserve their liberties.

## Grievance 7

---

***"He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands."***

There had been a large influx of German immigrants immigrating to America, and the King wanted to discourage such immigration. The Government was concerned over the increasing power of the colonies and the widespread popularity of republican ideals among German immigrants. After the

peace of 1763, few people settled west of the Alleghenies due to these restrictions, and immigration had almost ceased by the time of the revolution.

By restricting the movement of these new settlers, the Crown aimed to limit the cultural and political diversity that was strengthening colonial resistance to centralized authority. German immigrants, many of whom carried with them traditions of local autonomy and communal governance, were seen as a threat to the hierarchical structure Britain sought to preserve. The deliberate slowing of immigration was therefore not merely demographic management, but an ideological effort to prevent the colonies from becoming a refuge for independent-minded peoples who favored self-determination. In the end, these policies only intensified colonial resentment, reinforcing the belief that Britain feared the very freedoms that Americans increasingly viewed as their birthright.

## Grievance 8

---

***"He has obstructed the Administration of Justice by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary Powers."***

Parliament deprived the people of Massachusetts the right to elect their judges in 1774. Instead, the King appointed all the colony's judges, and they were dependent on him for their salaries and subject to his directions—and those salaries came from taxes and duties on the colonists. The same act deprived the colonists of the benefit of trial by jury, and the "administration of justice" was obstructed. Other colonies expressed similar grievances concerning the courts of law.

This shift transformed the judiciary from an impartial guardian of rights into an instrument of royal enforcement, severing the essential bond of trust between the people and their courts. By tying judicial compensation to the Crown—and extracting that compensation from the very citizens subjected to these rulings—Britain created a legal system in which justice could be purchased by power rather than secured by principle. The erosion of trial by jury, one of the oldest protections of English liberty, signaled to the colonists that even the basic safeguards of fairness could be revoked whenever they proved inconvenient to imperial aims. Faced with courts that no longer defended their rights, the colonists increasingly came to view independence as the only path to restoring lawful justice and constitutional integrity.

## Grievance 9

---

***"He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries."***

Judges and royally appointed governors did not depend upon the colonists for their income; they drew their salaries from the King, and the American colonists saw that this led their officers to

sympathize with Parliament but not with the colonies. The Colonial assemblies protested against these measures, leading to the formation of the Committees of correspondence in 1774.

When Chief Justice Oliver declared it to be his intention to receive his salary from the crown, the Assembly proceeded to impeach him and petitioned Governor Thomas Hutchinson for his removal. The governor refused compliance and great irritation ensued.

The colonists understood that a judiciary and executive financially tethered to the Crown could never serve as neutral arbiters of justice, but would inevitably function as extensions of royal will. Oliver's defiance confirmed their worst suspicions—that British officials were prepared to abandon local accountability entirely in favor of unwavering loyalty to London. The governor's refusal to honor the Assembly's impeachment signaled that even lawful colonial remedies were now being overridden, leaving the people without any legitimate avenue for redress. This escalating disregard for colonial authority deepened the sense that a constitutional breaking point had been reached, compelling the colonies to organize more systematically in defense of their rights and liberties.

## Grievance 10

---

***"He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people and eat out their substance."***

After the passage of the Stamp Act, stamp distributors were appointed in every considerable town. In 1766 and 1767, acts for the collection of duties created "swarms of officers", all of whom received high salaries; and when in 1768, admiralty and vice-admiralty courts were established on a new basis, an increase in the number of officers was made. The high salaries and extensive perquisites of all of these were paid with the people's money, and thus "swarms of officers, ate out their substance."

These proliferating officials did not merely enforce regulations—they became daily reminders of an expanding bureaucracy imposed without the consent of the governed. Their authority reached into commerce, transportation, property, and even personal correspondence, turning ordinary life into a constant negotiation with distant imperial power. As their numbers grew, so did the financial burden on the colonists, who were forced to fund a system designed to regulate and restrain them rather than represent or protect them. This unchecked expansion of salaried officers convinced many Americans that Britain intended to govern them through administrative domination, not constitutional partnership, and that such a system could no longer be tolerated by a free people.

## Grievance 11

---

***"He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures."***

In 1763, Britain and France signed the Treaty of Paris to end the Seven Years' War. Parliament realized they needed to keep a permanent army in the American colonies in order both to keep the French from reasserting their control of their former territories and to prevent open warfare between the colonists and the Native Americans along the frontier. Although the colonists initially welcomed the protection provided by the soldiers by the 1760s and early 1770s they had increasingly come to see the army as a tool for Parliament to enforce various revenue acts—e.g. the Stamp Act and Townshend Acts—that many colonists viewed as illegitimate. The last straw came in 1774 when Parliament passed the Quartering Act in response to the Boston Tea Party. This act allowed army officers to appropriate private property to quarter their troops without the consent of the property's owners. When General Thomas Gage occupied Boston in September 1774, he relied on this act to quarter his troops. It was Gage's military occupation of Boston that led the Second Continental Congress to include this grievance in the Declaration of Independence.

## Grievance 12

---

***"He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil Power."***

Upon his arrival at Boston in 1774, Thomas Gage – commander-in-chief of the British forces in North America – assumed control of the civil government as royal governor of Massachusetts. Both offices were held by royal appointment and without the approval of the people or the provincial government of Massachusetts. This was done according to the authority of Parliament (see: Massachusetts Government Act) in which the colonies were not represented. The purpose of this arrangement was to enforce the payment of customs, quell insurrection and resistance, and execute punitive measures. The Continental Congress considered that the police power of the state had been removed from accountability to the people of the province or their local, duly-elected leaders and could thus be used despotically to further the unjust policies imposed by the crown.

By concentrating both military and civil authority in the hands of a single royal appointee, the Crown signaled its intention to rule Massachusetts not through consent, but through coercion. This fusion of powers violated the long-standing English principle that military force must remain subordinate to civilian oversight—a safeguard essential to the preservation of liberty. To the colonists, Gage's dual authority confirmed that peaceful constitutional remedies had been exhausted and that the defense of their rights now required united and decisive action.

## Grievance 13

---

***"He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:"***

The "others" with whom the King is thus said to have combined were the members of Parliament, the existence of which as a legally constituted body possessing authority over them the Americans thus

refused even by implication to recognize. This was due to the establishment of a Board of Trade, to act independently of colonial legislation through its creatures (resident commissioners of customs) in the enforcement of revenue laws. This was altogether foreign to the constitution of any of the colonies and produced great indignation. The establishment of this power and the remodelling of the admiralty courts to exclude trial by jury therein, in most cases rendered the government fully obnoxious to the charge in the text. The people felt their degradation under such petty tyranny and resolved to spurn it. It was effectually done in Boston, and the government, after all its bluster, was obliged to recede. In 1774, the members of the council of Massachusetts, were, by a Parliamentary enactment, chosen by the king, to hold the office during his pleasure. Almost unlimited power was also given to the governor, and the people were indeed subjected to "a jurisdiction foreign to their constitution" by these members of royalty.

Such sweeping alterations made clear that the colonial charters—once solemn compacts guaranteeing local self-rule—were now treated as expendable obstacles to imperial control. By placing the council under royal appointment and investing the governor with near-absolute authority, Parliament erased the last meaningful remnants of representative government in Massachusetts. To the colonists, this was unmistakable proof that the Crown intended to replace their lawful institutions with an imposed regime answerable only to itself, a usurpation they could neither accept nor endure.

## Grievance 14

---

### ***"For quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:"***

In 1765, Parliament passed an amendment to the Mutiny Act commonly referred to as the Quartering Act. It allowed soldiers stationed in the colonies to request shelter from any citizen, and created the punishment for refusal.

The colonists sharply opposed this mandate because it violated one of the most fundamental principles of English liberty: that a man's home is his own castle, free from intrusion by armed authority without his consent. Forcing private citizens to house soldiers—often in times of peace and without any demonstrated necessity—blurred the line between civil society and military power. It signaled that Parliament viewed the colonies not as communities of self-governing English subjects, but as territories to be controlled through perpetual military presence. This was especially alarming given the broader context of British policies during the 1760s: increased enforcement of revenue laws, expanded customs authority, and a rising tide of coercive measures that made the people fear that martial rule was replacing civil government.

The Quartering Act thus became a powerful symbol of the Crown's growing contempt for the natural rights of the colonists, demonstrating that British officials were willing to subvert privacy, property, and local traditions in order to maintain a standing army among a free people. To many, it represented an intentional strategy to keep soldiers interwoven into daily life, both to intimidate the population and to enforce increasingly unpopular statutes. The resentment generated by such compulsory quartering helped cement the belief that the British ministry no longer governed by consent, but by occupation. In the years leading up to the Revolution, few grievances stirred deeper anger or inspired clearer

warnings about tyranny than the presence of redcoats lodged by force under the roofs of unwilling American families.

## Grievance 15

---

***"For protecting them, by a mock Trial from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:"***

In 1768, two citizens of Annapolis, in Maryland, died in a violent dispute against a group of Marines. The trial was controversial; and in the face of overwhelming evidence against them, the defendants were acquitted.

To the colonists, the acquittal confirmed their deepest fears about the administration of British justice in America—that soldiers of the Crown could commit violence against civilians with near-total impunity. The proceedings demonstrated not only the influence of military authority over civil courts, but also the danger of trying such cases in environments where juries might be swayed by fear, bias, or political pressure. Many believed that British officials were more concerned with protecting the reputation of their armed forces than with delivering justice to colonial victims. The outcome left the people of Maryland outraged, feeling that their lives and safety were no longer protected by the legal institutions that were supposed to shield them.

This incident became another rallying point for those who warned that a standing army in peacetime—especially one operating beyond the reach of impartial local courts—posed a direct threat to the liberties of the American people. It served as a sobering example of what happens when the military is placed above civilian accountability and when colonial grievances are dismissed by imperial authorities. As news of the acquittal spread throughout the colonies, it reinforced the growing consensus that British rule was becoming arbitrary, unjust, and fundamentally incompatible with the rights of free Englishmen. In the minds of many, the tragedy at Annapolis was not an isolated event but part of a broader pattern of abuses that made resistance not only justified, but necessary.

## Grievance 16

---

***"For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world".***

This refers to the 1774 Boston Port Act, which punished the people of Boston for the Boston Tea Party by closing their port.

By shutting down one of the busiest harbors in North America, Parliament weaponized economic deprivation as a tool of political coercion. The people of Boston suddenly found their livelihoods held hostage, not because they had broken any law themselves, but because Parliament sought to make an example of them. This was collective punishment on a sweeping scale, aimed at forcing submission through hunger, isolation, and the destruction of commerce. The Act made clear that the

British ministry was willing to inflict widespread suffering on an entire city in order to stamp out the spirit of resistance.

Yet the severity of this measure had the opposite of its intended effect. Instead of cowing the colonies, it awakened them to the realization that if Parliament could crush Boston so ruthlessly, no community was safe from similar retribution. Aid poured in from towns and colonies throughout the continent, forging bonds of unity that had never before existed on such a scale. The Boston Port Act thus became a catalyst for national solidarity, convincing many Americans that their only hope for preserving liberty lay in standing together against imperial tyranny.

## Grievance 17

---

### ***"For imposing taxes on us without our consent:"***

In addition to the revenue taxes imposed from and were attempted to be collected utilizing writs of assistance, the Stamp Act was passed, and duties upon paper, painters' colors, glass, tea, and many other goods, were levied. This worsened tension between the colonists and the government, as most colonists believed that representation was needed as a justification for being taxed, and the Government was continually always trying to pay off debt from the Seven Years' War.

To the colonists, these measures were not isolated fiscal policies but part of a broader pattern of taxation without consent—an alarming departure from the long-standing English principle that no subject should be taxed except through their own elected representatives. The government's insistence on raising revenue through unilateral parliamentary acts revealed a shift in how Britain viewed the colonies: not as partners within a shared constitutional framework, but as revenue-producing possessions to be exploited for imperial debts. Writs of assistance, which allowed customs officials to search homes and businesses without specific warrants, only intensified resentment by demonstrating how easily personal liberties could be violated under the guise of financial enforcement. These intrusive practices fostered a growing belief that British authority was becoming incompatible with the rights of free Englishmen living in America.

As Parliament layered tax upon tax and expanded its administrative machinery to enforce them, the colonists increasingly interpreted these acts as attempts to assert total parliamentary supremacy over their internal affairs. Every new duty, fee, or regulation fed the suspicion that Britain intended not merely to raise revenue, but to bind the colonies in a state of perpetual economic subordination. The cumulative effect was a profound sense of constitutional betrayal, prompting colonial assemblies, merchants, and ordinary citizens to question whether the British government still recognized their rights at all. These tensions laid the groundwork for an ideological shift: taxation became not only an economic grievance but a symbol of broader political oppression, driving the colonies toward united resistance and ultimately toward independence.

## Grievance 18

---

***"For depriving us in many cases, of the benefit of Jury trial:"***

After these functionaries were driven from Boston in 1768, an act was passed that placed violations of the revenue laws under the jurisdiction of the admiralty courts, where the offenders were tried, but the prosecutors were biased towards the crown.

The transfer of these cases to admiralty courts effectively stripped the accused of one of their most cherished protections: the right to a trial by jury composed of their peers. Instead of being judged by impartial citizens familiar with local conditions, defendants now faced judges appointed by and financially dependent upon the Crown—men whose careers advanced by securing convictions and enforcing imperial policy. This procedural shift transformed revenue enforcement from a matter of civil adjudication into a mechanism of political control. The colonists recognized that when the rules of justice are altered to guarantee the government's victory, true justice no longer exists.

Moreover, the admiralty courts operated far from public oversight, functioning in a manner that colonists viewed as arbitrary, secretive, and hostile to fundamental English liberties. Because judges in these courts received a portion of the fines they imposed, the structure itself encouraged corruption and partiality. As a result, the people came to see the admiralty system not merely as unjust, but as a deliberate tool to weaken their constitutional protections and strengthen the machinery of imperial authority. This deepened colonial distrust and further unified opposition, as many believed that a government willing to manipulate the judicial system for its own advantage had already abandoned the principles of legitimate rule.

## **Grievance 19**

---

***"For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses:"***

On the fifteenth of April, 1774, Lord North introduced a bill in Parliament, entitled "A bill for the impartial administration of justice in the cases of persons questioned for any acts done by them in the execution of the laws, or for the suppression of riots and tumults in the province of Massachusetts Bay, in New England." This bill, known as the Administration of Justice Act, provided that in case any person indicted for murder in that province, or any other capital offense, or an indictment for riot, the resistance of the magistrate, or impeding the revenue laws in the smallest degree, he might, at the option of the Governor, or, in his absence, of the Lieutenant Governor, be taken to another colony, or transported from the colonies, for trial.

The bill met violent opposition in parliament. The minister seemed to be actuated more by a spirit of retaliation, than by a conviction of the necessity of such a measure. "We must show the Americans," said he, "that we will no longer sit quietly under their insults; and also, that even when roused, our measures are not cruel or vindictive, but necessary and efficacious." Colonel Barre denounced the bill in unmeasured terms. "This," said he, "is indeed the most extraordinary resolution that was ever

heard in the Parliament of England. It offers new encouragement to military insolence, already so insupportable".

The text of the bill contained the following:

In that case, it shall and may be lawful for the governor, or lieutenant-governor, to direct, with the advice and consent of the council, that the inquisition, indictment, or appeal, shall be tried in some other of his Majesty's colonies, or Great Britain

To the American colonists, this act represented nothing less than the intentional destruction of local justice, for it allowed officials accused of violence or abuse to escape the scrutiny of Massachusetts juries and be tried instead before distant tribunals where royal influence was overwhelming. It signaled that British authorities no longer trusted or respected colonial courts, and that they were willing to remove even the most serious criminal cases from the community most affected by them. Worse still, the act effectively placed soldiers and officers above the law, assuring them that any excesses committed in the enforcement of imperial policy would be shielded from local accountability. In the eyes of the colonists, this was a clear admission that the Crown did not seek justice at all, but only obedience—and that such measures revealed a government prepared to sacrifice the rights of its subjects in order to maintain its own power.

## Grievance 20

---

***"For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighboring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:"***

This refers to the Quebec Act of 1774 which expanded the use of French civil law in Quebec (as compared to English common law) and expanded Canadian borders into what is now the Midwestern states of the United States.

To the American colonists, the Quebec Act was alarming not simply because it altered boundaries, but because it established a model of governance fundamentally at odds with the inherited traditions of English liberty. By extending French civil law—rooted in Roman and feudal principles—into vast western territories that many colonies had long claimed, Parliament signaled that it was willing to impose legal systems upon freeborn English subjects without their consent. Even more troubling was the Act's provision allowing the governor and council of Quebec to rule without an elected assembly, setting a precedent for authoritarian administration. To the colonists, this appeared to be the blueprint for how Britain intended to govern the rest of North America: through appointed officials, not representative bodies.

The Act also carried strategic consequences that inflamed colonial fears. By granting extensive territory and generous political accommodations to the French Canadians, Parliament seemed to be cultivating their loyalty at the very moment it was withdrawing similar rights from the English colonists. Many Americans interpreted the measure as an attempt to encircle them with populations more likely

to ally with the Crown in suppressing colonial resistance. Thus, the Quebec Act became one of the “Intolerable Acts” not only because of its immediate effects, but because it revealed an imperial agenda that sought to reshape the continent in ways that undermined constitutional rights and shifted the balance of power decisively against the colonies.

## Grievance 21

---

***"For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:"***

This is a reiteration of a charge already considered, and refers to the alteration of the Massachusetts charter, to make judges and other officers independent of the people, and subservient to the crown. The governor was empowered to remove and appoint all inferior judges, the attorney-generals, provost-marshals, and justices of the peace, and to appoint sheriffs independent of the council. As the sheriffs chose jurors, trial by jury became mostly nonexistent. The people had hitherto been allowed, by their charter, to select jurors; now the entire matter was placed in the hands of the government.

By transferring the power of judicial appointments and jury selection from the people to royal officers, Parliament effectively dismantled the last structural safeguards that had protected Massachusetts from arbitrary rule. The independence of juries—long considered the cornerstone of English liberty—was replaced by a system in which verdicts could be shaped, influenced, or predetermined by officers beholden to the Crown. Such a system transformed courts from neutral arbiters into instruments of political enforcement, ensuring that colonists accused of resisting British policy would face proceedings designed not to discover truth, but to secure conviction. The colonists recognized immediately that justice administered under these conditions was justice in name only.

This sweeping reconfiguration of the judicial process revealed a deeper intent: to silence opposition by making lawful resistance indistinguishable from criminal defiance. Without control over their own juries, colonists lost the capacity to protect themselves from unjust indictments or to check governmental overreach through the traditional power of acquittal. Instead of serving as a forum where the community defended its rights, the courts became another arm of imperial authority, wielded to enforce compliance and quash dissent. These changes made it unmistakably clear that the Crown no longer viewed the colonists as partners in a shared constitutional order, but as subjects to be ruled—an insight that helped propel the colonies from grievance to revolution.

## Grievance 22

---

***"For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever".***

This, too, is another phase of the charge just considered. Suppression occurred of the Legislature of New York, and in several cases, the governors, after dissolving Colonial Assemblies, assumed the right to make proclamations stand in the place of statute law. Lord Dunmore assumed this right in 1775, and so did Sir James Wright of Georgia, and Lord William Campbell of South Carolina.

Such conduct exposed a dangerous shift in the nature of colonial governance: assemblies rooted in the consent of the people were being replaced by the unilateral commands of royal governors whose authority no longer rested on law, but on executive fiat. When proclamations—issued without deliberation, debate, or representation—were elevated to the status of binding law, the constitutional fabric of the colonies began to unravel. The colonists understood this for what it was: an attempt to bypass their elected institutions entirely and to impose policies that could never withstand scrutiny in a freely chosen legislature. Each dissolved assembly, each silenced chamber, and each proclamation issued in place of lawful statute revealed how rapidly the colonies were being stripped of the rights they had exercised for generations.

These abuses made unmistakably clear that the British government no longer regarded Colonial Assemblies as legitimate partners, but as obstacles to be subdued. The elevation of executive decrees over representative lawmaking severed the essential principle that government derives its authority from the people it serves. As governors like Dunmore, Wright, and Campbell wielded their proclamations like edicts from a distant monarch, colonists came to see that their constitutional protections had become fragile illusions. In response, they began organizing congresses, conventions, and committees of safety—structures grounded not in royal authority, but in the collective will of the people. Through these bodies, the colonists asserted that if the Crown would not govern within the bounds of law, then the people themselves would reclaim that authority, preserving self-government by creating new institutions capable of defending their rights.

## Grievance 23

---

***"He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us."***

In his message to Parliament early in 1775, George III declared the colonists to be in a state of open rebellion; and by sending armies to the Americas, he "abdicated government," by thus declaring them no longer under his protection. Shortly after, the Prohibitory Act was passed by Parliament. He sanctioned the acts of governors in employing Native Americans to quell his rebellion, and negotiated the hiring of German soldiers.

John Adams said of the Prohibitory act: "It throws thirteen colonies out of the royal protection, levels all distinctions, and makes us independent in spite of our supplications and entreaties ... It may be fortunate that the act of independency should come from the British Parliament rather than the American Congress."

To the colonists, these measures confirmed that the King had cast aside his role as a constitutional sovereign and embraced the posture of a foreign enemy waging war against his own subjects. By

unleashing professional armies, foreign mercenaries, and Native alliances upon the colonies, George III demonstrated that he preferred coercion over reconciliation and force over lawful governance. The Prohibitory Act, in cutting off American trade and declaring all colonial vessels to be lawful prizes, effectively treated the colonies as a hostile nation long before they had formally claimed independence. Thus, as Adams observed, the British government's own actions accomplished what petitions, remonstrances, and humble appeals had never sought to precipitate: the clear and irrevocable dissolution of political ties, leaving the American people no choice but to assume the powers and responsibilities of an independent nation.

## Grievance 24

---

***"He has plundered our seas, ravaged our coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people."***

Lord Dunmore ordered the seizure of several American merchant vessels, and several naval assaults were made upon the colonies, disrupting the affected towns.

These attacks were viewed by the colonists not as isolated military maneuvers, but as deliberate assaults upon civilian life and private property—acts that no legitimate government would ever commit against its own people. Dunmore's naval raids burned homes, destroyed warehouses, and left families destitute, demonstrating a willingness to wage war on unarmed communities for the sole purpose of intimidating them into submission. Such tactics violated long-standing principles of English constitutionalism, which held that the Crown existed to safeguard the lives and liberties of its subjects, not to terrorize them. As colonial towns watched their harbors invaded and their livelihoods shattered, the realization spread that British rule had crossed the line from governance into open hostility.

The severity of these operations also galvanized colonial unity and deepened the conviction that reconciliation with Britain was becoming impossible. When a royal governor resorted to plundering American vessels and turning naval fire upon peaceful populations, he proved that the Crown no longer sought justice or stability, but the destruction of resistance by any means available. This recognition strengthened the resolve of colonial leaders and local militias, who increasingly saw self-defense as both a practical necessity and a moral obligation. Dunmore's outrages, intended to crush resistance, instead hastened the revolutionary cause by convincing thousands that independence was the only remaining path to secure their lives, liberty, and property.

## Grievance 25

---

***"He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to complete the works of death, desolation, and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & Perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and unworthy the Head of a civilized nation."***

The hiring of German soldiers for use against the Thirteen Colonies was seen as an outrage by the Americans.

To the American colonists, the decision to hire German auxiliaries—commonly referred to as “Hessians”—was a shocking betrayal that revealed the Crown’s willingness to employ foreign warriors to subdue British subjects on their own soil. This act violated the implicit trust that existed between a sovereign and his people, for it demonstrated that George III preferred outsourcing the suppression of colonial resistance rather than addressing their grievances through dialogue and constitutional means. The arrival of professional foreign troops on American shores confirmed that the struggle was no longer a mere political dispute but a full-scale military campaign designed to crush the colonies into obedience.

The outrage intensified because many colonists believed that a king who must rely on mercenaries to enforce his authority had already lost the moral legitimacy required to govern a free people. These German forces, unfamiliar with the colonies and indifferent to local conditions, were feared not only for their discipline and efficiency but also for their perceived brutality. Their deployment sent a message that the Crown viewed the colonists not as fellow Englishmen entitled to the protections of the British Constitution, but as rebellious subjects to be subdued at any cost. This deliberate escalation hardened colonial attitudes and contributed to the growing belief that reconciliation was no longer possible.

Moreover, the use of foreign soldiers provided powerful rhetorical fuel for the patriot cause, becoming a symbol of the Crown’s abandonment of constitutional principles. Pamphleteers, preachers, and statesmen denounced the measure as an affront to the laws of nations and the rights of mankind. In their view, a monarch who invited foreign powers to wage war against his own people had effectively declared himself unworthy of their allegiance. The presence of German troops thus helped transform colonial resentment into revolutionary resolve, accelerating the movement toward independence by convincing many undecided Americans that a government willing to employ hired strangers to enforce its will would never again rule them justly.

## Grievance 26

---

***"He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands."***

An act of Parliament, passed toward the close of December 1775, authorized the capture of all American vessels, and also directed the treatment of the crews of armed vessels to be impressed

and not kept prisoners of war. This act was condemned on the floor of Parliament as unworthy of a Christian people, and "a refinement of cruelty unknown among savage nations."

To the colonists, this measure stripped away any remaining pretense that Britain sought reconciliation or justice; it was a declaration that Americans were no longer viewed as subjects but as enemies to be subdued through economic strangulation and personal degradation. The impressment of captured sailors—forcing them into service rather than treating them as prisoners of war—was seen as a barbaric practice that violated the customs of civilized nations and the long-established laws of maritime conflict. By authorizing the wholesale seizure of American ships and reducing their crews to coerced laborers, Parliament effectively sanctioned piracy under the banner of imperial authority. Such policies convinced many that Britain's aim was not to restore order, but to break the spirit of the colonies through humiliation and hardship.

This act also exposed the moral desperation of the British ministry, for it embraced tactics that even members of Parliament denounced as cruel, dishonorable, and contrary to the principles of a Christian empire. If Britain was willing to treat its own seafaring countrymen with such calculated brutality, the colonists argued, then no measure of tyranny was beyond its reach. The law underscored the widening gulf between the Crown and the American people, proving that the imperial government had abandoned every restraint of justice, mercy, and constitutional duty. Far from intimidating the colonies into submission, these actions strengthened their determination to sever ties with a government that had chosen coercion over conscience and force over lawful authority.

## Grievance 27

---

***"He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes, and conditions."***

This was done in several instances. Dunmore was charged with a design to employ Native Americans ("savages") against the Virginians as early as 1774. Dunmore's Proclamation in November 1775, encouraged a slave rebellion against colonial masters. He was also concerned with Governor Gage and others, and under instructions from the Government Ministry, ordered the Shawnee and other native inhabitants of the Ohio country to fight against the colonists. Emissaries were also sent among the Cherokee and Muscogee for the same purpose; and all of the tribes of the Six Nations, except the Oneida, fought against the colonists when the war began.

To the colonists, the deliberate enlistment of Native tribes and the incitement of slave uprisings revealed a level of desperation and vindictiveness within the British ministry that shattered any remaining trust in imperial governance. These strategies were not merely military maneuvers; they were seen as attempts to unleash devastation upon civilian populations by turning neighboring peoples and enslaved laborers into instruments of terror. The use of Native warriors—who the British themselves routinely labeled "savages"—was viewed as especially hypocritical, given that British officials had long condemned frontier violence when it suited their political aims. Now, with the

ministry openly encouraging Native attacks, colonists perceived this as proof that Britain sought to punish their resistance by bringing war directly into their settlements, farms, and homes.

Furthermore, Dunmore's Proclamation of 1775—promising freedom to enslaved men who joined British forces—was interpreted by Virginians and other Southerners as an assault on their social order, designed to ignite chaos behind colonial lines. Rather than weakening the patriot cause, these measures hardened colonial resolve by demonstrating that the Crown was willing to destabilize entire regions in order to suppress demands for constitutional rights. As reports spread of British agents working among the Cherokee, Muscogee, and the western nations of the Six Nations, the colonies recognized that they were facing a ministry not simply intent on military victory, but on unleashing every available force—Native, enslaved, foreign, or otherwise—to break American resistance. This realization became a powerful catalyst for unity, convincing even the most reluctant colonists that independence was the only safeguard against a government prepared to wage war by any means, no matter how destructive or dishonorable.

---

## Why It Matters

---

### ♦ 1. Establishes Natural Law and Creator-Granted Rights

The Declaration does not invoke man-made laws or royal charters—it rests entirely upon the **Laws of Nature and Nature's God**. This phrase is not poetic rhetoric; it is a **legal invocation of Natural Law**—a transcendent legal order that predates and supersedes all human codes, constitutions, or court decisions.

According to Natural Law:

- **All men are created equal**—no man has rightful dominion over another without consent.
- Rights are **unalienable**—they cannot be taken, sold, or legislated away.
- The **source of law and liberty is the Creator**, not government.

This legal foundation is the **bedrock of American sovereignty**. It makes clear that rights are **inherent, not conferred**, and therefore **cannot be rescinded by statutes, licenses, mandates, or decrees**.

---

### ♦ 2. Defines Lawful Rebellion Against Tyranny

Unlike mere revolution or rebellion, the Declaration defines and justifies **lawful separation from corrupt government**. It outlines a precise **legal process for dissolution** based on long-standing principles of natural justice and common law:

- **Governments exist only to secure rights.**
- When governments violate this purpose, they become **illegitimate**.
- It is the **right and duty** of the People to **abolish** or **alter** such governments.
- The People may **institute new government**, based on **their will and safety**, not on inherited systems of control.

This doctrine does not expire. It stands as an **eternal safeguard** against tyranny and as the legal precedent for **reclaiming de jure governance**.

---

### ♦ 3. Asserts that Government Derives Power from the Consent of the Governed

This principle fundamentally rejects monarchy, dictatorship, and even unconstrained democracy. It declares that **no government has lawful power unless it receives consent** from the People. Importantly:

- Consent must be **informed and voluntary**.
- Coerced, presumed, or fabricated consent (such as via **legal fiction**, **strawman entities**, or **emergency powers**) is **invalid** under natural law.
- Government is a **trust**, not a sovereign—it is an **agent of the People**, not their master.

This principle undergirds the lawful challenge to the modern **corporate UNITED STATES**, which operates under **implied consent** and uses the **legal fiction of the 14th Amendment “citizen”** to bind the People to statutory, commercial jurisdiction.

---

### ♦ 4. A Foundational Trust Instrument: People as Grantors, Government as Trustee

The Declaration of Independence is not only a political document—it is a **trust indenture**. The People are the **grantors**; they delegate specific powers to their **trustee**, the government, for a defined purpose: to **secure rights**.

In lawful trust structure:

- The **People are the sovereign principals**.

- The **government is a fiduciary agent**, obligated to act **within the scope of delegated authority**.
- Any government acting outside that trust is **void of lawful legitimacy**.

The Declaration therefore becomes the **legal and spiritual foundation of all lawful governance in America**. It precedes the Constitution, undergirds its meaning, and remains the **final authority for withdrawing consent and reorganizing government**.

---

## Modern Implications

The relevance of the Declaration today cannot be overstated. Every time a citizen:

- Is forced to accept statutes over unalienable rights...
- Is presumed to be a “person,” “resident,” or “U.S. citizen” without consent...
- Is denied access to common law remedy...
- Is prosecuted under corporate statutory codes...

They are suffering under **government that has become destructive to its ends**.

The Declaration provides not only **historical inspiration**, but also **lawful justification** for withdrawing from unlawful jurisdiction and **reassembling government under common law**. It affirms the right to:

- **Declare status as a living man or woman.**
  - **Reestablish local assemblies and lawful grand juries.**
  - **Challenge unlawful authority through peaceful, lawful means.**
  - **Hold corporate agents accountable to the trust.**
- 

## Conclusion: The Declaration Is Still Law

Let no man say the Declaration is a relic. It is **living law**, codified by moral truth and **ratified by blood**. It affirms that the **source of law is not Washington D.C., not the Supreme Court, not the legislature—but the People themselves**, guided by the divine moral compass of Natural Law.

Its power lies in its **uncompromising clarity**: rights are not granted—they are protected. Governments do not command—they serve. And when they fail, the People must rise—not in violence, but in **lawful reassembly**, armed with the eternal truth that **freedom is not a gift—it is a birthright**.

This document is the **first breath of the American Republic**, and with it, the People may breathe free again—if they only remember.

---

## **2. The Articles of Confederation (1781)**

**A Precursor to the Constitution and a Testament to State Sovereignty**

---

**Introduction: America's First National Charter**

Before there was a U.S. Constitution, there was the **Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union**, ratified in **1781** during the height of the American Revolutionary War. Often overshadowed by its successor, the Articles of Confederation stand as the **first binding legal agreement among the newly independent states**, and the earliest expression of the American experiment in self-governance and federalism. It was under this compact that the states **fought the British Empire**, formed alliances, and conducted diplomacy—as **free and independent sovereigns** in union, not as subordinates of a central government.

The Articles provide more than just historical background—they enshrine vital principles that distinguish a **confederation of republics** from a **nationalized corporate democracy**. At their core, they codify the **sovereignty of the states**, the **limited nature of delegated powers**, and the notion that government exists **by compact among equals**, not by hierarchy or central coercion.

Understanding the Articles is critical for any lawful reconstruction of American governance under **common law and state sovereignty**. It remains a foundational trust instrument and serves as **evidence that the union of states was never meant to override state independence**—a truth systematically obscured by later legal frameworks, such as the **corporate Constitution of 1871**, the **14th Amendment**, and **federal statutory overlays**.

---

## Preamble and Key Articles: A Legal Overview

### Preamble

“To all to whom these Presents shall come, we the undersigned Delegates of the States affixed to our Names send greeting.

Whereas the Delegates of the United States of America in Congress assembled did on the fifteenth day of November in the Year of our Lord One Thousand Seven Hundred and Seventy-seven, and in the Second Year of the Independence of America agree to certain articles of Confederation and perpetual Union between the States...”

Right from the beginning, the **Articles frame the Union as perpetual**—not as a singular, national government but as a **compact between sovereign states**. This is crucial: it affirms that sovereignty does not lie in the Union itself, but **in the states individually**, who **voluntarily delegate** limited powers to the central body.

---

### ♦ Article II – The Cornerstone of State Sovereignty

“Each state retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.”

This is arguably the **most important clause** in the entire document. It clearly states:

- **Sovereignty is retained by each state.**
- **Only expressly delegated powers** belong to the central body.
- **All other powers remain with the states.**

This clause would later be echoed in the **10th Amendment** to the Constitution, but in the Articles it was even **more explicit and binding**, and it was not yet diluted by federal supremacy clauses or commercial overlays.

---

#### ♦ **Article III – League of Friendship**

“The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other...”

The phrase “**league of friendship**” is not a romantic expression—it is a **legal term**. It denotes a **voluntary alliance**, not a subordination of one party to another. Each state is a **sovereign peer**, not a province or department of a federal master.

The purpose of this league was mutual defense, securing liberties, and general welfare—not the **central administration of law**, taxation, commerce, or citizenship. Those were to remain **local matters** under the laws of each state.

---

#### ♦ **Article V – One Vote per State, Equal Representation**

Under the Articles, **each state had one vote**, regardless of size or population. Representation was **by state**, not by people or population metrics. This reinforces the idea that the Union was a **compact of sovereign entities**, not a democracy of individuals under a single national system.

---

#### ♦ **Article VI – No Standing Army Without State Consent**

“No state shall keep up any body of forces in time of peace...nor shall any body of forces be kept up by the United States in time of peace, except such number only, as in the judgment of the United States in Congress assembled, shall be deemed requisite to garrison the forts...”

This clause establishes an **anti-militaristic stance** rooted in the memory of British tyranny. It also demonstrates a profound distrust of **centralized force**—a far cry from today’s federal militarization of police, National Guard, and standing army doctrine.

---

#### ♦ **Article IX – Delegated Powers to Congress (Limited Scope)**

The central government had **very limited powers**, including:

- Declaring war
- Making treaties
- Establishing currency
- Deciding disputes between states

There was **no power to tax**, no power to regulate commerce, and no ability to enforce laws on individuals. The Articles created a **confederation**, not a **national government**.

---

## Why It Matters Today

---

### ♦ 1. Confirms State Sovereignty

The central theme of the Articles is **sovereignty retained by the states**. In the original design:

- **The People were sovereign** over their state governments.
- **States were sovereign** over the central body.
- The **central body existed only by delegation**, not by fiat or claim of supremacy.

This directly contradicts the post-14th Amendment framework where:

- The federal government presumes sovereignty.
  - Individuals are presumed to be **U.S. citizens**, i.e., corporate subjects.
  - States are treated as administrative subdivisions, not sovereign entities.
- 

### ♦ 2. Decentralized Authority vs. Centralized Corporate Control

The Articles represent a vision of **decentralized governance**, where local control, local law, and local customs are supreme. Today's United States operates in complete inversion:

| Articles of Confederation | Modern Corporate U.S.              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| State sovereignty         | Federal supremacy                  |
| Consent-based governance  | Presumed jurisdiction              |
| Common law                | Admiralty/statutory law            |
| No direct taxation        | IRS enforcement powers             |
| Decentralized military    | Federal standing armies & agencies |

### ♦ 3. Legal Precedent for Reassembly

The Articles were never lawfully repealed. While the Constitution of 1787 “replaced” them in practice, many legal scholars and constitutionalists argue that the **principles of the Articles remain valid** for any movement seeking to:

- Reassemble under **common law jurisdiction**.
- Reassert **county and state-level sovereignty**.
- Challenge the **validity of federal overreach and commercial jurisdiction**.

They provide the legal **precedent for county assemblies, state jural societies, and the lawful restoration of the republic**.

---

## Conclusion: The Articles Were Not a Failure — They Were a Promise

Though the Articles of Confederation were eventually replaced due to practical difficulties—chiefly the inability to raise revenue or unify policy—they were **not a failure in principle**. Rather, they were a **blueprint for liberty**, designed to protect against exactly what America would become: a **consolidated, militarized, commercial empire governed from the top down**.

By affirming:

- That each state is sovereign,
- That delegated powers must be limited and express,
- That governance must derive from the People’s consent,

...the Articles offer a lawful path back to **self-determination, local control, and unalienable rights**. They remind us that the People are the **grantors**, not the grantees, of power—and that the union was meant to be a **servant, not a master**.

---

### 3. The Constitution for the united States of America (1787)

#### A Lawful Compact of Limited Government, Consent, and Sovereignty

---

##### Introduction: The Supreme Organic Law of the Land

The Constitution for the united States of America, ratified in 1787 and effective by 1789, stands as the **organic charter** of the original constitutional republic established by the People through their several states. It is a binding **contractual agreement** created under the authority of **Natural Law** and **the consent of the governed**. It is not merely a governmental blueprint—it is a **jurisdictional trust instrument**, organizing a federal government with strictly **limited and delegated powers**.

Crucially, this **organic Constitution** is distinct from the later **corporate charter** created under the **District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871**, which restructured the federal government into a for-profit municipal corporation known as **THE UNITED STATES** (in all capital letters). The Constitution of 1787 is **de jure**—lawful in nature, founded in the sovereignty of the People. The charter of 1871 is **de facto**—legal in nature, commercial in function, and foreign to the principles of the republic.

To understand how America was transformed from a **free union of sovereign states** to a **centralized corporate democracy**, one must begin with the **original Constitution in its pure form**—its language, its intent, its jurisdiction, and its consent-based nature.

---

##### Full Text (Excerpts) in Original Punctuation and Spelling

###### Preamble

“We the People of the united States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the united States of America.”

The language of the Preamble is vital. “**We the People**” are the **sovereign grantors** of the compact. The Constitution is not imposed by a monarchy, corporation, or elite—it is **ordained and established by the People**, in whom all lawful power originates.

Also note the title: “**for the united States of America**,” not “of the United States.” The use of lowercase “**united**” affirms the original intent: a **union of sovereign states**, each retaining full internal sovereignty, and delegating only select powers to a common federal agent.

---

♦ 1. This is the Organic Constitution, Not the Corporate Charter of 1871

The Constitution of 1787 represents the **de jure framework** of American governance—a lawful republic of sovereign states and free people. In contrast, the 1871 charter creates a **municipal corporate overlay**, known as **THE UNITED STATES**, which impersonates the organic government but operates under **commercial codes, admiralty jurisdiction, and statutory presumptions**.

| Organic Constitution (1787)                 | Corporate Charter (1871)                               |
|---|--|
| "for the united States of America"          | "of the United States"                                 |
| Lawful compact between People and States    | Corporate charter of a municipal entity                |
| Enumerated powers, limited by consent       | Unlimited regulatory powers by statute                 |
| Sovereign authority remains with the People | Jurisdiction presumed over corporate citizens          |
| Courts of record under Article III          | Administrative tribunals under admiralty/statutory law |

Understanding this distinction is critical. Most Americans are unknowingly subject to the **corporate UNITED STATES**, identified as **"U.S. citizens" under the 14th Amendment**, and subject to **commercial law**, not the Constitution. The organic Constitution applies only when **consent is clearly stated and jurisdiction is lawfully rebutted**.

♦ 2. Creates a Limited, Delegated Government Bound by Enumerated Powers

The Constitution does not create an all-powerful federal government. Instead, it:

- **Enumerates specific powers** granted to Congress (Article I, Section 8)
- **Separates powers** among three co-equal branches (Legislative, Executive, Judicial)
- **Limits federal jurisdiction** to specific areas such as interstate commerce, foreign policy, and defense
- **Affirms state sovereignty** in all matters not expressly delegated

Article I, Section 8 begins with:

"The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes...To regulate Commerce...To coin Money...To declare War..."

These powers are **express**, **finite**, and **delegated conditionally**. No clause allows for:

- General police powers
- Regulation of private conduct
- Licensing of rights
- Presumption of citizenship or subject status

The **Tenth Amendment** later affirms:

“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution...are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

---

♦ **3. Lawfully Binding Only Upon Contract, Jurisdiction, and Consent**

A principle often lost in modern discourse is that the Constitution is **not universally applicable**. It binds only those:

- **Who are parties to the compact** (i.e., the states and their representatives)
- **Who consent to be governed by it**, explicitly or implicitly
- **Who act within its jurisdictional scope**

This makes the Constitution a **trust instrument**:

- The **People** are the grantors (sovereign authority)
- The **federal government** is the trustee (agent with limited duties)
- The **powers delegated** are the trust terms
- The **Bill of Rights** are express limitations on government conduct

Any extension of power **beyond this trust agreement** is ultra vires—**without lawful authority**—and is therefore null and void under common law.

---

## **Structural Highlights: Articles and Powers**

| Article | Subject            | Significance                                    |
|---------|--------------------|---|
| I       | Legislative Branch | Enumerates powers of Congress; limits scope     |
| II      | Executive Branch   | Establishes limited executive authority         |
| III     | Judicial Branch    | Creates courts of record under common law       |
| IV      | States' Rights     | Requires mutual respect among states            |
| V       | Amendments         | Establishes lawful process for change           |
| VI      | Supremacy Clause   | Federal law is supreme only when constitutional |
| VII     | Ratification       | Affirms consent-based entry into compact        |

Note especially **Article III, Section 2**:

“The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution...”

This section grants judicial power **only to law and equity cases**, not **commercial or maritime administrative tribunals** that now dominate the federal judiciary.

---

## Conclusion: The Organic Constitution is the People's Charter

The Constitution for the united States of America (1787) remains the **lawful foundation** for any reassertion of **de jure governance**. Though it has been overshadowed by:

- **The 14th Amendment's corporate citizenship construct**
- **The 1871 municipal charter**
- **Statutory laws and regulatory overreach**

...it **has never been lawfully repealed**. It still stands—**silent but supreme**, waiting to be reactivated by **living men and women** who understand their lawful capacity.

To operate within its protections, one must:

- Rebut presumptions of statutory and admiralty jurisdiction
- Reclaim one's status as a **living, sovereign American**
- Operate through **lawful assemblies and courts of record**

- Restore the trust instrument by **consent and declaration**

This Constitution is not merely history. It is a living agreement—a lawful pathway to liberty, and a standard against which all modern government must be judged.

---

## 4. The Bill of Rights (1791)

### Securing Unalienable Rights and Restricting Government Power

---

#### Introduction: Not a Grant of Rights, But a Wall Against Tyranny

The **Bill of Rights**, ratified in **1791**, comprises the first **ten amendments** to the Constitution for the united States of America. Contrary to popular belief, the Bill of Rights **does not grant** any rights. It merely **recognizes and secures pre-existing rights**—those endowed to all men and women by their **Creator**, as affirmed in the **Declaration of Independence**. These rights are **unalienable**, meaning they cannot be given away, taken, or transferred without consent.

The true purpose of the Bill of Rights is to **restrict the powers of government**. It is a **limitation on federal authority**, not an enumeration of government-granted privileges. It forms an essential **safeguard within the lawful, de jure constitutional structure**, drawing a legal boundary that Congress and all federal agents are forbidden to cross. These amendments are expressions of **Natural Law**, written into positive law, and serve as a **test of legitimacy** for all government actions.

Though drafted over two centuries ago, the principles of the Bill of Rights are **eternal and inviolable**. They are particularly relevant today, as governments at every level—often operating under **de facto statutory authority**, corporate interests, or emergency declarations—routinely **violate these provisions**, often under the color of law. Understanding the **Bill of Rights** is essential for reclaiming **lawful jurisdiction**, reestablishing **constitutional order**, and asserting one's **sovereign status**.

---

#### The First Ten Amendments: Overview and Key Interpretations

---

## 1st Amendment — Religion, Speech, Press, Assembly, Petition

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

- **Why it matters:** Protects **spiritual conscience**, freedom of **thought and expression**, and the right to **organize against injustice**.
- **Modern context:** Government-mandated speech codes, media censorship partnerships, and protest suppression all violate this amendment.
- **Common law significance:** These are natural rights that preexist government—**inalienable** and **non-negotiable**.

At its core, the First Amendment serves as the people’s shield against the rise of tyranny, because a government cannot enslave a population that is free to worship according to conscience, speak truth without fear, publish information that exposes corruption, gather in unified resistance, and demand accountability from those in power. These liberties function together as a constitutional firewall, ensuring that no ruling class—whether political, corporate, or ideological—can monopolize truth or silence dissent without immediately violating the fundamental compact on which the Republic stands. In every era, from the Founding to the digital age, attempts to control speech, suppress religious conviction, or criminalize peaceful assembly have been the unmistakable marks of governments drifting toward despotism. The First Amendment therefore remains not simply a legal guarantee, but the living expression of the natural rights inherent in every man and woman—rights that no statute, mandate, or executive order can lawfully diminish.

---

## 2nd Amendment — Right to Bear Arms

“A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms shall not be infringed.”

- **Why it matters:** Affirms the **People’s right to self-defense** against tyranny, both foreign and domestic.
- **Modern context:** Gun control legislation and registration schemes are direct infringements.
- **Common law significance:** The right to bear arms is a **natural extension of the right to life and defense**.

The Second Amendment stands as the practical guarantee of every other liberty, for without the means to resist coercion, the written protections of a constitution can be reduced to mere words on paper. The Founders understood that a free people must always retain the capacity to deter or

oppose any force—governmental or otherwise—that seeks to disarm them and thereby render them dependent or defenseless. This amendment was never about hunting or sport; it was about ensuring that ultimate authority rests with the people, not with standing armies, political elites, or centralized power. In the common-law tradition, the right to bear arms arises from the inherent right to preserve one’s own life, family, property, and community, and thus any attempt to restrict or license this right is an unlawful encroachment upon the very foundation of human liberty.

---

### 3rd Amendment — Quartering of Troops

“No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner...”

- **Why it matters:** Protects the **sanctity of private property** and personal space.
- **Modern context:** While rare today, modern equivalents include **militarized police overreach** or federal agency occupation.
- **Common law significance:** Reaffirms the **sacred boundaries of private domain**.

The Third Amendment stands as a vivid reminder of the Founders’ lived experience with a government that treated private homes as extensions of state power, and it therefore enshrines the principle that a person’s dwelling is a realm where government intrusion has no inherent authority. Though explicit quartering of soldiers is uncommon in modern times, the spirit of this amendment speaks forcefully against any practice—militarized raids, warrantless intrusions, or occupations by federal agents—that blurs the line between civilian life and armed government presence. It affirms that the home is a sanctuary, a place where the individual’s autonomy outranks the demands of the state, and that no government committed to liberty may convert private property into an instrument of control. In the common-law tradition, the home has always been regarded as a man’s castle, and the Third Amendment preserves that ancient principle as a safeguard against the ever-present temptation of authorities to impose their will through intimidation or force.

---

### 4th Amendment — Search and Seizure

“The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects... shall not be violated...”

- **Why it matters:** Protects against **unlawful surveillance, searches, and data collection**.
- **Modern context:** Warrantless searches, digital surveillance, and civil asset forfeiture violate this amendment.
- **Common law significance:** Affirms the right to **bodily integrity and property security**.

The Fourth Amendment establishes a clear barrier between the individual and the state, ensuring that government power cannot intrude into the private sphere without lawful justification grounded in probable cause and judicial oversight. It embodies the principle that citizens are not subjects to be monitored at will, nor are their homes, bodies, communications, or possessions the property of the government to inspect or seize. In the digital era—where personal data, biometric information, and private correspondence can be accessed with a keystroke—this amendment stands as one of the most critical defenses against a surveillance state. Rooted in centuries of common-law protections against arbitrary authority, the Fourth Amendment insists that liberty cannot exist where privacy is ignored, and that a free people must remain secure from the prying eyes and unchecked power of the state.

---

## 5th Amendment — Due Process, Double Jeopardy, Self-Incrimination

“No person shall... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law...”

- **Why it matters:** Protects the individual from **unjust prosecution** and forced confessions.
- **Modern context:** Administrative courts, compelled testimony, and presumption of guilt all violate due process.
- **Common law significance:** Due process is **non-negotiable**, rooted in natural justice.

The Fifth Amendment stands as a bulwark against the arbitrary exercise of state power, guaranteeing that no man or woman may be punished, dispossessed, or deprived of fundamental rights without the full and fair procedures that justice demands. It ensures that the individual is never reduced to a mere instrument of government policy, nor forced to become a witness against himself through coercion, deception, or intimidation. By prohibiting double jeopardy, it protects citizens from being endlessly pursued by the state until a desired conviction is obtained—an abuse historically associated with tyrannical regimes. Rooted in the ancient principles of natural justice and common law, the Fifth Amendment affirms that the dignity, autonomy, and liberty of each individual exist prior to government, and that no authority, however powerful, may override the moral and legal safeguards that due process provides.

---

## 6th Amendment — Speedy Trial, Impartial Jury

“In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury...”

- **Why it matters:** Prevents **indefinite detention** and ensures **accountability** in judicial proceedings.
- **Modern context:** Long pre-trial detentions, closed courtrooms, and biased juries subvert this protection.
- **Common law significance:** Upholds the principle of **open justice among peers**.

The Sixth Amendment ensures that the power of the state cannot be used to silently destroy a man or woman through delay, secrecy, or prejudiced proceedings. It demands that justice be both swift and transparent, preventing governments from imprisoning people indefinitely while avoiding public scrutiny of their actions. By requiring an impartial jury drawn from the community, it places the judgment of guilt or innocence not in the hands of officials tied to the state, but in the hands of one's peers—those most capable of evaluating facts without institutional bias. In the common-law tradition, this amendment embodies the belief that a free society must guarantee not merely the appearance of justice but its genuine and visible practice, ensuring that every accused man or woman stands before an open court, a fair jury, and the light of public accountability.

---

## 7th Amendment — Trial by Jury in Civil Cases

“In suits at common law... the right of trial by jury shall be preserved...”

- **Why it matters:** Affirms the **supremacy of the People in civil matters**.
- **Modern context:** Administrative law, family court, and civil tribunals often deny jury trials.
- **Common law significance:** Recognizes **jury nullification** and **people's ultimate authority**.

The Seventh Amendment preserves one of the most vital protections against governmental and judicial overreach by ensuring that ordinary citizens—not bureaucrats, not judges, and not administrative agencies—remain the final arbiters in disputes affecting property, contracts, and private rights. It enshrines the principle that justice in a free society must be rooted in the collective judgment of the community, rather than in the unilateral decisions of government-appointed officials. In an age where civil disputes are increasingly diverted into administrative courts that lack juries and often bypass constitutional safeguards, the Seventh Amendment stands as a powerful reminder that the people themselves are the ultimate check on the legal system. By upholding the right to civil jury trials and the long-recognized power of jury nullification, it safeguards the balance of authority and ensures that no individual can be deprived of rights or property without the consent of a jury grounded in common sense, fairness, and the lived experience of the community.

---

## 8th Amendment — Excessive Bail, Cruel Punishment

“Excessive bail shall not be required... nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.”

- **Why it matters:** Protects against **government abuse** and **coercion through punishment**.
- **Modern context:** Solitary confinement, disproportionate fines, and coercive plea deals violate this amendment.
- **Common law significance:** Anchors justice in **human dignity and fairness**.

The Eighth Amendment stands as a moral boundary that prevents the state from using its punitive power as a tool of oppression, ensuring that punishment remains proportionate, humane, and restrained by the principles of justice. It rejects the idea that government may coerce confessions or compliance by subjecting individuals to unbearable conditions, grossly excessive bail, or punishments designed to break the human spirit. In modern times, abusive sentencing practices, predatory fines, and the psychological torment of extended solitary confinement represent the very dangers the Founders sought to prohibit. Rooted in the ancient common-law belief that even the guilty retain inherent dignity, the Eighth Amendment insists that the state must never become a dispenser of cruelty, but must uphold fairness, mercy, and the rule of law in all its dealings.

---

## 9th Amendment — Rights Retained by the People

“The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

- **Why it matters:** Clarifies that **natural rights exceed written law**.
- **Modern context:** Courts often ignore this, assuming any unlisted right is unprotected.
- **Common law significance:** Affirms that **rights come from the Creator**, not government.

The Ninth Amendment serves as a sweeping constitutional safeguard against the reduction of human liberty to a finite list, making clear that the people possess countless natural rights that exist beyond anything the Founders could enumerate. It prevents government actors from claiming that a right is forfeited simply because it is not explicitly spelled out in the text, reinforcing the truth that written constitutions are declarations of protections—not limitations on the inherent freedoms of mankind. In an era where courts and agencies often assume that unlisted rights are subject to regulation or denial, the Ninth Amendment stands as a constitutional rebuke, reminding all levels of government that their authority is strictly limited to what the people have delegated. Rooted in natural law, it affirms that rights originate from the Creator and remain with the individual unless explicitly and lawfully surrendered, ensuring that the sphere of personal liberty remains far greater than the powers

of the state.

---

## 10th Amendment — Powers Reserved to States or People

“The powers not delegated to the United States... are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.”

- **Why it matters:** Reinforces **state sovereignty and individual autonomy**.
- **Modern context:** Federal overreach via mandates and agencies violates this principle daily.
- **Common law significance:** Grounds the **jurisdictional limit of federal power**.

The Tenth Amendment stands as the constitutional reminder that the federal government is not the source of authority in America, but a creation of the states and the people, endowed only with the powers they deliberately delegated. It preserves the delicate balance of federalism by ensuring that all remaining powers—those touching daily life, local governance, personal liberty, and community affairs—remain outside federal reach unless expressly granted. In modern times, expansive agencies, executive mandates, and judicial reinterpretations have increasingly attempted to blur or override these boundaries, often placing Washington’s will above that of sovereign states and free individuals. The Tenth Amendment reasserts that true constitutional order depends on decentralization and that liberty is best protected when power remains closest to the people, rooted in the consent of the governed and insulated from the ambitions of distant authorities.

---

## Unalienable Rights vs. Government Privileges

The Bill of Rights secures rights such as:

- **Speech**

- **Faith**
- **Assembly**
- **Self-defense**
- **Privacy**
- **Due process**
- **Property ownership**
- **Jury trials**

These are not granted by the government—they are **secured against government**. Any government action that infringes upon these is **unlawful and null under common law**. As the Founders understood, rights do not disappear in emergencies. There is **no lawful power to suspend** the Bill of Rights via:

- War powers
- Executive orders
- Public health emergencies
- National security claims

Statutory acts, administrative policies, or federal directives are **void ab initio** (from the beginning) if they contradict the Bill of Rights. This includes:

- Censorship via Big Tech partnerships
- Firearm confiscation or red flag laws
- Surveillance without specific warrants
- Vaccine mandates or biometric data collection

The distinction between unalienable rights and government-issued privileges is the cornerstone of the American constitutional order. Rights exist because the individual exists; they are woven into the fabric of human nature and therefore stand above statutes, policies, executive preferences, and even majority opinion. Privileges, by contrast, are permissions granted conditionally by government and may be altered or revoked. The Bill of Rights draws a bright line between the two by placing the natural rights of the people beyond the reach of any governmental actor—ensuring that liberty is not

something dispensed by rulers but something preserved against them. The moment a government treats rights as permissions, it ceases to operate within the bounds of constitutional authority.

In every era, governments have attempted to blur this line, claiming emergency powers, administrative necessity, or national security as justification for overriding rights that precede the state itself. But the Founders intentionally designed the Constitution to withstand the pressures of crisis, precisely because emergencies are the moments when tyranny most often seeks foothold. Under common law, a right that can be suspended is not a right at all—it is a privilege masked as one. Thus, any attempt to sideline the Bill of Rights under the guise of temporary necessity is an admission that the government has left its lawful jurisdiction. When officials invoke “extraordinary circumstances” to justify censorship, disarmament, medical coercion, or mass surveillance, they reveal not the flexibility of the Constitution, but their own departure from it.

For this reason, unconstitutional acts carry no lawful force, even when wrapped in the language of safety or public order. Red flag laws remain violations of due process; censorship conducted through private platforms remains state action; warrantless surveillance remains an intrusion forbidden by the Fourth Amendment; and compulsory medical directives remain assaults on bodily autonomy. The Constitution recognizes no exception that allows the government to suspend the rights it is bound to secure, and any such attempt is void ab initio because it contradicts the very authority from which government power derives. Ultimately, the preservation of liberty depends on the people remembering this truth: rights are not gifts from government—they are limits upon it. And whenever those limits are crossed, it is the people who must remind the state of its lawful boundaries.

---

## Conclusion: The Bill of Rights as a Legal Firewall

The **Bill of Rights** is a **legal firewall** against despotism. It marks the boundary line between **liberty and tyranny**, **lawful governance and corporate overreach**, **sovereignty and slavery**. To the extent that we forget, waive, or surrender these rights, we become **subjects, not sovereigns**.

To reclaim the Republic, one must first reclaim their standing under the **Bill of Rights**—not by asking for them, but by asserting them **as a living man or woman under natural law**, invoking lawful remedy, and refusing to contract into inferior jurisdictions.

---

## 5. The Reconstruction Acts (1867–1868)

### Sections establishing military rule over the southern states

“...the said rebel States shall be divided into military districts...”

## Why It Matters:

- **Imposed martial law** and replaced civilian governments with military governors.
- These Acts laid the groundwork for creating the **federal corporate structure** and the **14th Amendment jurisdiction**.

## The Reconstruction Acts (1867–1868)

### The Imposition of Military Rule and the Birth of Federal Jurisdiction Over the States

---

#### Introduction: Post-War Chaos and the Pretext for Control

In the aftermath of the Civil War, the American republic stood at a crossroads. Though the Union had defeated the Confederacy militarily, the real war—**the war over jurisdiction, sovereignty, and governance**—was only just beginning. The so-called **Reconstruction Acts**, passed between 1867 and 1868, were not merely legislative tools to reintegrate the Southern states. They were in fact **emergency measures to install martial rule**, suspend constitutional governance, and inaugurate a new **federal framework of control** that would eventually apply to all states, not just the South.

These Acts mark a **fundamental rupture in lawful government**, transitioning from a **decentralized constitutional republic** toward a **centrally-administered federal system** operating under emergency, military, and corporate authority. Though framed as temporary measures to “reconstruct” the South, these Acts introduced a long-lasting precedent: **civilian governments could be overthrown and replaced by military governors under federal authority**, effectively eliminating **the sovereignty of the states** guaranteed by the original Constitution.

---

#### Full Text and Key Clauses: “Military Districts” and Martial Authority

The First Reconstruction Act was passed on **March 2, 1867**, followed by three supplemental acts that refined its application. The central provision reads:

**“That said rebel States shall be divided into military districts and made subject to the military authority of the United States as hereinafter prescribed...”**

Under this language, **ten formerly Confederate states were divided into five military districts**, each commanded by a **Union general** with the power to:

- **Suspend state legislatures**

- **Appoint and remove local officials**
- **Oversee voter registration**
- **Establish courts and tribunals**
- **Enforce federal statutes over state constitutions**

The districts were as follows:

| <b>Military District</b> | <b>States Included</b>    | <b>Commanding General</b> |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| First                    | Virginia                  | General John Schofield    |
| Second                   | North & South Carolina    | General Daniel Sickles    |
| Third                    | Georgia, Alabama, Florida | General John Pope         |
| Fourth                   | Arkansas, Mississippi     | General Edward Ord        |
| Fifth                    | Texas, Louisiana          | General Philip Sheridan   |

These generals were **not subject to local laws**. Instead, they reported directly to the Secretary of War—at the time, **Edwin Stanton**, a radical Republican and key architect of Lincoln’s war powers.

---

## Why It Matters

### ◆ 1. The De Facto Establishment of Martial Law

Though the Civil War had ended two years earlier, the Reconstruction Acts effectively **extended wartime emergency powers indefinitely**. In practical terms:

- **Civil authority was abolished.**
- **Common law was suspended.**
- **The will of the People in each state was nullified.**

This was not reconstruction—it was **occupation**.

The Acts did not merely fill a power vacuum—they **restructured the relationship between the federal government and the states**, paving the way for the federal authority to **override state constitutions** and **impose governance by force**.

---

## ♦ 2. Foundation of the 14th Amendment Jurisdiction

One of the Reconstruction Acts' main conditions for the Southern states to be readmitted into the Union was the **ratification of the 14th Amendment**. This amendment:

- **Redefined citizenship**—creating a new federal class of “U.S. citizen”.
- Required states to **guarantee “equal protection under the law”**—a legal phrase that seems noble but was used to **centralize control** through federal enforcement.
- Was **forced upon the Southern states** as a **condition of re-entry**, meaning it **lacked free, lawful consent**.

The Reconstruction Acts were thus the **brute force mechanism** that enabled the imposition of a new citizenship and jurisdictional framework, transforming sovereign men and women of the several states into **subjects of the federal United States**.

---

## ♦ 3. Precedent for Federal Supremacy Over States

Although initially applied only to the Southern states, the legal theories behind the Reconstruction Acts (military necessity, emergency jurisdiction, and federal supremacy) were later **extended nationwide**. This gave rise to:

- **The nationalization of the National Guard**
- **The suspension of habeas corpus during “emergencies”**
- **The use of federal military and law enforcement within states (e.g., Kent State, 1960s riots)**

The federal government now claimed the **de facto power to intervene in any state**, not only in rebellion but in **any perceived failure to meet federal standards**, including in elections, civil rights, and public health.

---

## ♦ 4. Gateway to the Corporate UNITED STATES (1871)

The centralized control exerted through the Reconstruction Acts prepared the ground for the next great transformation: the **District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871**. Without the Reconstruction Acts:

- The Southern states might have resisted a corporate overlay.
- The 14th Amendment would likely have failed ratification.
- The people would have retained a stronger sense of **state sovereignty and lawful government**.

Thus, the Reconstruction Acts were not isolated historical events but **pivotal legal tools** that enabled the **destruction of the original constitutional republic** and its replacement with a **federal corporate entity**.

---

### Consequences of Reconstruction Jurisdictional Shift

| Consequence                      | Effect  |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Martial Law Precedent            | Used to justify modern emergency powers and federal agency overreach        |
| 14th Amendment Jurisdiction      | Established the legal fiction of the "U.S. citizen" as a commercial subject |
| Court Overreach                  | Courts now rule in equity/admiralty, not under Article III common law       |
| Federal Voting Acts              | Voting now governed by federal standards, not state constitutions           |
| Destruction of State Sovereignty | Governors answer to federal agencies, not their constituents                |

### Conclusion: Reconstruction Was a Reset

The Reconstruction Acts did not restore the Union—they **restructured it**. They created a system where **military control and commercial jurisdiction replaced lawful representation and natural rights**. This shift was done **without constitutional amendment, without the consent of the governed, and under the guise of national healing**.

Today, every time a court rules based on **federal supremacy**, every time a citizen is presumed guilty under a **statutory violation**, and every time emergency orders are declared at the federal level, we are still living under the legacy of Reconstruction.

Understanding these Acts is vital to reclaiming jurisdiction. We must see them not as healing tools of a post-war Union, but as **the instruments of subjugation**—the first bricks laid in building **the corporate edifice** that is the **UNITED STATES INC.**

---

## 6. The District of Columbia Organic Act (1871)

### Full Text and Charter Analysis

“An Act to provide a government for the District of Columbia...”

## Why It Matters:

- Created the **corporate entity** known as **THE UNITED STATES**, a municipal corporation.
- Enabled the federal government to operate as a **for-profit private corporation** outside the original constitutional trust.
- Replaced the organic Constitution with a corporate charter **styled similarly** but governed under **Roman Civil Law**.

## Full Text and Charter Analysis

### “An Act to Provide a Government for the District of Columbia...” (The Organic Act of 1871)

---

#### Introduction

The Act of February 21, 1871, commonly referred to as the **District of Columbia Organic Act of 1871**, is a pivotal piece of legislation that restructured the governance of the District of Columbia. But far beyond merely establishing a municipal framework for the federal capital, this Act **laid the legal foundation for transforming the lawful republic into a corporate democracy**, replacing the **organic trust of the Constitution** with a **commercial charter** designed for **profit, regulation, and control**.

This law created the **corporate entity known as “THE UNITED STATES”**—a **municipal corporation**, distinct from the constitutional “united States of America.” Though the language of the Constitution was retained in style, its lawful **substance** was replaced by a **private corporate structure** governed under **Roman Civil Law**, not Common Law.

Understanding the Act of 1871 is essential to unraveling the **jurisdictional bait-and-switch** that took place after the Civil War, through Reconstruction, and into the financial entrapments of the 20th century. It represents the **moment the republic became a corporation**, with the People unknowingly transformed into **sureties, subjects, and commercial vessels** under the U.S. corporate structure.

---

#### The Act Itself — Key Excerpts and Language

The official title of the legislation reads:

## **“An Act to provide a Government for the District of Columbia”**

Approved **February 21, 1871**, 41st Congress, Session III, Chapter 62.

The core of the Act is deceptively simple in structure. It consolidates the city of Washington and the District of Columbia into a **single municipal entity** and vests **governmental authority in a governor and municipal officers** appointed by Congress.

Key provisions include:

- The creation of a **“body corporate for municipal purposes”** known as the **“District of Columbia”**.
- Granting the corporate entity the ability to **sue and be sued**, to **enter into contracts**, and to **own property**.
- The provision for a **territorial government** controlled by Congress, not by the People.
- The extension of power to enact and enforce **municipal bylaws, ordinances, and regulations**.

Here is a particularly revealing clause:

“...the said District and the government thereof shall be created into a body corporate for municipal purposes, by the name of the District of Columbia...”

This clause may seem innocent—but it legally separates the **corporate entity** from the **land and people** of the several states. It marks the beginning of a **municipal (corporate) governance system** that would later be used as a template for **extending corporate jurisdiction nationwide**.

At first glance, the Act appears to be a benign piece of municipal reorganization, but its underlying structure reveals a profound shift in how governance itself was conceptualized in the post–Civil War era. By transforming the seat of the federal government into a corporate municipal entity, Congress effectively created a separate political body distinct from the constitutional Republic established in 1787. This corporate entity was empowered to operate under bylaws and ordinances—tools of municipal corporations, not organic constitutional governments. The terminology itself signals the legal strategy: to move governance from the realm of the People’s consent into the realm of corporate administration. In doing so, Congress erected a jurisdictional model that would slowly supplant the constitutional mechanisms of self-government with commercial and bureaucratic frameworks.

The Act marks a critical turning point because it laid the foundation for future expansions of federal corporate authority under the guise of municipal necessity. Once the District of Columbia was defined as a “body corporate,” Congress could delegate powers, issue charters, create departments, incur debt, and operate under commercial law in ways that would be impossible under strict constitutional limitations. Over time, this corporate model became the template for federal agencies, commissions, and administrative bodies—structures that exercise immense power yet remain largely insulated from direct democratic oversight. Instead of sovereignty flowing upward from the People, authority became

increasingly concentrated in appointed officials operating within corporate-style hierarchies, guided by bylaws rather than the will of the electorate. This subtle but sweeping shift helped pave the way for the administrative state that now dominates much of American governance.

Furthermore, the Act's corporate framework opened the door for a dual system of jurisdiction—one constitutional, based on the original Republic, and one corporate, based on municipal and commercial authority. As federal power expanded through the 20th century, the corporate model of D.C. increasingly overshadowed the constitutional model of limited government. Statutes, codes, and administrative regulations began to function as binding “law,” even when they exceeded or contradicted the Constitution, because they operated within the corporate jurisdiction established in 1871. The American people, never fully informed of this structural shift, found themselves gradually treated not as sovereign inhabitants of a constitutional Republic, but as subjects of a commercial corporation governed by policies, licenses, contracts, and administrative decrees. Understanding the 1871 Act is therefore essential to understanding how the People's government was quietly transformed into a corporate entity—and how restoring the Republic requires reclaiming the original jurisdiction that predates and supersedes this corporate framework.

---

## Why It Matters

### ◆ 1. Birth of THE UNITED STATES Corporation

The Act of 1871 created the **municipal corporate entity** called the **District of Columbia**. Over time, that corporation came to operate under the name “**THE UNITED STATES**”, in all capital letters, distinguishing it legally from the constitutional “united States of America.”

This distinction, while seemingly a matter of formatting, is not trivial in law. In **legal style manuals and Black's Law Dictionary**, the use of all capital letters signifies a **corporate entity or artificial person**. Thus, “**UNITED STATES**” is not the same as “**united States.**”

This corporate entity was:

- **Incorporated in London** (City of London Corporation banking system) through international registration.
- **Owned and controlled by foreign financial interests**, particularly those connected with the Vatican and the Crown via the District of Columbia's special status.
- Operated under **commercial and equity law**, not Common Law.

As this corporate structure expanded its reach, it gradually overlaid the original constitutional Republic with a parallel system of governance rooted in commercial law, international banking frameworks, and contractual presumption. What began as a municipal incorporation for the District of Columbia evolved into a mechanism through which foreign creditors, central banking interests, and maritime-equity jurisdiction could exert control over the American political and financial system. By operating under the corporate name “THE UNITED STATES,” this entity claimed the authority to issue

debt, regulate commerce, impose administrative codes, and treat living men and women as “subjects” or “persons” within a commercial jurisdiction rather than as sovereign inhabitants of a constitutional Republic. Over generations, this distinction blurred in the public mind, allowing the corporate entity to act with increasing impunity while the true, organic “United States of America” receded into the background. Understanding this transformation is crucial, because it reveals how the people’s sovereignty was gradually displaced by a corporate framework that serves creditors, not citizens, and that governs through contracts, statutes, and adhesion agreements rather than through the unalienable rights secured by the Constitution.

---

## ♦ 2. A Private Corporation Operating Outside the Constitutional Trust

Before 1871, the federal government operated under a **limited delegation of authority**—a **trust contract** created by the Constitution **for** the several sovereign states. The Constitution granted **enumerated powers**, and any power not delegated remained with the states or the People.

But after the Act of 1871:

- The **corporate UNITED STATES** began to act as a **private government overlaid on the de jure republic**.
- It created **statutory codes** (U.S. Code, CFR, UCC) enforceable under **contractual commercial law**, not constitutional authority.
- It operated with the power to **tax, regulate, and impose obligations** on “citizens” of the corporation, who were presumed to be legal entities (i.e., STRAWMEN) by virtue of **birth certificate registration** and **consent-based contracts**.

This transition **nullified lawful governance** without openly admitting it. The People continued to believe they lived in a constitutional republic, while in practice, they were now **subjects of a municipal corporation**.

This quiet substitution of a corporate, commercial authority for the original constitutional trust fundamentally altered the relationship between the People and their government, transforming free sovereign inhabitants into regulated participants within an administrative system that presumed their consent. Under this framework, the corporate UNITED STATES could impose statutes as though they were supreme law, sidestepping constitutional limitations by treating every interaction—licenses, registrations, financial transactions, taxation—as commercial contracts binding on the artificial “person” rather than the living man or woman. In this way, the corporate entity expanded its reach far beyond what the Founders authorized, governing through adhesion contracts and statutory presumption instead of delegated authority and consent. The tragedy of this transition is that it happened so subtly—and was buried so deeply under layers of legal complexity—that generations of Americans remained unaware that their constitutional Republic had been overshadowed by a private

municipal corporation acting under color of law rather than under the lawful authority of the Constitution.

---

### ♦ 3. Corporate Charter Styled After the Constitution

The deception was brilliantly executed through **styling continuity**. The new charter adopted much of the language and formatting of the Constitution, but it was not the **Constitution for the united States of America**—it was the **governing charter of the District of Columbia municipal corporation**.

This bait-and-switch has created the illusion that Americans are still governed by the original Constitution, when in fact:

- Courts operate under **Admiralty jurisdiction**.
- Statutory codes are enforced under **corporate commercial policy**.
- Rights are no longer considered **unalienable**, but rather **revocable civil privileges**.

By mirroring the structure and vocabulary of the original Constitution, the municipal charter allowed the corporate UNITED STATES to operate behind a façade of legitimacy while quietly shifting the legal foundation from Common Law and unalienable rights to corporate policy and administrative control. The public saw familiar terminology—“Congress,” “President,” “courts,” “offices”—and assumed continuity of government, never realizing that these offices were now functioning within a separate and distinct jurisdiction. This corporate framework reinterpreted the People not as sovereigns delegating limited powers, but as subjects bound by commercial statutes, maritime rules, and regulatory codes enforced upon their artificial legal personas. What appeared to be a patriotic evolution of government was, in truth, a jurisdictional transformation that replaced the constitutional Republic with a corporate governance model operating under color of law.

The consequences of this structural shift are profound. Once the corporate charter became the operative system, the protections of the Bill of Rights no longer applied in their original, unqualified form. Courts, operating under Admiralty and equity jurisdiction, began treating rights as privileges granted by the state rather than inherent liberties belonging to the People. Agencies and bureaucracies, empowered by statutory authority instead of constitutional delegation, grew into an administrative state capable of regulating nearly every aspect of life—finance, travel, education, health, commerce—without needing direct consent of the governed. Under this model, Americans unknowingly transitioned from sovereign members of a constitutional union to corporate stakeholders governed by policy, contract, and presumption. Recognizing this shift is the first step toward reclaiming the original Republic and restoring the supremacy of unalienable rights over corporate authority.

---

#### ♦ 4. Governance Under Roman Civil Law (Lex Mercatoria)

The adoption of the corporate charter enabled the District of Columbia (and, by extension, all “U.S. Citizens”) to be governed under **Roman Civil Law**, also called **Civilian Law**, **Equity Law**, or **Lex Mercatoria**.

Roman Civil Law is:

- **Top-down and authoritarian**, unlike the **Common Law**, which is **bottom-up and consent-based**.
- Focused on **obligations, duties, and enforcement** through presumptions of guilt and contract.
- Governed by codes, licenses, permits, and privileges.

This is the same form of law used by **corporate tribunals**, **military courts**, and **international banks**.

Today’s courtrooms, under the jurisdiction of the UNITED STATES, follow this structure—**not the structure of the common law Article III courts** originally created by the Constitution.

This shift to Roman Civil Law fundamentally redefined the relationship between the individual and the state, placing the government in the superior position and the people in the subordinate role of obligated parties presumed to have consented to its authority. Under this framework, every interaction with the state—whether obtaining a license, paying a tax, responding to a citation, or engaging in commerce—is treated as a contractual act binding the artificial “person” to the corporate jurisdiction of the UNITED STATES. The presumption is always that the state holds authority unless the individual can prove otherwise, reversing the common-law principle that government must justify its intrusion. As a result, modern courtrooms function more like administrative enforcement centers than true courts of justice, where judges act as magistrates of corporate codes rather than guardians of unalienable rights. This legal architecture is the backbone of the administrative state, and understanding its Roman origins is essential to understanding how Americans were shifted from sovereign citizens of a constitutional Republic to regulated subjects of a commercial corporation.

---

### The Chain Reaction: 1871 to Today

1. **1871** – District of Columbia is incorporated; the municipal corporate structure of THE UNITED STATES begins.
2. **1868–1890s** – 14th Amendment applied, creating U.S. citizen status and dissolving state sovereignty.

3. **1933** – All Americans declared “enemies of the State” via Trading with the Enemy Act; Birth Certificates are bonded as **commercial securities**.
  4. **Today** – The UNITED STATES operates as a **bankrupt corporation** under perpetual emergency, controlling individuals via the STRAWMAN trust and commercial contracts.
- 

## **Conclusion: A Silent Coup**

The Act of 1871 represents a **silent and bloodless coup**—a transition from **lawful governance by consent** to **corporate rule by contract**. It replaced the original constitutional trust with a **corporate charter**, subjecting the American people to **private international commercial law** without full disclosure or genuine consent.

Understanding the Act is the first step in **reclaiming your lawful status, revoking your presumed consent**, and **restoring the original jurisdiction** of the Republic. It is not merely a piece of historical trivia—it is the legal Rosetta Stone that explains why the system **feels corrupt, functions as tyranny**, and yet insists it is lawful.

Only by exposing this fraudulent jurisdiction can the People return to **common law, constitutional governance**, and **sovereignty under the Creator**.

---

## 7. The 14th Amendment (1868)

### As Ratified Text

“All persons born or naturalized in the United States... are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside...”

### Why It Matters:

- Created a **second class of citizenship**: the **federal U.S. citizen**, subordinate to the corporate United States.
- Substituted **civil privileges** for unalienable rights.
- Used as the foundation for **statutory control, commercial jurisdiction**, and the creation of the **STRAWMAN** legal fiction.

The 14th Amendment introduced a subtle but monumental shift in American political identity by redefining citizenship in a way that had never existed under the original constitutional framework. Prior to 1868, the People of the several states were “State Citizens,” deriving their sovereignty from natural law and the Constitution, not from federal designation. With the ratification of the amendment, Congress created a new category—“citizen of the United States”—a status tied not to inherent rights but to federal jurisdiction. This federal citizenship is a political construct, not a natural condition, and it carries with it obligations, dependencies, and statutory expectations that did not exist for the free inhabitants of the original Republic. In effect, the amendment reclassified the population into subjects of federal authority, shifting sovereignty upward from the People to the centralized corporate government.

This new form of citizenship was the key legal mechanism that allowed later corporate governance—especially after the Act of 1871—to treat individuals as “persons” within a commercial jurisdiction rather than as sovereign beings with unalienable rights. Under the common law, rights exist independent of government and cannot be revoked; under the 14th Amendment citizenship model, however, “rights” are interpreted as privileges granted by the state, which can be regulated, restricted, or conditioned through statutes. This is why federal courts routinely interpret constitutional protections through the lens of “compelling government interests,” “balancing tests,” and “qualified rights”—terminology that only makes sense when the underlying rights are no longer viewed as inherent but as permissions within a corporate jurisdiction. The amendment thus served as the bridge between the constitutional Republic and the administrative state, enabling federal agencies, courts, and corporate structures to exert authority over individuals who believed they were still living under the original guarantees of the Bill of Rights.

Furthermore, the legal fiction known as the STRAWMAN—created through birth registration and associated with the all-capital-letters name—depends entirely on the 14th Amendment framework. The corporate UNITED STATES can only regulate artificial entities within its jurisdiction; therefore, by defining every newborn as a “citizen of the United States,” the government claims presumptive authority over the legal persona tied to that name. This artificial entity becomes the target of taxation,

licensing, regulation, debt enforcement, and administrative law, while the living man or woman remains largely unaware that a distinction exists. The 14th Amendment, therefore, was not merely a reconstruction-era reform—it was the legal foundation upon which the corporate jurisdiction of the UNITED STATES was built, enabling the gradual transfer of Americans from sovereign constitutional status into a system of commercial governance that treats them as assets, debtors, and legally constructed persons rather than as free inhabitants endowed with unalienable rights.

---

## 8. The Trading with the Enemy Act (1917)

### Selected Sections

“During time of war, the President may... regulate or prohibit any transactions...”

### Why It Matters:

- Used to **declare all U.S. citizens as enemies** of the State during economic war.
- Re-applied in 1933 to enslave the people under **commercial jurisdiction** during the Great Depression.
- Foundation for **emergency powers, banking control, and commercial licenses**.

The Trading with the Enemy Act was originally framed as a wartime measure targeting foreign adversaries, but its broad language created a legal instrument that could later be turned inward against the American people themselves. By empowering the President to regulate all “transactions,” “communications,” and “property” involving designated enemies, the Act provided an expansive gateway into economic and personal control. While initially justified under the pressures of World War I, the Act quietly established a precedent: that extraordinary executive power could be invoked not only on foreign battlefields, but within the domestic economy. This redefinition of “war powers” laid the groundwork for future administrations to claim authority over banking, currency, commerce, and even private contracts in the name of national security or financial stability.

The real transformation occurred in 1933 when President Franklin D. Roosevelt—facing the financial collapse of the Great Depression—invoked the Act and reclassified the American people as “enemies” within the context of a domestic economic emergency. This maneuver allowed the federal government to seize gold, suspend the redeemability of currency, control banking operations, and impose far-reaching commercial regulations under what was essentially a wartime framework applied to civilians. By shifting the nation from constitutional money to Federal Reserve Notes, the government placed the public into a perpetual state of commercial dependency. Under the expanded interpretation of the Act, ordinary Americans were treated as participants in a regulated wartime economy, subject to licensing schemes, executive decrees, and financial obligations that would have been unthinkable under the constitutional Republic.

Moreover, the Trading with the Enemy Act became the legal backbone for every subsequent expansion of “emergency powers,” forming the basis for the modern administrative state’s authority

over commerce, currency, property, and individual behavior. From banking regulations to federal licensing requirements, from wartime rationing to peacetime surveillance, the doctrine of permanent emergency has allowed executive agencies to bypass constitutional limitations and operate under a continuous presumption of crisis. As long as the nation remains under states of declared emergency—which it has almost continuously since 1933—the people remain trapped within a commercial jurisdiction where rights are interpreted as privileges, and the government exercises authority as though it were managing an occupied economic territory. In this way, the Trading with the Enemy Act did not merely alter wartime policy; it restructured the entire legal relationship between the American people and the federal government, placing the nation into a mode of governance that operates far outside the bounds of the original Constitution.

---

## 9. House Joint Resolution 192 (1933)

### Eliminated the obligation to pay debts with lawful money

“...every provision requiring payment in gold is declared to be against public policy.”

#### Why It Matters:

- Made **debt discharge** the default, not debt payment.
- Introduced the use of **private credit** (FRNs) instead of lawful currency.
- Created the legal structure for **bonding of individuals' labor and trust accounts**.
- Tied directly to the **monetization of signatures** and **CUSIP-linked birth certificates**.

House Joint Resolution 192 did far more than remove gold clauses from contracts—it fundamentally redefined the nature of money, obligation, and personal economic participation within the United States. By declaring that no contract could require payment in lawful money, Congress effectively shifted all financial transactions into the realm of commercial debt instruments backed not by tangible value but by the collective credit of the American people. This move relieved the government of its obligation to provide constitutional money and replaced it with a system in which debts could only be discharged using Federal Reserve promissory notes. In essence, the resolution dissolved the gold-based economy and forced every contract, loan, mortgage, and commercial agreement into a fiat-credit system managed by private banking interests rather than by the constitutional Republic.

Once lawful money was removed from circulation, the government and Federal Reserve established a framework in which the people themselves became the surety for the nation's debt through their labor, legal presence, and financial activity. Because debts could no longer be “paid” in the constitutional sense, every individual transaction became a matter of discharging obligations using corporate credit instruments. This shift opened the door for the creation of trust accounts, signature-based securities, and the use of the all-capital-letters legal persona as collateral within the commercial system. Birth certificates—assigned CUSIP numbers and treated as financial

instruments—provided the identification and tracking mechanism needed for banks and government agencies to monetize the presumed future labor of each individual. Thus, HJR-192 laid the legal foundation for a system in which the STRAWMAN became the economic proxy for the living man or woman, enabling expansive state control over property, labor, and commerce.

The long-term impact of this resolution cannot be overstated. By replacing lawful money with private credit, the government placed the entire nation under a perpetual state of commercial receivership, allowing banks and federal agencies to treat every citizen as a party to ongoing debt obligations. Licenses, registrations, fines, and financial instruments all operate within this credit-based model, and the courts enforce these obligations not as matters of constitutional law but as matters of commercial contract. As a result, the people became unknowingly bound to a corporate financial system that claims authority over their property, wages, and even personal identity. HJR-192 was therefore not merely an economic adjustment during a crisis—it was a structural pivot that transformed Americans from sovereign participants in a constitutional economy into collateralized entities within a debt-driven corporate system, completing a key stage in the transition from the original Republic to the commercial jurisdiction of the UNITED STATES corporation.

---

## 10. Key Supreme Court Case Excerpts

### Upholding Individual Sovereignty, Limiting Martial Authority, and Confirming the Lawful Distinctions Between People and Corporations

---

#### Introduction: Why Supreme Court Precedent Still Matters

In a nation governed by the **rule of law** and grounded in a written Constitution, the rulings of the **Supreme Court of the United States** serve as vital interpretive guides to the original intent, lawful limits, and jurisdictional scope of government power. In the context of the **organic constitutional republic**—as opposed to the **corporate federal overlay post-1871**—key Supreme Court cases affirm timeless truths about **sovereignty, due process, martial law**, and the distinction between a **living man or woman** and a **legal fiction or corporate entity**.

Two landmark cases in particular—**Ex parte Milligan (1866)** and **Hale v. Henkel (1906)**—remain towering affirmations of the **inalienable rights of the individual** and the lawful structure of **de jure governance**. While both are routinely ignored or obfuscated by de facto courts operating under statutory or administrative codes today, their legal conclusions **have never been overturned**, and they continue to serve as lawful anchors for those seeking to reclaim their **constitutional standing**.

---

#### ♦ Ex parte Milligan (1866)

#### Civilians Cannot Be Tried by Military Courts When Civil Courts Are Available

##### Case Summary:

- **Citation:** 71 U.S. (4 Wall.) 2 (1866)
- **Decision Date:** April 3, 1866
- **Context:** In the aftermath of the Civil War, **Lambdin P. Milligan**, a civilian resident of Indiana, was arrested by military authorities, tried before a military tribunal, and sentenced to death for alleged disloyal activities.
- He had never been in the military, and the civil courts in Indiana were fully operational at the time of his arrest.

##### Key Excerpt:

**“Martial rule can never exist where the courts are open, and in the proper and unobstructed exercise of their jurisdiction.”**

##### Significance:

- **Affirms that martial law is unconstitutional** where **civilian courts are available and functioning**. Military tribunals may not replace the judicial system simply because a crisis or emergency is declared.
- Emphasizes the **supremacy of due process and the right to trial by jury** in peacetime—cornerstones of **common law** and **natural rights**.
- Sets precedent that the **executive branch (including military officers)** cannot suspend the Constitution or bypass the judicial system under the pretext of war powers or emergency.

Ex parte Milligan forcefully reasserted a principle that the Founders considered non-negotiable: that no emergency, no war, and no claim of national security can override the constitutional protections guaranteed to the people. The decision made clear that the Constitution is not a document to be followed only in times of peace, but the supreme law that governs precisely when government is most tempted to exceed its limits. By holding that civilians may not be hauled before military tribunals while civil courts are open, the Supreme Court rejected the notion that the executive branch may unilaterally determine when constitutional rights are suspended. In doing so, it struck at the heart of arbitrary power and reaffirmed that due process belongs to the individual—not to the discretion of government officials.

The ruling also exposed the dangers of conflating military necessity with lawful authority, a practice that had surged during the Civil War and would later reappear under various “emergency powers” regimes. Milligan establishes that military jurisdiction is an exceptional, narrowly confined authority that cannot be expanded simply because the government finds it more expedient or politically convenient. The Court warned explicitly that allowing military tribunals to replace civil courts would create a system where rights depend not on constitutional guarantees but on the whims of military officers. Such a system, it argued, is antithetical to a free nation and incompatible with the structure of government ordained by the People. In this way, Milligan serves as a constitutional firewall against the creeping normalization of executive emergency rule.

In the broader arc of American jurisprudence, Ex parte Milligan stands as a direct challenge to the post-1861 shift toward centralized federal power, corporate governance, and administrative authority. It reminds the nation that the separation between civilian law and military power is fundamental—and that any attempt to blur that line constitutes an assault on the Republic itself. Even today, as governments rely increasingly on emergency declarations, administrative courts, and national-security justifications to circumvent due process, Milligan remains a binding declaration that such practices are illegitimate and unconstitutional. It is a judicial affirmation that the People retain their rights even in crisis, that the Constitution remains supreme in every season, and that martial jurisdiction has no lawful foothold wherever civilian justice endures.

### **Why It Still Matters:**

Today, we see similar **unlawful military-style processes** occurring under the cloak of:

- **Administrative courts (e.g., family court, tax court, traffic court)** acting without juries
- **Emergency executive orders** bypassing legislative oversight
- **Federal agencies** operating under Department of Homeland Security, FEMA, or health directives overriding the rights of individuals

But *Ex parte Milligan* is a clear rebuke of such practices. It confirms that **no emergency, real or imagined, gives the state the right to suspend due process** when courts are open. Any claim of martial jurisdiction over a civilian in peacetime is **null and void** under this ruling.

---

### ♦ **Hale v. Henkel (1906)**

#### **Individuals Are Not Corporations and May Not Be Forced to Waive Rights**



##### **Case Summary:**

- **Citation:** 201 U.S. 43 (1906)
- **Decision Date:** January 3, 1906
- **Context:** The U.S. government subpoenaed **Clarence Hale**, secretary of the American Tobacco Company, in a case involving a corporate trust investigation.
- Hale refused to produce certain personal and corporate records, asserting his **Fifth Amendment right** against self-incrimination and **Fourth Amendment protection** against unreasonable search.



##### **Key Excerpt:**

**"The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the State or to his neighbors to divulge his business, or to open his doors to an investigation, so far as it may tend to incriminate him..."**

**"...The corporation is a creature of the State. It is presumed to be incorporated for the benefit of the public... It receives certain special privileges and franchises... and it is subject to the laws of its creation. It has no constitutional rights to privacy or silence that may obstruct regulation."**



##### **Significance:**

- This case draws a **clear legal distinction** between a **living man or woman** (a natural person) and a **corporation** (a legal fiction).
- Affirms that **a sovereign individual has unalienable rights**—including the right to **contract**, to **privacy**, and to **refuse consent**.
- Declares that corporations, being **state-created entities**, are **subject to government regulation** and **do not enjoy the full protections** of the Constitution.
- Supports the idea that a living being is **not bound to comply with administrative or statutory demands** unless they have voluntarily contracted into that system.

Hale v. Henkel establishes one of the clearest judicial affirmations of individual sovereignty ever issued by the United States Supreme Court. The Court drew an unmistakable boundary between the living man—whose rights are inherent, unalienable, and prior to the state—and the corporation, which exists only by legislative permission and is therefore subordinate to government regulation. The decision recognizes that an individual engages in private business by natural right, not by government grant, and thus retains the power to refuse disclosure, resist compelled testimony, and maintain full constitutional protections without qualification. This principle sharply contrasts with the powers the state holds over corporations, whose privileges can be expanded, limited, or revoked because they are mere constructs of statute, not creations of nature.

The Court's ruling exposes a profound truth often obscured in the modern administrative state: living individuals do not automatically fall under the same obligations as corporate entities unless they knowingly enter into contracts that place them there. The distinction is essential because it prevents the government from treating human beings as extensions of corporate or administrative structures. Under Hale v. Henkel, no statute, policy, or regulatory scheme can compel a man or woman to waive their rights through presumption or coercion. Only through voluntary, fully informed consent—typically via contracts, licenses, registrations, or applications—can an individual enter the corporate jurisdiction where obligations may replace rights. This ruling therefore strikes at the heart of corporate-statutory overreach and affirms that constitutional protections remain intact unless lawfully waived.

Furthermore, Hale v. Henkel remains a vital reminder that the state cannot convert a living being into a regulated entity merely by declaration or assumption. In an age where government agencies increasingly treat individuals as taxable persons, administrative subjects, or corporate surrogates through mechanisms like the STRAWMAN framework, the case stands as a powerful counterweight. It clarifies that corporations owe duties to the state because they are created by it, but individuals, created by the Creator and endowed with inherent rights, owe no such duties unless they choose to contract into that system. This distinction is foundational to restoring lawful governance, as it reinforces the natural-law premise that the People are sovereign, the government is their servant, and no administrative body may lawfully compel what a man or woman has not voluntarily agreed to.

## Why It Still Matters:

Hale v. Henkel continues to be cited by sovereignty advocates and lawful researchers as proof that:

- **You are not your STRAWMAN**—the all-cap name on your license, birth certificate, or court papers is a legal fiction.
- **You cannot be compelled to incriminate yourself**, produce personal papers, or comply with administrative orders **unless you've entered into contract**.
- Many modern legal processes **presume consent** to statutory jurisdiction. But Hale v. Henkel makes clear that without express consent, the individual may **stand upon their natural, unalienable rights**.

## Summary Table of Principles Affirmed

| Principle                   | Ex parte Milligan (1866)         | Hale v. Henkel (1906)                 |
|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Due process required        | ✅ Civilian courts must be used   | ✅ Cannot be compelled to waive rights |
| No martial law in peacetime | ✅ Explicitly prohibited          | ❖ Implied through civil context       |
| Individuals ≠ Corporations  | ❖ Not the focus                  | ✅ Clear distinction made              |
| Statutes ≠ Consent          | ✅ Military authority not implied | ✅ Consent to statute must be given    |
| Constitutional supremacy    | ✅ Above military orders          | ✅ Above corporate/statutory schemes   |

## Conclusion: Supreme Court Truths in an Age of Corporate Governance

Though often ignored by today's courts and bureaucracies, **Ex parte Milligan** and **Hale v. Henkel** remain **binding Supreme Court precedent**. They affirm that:

- The government has **no lawful power** to suspend the Constitution, even during crises.
- A living man or woman **cannot be presumed to be a corporate entity** subject to administrative regulations.

- Rights are **not privileges**, and **statutory jurisdiction cannot be forced** upon individuals without informed, voluntary consent.

In a world of increasing legal complexity, surveillance, and corporate control, these decisions stand as **beacons of lawful clarity**. They remind us that **our rights are unalienable**, that **the government is our servant**, and that **jurisdiction must be proven, not presumed**.

---

## Conclusion: These Documents Are Our Weapons

In every courtroom, in every interaction with the state, these documents—when properly cited and understood—become more powerful than any statute. They form the **lawful record** of the **People's authority** and the **trust law** which limits government.

The deception of corporate government lies in the **erasure of history**, the **obfuscation of language**, and the **misapplication of law**. This appendix restores that record. It is not only a resource but a declaration of evidence for those who seek to restore what was lost.

Let this appendix be **preserved, copied, and disseminated** widely. The truth is not hidden—it is merely forgotten. And by remembering, we reclaim.

These documents are more than historical artifacts—they are living instruments of lawful resistance that expose the limits of governmental power and reaffirm the supremacy of the People as the true sovereigns of the Republic. Whenever officials overstep their delegated authority, these rulings, statutes, and constitutional provisions become the lawful shield by which a man or woman may stand upon their rights and refuse unlawful encroachment. The power of these documents comes not from the paper they are printed on, but from the immutable principles they articulate: that government exists by consent, that rights are inherent, and that no administrative authority can override the natural law that predates all constitutions. When properly understood, they empower every individual to challenge jurisdiction, demand due process, and expose the difference between color-of-law and true law.

The restoration of this knowledge represents a profound form of peaceful rebellion against the silent conquest of corporate governance. For generations, Americans have been conditioned to believe that statutory codes are supreme, that administrative orders carry the weight of law, and that compliance is mandatory simply because an agency commands it. But the cases and constitutional truths preserved in this appendix shatter that illusion by demonstrating that no statute can contradict the Constitution, no corporate policy can override natural rights, and no office-holder can claim powers not explicitly delegated to them. Reclaiming these principles is not an act of defiance, but an act of fidelity—to the Founders, to the Republic, and to the Creator who endowed every person with unalienable rights.

Let this appendix serve not only as a record of what the government may not do, but as a reminder of what the People must do: to stand, to speak, and to assert the jurisdiction that has always been theirs. Knowledge of lawful authority is the foundation of self-governance, and once a People remember who they are, no deception, no administrative machinery, and no corporate façade can withstand them. These documents shine light into the manufactured darkness that has obscured the truth for more than a century, and in that illumination, the People find their way back to the original Republic. To reclaim is to remember, and to remember is to restore.