

INJURY DEFENSE FRANCHISE AND AGREEMENT FORM INSTRUCTIONS

1. PURPOSE:

This form is a defensive tool for use by those interfacing with either a government officer or government agency. Its purpose is to:

1. Establish and protect your sovereignty.
2. Preserve your equitable position and prevent you from becoming unequal or inferior in relation to any government or Government Actor. The only way you can become unequal is by consenting to it in some form.
3. Ensure that you cannot lawfully participate in any franchise court or be subject to the whims of any government agency or the administrative law that implements it, such as:
 - 3.1. Traffic Court.
 - 3.2. Family Court.
 - 3.3. Tax Court.
4. Invoke **ONLY** the protections of the common law and the Constitution and not statutory civil law. All statutory civil law is law for government and not private human beings.¹
5. Ensure that everyone you deal with in the government is constrained to provide the **ONLY** thing that the government was established for, which is to protect **PRIVATE** property and **PRIVATE** rights.
6. Impose an anti-franchise franchise that prevents the enforcement of any government franchise against you.
7. Maintain the status of your **PRIVATE** property as private and prevent it from being donated to a public use, public purpose, or public office without your express written consent.
8. Establish, preserve, and protect your proper civil status within existing state and federal law.
9. Prevent private people from being victimized by the presumptions or equivocations of others by defining the meaning and context of all key terms and burden of proof against the government in **REDEFINING** them for nefarious uses.
10. Keep you disconnected from all government statutory civil law, which can lawfully regulate only Government Actors and instead impose only the common law for the protection of your rights.
11. Invoke all the same presumptions against the government that they invoke against you and therefore turn the tables.
12. Prevent any commercial use of materials or services or interactions by Government Actor as against Protected Party.
13. To prevent and punish the tendency of sophists in the government to use word games to evade their responsibility to obey our Member Agreement if they want to use our privileged and protected information or services for a commercial purpose that might benefit them in any way.²

The authority for creating and enforcing this franchise and agreement is the requirement for equal protection and equal treatment that is the foundation of the United States Constitution. Since governments have implemented franchises on a grand scale, we claim the **EQUAL** right to establish and enforce similar franchises to prevent us from being compelled to be part of theirs.

Attach this form to correspondence sent to the government to give reasonable notice of what the recipient mandatorily agrees to as a condition of either demanding or receiving any of your property or services.

2. OTHER FORMS THIS FORM IS REFERENCED IN

This form is incorporated by reference into the following other forms. Therefore, there is no need to add it to these forms:

1. *SEDM Member Agreement*, Form #01.001, Section 5
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
2. *SEDM Disclaimer*, Section 5
<http://www.sedm.org/disclaimer.htm>

¹ See: *Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons*, Form #05.037; <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf>.

² See: *An Introduction to Sophistry Course*, Form #12.042; <https://sedm.org/an-introduction-to-sophistry/>.

3. *Deposition Handout: Member Deposition*, Form #03.005, Exhibit 1
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
4. *Federal Pleading/Motion/Petition Attachment*, Litigation Tool #01.002, Section 8
<http://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>
5. *Affidavit of Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status*, Form #02.001, Section 4
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
6. *Tax Form Attachment*, Form #04.201, Section 6
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

3. **FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTION(S)**

3.1 **QUESTION 1: Why would anyone in their right mind want to sign or consent to this agreement?"**

Hi, I just finished reading the Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form 06.027. At the end of this document, there is a page for the signature of the Protected Party AND signature of the "Government Actor."

My question is no "Government Actor" in his/her right mind is actually going to sign this document, so I would like to know what it is that "binds" the Government Actor to the stipulations within the Anti-Franchise Franchise.

I realize that WE DID NOT agree to the stipulations of their franchises either, at least not knowingly, and that this is kind of the whole point in making the Anti-Franchise Franchise, but how can this be used against them if they refuse to sign it, which they obviously will do?

3.2 **ANSWER 1:**

What binds them is the SAME thing that binds us to THEIR franchises: Acceptance of the "benefits" of the relationship. Those "benefits" are enumerated in this document itself. Here are some legal authorities documenting that the acceptance of the benefits described constitutes constructive consent to all the obligations arising from the delivery of the benefit, property, or services from you that they seek, including in the form of civil statutory obligations:

"The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege, in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege conferred, its acceptance implies an assent [a type of CONSENT] to the regulation of its use and the compensation for it."
[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]

CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE
DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS
PART 2. CONTRACTS
CHAPTER 3. CONSENT
Section 1589

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

He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage.”
“Que sentit commodum, sentire debet et onus.

He who derives a benefit from a thing, ought to feel the disadvantages attending it. 2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1433.”

[Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856;

SOURCE:

<http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

Under our system of law, ALL "persons" are equal. If the government can rope US into THEIR franchises by the above mechanisms, which is EXACTLY what they do, then we can do the SAME thing to them under the concept of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL TREATMENT. Any assertion to the contrary is a violation of due process of law and a denial of equal protection and equal treatment.

Any Government Actor who argues against the above approach is essentially:

1. Discrediting the ONLY useful tool they have to prosecute tax crimes.
2. Contradicting their own statements and behavior.
3. Declaring any and all previous criminal tax prosecutions as VOID and FRAUDULENT.

Whenever they prosecute people for tax crimes, they ALWAYS do the same thing as the anti-franchise franchise does:

1. They claim that the defendant is accepting the "benefits" of living here without "paying their fair share".
2. Getting the jury angry at the defendant because it increases THEIR tax bill, which incidentally is a CRIME called jury tampering and criminal financial conflict of interest under 18 U.S.C. §208.

The above techniques are documented in:

The Government Benefits Scam, Form #05.040

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

If THEY can do it, then YOU can do it! In a nation that at least gives LIP service to EQUALITY OF ALL and where Obama stated in his very own inauguration speech that "we are all equal", anyone who claims otherwise is a HYPOCRITE AND is calling our very own president a LIAR!

Every technique that is or can be successful against the corrupted government will ALWAYS emulate their very own behavior and let them discredit themselves in the process of defending against it. And what jurist DOESN'T hate that kind of hypocrisy? We don't know any. That's Sun Tzu's approach:

“Use the enemy's main strength against himself.”

The U.S. Supreme Court has held that EQUALITY OF RIGHTS and TREATMENT are the FOUNDATIONS of ALL of your freedom!

“No duty rests more imperatively upon the courts than the enforcement of those constitutional provisions intended to secure that equality of rights which is the foundation of free government.”

[Gulf, C. & S. F. R. Co. v. Ellis, 165 U.S. 150 (1897)]

The ONLY way you can lawfully be treated UNEQUALLY is with your express consent. Any government which asserts a right that they refuse to allow you to have has the burden of proving with evidence introduced into the record that you EXPRESSLY CONSENTED to be treated unequally in relation to them in a form and in a manner that ONLY you can specify. That manner should ALWAYS be in writing with your signature on it and with the signature of someone from the government who has delegated authority to make such a commitment.

If you would like to know more about the legal requirement for EQUAL PROTECTION AND EQUAL TREATMENT that is the FOUNDATION of the United States Constitution, see:

Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment, Form #05.033
DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/EqualProtection.pdf>
FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

You can't "govern" people who are equal. They have to consent to be UNEQUAL before they can be CIVILLY governed and be called a "subject". AND you can't be a "sovereign" and a "subject" at the same time. A statutory "citizen" is a subject, and therefore is UNEQUAL and INFERIOR to the government they are a member of. That is the conclusion of the following wonderful memorandum of law, which you should ALSO read:

Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and not Private Persons, Form #05.037
DIRECT LINK: <http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf>
FORMS PAGE: <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

7. RESOURCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

- 7.1. *Sovereignty and Freedom Page*-Family Guardian Website
<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Freedom/Freedom.htm>
- 7.2. *Government Franchises Course*, Form #12.012
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 7.3. *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030-how the government accomplishes the OPPOSITE of the purpose of its creation, and thereby illegally converts all private property to public property.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 7.4. *The "Trade or Business" Scam*, Form #05.001-heart of the IRS fraud
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 7.5. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions*, Form #10.005-how to restore one's sovereignty
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 7.6. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004-online version of the above
<http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr.htm>

INJURY DEFENSE FRANCHISE AND AGREEMENT



If you want or expect any private services or private property from me, you have to pay for it by obeying this document. The obligations described herein are “taxes” defined above to the party making the demand or request for compliance, services, or property. All such requests establish a waiver of official, judicial, and sovereign immunity because of the pursuit of a benefit in a legislatively but not constitutionally foreign jurisdiction.

The only thing I demand from you is obedience to the constitution and respect for private property, which is not a franchise benefit and which can never become a privilege without violating the constitution. Thus, the only party waiving sovereignty and sovereign immunity is YOU, not me. I accept and consent to no civil statutory status or the rights or obligations attached to it in the context of any and all interactions between us.

Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>

The following authorities go BOTH WAYS under the concept of equal protection and equal treatment. If you want the benefit, use, or control of my absolutely owned private property, then only I can make the rules governing our relationship. This includes any and all civil enforcement activity. If I want your property or services OTHER than obeying the constitution or respecting private property as documented herein then YOU make the rules under Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2.

“The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege, in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the compensation for it.”

[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]

*“We have repeatedly held that the Federal Government may impose appropriate conditions on the use of federal property or privileges [franchises, Form #05.030] and may require that state instrumentalities comply with conditions [obligations, Form #12.040] that are reasonably related to the federal interest in particular national projects or programs. See, e. g., *Ivanhoe Irrigation Dist. v. McCracken*, 357 U.S. 275, 294 -296 (1958); *Oklahoma v. Civil Service Comm'n*, 330 U.S. 127, 142 -144 (1947); *United States v. San Francisco*, 310 U.S. 16 (1940); cf. *National League of Cities v. Usery*, 426 U.S. 833, 853 (1976); *Fry v. United States*, 421 U.S. 542 (1975). A requirement that States, like all other users, pay a portion of the costs of the benefits [Form #05.040] they enjoy from federal programs is surely permissible [meaning CONSTITUTIONAL] since it is closely related to the [435 U.S. 444, 462] federal interest in recovering costs from those who benefit and since it effects no greater interference with state sovereignty than do the restrictions which this Court has approved.”*

[*Massachusetts v. United States*, 435 U.S. 444 (1978);

https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=16842193024599209893]

LIST OF TABLES	4
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	4
DEDICATION	20
1 Purpose	29
2 Injurious activities which constitute implied consent to this franchise and agreement	30
3 Limitations Upon Delegated Authority of Protected Party	37
4 Definitions and Rules of Construction and Interpretation	39
4.1 Definition of Specific Terms	40
4.1.1 Human.....	40
4.1.2 “Should”, “Shall”, “Must”, “We Recommend”	40
4.1.3 Private	41
4.1.4 Government	42
4.1.5 Civil Status.....	45
4.1.6 Civil Service	47
4.1.7 Common Law	47
4.1.8 Law	52
4.1.9 Copyright	57
4.1.10 Franchise.....	58
4.1.11 Frivolous.....	63
4.1.12 Federal Income Tax	63
4.1.13 Tax	63
4.1.14 Protection.....	64
4.1.15 Fact	64
4.1.16 Statutory.....	64
4.1.17 Statutory Citizen	65
4.1.18 Constitutional.....	66
4.1.19 Law Practice	66
4.1.20 Sovereign	66
4.1.21 Anarchy.....	67
4.1.22 Political	68
4.1.23 Non-citizen national.....	69
4.1.24 State national	69
4.1.25 “Non-Person” or “Non-Resident Non-Person”.....	70
4.1.26 “Advice” or “legal advice”	77
4.1.27 Socialism.....	78
4.1.28 “Grant” or “loan”	79
4.1.29 Benefit.....	85
4.1.30 Weaponization of Government.....	86
4.1.31 Natural law.....	90
4.2 Rules for interpreting words or terms that are not expressly defined	91
4.3 Terms in quotation marks	92
4.4 Geographical Definitions and Conventions	92
4.4.1 Background Information.....	92
4.4.2 Geographical definitions.....	93
4.4.3 Capitalization within Statutes and Regulations	102
4.4.4 Legal Status of Federal Enclaves within the States	103
4.4.5 Relationship of Citizenship Terms to Geographical Definitions	106
5 Significance of Identifying Numbers Used in Correspondence between Protected Party and either Government or Government Actor	106
6 Significance of Perjury statements signed by Protected Party on All Government Forms .	108
6.1 Specific information validated as true on all government forms signed with a perjury statement	108
6.2 Materiality of any perjury statements in the context of criminal enforcement by Government Actor	111

7	Parties.....	113
8	Consideration.....	113
9	Authority and even OBLIGATION for Establishment of this Agreement	115
10	Evidence of Consent to this Offer/Agreement	119
	10.1 Generally	121
	10.2 Attorneys	122
	10.3 Judges	122
	10.4 Government employees	124
11	Agreement is NOT an “unjust enrichment” or an Adhesion Contract, like everything the GOVERNMENT Offers	126
	11.1 Introduction	126
	11.2 The PROBLEM with the “Social Compact” (CIVIL STATUTORY LAW) as explained by a legal expert that got 90% on the Bar Exam.....	128
	11.3 Circumstances of the government’s usual offer of CIVIL STATUTORY protection to the Protected Party... 135	
	11.4 Mandatory closing statements to the jury relating to this agreement that prove this is NOT an unjust enrichment 139	
12	Rights acquired by Protected Party Against Government Actor	143
	12.1 Return of Any and all Property of Protected Party Acquired by Government Actor or his Employer	143
	12.2 Agency Established	144
	12.3 Waiver of Full Payment Rule, Anti-Injunction Act, Exceptions to Declaratory Judgment Act, Need to Exhaust Administrative Remedies, and ability to remove to Federal Court.....	144
	12.4 Information about Protected Party is PRIVATE Property Subject to Non-Disclosure.....	144
	12.5 Waiver of Government Agency, Official, and Judicial Immunity on the Part of Government Actor.....	144
	12.6 Waiver of Sovereign Immunity	145
	12.7 Presumptions Established and Stipulated by All Parties	147
	12.8 Enforcement Authority of Protected Party Against Government Actor	150
	12.9 Issues not subject to dispute, default answers stipulated	150
	12.10 Authority conferred by Government Actor upon Protected Party	151
	12.11 Stipulations regarding communications between Protected Party and Government Actor	152
	12.12 Use of Information About Protected Party	152
	12.13 Other Terms and Conditions.....	153
13	Dispute Resolution	153
	13.1 Agency and Status of Parties	154
	13.2 Choice of Law	155
	13.3 Venue.....	156
	13.4 No Statutes of Limitation.....	156
	13.5 All governments excluded from suit, joinder of parties.....	158
	13.6 Stipulations Applying to all Litigation	159
	13.7 Burden of Proof Upon All Government Officers	164
	13.8 Service of Process.....	164
14	Method of Amendment	165
15	Severability and Affirmation	165

LIST OF TABLES

No table of figures entries found.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitutional Provisions

art. I, § 8, cl. 4	65
Art. I, sec. 20	98

Art. I, sec. 8	98
Art. I, sec. 9, P4.....	98
Art. III	49, 59
Article 1, Section 10.....	156
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17	65
Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8	36, 55, 125
Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution	68
Article 4, Section 3.....	115
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2	35, 38, 74, 81, 155
Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution	62, 94, 95
Article 4, Section 4.....	27, 42, 82, 121, 146, 158
Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution	138
Article I	35, 59
Article III.....	35, 59
Article IV	35, 59
Bill of Rights	55, 56, 147, 155
Constitution of Massachusetts	80
Fifth Amendment	80
First Amendment.....	25, 31, 37, 51, 111, 142, 156
Fourteenth Amendment.....	65, 80, 98
Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution	72
Thirteenth Amendment.....	48, 51, 71, 85, 87, 100, 153
U.S. Const, art. IV, § 3, cl. 2	65
U.S. Constitution, Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2	86
United States Constitution.....	29

Statutes

17 U.S.C. §105	57
18 U.S.C. §§1001 and 1030	26
18 U.S.C. §§201 and 210	142
18 U.S.C. §§201, 210, 211	95
18 U.S.C. §§210 and 211	146
18 U.S.C. §§911 and 912	26
18 U.S.C. §1001	152
18 U.S.C. §1028(a)(7).....	107, 108
18 U.S.C. §1028A	107, 108
18 U.S.C. §1512	146
18 U.S.C. §1581	72, 87
18 U.S.C. §1583	85
18 U.S.C. §1589	25, 48
18 U.S.C. §1589(a)(3).....	63
18 U.S.C. §1956.....	107
18 U.S.C. §201	85, 87
18 U.S.C. §208	42, 85, 87, 123, 126
18 U.S.C. §2381	48, 104
18 U.S.C. §241	107
18 U.S.C. §597	85
18 U.S.C. §6002.....	145
18 U.S.C. §654.....	107
18 U.S.C. §872	87
18 U.S.C. §91	72
18 U.S.C. §912	87, 108, 142, 154
18 U.S.C. Chapter 41	25
26 U.S.C. §1	152
26 U.S.C. §162	152
26 U.S.C. §3121(e).....	70, 121
26 U.S.C. §32	152

26 U.S.C. §3401	34
26 U.S.C. §3401(a).....	72, 92
26 U.S.C. §3401(c).....	41, 92
26 U.S.C. §3402(p)	25
26 U.S.C. §3406.....	72
26 U.S.C. §501(c)(4)	68
26 U.S.C. §6041	72, 113, 154
26 U.S.C. §6065	37, 68, 126, 161
26 U.S.C. §6109	106, 107, 108, 153, 155
26 U.S.C. §6331	155
26 U.S.C. §6331(a).....	155
26 U.S.C. §6671(b)	99, 111, 126, 154
26 U.S.C. §6671(b) and §7343	70
26 U.S.C. §6901	143
26 U.S.C. §7206 and/or 7207	154
26 U.S.C. §7343	99, 111, 126, 154
26 U.S.C. §7408(d)	121, 155
26 U.S.C. §7423	158
26 U.S.C. §7441	48
26 U.S.C. §7521	152
26 U.S.C. §7521(a).....	152
26 U.S.C. §7601	155
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16)	113
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)	94, 99, 107, 152
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(30)	70, 71, 107, 154
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(31)	72
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(39).....	121, 155
26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10)	24, 26, 71, 72, 94, 99, 155, 165
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)	71, 94
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(1)(A)	71, 154
26 U.S.C. §7701(b)(4)(B).....	153
26 U.S.C. §7811	110
26 U.S.C. §861(a)(3)(C)(i).....	72
26 U.S.C. §871	72, 106
26 U.S.C. §871(a).....	72
26 U.S.C. §872	25, 72
26 U.S.C. §873(b)(3).....	72
26 U.S.C. §877	72
26 U.S.C. §911	70, 94
26 U.S.C. Subtitle A.....	107
28 U.S.C. §§144 or 455	123
28 U.S.C. §§144, and 455	42
28 U.S.C. §1332	154
28 U.S.C. §144	85
28 U.S.C. §1605	121
28 U.S.C. §1746	34
28 U.S.C. §1746(1)	165
28 U.S.C. §2679	38, 146, 158
28 U.S.C. §455	85
28 U.S.C. Chapter 5	155
3 Stat. 216, c. 60, Fed. 17, 1815	98
4 U.S.C. §§105-113.....	103
4 U.S.C. §110(d)	94, 102, 104, 105, 155
4 U.S.C. §72	76, 94, 99, 164
42 U.S. Code Subchapter I-Grants to the States for Old-Age Assistance	59
42 U.S.C. §1301(a)(1)	59
42 U.S.C. §1994	85
42 U.S.C. §405(c)(2)(C)(i).....	107, 108

42 U.S.C. §408	107
42 U.S.C. §408(a)(7)	107, 108
42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8)	107, 108, 155
44 U.S.C. §1505(a)(1)	82, 94, 99
5 U.S.C. §552a(a)(13)	107, 154
5 U.S.C. §553(a)	82
5 U.S.C. §553(a)(1)	94, 99
5 U.S.C. §553(a)(2)	74, 81, 86, 94, 99, 121
50 U.S.C. §841	125
8 U.S.C. §1101	70
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21)	69, 70, 71, 72, 147
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)	69
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(22)(A)	69
8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(36)	70
8 U.S.C. §1401	69, 70, 71, 72, 88, 121, 147, 154
8 U.S.C. §1408	69, 70
8 U.S.C. §1452	70
8 U.S.C. §1502	70
9 Anne, ch. 20	41
Anti Injunction Act	33
Anti-Injunction Act, 26 U.S.C. §7421	144
Buck Act, 4 U.S.C. §§105-110	103, 104
California Civil Code Section 1428	71
California Civil Code, §1589	121
California Civil Code, §2224	114
California Civil Code, Section 1589	61
California Revenue and Taxation Code (R&TC) sections 17018 and 6017	103
California Revenue and Taxation Code, section 17018	102
California Revenue and Taxation Code, section 6017	102
Declaratory Judgments Act	33
Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201	144
Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201(a)	160
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA), 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97	71, 94
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act found in 28 U.S.C. §1605(a)(2)	119
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. §1603	145
Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97	46, 76, 145
I.R.C. §1	118
I.R.C. §162	118
I.R.C. §32	118
I.R.C. §7701(a)(26)	118
Internal Revenue Code	76, 139
Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A	155
Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A through C	113, 152
Internal Revenue Code, Title 26 of the United States Code	121
IRS Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998, Section 1102, 112 Stat. 704	110
Judicial Code of 1940	35
Omnibus Taxpayer Bill of Rights Act	109
Religious Freedom Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B	68
Technical and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988	109
Title 17 of the U.S. Code	107
Title 48 of the U.S. Code	94
Title 50 of the U.S. Code	94
Title 8	65
Title 8 of the U.S. Code	65
Title IX, §§ 903 (a) (3), 904 (a), (b), (e)	59
Tucker Act	114
U.C.C. §1-207	66
U.C.C. §1-303, Course of Usage and Trade	121

U.C.C. §1-308	29, 46, 66, 69, 111
U.C.C. §2-103(1).....	118
U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a)	113
U.C.C. §2-104(1).....	113
U.C.C. §2-209	29
Uniform Code of Military Justice (U.C.M.J.), 10 U.S.C. Chapter 47	94

Regulations

20 C.F.R. §422.103	108
20 C.F.R. §422.103(d).....	60, 74, 107, 108, 117, 118, 143, 153
20 C.F.R. §422.104	106
22 C.F.R. §51.1	71
26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c).....	70, 71, 72, 88, 121
26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(b)(5)(i).....	72
26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3)(i)	71
26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(e)(1)(ii)(A)(1)	72
26 C.F.R. §1.6041-4(a)(1)	72
26 C.F.R. §1.871-2(b)	71, 72
26 C.F.R. §1.871-7(a)(4)	72
26 C.F.R. §1.872-2(f)	25, 72
26 C.F.R. §301.3401(c)-1.....	41
26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1	107
26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1(b)(2).....	73
26 C.F.R. §301.7701(b)-1(c)(2)	71
26 C.F.R. §31.3121(b)-3(c)(1)	25, 72
26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)(6)-1(b)	25, 72
26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3.....	92
26 C.F.R. §31.3406(g)-1(e).....	72
26 C.F.R. §601.201(k)(2)	109
31 C.F.R. §1020.410(b)(3)(x)	73
31 C.F.R. §306.10	106

Rules

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17	35, 71, 76, 164
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(a).....	46
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b)	24, 46, 63, 65, 155
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b)(2) and (b)(3).....	155
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 19	161
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 29	161
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 31	162
Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6).....	122
Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8).....	123
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	162
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure	161

Cases

Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 (1936).....	53, 81
Atlas Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n, 430 U.S. 442, 450, n. 7, 97 S.Ct. 1261, 1266, n. 7, 51 L.Ed.2d. 464 (1977)	59
Attorney General v. ___, 2 Ans.Rep. 558	137
Attorney General v. Jewers and Batty, Bunbury's Exch. Rep. 225	137

Attorney General v. Sewell, 4 M.&W. 77	137
Attorney General v. Weeks, Bunbury's Exch. Rep. 223	137
Babcock v. City of Buffalo, 56 N. Y. 268, affirming 1 Sheld. 317	157
Barhydt v. Cross, 156 Iowa 271, 277-278 (1912)	127
Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat'l Bank, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326.....	122
Bartholomew v. United States, 740 F.2d. 526, 532 n. 3 (7th Cir. 1984)	109
Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.....	114, 153
Board of County Com'rs of Lemhi County v. Swensen, Idaho, 80 Idaho 198, 327 P.2d. 361, 362	60
Boulez v. C.I.R., 258 U.S.App. D.C. 90, 810 F.2d. 209 (1987)	109
Bowers v. Kerbaugh-Empire Co., 271 U.S. 170, 174, (1926)	97
Boyd v. State of Nebraska, 143 U.S. 135 (1892)	156
Bridge Co. v. Paige, 83 N. Y. 188-190.....	157
Bridgeport v. New York & N.H. R. Co., 36 Conn. 255, 4 Am.Rep. 63	58
Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall 205, 19 L.Ed. 134.....	122
Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S., at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683.....	49, 59
Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 261, 55 S.Ct. 695, 700, 79 L.Ed. 1421	115, 120
Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 U.S.T.C. ¶ 9346, 15 A.F.T.R. 1069	153
Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325	159
Button's Estate v. Anderson, 112 Vt. 531, 28 A.2d. 404, 143 A.L.R. 195.....	153
Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478	38
Calder v. Bull, 3 Dall. 386.....	157
Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398	64, 140
Carroll v. Fetty, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521.....	122
Caterpillar Tractor Co. v. United States, 589 F.2d. 1040, 1043, 218 Ct.Cl. 517 (1978)	108, 109
Charbonnet v. United States, 455 F.2d. 1195, 1199-1200 (5th Cir.1972)	109
Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452.....	43, 125
Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181	43, 124
Christiansen v. National Savings and Trust Co., 683 F.2d. 520, 529 (D.C. Cir. 1982).....	25
City of Boerne v. Flores, 521 U.S. 507 (1997).....	47
Clark v. Insurance Co., 40 N.H. 338, 77 Am.Dec. 721	112
Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. LaFleur (1974) 414 U.S. 632, 639-640, 94 S.Ct. 1208, 1215.....	30
Coates v. Mayor of New York, 7 Cow. 585	157
Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10	104, 159
Com. v. Tewksbury, 11 Metc. 55	157
Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. v. George, 52 Okl. 432, 153 P. 116, 119.....	111
Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 (1924)	99
Cover v. Hatten, 136 Iowa 63 at 65, 113 N.W. 470	127
Curtin v. State, 61 Cal.App. 377, 214 P. 1030, 1035	74, 146
Davidson v. Hackett, 49 Wis. 186, 5 N.W. 459	112
Dollar Savings Bank v. United States, 19 Wall. 227.....	137
Donovan v. United States, 139 U.S. App. D.C. 364, 433 F.2d. 522 (D.C.Cir.)	108
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901).....	26, 98
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 (1901), Justice Harlan, Dissenting	56
Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244, 279 (1901).....	65
Doyle v. Mitchell Brothers Co., 247 U.S. 179, 185	97
Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393, 509-510 (1856)	74
Dred Scott v. Sanford, 60 U.S. 393 (1857).....	95
Dunphy v. United States, 529 F.2d. 532, 208 Ct.Cl. 986 (1975).....	108
Edwards v. Cuba Railroad, 268 U.S. 628, 633	97
Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 207	97
Electric Co. v. Dow, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088.....	53
Elliott v. City of Eugene, 135 Or. 108, 294 P. 358, 360.....	58
Erwin v. U. S., D.C.Ga., 37 F. 488, 2 L.R.A. 229	156
Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Melc., Mass., 168	156
Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171	156
Ex parte Thistleton, 52 Cal. 225	156
Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144.....	122
Fauntleroy v. Lum, 210 U.S. 230, 28 S.Ct. 641	137

Fiorentino v. United States, 607 F.2d. 963, 968, 221 Ct.Cl. 545 (1979)	109
Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603 (1960)	62, 165
Flora v. United States, 357 U.S. 63, 78 S.Ct. 1079, 2 L.Ed.2d. 1165 (1958)	144
Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of N.J., 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935)	92, 104, 159
Franklin Life Ins. Co. v. Dossett, Tex.Civ.App., 265 S.W. 259, 262	112
Fry v. United States, 421 U.S. 542 (1975)	2, 50
Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524	43, 124
Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773	122
Glotfelty v. Brown, 148 Iowa 124, 126 N.W. 797	127
Goodrich v. Edwards, 255 U.S. 527, 535	97
Gordon v. U. S., 227 Ct.Cl. 328, 649 F.2d. 837 (Ct.Cl., 1981)	114, 120
Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General, 124 U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527	53
Gulf Refining Co. v. Cleveland Trust Co., 166 Miss. 759, 108 So. 158, 160	58
Hansen v. Sandvik, 128 Wash. 60. 222 P. 205. 207	112
Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47	64
Harlow Et Al. v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800 (1982)	38
Hatter v. U.S, 532 U.S. 557 (2001)	44
Heider v. Unicum, 142 Or. 416, 20 P.2d. 384	122
Heininger v. Davis, 96 Ohio.St. 205, 117 N.E. 229, 231	156
Hobbs v. McLean, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870	114, 153
Howard v. Commissioners, 344 U.S. 624, 626, 73 S.Ct. 465, 97 L.Ed. 617 (1953)	103, 105
In re Titterington, 130 Iowa 356 at 358, 106 N.W. 761	127
In re Young, 235 B.R. 666 (Bankr.M.D.Fla., 1999)	48
Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172	43, 125
International News Service v. Associated Press, 248 U.S. 215, 250 (1918)	77
International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945)	46
Intoxicating Liquor Cases, (BREWER, J.), 25 Kan. 765	157
Irwin v. Gavit, 268 U.S. 161, 167	97
Ivanhoe Irrigation Dist. v. McCracken, 357 U.S. 275, 294 -296 (1958)	2, 50
Jackman v. Rosenbaum Co., 260 U.S. 22, 31 (1922)	65
Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8	43, 124
Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227. 229	156
Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164 (1979)	77
Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164, 176 (1979)	77
Lacey v. State, 13 Ala.App. 212, 68 So. 706, 710	74, 146
Laing v. U.S., 423 U.S. 161, 96 S.Ct. 473 (U.S.Ky. 1976)	144
Lake View v. Cemetery Co., 70 Ill. 191	157
Langbord v. U.S. Department of Treasury, CIVIL ACTION No. 06-5315, at *22 (E.D. Pa. July 5, 2011)	25
Lawrence v. State Tax Commission, 286 U.S. 276 (1932)	98, 105
Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244 N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689	156
Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R. Co., 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108	53
Lester v. Redmond, 6 Hill, N.Y., 590	156
License Cases, 5 How. 583	80
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462 (1866)	27, 44
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)	82, 138
License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 68 S.Ct. 331 (1866)	72
Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)	62, 64
Loan Association v. Topeka, 87 U.S. 655, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)	140
Lord v. Equitable Life Assur. Soc., 194 N.Y. 212, 87 N.E. 443, 22 L.R.A. (N.S.) 420	58
Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp., 458 U.S. 419, 433 (1982)	77
Loughborough v. Blake, 18 U.S. 317, 5 Wheat. 317, 5 L.Ed. 98	98
Loughborough v. Blake, 5 Wheat. 317, 5 L.Ed. 98	26
Lucas v. Earl, 281 U.S. 111 (1930)	44
Lyons v. Stephens, 45 Ga. 143	111
Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697	43
Madlener v. Finley, 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697 (1st Dist)	124
Magill v. Browne, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408	42, 54
Manning v Leighton, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A. 258, motion dismd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A 630	114, 153

Martin v. Hunter, 1 Wheat. 304, 326, 331	55
Massachusetts v. United States, 435 U.S. 444 (1978)	2, 51
Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11 Johns., 77	64, 140
Meese v. Keene, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485 (1987).....	104, 159
Merchants' L. & T. Co. v. Smietanka, 255 U.S. 509, 219	97
Merchants' L. & T. Co. v. Smietanka, supra; 518	97
Meredith v. United States, 13 Pet. 486, 493.....	137
Miles v. Safe Deposit Co., 259 U.S. 247, 252-253.....	97
Milwaukee v. White, 296 U.S. 268 (1935).....	94, 117, 137
Mugler v. Kansas, 123 U.S. 623 (1887)	157
Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)	61, 75, 81, 128, 137
Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113, 139-140 (1876)	61
Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 141	157
Murphy v. Insurance Co., 205 Pa. 444, 55 A. 19	112
Najim v. CACI Premier Tech., Inc., 368 F.Supp.3d. 935 (2019)	88
National League of Cities v. Usery, 426 U.S. 833, 853 (1976).....	2, 50
Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100.....	159
Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n, 483 U.S. 825 (1987)	77
Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa.St. 104.....	64, 140
Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858 (1983).....	49, 60
Nugent v. Bates, 51 Iowa 77 at 79, 50 N.W. 76	127
Oklahoma v. Civil Service Comm'n, 330 U.S. 127, 142 -144 (1947)	2, 50
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438	77
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928).....	68
Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 485 (1928).....	110
O'Malley v. Woodrough, 307 U.S. 277 (1939)	44
Pangburn v. State, Tex.Cr.App., 56 S.W. 72, 73.....	111
Penn Mut. L. Ins. Co. v. Mechanics' Sav. Bank, 19 C.C.A. 286, 72 F. 413, 38 L.R.A. 33	112
People v. Marx, 99 N.Y. 377, 386, 2 N.E. Rep. 29	157
People v. Utica Ins. Co., 15 Johns., N.Y., 387, 8 Am.Dec. 243	58
Pierce v. Emery, 32 N.H. 484.....	58
Pierce v. Somerset Ry., 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316	53
Pollock v. Farmers' Loan and Trust, 157 U.S. 429 (1895)	60
Porter v. Valentine, 18 Misc. 213, 41 N.Y.S. 507	111
Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69.....	64
Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St., 69.....	140
Price v. United States, 269 U.S. 492, 46 S.Ct. 180.....	137
Pumpelly v. Green Bay Co., 13 Wall. 177	157
Railway Co. v. City of Jacksonville, 67 Ill. 37.....	157
Sacramento Orphanage & Children's Home v. Chambers, 25 Cal.App. 536, 144 P. 317, 319	41
Sandheger v. Hosey, 26 W.Va. 223.....	112
Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232	38
Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon, 27 Ia., 47	140
Shelmadine v. City of Elkhart, 75 Ind.App. 493, 129 N.E. 878	74, 146
Sherwood Bros. v. Yellow Cab Co. of Philadelphia, 283 Pa. 488, 129 A. 563. 564	112
Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U.S. 700 (1878)	33
South Carolina v. Katzenbach, 383 U. S., at 325	47
Southern Pacific Co. v. Lowe, 247 U.S. 330, 335	97
St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast Construction Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351	53
Stanton v. Baltic Mining, 240 U.S. 103 (1916).....	95
State ex rel. Colorado River Commission v. Frohmiller, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486	74, 146
State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321	43, 124
State v. Black Diamond Co., 97 Ohio St. 24, 119 N.E. 195, 199, L.R.A. 1918E, 352.....	58
State v. Brennan, 49 Ohio.St. 33, 29 N.E. 593	74, 146
State v. Fernandez, 106 Fla. 779, 143 So. 638, 639, 86 A.L.R. 240.....	58
State v. Grosnickle, 189 Wis. 17, 206 N.W. 895, 896.....	41
State v. Topeka Water Co., 61 Kan. 547, 60 P. 337	58
Stenberg v. Carhart, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)	104, 159

Steward Machine Co. v. Davis, 301 U.S. 548 (1937)	59
Stockwell v. United States, 13 Wall. 531, 542	137
Stone v. Mississippi, 101 U.S. 814.....	157
Stratton's Independence v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 415	97
Tenement- House Cigar Case, 98 N. Y. 98	157
The Thomas Fletcher, C.C.Ga., 24 F. 481	156
Thorpe v. R. & B. Railroad Co., 27 Vt. 143.....	80
Tuaua v. U.S.A, 951 F.Supp.2d. 88 (2013)	65
Tuttle v. Wood, 115 Iowa 507 at 509, 88 N.W. 1056	127
U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)	64, 140
Union Refrigerator Transit Company v. Kentucky, 199 U.S. 194 (1905).....	27
United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 A.F.T.R. 4628	114, 153
United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz, 449 U.S. 166 (1980)	62
United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223	43
United States v. Boylan, 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223 (CA1 Mass).....	125
United States v. Chamberlin, 219 U.S. 250, 31 S.Ct. 155	137
United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875).....	115
United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304	43
United States v. Holzer, 816 F.2d. 304 (CA7 Ill)	124
United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S.Ct. 240 (1882)	36, 68
United States v. Little (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367	43
United States v. Little, 889 F.2d. 1367 (CA5 Miss).....	125
United States v. Lutz, 295 F.2d. 736, 740 (CA5 1961)	77
United States v. Osser (CA3 Pa) 864 F.2d. 1056)	43
United States v. Phellis, 257 U.S. 156, 169.....	97
United States v. Pueblo of San Ildefonso, 206 Ct.Cl. 649, 669-670, 513 F.2d. 1383, 1394 (1975)	77
United States v. San Francisco, 310 U.S. 16 (1940).....	2, 50
United States v. State Bank, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto. 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.....	153
United States v. Supplee-Biddle Co., 265 U.S. 189, 194	97
Utah Farm Bureau Ins. Co. v. Utah Ins. Guaranty Ass'n, Utah, 564 P.2d. 751, 754	60
Van Valkenburg v. Brown, 43 Cal. 43 (1872).....	81
Virginia Canon Toll Road Co. v. People, 22 Colo. 429, 45 P. 398 37 L.R.A. 711	58
Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58	74, 146
Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407, 411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229	53
Walz v. Tax Comm'n, 397 U.S. 664, 678 (1970).....	65
Wendland v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 739 F.2d. 580, 581 (11th Cir.1984)	109
West Virginia Bd. of Ed. v. Barnett, 319 U.S. 624, 638 (1943)	48
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945).....	104, 159
Wilson v. Shaw, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233	114, 153
Wisconsin v. Pelican Insurance Co., 127 U.S. 265, 292, et seq. 8 S.Ct. 1370	137
Wittels Loan & Mercantile Co. v. American Cent. Ins. Co., Mo. APP., 273 S.W. 1084, 1086	112
Woolman Const. Co. v. Sampson, 219 Mich. 125, 188 N.W. 420. 422	112
Yaselli v. Goff, C.C.A., 12 F.2d. 396, 403, 56 A.L.R. 1239	74, 146

Other Authorities

"U.S. Person" Position, Form #05.053	89
1 Chitty on Pleading, 123	137
1 Litt. R. 342	81
1040 return	98
1099-CC	26
2 Bouv. Inst. n. 1433	120
2 Kent, Comm. 340	157
2A N. Singer, Sutherland on Statutes and Statutory Construction § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992)	104, 159
3 B1. Comm. 24	156
3 Com. 262 [4th Am. Ed.] 322	58
3 Steph. Comm. 383.....	156

6 Words and Phrases, 5583, 5584	42, 54
63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999)	42, 125
A J. Lien, “Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States,” in Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. 54, p. 31	42, 54
About IRS Form W-8BEN, Form #04.202.....	89
About SSNs and TINs on Government Forms and Correspondence, Form #04.104	73
About SSNs and TINs on Government Forms and Correspondence, Form #05.012	73
Administrative State: Tactics and Defenses Course, Form #12.041	84, 90
Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Tax Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005	24, 37
American Empire, SEDM	92
American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, §21 (1999).....	123
American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45 (1999)	114, 153
An Introduction to Sophistry Course, Form #12.042	1
Are You an “Idiot”?, Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry (SEDM)	46
Authorities on Rights as Property, SEDM Blog	84
Avoiding Traps in Government Forms Course, Form #12.023	34, 35, 46, 63, 78
Bish. St. Cr. 995	157
Bitclub	90
Black’s Law Dictionary.....	102
Black’s Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, pp. 786-787.....	59
Black’s Law Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, pp. 1849-1850.....	136
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1128	112
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1235	74, 82, 146
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1359	41
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1693	38
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, pp. 1359-1360	41
Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, pp. 425-426	156
Black’s Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 668	159
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1196.....	154
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 269.....	118
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581.....	160
Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pp. 1397-1398	60
Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2131	115
Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2147	115
Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2159.....	115
Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856.....	27, 71, 120, 136, 141
Catalog of U.S. Supreme Court Doctrines, Litigation Tool #10.020, Section 5.5.....	103
Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052 ...	76, 78, 82, 84, 99, 102, 142
ChatGPT AI Chatbot	104
ChatGPT-4 AI Chatbot.....	100
Chief Justice Taney	80
Choice of Law, Litigation Tool #01.010	155
Citizenship Diagrams, Form #10.010.....	106
Citizenship Status Profile (CSP) Codes.....	34
Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Form #10.011	31, 106
Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status Options, Form #10.003	106
Civil Status (Important!)-SEDM	46, 65, 74
Clearfield Doctrine of the U.S. Supreme Court.....	140
Communist Party	55
Comyn’s Digest (Title ‘Dett,’ A, 9)	137
Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., at 1064 (statement of Rep. Hale)	47
Congressional Debates on the Sixteenth Amendment, Family Guardian Fellowship	102
Congressman Traficant.....	55
Cooley, Const. Lim. (5th Ed.) 110, 445, 446	157
Cooley, Const. Lim., 479	64, 140
Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001	33, 66
Corruption, Scams, and Frauds, Family Guardian Fellowship	24

De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043	36, 87, 90, 116, 146
De Portibus Maris, 1 Harg. Law Tracts, 78.....	81
Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007	37, 67, 113, 142
Department of Defense (DOD)	94
Department of Homeland Security (DHS)	94
Department of Justice (D.O.J.)	36
Department of State.....	70
Department of State (DOS)	94
Department of the Treasury.....	94
District Attorney.....	36
District of CRIMINALS.....	83
Edward I.....	159
eGold.....	90
Enumeration of Inalienable Rights, Form #10.002	39, 69
Exhibit #05.051	43
Exhibits #05.025 and #05.051	52
Farewell Address, President Obama.....	71
Federal and State Withholding Options for Private Employers, Form #09.001	89
Federal Courts and IRS' Own IRM Say NOT RESPONSIBLE for its actions or its words or following its own internal procedures, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	31
Federal Enforcement Authority Within States of the Union, Form #05.032.....	84, 102, 158
Federal Trade Commission (F.T.C.).....	145
Federal Trade Commission (F.T.C.) Franchise Compliance Guide	34
Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004.....	150
Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004, Sections 8.11 and 8.12.....	33
Form #02.005	43
Form #04.001	25, 91
Form #05.001	55, 72, 125
Form #05.002	47, 52, 91, 163
Form #05.003	43, 44, 47, 52, 78
Form #05.007	43, 55, 126
Form #05.010	163
Form #05.014	125
Form #05.018, Section 3	162
Form #05.020	44, 70
Form #05.022	162
Form #05.024	142
Form #05.030	42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 50, 55, 64, 91, 126, 136
Form #05.033	52, 71
Form #05.037	48, 71, 90, 163
Form #05.040	2, 50
Form #05.042	52, 71
Form #05.043	43, 44, 71, 94, 104, 105, 145
Form #05.046	43, 44, 52, 55, 64, 95, 125
Form #05.048	44
Form #05.050	62, 64, 71
Form #06.001	59
Form #06.010	145
Form #06.027	142
Form #08.020	125
Form #10.002	55, 125
Form #11.401	43, 44
Form #12.021 Video 4.....	43
Form #12.022	43
Form #12.023	43, 47, 72
Form #12.024	42
Form #12.025	47, 95
Form #12.038	46

Form #12.040	2, 61, 71
Form #13.007	44, 69
Form #13.008	64, 71, 78
Form 1042s.....	72
Form W-4.....	72
Form W-7.....	73
Forms W4, W-8, and W-9.....	33
Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 1: Introduction.....	51
Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 4	52
Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 4: Willful Government Deception and Propaganda	39
Frederic Bastiat	52
FTC Franchise Rule Compliance Guide, May 2008, p. 1	145
Getting a USA Passport as a "State National", Form #10.013	88
Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023	32, 49, 102, 104
Government Corruption, Form #11.401	24, 37, 39
Government Corruption: Causes and Remedies Course, Form #12.026	24, 37
Government Establishment of Religion, Form #05.038	31
Government Franchises Course, Form #12.012	24, 51, 62, 84, 145
Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046	34, 46, 78, 122, 123, 124
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030.....	24, 32, 48, 51, 56, 62, 78, 84, 86, 120, 145, 158
Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 28.2	124
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302.....	102
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Section 6.7.1: 1925: William H. Taft's Certiorari Act of 1925.....	101
Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302, Sections 3.8.11 and 3.8.12.....	101
Handbook of Common Law Pleading, Benjamin Shipman.....	50
Handbook of Common Law Pleading, Joseph Koeffler	50
Hierarchy of Sovereignty: The Power to Create is the Power to Tax, Family Guardian Fellowship	50, 100
Hot Issues: Common Law and Equity Litigation, SEDM	136
Hot Issues: Identification*, SEDM.....	90
Hot Issues: Invisible Consent*, SEDM	72, 91, 95
Hot Issues: Laws of Property, SEDM	84, 102
How Judges Unconstitutionally "Make Law", Litigation Tool #01.009	35
How Scoundrels Corrupted Our Republican Form of Government, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	32, 84, 119, 127
How State Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax, Form #08.024	72, 95, 98
Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN)	73
Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027	63, 142
Instructions for the Requesters of Forms W-8BEN, W-8BEN-E, W-8ECI, W-8EXP, and W-8IMY, p. 1,2,6 (Cat 26698G).....	73
Internal Revenue Definitions are Binding Without Your Consent to the Office the Obligation Attaches To, SEDM.....	38
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.7	109
Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8	152, 160
IRS Due Process Meeting Handout, Form #03.008	102
IRS Form 56.....	151
IRS Form 843	73
IRS Form 8822.....	151
IRS Forms W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099	147, 154
IRS Forms W-2C, W-3, 1042-S, 1096, 1098, 1099, and 8300.....	151
IRS Publications	110
James Madison. House of Representatives, February 7, 1792, On the Cod Fishery Bill, granting Bounties	28, 116
Katz, Federal Legislative Courts, 43 Harv.L.Rev. 894, 917-918 (1930).....	59
Kingdom Bible Studies, Lesson 1: WHO'S WHO?-The Correct Meaning of Names, Sheldon Emry Memorial Library	40
Lawfully Avoiding Government Obligations Course, Form #12.040	30, 84
Laws of the Bible, Litigation Tool #09.001	46
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014	31, 39, 54, 88, 111, 124
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014, Section 13.4	34
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014, Sections 12.4.13, 12.4.17, 12.4.19, and 12.4.26	40
Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014, Sections 15 and 16	34, 35
Legal Fictions, Form #09.071	46
Legal Notice of Change in Domicile/Citizenship Records and Divorce from the United States, Form #10.001	37, 153

Liberty Dollar.....	90
Litigation Tool #01.009.....	90
Marcus Tullius Cicero, 106-43 B.C.	53
Mirror Image Rule.....	39
Money Laundering Enforcement Scam, Form #05.044	90
National Commodity and Barter Association (NCBA).....	90
Natural Law, Chapter 1, Section IV, Lysander Spooner	54
Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020	69, 163
On Why you MUST define Franchise “words of art” on all government forms and how to do it, SEDM Blog	111
Openai ChatGPT-4 AI Chatbot	128
Oreilly Factor, April 8, 2015, John Piper of the Oklahoma Wesleyan University	40
Origins and Authority of the Internal Revenue Service, Form #05.005	158
Overcoming the World 2014 Conference: Against the World, Ligonier Ministries.....	40
Ownership as the Origin of the Right to Define, SEDM Blog	38
Path to Freedom, Form #09.015, Section 5	63
Path to Freedom, Form #09.015, Sections 5.3 through 5.8	40, 84
Petition for Admission to Practice, Family Guardian Fellowship	162
Philosophy of Liberty, SEDM.....	52
Pleadings and Practice in Actions At Common Law, Martin Burks	50
Policy Document: IRS Fraud and Deception About the Statutory Word “Person”, Form #08.023	33
Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty, Form #08.018	150
Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments Against This Website, Form #08.011	150
President Obama	51, 71
Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction, Form #05.017	163
Principles of Common Law Pleading, John McKelvey.....	50
Private Right or Public Right? Course, Form #12.044	84
Problems with Atheistic Anarchism, Form #08.020	39
Proof of Claim: Your Main Defense Against Government Greed and Corruption, Form #09.073	84
Proof that Involuntary Income Taxes on Your Labor are Slavery, Form #05.055	127
Proof That There Is a “Straw Man”, Form #05.042	88, 95, 123
Proof: How to Prove in Court that a So-Called Tax is REALLY an Illegal Extortion”**	86
Pub 515 Inst. p. 7 (Cat. No 16029L)	73
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 4	54
Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 543	61, 117, 120, 143
Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007.....	111, 113, 124, 126
Rebutted False Arguments about the Common Law, Form #08.025	51
Rebutted Version of “Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions”, Form #08.007	150
Rebutted Version of CRS Report 97-59A: “Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the Federal Income Tax”, Form #08.006.....	150
Rebutted Version of the IRS “The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments”, Form #08.005.....	150
Requirement for Consent, Form #05.003, Section 9.6	30
Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment, Form #05.033	31, 87, 123
Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002	37, 106, 153
Restatement 2d, Contracts §174.....	123
Roman Catholicism and the Battle Over Words, Ligonier Ministries.....	40
Roman statesman Cicero	52
Rules of Presumption and Statutory Interpretation, Litigation Tool #01.006	31
SEDM Articles of Mission, Form #01.004, Section 1.3.....	30
SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4	40
SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4.30	139
SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4.6	46, 91
SEDM Exhibit #01.018	71
SEDM Form #06.042	73
SEDM Form #06.044	73
SEDM Form W-8SUB, Form #04.231	72
SEDM Forms Page, Section 1.5, Memorandums of Law.....	150
SEDM Forms/Pubs Page, Section 1.6: Avoiding Government Franchises	63
SEDM Opening Page	70, 76

SEDM Website Opening Page	138
Self Government Federation: Articles of Confederation, Form #13.002	45, 91, 127
Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025 . 25, 39, 42, 46, 57, 62, 64, 76, 84, 87, 90, 100, 116, 121, 123, 147	
Separation of Powers Doctrine	48
Social Security Admin FOIA for CSP Code Values, SEDM Exhibit 01.011	34
Social Security: Mark of the Beast, Form #11.407	79
Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016.....	45, 51, 68, 79, 87, 116, 142
Sovereignty and Freedom Points and Authorities, Litigation Tool #10.018, Section 1	39
Sovereignty and Freedom Points and Authorities, Litigation Tool #10.018, Section 4.10: "Benefits": ALLEGED but not ACTUAL public rights/property that CANNOT form lawful "consideration" in forming a lawful contract or civil statutory obligation.....	86
Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry (SEDM) Website Opening Page	87
Sovereignty for Police Officers Course, Form #12.022	162
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004.....	31
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic	40
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites By Topic.....	91
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "Separation of Powers"	102
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "benefit".....	85
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "estoppel"	39
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "franchise"	62
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "socialism"	79
SSA Form 7008.....	73
SSA Form SS-5	118
State Action Doctrine of the U.S. Supreme Court.....	44
State Income Taxes, Form #05.031	105
State Income Taxes, Form #05.031, Section 10.6	103, 105
State Income Taxes, Form #05.031, Section 5	103
Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201	147, 154
Tax Procedure and Tax Fraud, Patricia Morgan, 1999, ISBN 0-314-06586-5.....	109
Taxation Page, Section 13: 16th Amendment, Family Guardian Fellowship.....	101
The "Trade or Business" Scam, Form #05.001	25, 35, 62, 78, 95, 99, 103, 145
The Beginning of Wisdom is to Call Things By Their Proper Names, Stefan Molyneux.....	39
The Free Dictionary, Farlex	70
The Government "Benefits" Scam, Form #05.040.....	63, 86, 121
The Keys to Freedom, Bob Hamp.....	40
The Law of Nations, Book 1, Section 213	46
The Law that Never Was, William Benson.....	102
The Money Laundering Enforcement Scam, Form #05.044	89
The Money Scam, Form #05.041	32, 89, 90
The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10.....	42, 54
The Spirit of Laws, Charles de Montesquieu, 1758, Book XI, Section 6.....	49
The Spirit of Laws, Charles de Montesquieu, Book XI, Section 6, 1758.....	105
There's No Such Thing as a Democrat Who Isn't "Privileged", SEDM.....	24
They are "non-persons" BY VIRTUE of not benefitting from any civil statutory privilege and therefore being "PRIVATE". By "privilege", we mean ANY of the things described in 5 U.S.C. 553(a)(2):	73
U.C.C. 1 Financing Statements	143
U.S. passport	60
U.S.C.I.S.	94
Unalienable Rights Course, Form #12.038	145
Understanding Your IRS Individual Taxpayer Identification Number, Publication 1915	73
Unlicensed Practice of Law, Form #05.029	89
Using the Laws of Property to Respond to a Federal or State Tax Collection Notice, Form #14.015	28
W.J.V. Windeyer, Lectures on Legal History 56-57 (2d ed. 1949).....	159
W-2 forms	73
W-2CC	26
W-8BEN Inst. p. 1,2,4,5 (Cat 25576H).....	73
W-8SUB, Form #04.231	77

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, page 1118	51
What Happened to Justice?, Form #06.012	32
What is "Justice"?, Form #05.050	33, 90
What is "law"?, Form #05.048	30, 57
What is "law"?, Form #05.048, Section 16	52
What is Federal Land? (federal enclave), SEDM	92
Who Are "Taxpayers" and Who Needs a "Taxpayer Identification Number"?, Form #05.013	33
Who Were the Pharisees and Saducees?, Form #05.047	50
Why Civil Statutory Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037	81
Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002	127, 142
Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 1	105
Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 8	162
Why Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051	128
Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a "Taxpayer Identification Number", Form #04.205	37
Why It is Illegal for You to Enforce Money Laundering Statutes In My Specific Case, Form #06.046	90
Why Penalties are Illegal for Anything But Government Franchisees, Employees, Contractors, or Agents, Form #05.010	126
Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037 1, 35, 48, 64, 67, 75, 78, 123, 156,	164
Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051	63, 86, 90, 139, 142
Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051, Section 2	126
Why the Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property, Form #04.404	86
Why You Are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006	106, 163
Why You Are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006, Section 14.13 ...	34
Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001	37, 73, 142, 145
Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a "Public Officer" for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008	60, 99
Wikipedia: Federal Enclave	103
Withdrawal of Plea-Federal, Litigation Tool #03.007	111
Word Crimes, Al Yankovic	40
Words are Our Enemies' Weapons, Part 1, Sheldon Emry	40
Words are Our Enemies' Weapons, Part 2, Sheldon Emry	40
Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008	2, 31, 46, 52, 60, 75
Your Irresponsible, Lawless, and Anarchist Beast Government, Form #05.054	39, 68

Scriptures

1 Cor. 6:19	67
1 Cor. 7:22	25
1 Sam. 8:10-22	86, 138
1 Sam. 8:4-8	149
2 Corinthians 6:17-18	149
2 Tim. 2:19	149
Deut. 10:14	38
Deut. 15:6	118
Deut. 23:19	84, 112
Deut. 23:20	84, 112
Deut. 28:12	112
Deut. 28:43-51	86, 113, 118, 128, 138, 141
Eph. 2:4-6	37
Eph. 5:11	149
Exodus 20:3	148
Exodus 23:32-33	83, 118, 148
Ezekial 20:10-20	149
Gal. 5:18	149
God	141
Heb. 8:10	37
Isaiah 1:1-26	118
Isaiah 45:12	38

James 1:27	148
James 4:4	148
Judges 2-1-4	118
Luke 16:13	42, 121
Matt. 20:25-28.....	45
Matt. 22:34-40.....	69
Matt. 6:24	39
Prov. 22:7	120, 141
Psalm 89:11-13.....	38
Psalm 94:20-23.....	52, 127, 149
Rev. 17:15	118
Rev. 17:1-6.....	119
Rev. 19:19	118
Revelation 19:19	119
Rom. 7:4-6.....	37

1 DEDICATION

Government is the coldest
of all cold monsters.

Coldly it lies; and this lie
slips from its mouth:
"I, government, am the people."


Everything government
says is a lie, and everything
government has it has
stolen.

Friedrich Nietzsche




2
3

IN ORDER TO EVEN
BEGIN TO UNDERSTAND
WHAT'S GOING ON
IN THE WORLD RIGHT
NOW. YOU HAVE TO
BE OPEN TO THE
IDEA OF UNLEARNING
ALMOST EVERYTHING
YOU WERE TAUGHT.



**THE PROBLEM IS NOT THAT
PEOPLE ARE UNEDUCATED. THE
PROBLEM IS THAT THEY ARE
EDUCATED JUST ENOUGH TO
BELIEVE WHAT THEY'VE BEEN
TAUGHT. AND NOT EDUCATED
ENOUGH TO QUESTION WHAT
THEY'VE BEEN TAUGHT.**



“I was educated once –
it took me years to get over it.”

— Mark Twain

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

QUESTION: If government doesn't produce anything and only redistributes OTHER people's money from outside its own territory to pay bribes to extend its influence beyond that territory and enslave people using franchises (Form #05.030), then how is a "source within the United States**" even realistically possible. Aren't all those who receive the proceeds of this "protection racket" essentially criminal money launderers beyond that point? More on this subject at:

1. *Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Tax Enforcement by De Facto Officers*, Form #02.005
FORMS PAGE: <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
PDF: <https://sedm.org/Forms/02-Affidavits/AffOfDuress-Tax.pdf>
2. *Government Franchises Course*, Form #12.012
VIDEO: <http://youtu.be/vnDcauqlbTQ>
PDF: <https://sedm.org/LibertyU/GovFranchises.pdf>
3. *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030
FORMS PAGE: <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
PDF: <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>
4. *There's No Such Thing as a Democrat Who Isn't "Privileged"*, SEDM
<https://sedm.org/theres-no-such-thing-as-a-democrat-who-isnt-privileged/>
5. *Corruption, Scams, and Frauds*, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Scams/scams.htm>
6. *Government Corruption: Causes and Remedies Course*, Form #12.026
<https://sedm.org/GovCorruption/GovCorruption.pdf>
7. *Government Corruption*, Form #11.401
<https://sedm.org/home/government-corruption/>

18

19 There IS, in fact NO SUCH THING as a “source within the United States” or being “in the United States” under the tax code
20 that does not originate from a government payment or a public office WITHIN the “United States” federal corporation
21 respectively. All payments originating from the “United States”, in fact, are GOVERNMENT PAYMENTS ONLY that
22 originated almost universally and ultimately from OUTSIDE the “United States” federal corporation and outside the
23 geographical “United States” defined in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10). There couldn’t be a better tax than one ONLY
24 upon the government!

25

Dear sir,

26

This letter is a response to your tax collection notice in which you allege, without evidence or even a valid signature of a real, accountable, living person who has a personal knowledge, that I have a liability under the Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A income tax franchise as a public officer engaged in a statutory “trade or business” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) while doing business on federal territory in the statutory “United States” defined geographically in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#) and (a)(10) as the District of Columbia and excluding the constitutional states of the Union which I presently inhabit.

27

28

This letter represents an honest attempt under the Beard Test to comply with the requirements of civil law applicable only to domiciliaries of the statutory geographical “United States” per Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b), which I am not:

29

30

1. It must purport to be a return.

31

2. It must contain enough information to calculate a tax liability (even \$0 is a tax liability for these purposes, just as 0 counts as a number) and

32

33

3. It must contain some affirmation of the correctness of the return (we seem to recall SCOTUS saying something like “magic words are not necessary” but we think the Beard Test says the return must be signed “under penalty of perjury” and

34

35

4. Finally it must be an honest and reasonable attempt to comply with the REQUIREMENTS of the APPLICABLE law.

36

37

38

I therefore hereby certify under penalty of perjury in response that this is a NON-STATUTORY return submitted by a non-resident party with the following civil status to both the PAYMENTS involved and the ABSOLUTE OWNER of the payment, which is me:

39

40

41

1 I am a “nonresident alien” not engaged in “the functions of a public office” or “trade
2 or business” excise taxable franchise described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#). I do not
3 consent to “effectively connect” any of my earnings to a “trade or business”.

4 My earnings are “excluded” but NOT “exempt” from STATUTORY “gross income” by
5 [26 U.S.C. §872](#) and [26 C.F.R. §1.872-2\(f\)](#) because they do not originate from either the
6 District of Columbia (statutory geographical “[United States](#)”) or from the U.S.
7 government (“[United States](#)”) federal corporation as a legal fiction.

8 I don’t need to file an income tax return or claim exemptions to reduce taxable
9 earnings because I don’t have STATUTORY “taxable income” or “gross income” under
10 the “trade or business” excise taxable franchise documented in: [The “Trade or
11 Business” Scam, Form #05.001; \[https://sedm.org/Forms/05-
12 MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf\]\(https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf\)](#).

13 4. There are no VOLUNTARY agreements in place between myself and any third party to
14 convert my PRIVATE earnings into excise taxable PUBLIC “wages” as described in [26
15 U.S.C. §3402\(p\)](#). Any evidence you have in your possession from third parties to the
16 contrary is FALSE and a product of ILLEGAL duress by my business associates and are
17 hereby declared VOID and a product of criminal extortion. Being threatened by a business
18 associate to either be FIRED or not hired for not signing and submitting a W-4 certainly
19 counts as criminal extortion in violation of [18 U.S.C. Chapter 41](#), recruitment into peonage
20 to pay off public debt, and involuntary servitude to a third party in violation of the
21 Thirteenth Amendment and [18 U.S.C. §1589](#). The product of such a CRIME cannot serve
22 as useful evidence of any [lawful form of “consent”](#). Further, unalienable rights cannot be
23 surrendered, even WITH consent, in a geographical place protected by the constitution, so
24 any such agreements are void except where the constitution does not apply, such as on
25 federal territory or abroad, which I do not work in. Further, it is a violation of my
26 [delegation of authority order direct from God \(the Bible\)](#) to consent to such agreements as
27 His full time agent, representative, and His property. Therefore such agreements can be of
28 no binding force and effect and therefore would constitute theft of religious property and
29 a violation of the First Amendment. I can’t logically consent to give away property that
30 doesn’t belong to me but belongs to my Principal as His agent.

31 “You were **bought** [as property by God] **at a price [by the blood of Jesus
32 Christ]**; do not become slaves of men [and by implication a
33 GOVERNMENT of men].”
34 [1 Cor. 7:22; Bible, NKJV]

35 WHERE is separation of church and state when you need it, keeping in mind that my
36 delegation of authority order says my BODY is God’s Temple and property? 1 Cor.
37 6:19. Separation of church and state, according to the Bible, means separation of
38 PRIVATE, which is God’s, from PUBLIC, which is Caesar’s. See: [Separation Between
39 Public and Private Course, Form #12.025;](#)
40 <https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>.

41 5. Any payments documented on information returns in your custody for the applicable
42 reporting period are not reportable as statutory “wages” under 26 U.S.C. §3406 because:

43 5.1 All services were performed outside the “United States” per:
44 5.1.1. 26 C.F.R. §31.3121(b)-3(c)(1) in the case of Social Security.
45 5.1.2. 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)(6)-1(b) in the case of income tax.
46 5.2. The payer cannot unilaterally make legal determinations or conclusions about the
47 status of the payment. Only the OWNER, which is me, can. *Christiansen v. National
48 Savings and Trust Co.*, 683 F.2d. 520, 529 (D.C. Cir. 1982), *Langbord v. U.S.*
49 *Department of Treasury, CIVIL ACTION No. 06-5315, at *22 (E.D. Pa. July 5, 2011)*,
50 and also Form #04.001 referenced later.

1 6.If you are in receipt of information returns for the reporting period referenced in your
2 communication(s) such as the W-4, 1042, 1098, 1099, etc., then these reports are FALSE
3 as described by reference in:

4 W-2CC: <https://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/3-Reporting/FormW-2CC-Cust/FormW-2CC.pdf>

5
6 1099-CC: <https://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/3-Reporting/Form1099-CC-Cust/Form1099-CC.pdf>
7

8 7.Because the earnings documented on the FALSE information returns are not “gross
9 income” or “wages”, they are therefore PRIVATE property protected by the Constitution
10 and earned by a constitutionally protected PRIVATE party, not a PUBLIC officer.

11 8.The submitter of these false information returns has NO STATUTORY AUTHORITY over
12 me as a NONRESIDENT party and NO DIRECT PERMISSION from me to convert these
13 PRIVATE earnings to PUBLIC earnings by connecting them to a civil status such as “gross
14 income” or “taxable income” or “reportable income”, because the earnings are NOT
15 THEIR property but MY absolutely owned exclusively private, constitutionally protected
16 property. Therefore any records in your possession falsely representing my PRIVATE
17 earnings as having any civil status within the Internal Revenue Code are in error and I
18 demand IMMEDIATE correction of all such records. Failure to NOT correct your records
19 is a criminal offense under [18 U.S.C. §§1001 and 1030](#) (fraud generally and in connection
20 with computers), and [18 U.S.C. §§911 and 912](#) (false personation) for which I demand that
21 you be criminally prosecuted and civilly penalized personally.

22 9.Any false information returns in your possession relating to the reporting period DO
23 NOT document the CIVIL STATUS of the payment absent my consent, because the
24 submitter is NOT AUTHORIZED to make legal determinations about:

25 9.1 My STATUTORY civil status as a “person”, “taxpayer”, “citizen”, “resident”, etc
26 or

27 9.2 The STATUTORY civil status of my earnings as “income”, “gross income”, etc.

28 9.3 Whether the earnings were paid from the STATUTORY geographical “United
29 States” per [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#) and (a)(10) or the “United States” federal
30 corporation as a legal person and fiction of law.

31 All such determinations can only be made by the OWNER of the payment as an exercise of
32 his First Amendment right to associate or disassociate and his/her constitutional right to
33 contract or not contract and his right to control the use of his absolutely owned private
34 property.

35 10. Since the human parties made directly liable on their worldwide income are “citizens and
36 residents” in 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(a), then those civil statuses must be privileges and voluntary
37 or else slavery in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment, peonage, and even international human
38 trafficking will be the result. I choose not to volunteer, so the only status left that does not
39 have direct liability attached is “nonresident alien”. If those parties are actually physical and
40 geographical parties, they would be tied to the “United States” in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and
41 (a)(10) as far as I can tell, and I’m not domiciled or present there or doing business there, so
42 they can’t be me.

43 11. Insofar as “sources in the United States” is concerned, it appears to me that the United
44 States in the I.R.C. is mostly referring to is the FICTIONAL corporation as a public officer and
45 not the geography, because slavery, peonage, and human trafficking are unconstitutional and
46 possibly even criminal everywhere in the Union and even the world, not just within a physical
47 state protected by the Constitution. Any other interpretation would lead to an interference with
48 the private right to contract and associate. The U.S. Supreme Court held in *Downes v. Bidwell*,
49 182 U.S. 244 (1901) and *Loughborough v. Blake*, 5 Wheat. 317, 5 L.Ed. 98 that an income tax
50 on the District of Columbia, which is what “United States” is defined as in 26 U.S.C.
51 §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10), is a tax upon THE GOVERNMENT and not upon the GEOGRAPHY,
52 and extends wherever and ONLY where that GOVERNMENT extends. To claim that I am IN

1 THIS “United States” or worst yet that I am rendering “services in THIS United States” is to
2 falsely claim that I am a public officer participating in an excise taxable franchise, which I am
3 not in this case and which the national government cannot even lawfully do within the borders
4 of a constitutional state per the License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462 (1866) without
5 unconstitutionally INVADING them in violation of Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution.

6 12. Under common law rules, I have a right to refuse ANY and ALL “benefits”, and by
7 implication privileges. You are a business that only delivers ONE product: Protection. I am the
8 customer and I get to decide if what you offer is a “benefit”, and it isn’t so I resign as the
9 “customer” of your “protection racket”. A refusal to recognize that right is a trespass upon
10 private, constitutionally protected property. The basis of all just powers of government is
11 CONSENT according to the Declaration of Independence, and I DO NOT consent to receive
12 or to PAY FOR any “benefit”:

13 *Invito beneficium non datur. No one is obliged to accept a benefit against*
14 *his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 69. But if he does not dissent he will be considered*
15 *as assenting. Vide Assent.*

16 *Potest quis renunciare pro se, et suis, juri quod pro se introductum est. A*
17 *man may relinquish, for himself and his heirs, a right which was introduced*
18 *for his own benefit. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.*
19 *[Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856;*
20 [https://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMax](https://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMaxims.htm)
21 [ims.htm\]](https://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMaxims.htm)

22 13. According to the U.S. Supreme Court, when I am incapable of receiving “benefits”, then
23 anything you collect outside my FOREIGN domicile in a constitutional state is “EXTORTION”
24 as legally defined. The states and not the national government protect private property where I
25 have my domicile. I don’t need you to protect me from THEM. I want THEM to protect me from
26 YOU and the constitution says in Article 4, Section 4, that you are INVADING the states by
27 trying to setup a “benefit” or “social insurance” business there not expressly authorized in the
28 constitution.

29 *“The power of taxation, indispensable to the existence of every civilized*
30 *government, is exercised upon the assumption of an equivalent rendered to*
31 *the taxpayer in the protection of his person and property, in adding to the*
32 *value of such property, or in the creation and maintenance of public*
33 *conveniences in which he shares — such, for instance, as roads, bridges,*
34 *sidewalks, pavements, and schools for the education of his children. If the*
35 *taxing power be in no position to render these services, or otherwise to*
36 *benefit the person or property taxed, and such property be wholly within the*
37 *taxing power of another state, to which it may be said to owe an allegiance,*
38 *and to which it looks for protection, the taxation of such property within the*
39 *domicil of the owner partakes rather of the nature of an extortion than a tax,*
40 *and has been repeatedly held by this Court to be beyond the power of the*
41 *legislature, and a taking of property without due process of law. Railroad*
42 *Company v. Jackson, 7 Wall. 262 ; State Tax on Foreign-Held Bonds, 15*
43 *Wall. 300; Tappan v. Merchants’ National Bank, 19 Wall. 490, 499 ;*
44 *Delaware &c. R. Co. v. Pennsylvania, 198 U.S. 341, 358 . In Chicago &c.*
45 *R. Co. v. Chicago, 166 U.S. 226, it was held, after full consideration, that*
46 *the taking of private property [199 U.S. 203] without compensation was a*
47 *denial of due process within the Fourteenth Amendment. See also Davidson*
48 *v. New Orleans, 96 U.S. 97, 102; Missouri Pacific Railway v. Nebraska, 164*
49 *U.S. 403, 417; Mt. Hope Cemetery v. Boston, 158 Mass. 509, 519.”*
50 *[Union Refrigerator Transit Company v. Kentucky, 199 U.S. 194 (1905)]*

1 *“With respect to the words general welfare, I have always regarded them as*
2 *qualified by the detail of powers connected with them. To take them in a*
3 *literal and unlimited sense would be a metamorphosis of the Constitution*
4 *into a character which there is a host of proofs was not contemplated by its*
5 *creator.”*

6 **“If Congress can employ money indefinitely to the general welfare, and**
7 **are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take**
8 **the care of religion into their own hands; they may appoint teachers in**
9 **every State, county and parish and pay them out of their public**
10 **treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children,**
11 **establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may**
12 **assume the provision of the poor; they may undertake the regulation of**
13 **all roads other than post-roads; in short, every thing, from the highest**
14 **object of state legislation down to the most minute object of police,**
15 **would be thrown under the power of Congress.... Were the power of**
16 **Congress to be established in the latitude contended for, it would**
17 **subvert the very foundations, and transmute the very nature of the**
18 **limited Government established by the people of America.”**

19 *“If Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and*
20 *will promote the general welfare, the government is no longer a limited one*
21 *possessing enumerated powers, but an indefinite one subject to particular*
22 *exceptions.”*

23 *[James Madison. House of Representatives, February 7, 1792, On the Cod*
24 *Fishery Bill, granting Bounties]*

25 *[Using the Laws of Property to Respond to a Federal or State Tax Collection Notice, Form*
26 *#14.015; SOURCE: [https://sedm.org/using-the-laws-of-property-to-respond-to-a-federal-](https://sedm.org/using-the-laws-of-property-to-respond-to-a-federal-or-state-tax-collection-notice/)*
27 *[or-state-tax-collection-notice/](https://sedm.org/using-the-laws-of-property-to-respond-to-a-federal-or-state-tax-collection-notice/)]*

1 Purpose

This form is a defensive tool for use by private parties interfacing with either a government officer or government agency. Its purpose is to do all the following with respect to the Protected Party:

1. Establish and protect their sovereignty.
2. Preserve their equitable position and prevent them from becoming unequal or inferior in relation to any government or Government Actor.
3. Ensure that the Protected party cannot lawfully participate in any franchise court or be subject to the whims of any government agency or the administrative law that implements it, such as:
 4. Traffic Court.
 5. Family Court.
 6. State or federal tax Court.
7. Invoke ONLY the protections of the common law and not statutory civil law. All statutory civil law is law for government and not private human beings.
8. Ensure that Government Actors are constrained to provide the ONLY thing that the government was established for, which is to protect private property and private rights.
9. Impose an anti-franchise franchise against Government Actors that prevents the enforcement of any government franchise against the Protected Party.
10. Maintain the status of their PRIVATE property as private and prevent it from being donated to a public use, public purpose, or public office without your consent.
11. Establish, preserve, and protect the proper status within existing state and federal law.
12. Prevent the Protected Party from being victimized by the presumptions of others by defining the meaning of all words and burden of proof against the government in redefining them.
13. Keep the Protected Party disconnected from all government statutory civil law, which can lawfully regulate only Government Actors and instead impose only the common law for the protection of your rights.
14. Invoke all the same presumptions against the government that they invoke against the Protected Party and therefore turn the tables.
15. Prevent any commercial use of materials or services or interactions by Government Actor as against Protected Party.

The authority for creating and enforcing this franchise and agreement is the requirement for equal protection and equal treatment that is the foundation of the United States Constitution. It uses the government's tactics in implementing and enforcing franchises against Government Actors as a way to prevent Protected Party from being victimized by their franchises. Equal protection mandates that the government must protect the SAME method of acquiring rights for all parties.

If this agreement was initiated in connection with a government form or application submitted to the Government Actor, then:

1. All rights are reserved by the Protected Party pursuant to U.C.C. §1-308 in relation to the original government offer that is the subject of the form.
2. The original application shall be superseded from an OFFER in commerce, and replaced with this COUNTEROFFER in commerce pursuant to U.C.C. §2-209.
3. No matter what the response to this counter-offer is by the Government Actor, the response by the Government Actor to the original application or offer by the Protected Party shall be the following:

“You are not eligible for the original offer or application and we can't force you to consent to it. Your LACK OF CONSENT is the reason you are ineligible. Therefore, any third party trying to force you to apply is doing so illegally and is instigating a THEFT of your property to try to force you to participate or consent. It is an abuse of government property or franchises to offer them outside of federal territory or to people who were not ALREADY public officers in the government BEFORE making application to participate.”

2 Injurious activities which constitute implied consent to this franchise and agreement

In order to enforce a civil obligation against any party under the common law, either a contract or an injury must be demonstrated.³ This section shall document injuries that give rise to consent to this contract. What all of these injuries have in common is that they are a trespass on the control or ownership of absolutely owned, constitutionally protected, private property. The intended use or benefit of the affected property gives rise to a privilege and this document explains the extent of that civil privilege.

The following harmful activities by Government Actor against Protected Party therefore constitute constructive and implied consent to this franchise agreement.

1. Activities described in the SEDM (<http://sedm.org>) Mission Statement:⁴

- 1.1. The abuse of [presumption](#) to injure the rights of sovereign Americans, in violation of due process of law and God's law found in [Numbers 15:30](#). Much of this presumption is compelled by the government by willfully dumbing-down the average Americans about legal subjects in the public (government) schools. This makes the legal profession into essentially a "priesthood" and a pagan "religion" that the average American blindly worships and obeys, without ever questioning authority. It is a supreme injustice to proceed against a person without every conclusion being based ONLY on fact and not presumption, opinion, or belief. [Click here](#) (<http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Presumption.pdf>) for a detailed article on this scam and sin.

"But the person who does anything presumptuously, whether he is native-born or a stranger, that one brings reproach on the LORD, and he shall be cut off from among his people."

[[Numbers 15:30](#), Bible, NKJV]

*"Due Process: [. . .] If any question of fact or liability be conclusively be presumed [rather than proven with evidence] against him, **this is not due process of law [in fact, it is the OPPOSITE of due process].**"*

[*Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 500*]

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

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

[[Rutter Group Practice Guide-Federal Civil Trials and Evidence, paragraph 8:4993, page 8K-34](#)]

- 1.2. Public servants deceiving the public by portraying "Private Law" or special law as "Public Law". See the following for a description of this form of government and legal profession corruption:

- 1.2.1. *What is "law"?*, Form #05.048

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhatIsLaw.pdf>

- 1.2.2. *Requirement for Consent*, Form #05.003, Section 9.6

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Consent.pdf>

- 1.3. Public servants refusing to acknowledge the requirement for consent in all human interactions. [Click here](#) for an article on this subject.

³ See: *Lawfully Avoiding Government Obligations Course*, Form #12.040; ;<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

⁴ See: *SEDM Articles of Mission*, Form #01.004, Section 1.3;<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

- 1 1.4. Willful omissions from government websites and publications that keep the public from hearing the whole truth.
2 The problem is not what these sources say, but what they DON'T say. The [Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302](#)
3 (OFFSITE LINK) contains over 2,500 pages of facts that neither the IRS nor any one in government is willing to
4 reveal to you because it would destroy the gravy train of plunder that pays their bloated salaries and fat retirement
5 in violation of [18 U.S.C. §208](#).
- 6 1.5. The abuse of "words of art" to deceive the people in both government publications and the law itself. [Click](#)
7 (OFFSITE LINK) here for examples.
- 8 1.5.1. [Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online](#), Form #10.004, Cites by Topic (OFFSITE LINK) for examples.
9 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 10 1.5.2. [Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud](#), Form #05.014-explains games to unlawfully expand legal
11 definitions
12 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 13 1.5.3. [Citizenship Status v. Tax Status](#), Form #10.011 -shows how STATUTORY v. CONSTITUTIONAL contexts
14 and GEOGRAPHICAL v. LEGAL contexts are confused to usurp jurisdiction.
15 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 16 1.5.4. [Rules of Presumption and Statutory Interpretation](#), Litigation Tool #01.006 -prevents abuse of words of art
17 during litigation.
18 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 19 1.6. The lack of "equal protection of the law" in courts of justice relating to the statements and actions of public
20 servants, whereby the IRS doesn't have to assume responsibility for its statements and actions, and yet persons
21 who fill out tax forms can be thrown in jail and prosecuted for fraud if they emulate the IRS by being just as
22 careless. This also includes "selective enforcement", where the DOJ positively refuses to prosecute submitters of
23 [false information returns](#) but spends a disproportionate share of its resources prosecuting false income tax returns.
24 They do this because they are more interested in STEALING your money than in justice. See:
- 25 1.6.1. [Federal Courts and IRS' Own IRM Say NOT RESPONSIBLE for its actions or its words or following its](#)
26 [own internal procedures, Family Guardian Fellowship](#)
27 <http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Articles/IRSNotResponsible.htm>
- 28 1.6.2. [Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment](#), Form #05.033
29 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 30 1.6.3. [Government Establishment of Religion](#), Form #05.038 -how government establishes itself as a pagan deity
31 and a religion by using franchises to systematically destroy the separation of powers and the requirement for
32 equal protection
33 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 34 1.7. Abuses of franchises that undermine the protection of private rights by the government and the courts:
- 35 1.7.1. Offering or enforcing NATIONAL franchises within states of the Union or outside of the federal territory
36 and federal domiciliaries that they are limited to. This results in the destruction of the [separation of powers](#).
- 37 1.7.2. Enforcing franchises, such as a " [trade or business](#)" without requiring explicit written consent in some form,
38 such as the issuance and voluntary signing of an application for a license. [Click here](#) for details.
- 39 1.7.3. [Forcing non-franchisees into franchise courts against their consent](#). This is a violation of the Fifth
40 Amendment takings clause and the prohibition against eminent domain.
- 41 1.7.4. Refusing to satisfy the burden of proof upon government opponents in a franchise court that the owner of
42 the property subject to the dispute VOLUNTARILY donated it to a public use, public purpose, and public
43 office. In other words, that all property is PRIVATE until it is **proven on the record with evidence** that the
44 owner EXPRESSLY AND VOLUNTARILY DONATED it to PUBLIC use and thereby made it subject to
45 government jurisdiction.
- 46 1.7.5. Abusing sovereign immunity to protect franchise administrators such as the IRS from [illegal enforcement of](#)
47 [the franchise against non-franchisees](#). All franchises are PRIVATE rather than GOVERNMENTAL in
48 nature and governments who offer them drop down to the level of ordinary persons when they offer them.
- 49 1.7.6. Refusing to provide a way to quit franchises or hiding forms for doing so.
- 50 1.7.7. PRESUMING or pretending like there is no such thing as a non-franchisee or non-taxpayer or that
51 EVERYONE is a statutory "taxpayer". This compels people to contract with the government and interferes
52 with their First Amendment right to legally and politically associate. See:
- [Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status](#), Form #13.008.
<http://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>
- 53 1.7.8. Attorney licensing, which destroys the integrity of the legal profession in its role as a check and balance
54 when the government or especially the judiciary becomes corrupt as it is now.

1.7.9. Abuse of the federal income tax system, which is a franchise and an excise, to bribe states of the Union to give up their sovereignty, act like federal "States" and territories, and accept what amounts to federal bribes to disrespect the rights of those under their care and protection. [Click here](#) for details.

See the following for details on the above abuses:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030

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

1.8. Efforts to destroy the separation of powers that is the main protection for our liberties. This results in abuses of the Court system for political, rather than legal, purposes (politicization of the courts). All of the federal courts we have now are Article IV, territorial courts that are part of the Executive, rather than the Judicial Branch of the de facto government. As such, there is no separation of powers and nothing but tyranny can result. See the following for proof of this destruction:

1.8.1. *Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers*, Form #05.023- shows how lying, thieving public servants have systematically destroyed the separation of powers since the founding of this country

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

1.8.2. *What Happened to Justice?*, Form #06.012-book which proves that we have no Judicial Branch within the federal government, and that all the existing federal courts are acting in an Article IV territorial capacity as part of the Executive, rather than Judicial, branch of the government.

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

1.8.3. *How Scoundrels Corrupted Our Republican Form of Government, Family Guardian Fellowship* (OFFSITE LINK)-brief overview of how the separation of powers has been systematically destroyed

<http://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm>

1.9. The abuse of the government's power to tax in order to transfer wealth between private individuals, which makes the government into a thief and a Robinhood. This includes:

1.9.1. Enforcing the tax laws against other than "public officers" of the government. [Click here](#) for details.

1.9.2. Offering government "benefits" of any kind to anyone who does not ALREADY work for the government. [Click here](#) for details.

1.10. Corruption of our monetary system that allows the government to:

1.10.1. Counterfeit while denying to all others the right, thus creating an unconstitutional "Title of Nobility" for itself and making itself into a pagan deity, and denying the equal protection to all that is the foundation of the Constitution.

1.10.2. STEAL from the American people by diluting the value of money already in circulation.

1.10.3. Exercise undue control of banks and financial institutions that causes them to effectively become federal employment recruiters for the federal government by compelling the use of government identifying numbers for those pursuing accounts or loans.

See the following for details on this scam:

The Money Scam, Form #05.041

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

1.11. Creating, perpetuating, condoning, or in any way protecting conflicts of financial interest within the government that cause the self-interest to undermine the requirements of the law, [EQUALITY](#), or the [protection of exclusively PRIVATE rights](#) by:

1.11.1. Making judges "taxpayers".

1.11.2. Making jurists or voters into "benefit" recipients, franchisees, and/or public officers.

1.11.3. Allowing judges to act in a POLITICAL mode within any franchise court in the Executive rather than Judicial Branch. This also violates the separation of powers.

1.11.4. Turning police officers into revenue collectors who enforce malum-prohibitum offenses that result in revenue to the state.

1.11.5. Allowing any judicial officer or witness to receive any kind of financial reward for essentially compelling someone to assume any civil status under any civil franchise, including the income tax.

1.11.6. Allowing judges to act BOTH as an Article III judge AND an Article IV judge at the same time.

1.11.7. Allowing PRIVATE citizens to appear before a franchise judge with a financial conflict of interest.

1.11.8. Making ordinary citizens ALSO into public officers in any context OTHER than as a jurist or voter. This causes income taxes to become poll taxes and disenfranchises all those who insist on remaining private.

[Click here](#) for details.

1.11.9. Constitutional states surrendering their sovereignty and agreeing to act essentially as federal territories or federal corporations in exchange for participation in national franchises such as Social Security, Medicare, etc.

1.11.10. [Governments going into debt and thereby becoming financial slaves to banks or bank cartels](#). This includes a debt-based fiat currency system such as the federal reserve.

- 1.12. Active interference with [common law remedies](#) for the protection of PRIVATE rights from abuse by Government Actors. Governments are established exclusively to protect PRIVATE rights and PRIVATE property. Any attempt to undermine such rights without the express written consent of the owner in each case is not only NOT a classical "government" function, but is an ANTI-government function that amounts to a MAFIA "protection racket". This includes but is not limited to:
- 1.12.1. Refusing to recognize or protect PRIVATE property or PRIVATE rights, the essence of which is the RIGHT TO EXCLUDE anyone and everyone from using or benefitting from the use of the property.
 - 1.12.2. PRESUMING that "a government OF THE PEOPLE, BY THE PEOPLE, and FOR THE PEOPLE" is a government in which everyone is a [public officer](#).
 - 1.12.3. Refusing to recognize or allow constitutional remedies and instead substituting STATUTORY remedies available only to [public officers](#).
 - 1.12.4. Interfering with the introduction of evidence that the court or forum is ONLY allowed to hear disputes involving [public officers in the government](#).
 - 1.1.1. PRESUMING or ASSUMING that the ownership of the property subject to dispute is QUALIFIED rather than ABSOLUTE and that the party the ownership is shared with is the government.
 - 1.12.5. Allowing government "benefit" recipients to be decision-makers in cases involving PRIVATE rights. This is a denial of a republican form of government, which is founded on impartial decision-makers. See [Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U.S. 700 \(1878\)](#).
 - 1.12.6. Interfering with or sanctioning litigants who insist on discussing the laws that have been violated in the courtroom or prohibiting jurists from reading the laws in question or accessing the law library in the courthouse while serving as jurists. This transforms a society of law into a society of men and allows the judge to substitute HIS will in place of what the law expressly requires.
 - 1.12.7. Illegally and unconstitutionally invoking the Declaratory Judgments Act or the Anti Injunction Act as an excuse to NOT protect PRIVATE rights from government interference in the case of EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE [people who are NOT statutory "taxpayers"](#). See [Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid, Form #08.004, Sections 8.22 and 8.12](#).
 - 1.12.8. Interfering with ways to change or correct your citizenship or statutory status in government records. That "status" is the "res" to which all franchise rights attach, usually ILLEGALLY.
- 1.13. Efforts to define the word "[justice](#)" in the context of secular law to mean anything OTHER than the right to be left alone and the obligation to provide a remedy for demonstrated injury AFTER the injury occurs. See: [What is "Justice"?, Form #05.050](#). All such efforts result in INJUSTICE and promote violations of the constitution.
2. Specific actions which implement some aspect of the above injurious activities which are not expressly mentioned above:
- 2.1. Refusing to provide a form, statute, regulation, and/or administrative procedure to quit any and all franchises or privileges offered by the government or interfering with people who try to quit informally.
 - 2.2. Refusing to issue NONRESIDENT ID in which:
 - 2.2.1. The applicant has no government identifying number and/or franchise mark such as an SSN or TIN.
 - 2.2.2. The applicant has no civil status such as "citizen", "resident", "driver", etc.
 - 2.3. Involuntarily "electing" private parties into public office by filing FALSE information returns against them and/or refusing to prosecute those who do. See:

[Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001](#)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 2.4. Forcing people to assume a privileged civil statutory status such as "taxpayer" in order to get monies returned to them that were withheld illegally and under duress. The constitutional alone ought to be enough to do that and justice should NEVER be a "privilege" and if it is a privilege, it becomes INJUSTICE. See:
 - 2.4.1. *What is "Justice"?*, Form #05.050
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 2.4.2. *Policy Document: IRS Fraud and Deception About the Statutory Word "Person"*, Form #08.023
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 2.4.3. *Who Are "Taxpayers" and Who Needs a "Taxpayer Identification Number"?*, Form #05.013
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 2.5. Invoking economic sanctions, liens, levies, or interference with commerce or travel, whether directly by the government or indirectly through private third parties, against anyone who does not consent to assume a PUBLIC privileged or statutory civil status or the benefits or obligations attached to the status on any type of government form, and especially passports and tax withholding paperwork such as the Forms W4, W-8, and W-9. Interference with commerce is a criminal offense. Such civil statuses include:
 - 2.5.1. "person" (under the civil code).
 - 2.5.2. "taxpayer" (under the tax code).

- 2.5.3. "citizen".
- 2.5.4. "resident".
- 2.5.5. "driver" (under the vehicle code).
- 2.5.6. "Employee". See IRS form W-4 and 26 U.S.C. §3401.
- 2.5.7. "U.S. person".

2.5.8. Anything connected with government identifying numbers, which are "franchise marks" according to the Federal Trade Commission (F.T.C.) Franchise Compliance Guide.

The result of the above is criminal identity theft, HUMAN TRAFFICKING, and SLAVERY, an international crime. Examples of the above include, but are not limited to, refusal to complete a commercial transaction, not hiring, or firing people, ticketing people operating private conveyances, etc who want but do not have a PRIVATE ID or who cannot GET private nonresident ID because of government discrimination. Details on identity theft are found at:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 2.6. SCAMS with government forms or correspondence which connect nonresident parties using them illegally to government franchises and offices domiciled on federal territory.
 - 2.6.1. Abusing Barnum Statements to deceive those using government forms or receiving government correspondence into falsely believing that they are privileged public officers or fictions of law.
 - 2.6.2. Not providing forms for non-franchisees or specific statuses on government forms which recognize the right to either QUIT or not join government franchises.
 - 2.6.3. Using perjury statements on government forms that place state of the Union applicants into the WRONG jurisdiction on federal territory in violation of 28 U.S.C. §1746.
 - 2.6.4. Interfering with efforts by nonresident state domiciled parties to invoke the correct perjury statement on government forms under 28 U.S.C. §1746.
 - 2.6.5. Using "permanent address" instead of "domicile" to replace human beings with privileged "resident" fictions of law so they are forced to waive their rights.
 - 2.6.6. Imputing or allowing any civil statutory status to be assigned to nonresident parties in states of the Union.
 - 2.6.7. Interfering with attempts by applicants using government forms or recipients of government correspondence to correctly define "words of art" to exclude jurisdiction over them.
 - 2.6.8. Refusing to accept CUSTOM forms that correctly add nonresident or non-participant status to all government franchises, including Social Security, driver licensing, etc.
 - 2.6.9. Abusing equivocation and obfuscation of terms on government forms to recruit people unknowingly and without their express consent into government franchises Such terms include
 - 2.6.9.1. "United States".
 - 2.6.9.2. "State".
 - 2.6.9.3. "citizen".
 - 2.6.9.4. "resident".
 - 2.6.9.5. "U.S. citizen".
 - 2.6.9.6. "U.S. resident".
 - 2.6.9.7. "Employee"

See:

Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014, Section 13.4
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

Methods of equivocation which deceive extraterritorial or nongovernment parties to participate are documented in:

Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014, Sections 15 and 16
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 2.6.10. Using ambiguous citizenship terms on government forms. See:
 - Avoiding Traps in Government Forms Course*, Form #12.023
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 2.6.11. Assigning Citizenship Status Profile (CSP) Codes of STATUTOTY or TERRITORIAL citizens to those in constitutional states, and/or hiding the meaning of the codes. See:
 - 2.6.11.1. *Why You Are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen*, Form #05.006, Section 14.13
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 2.6.11.2. *Social Security Admin FOIA for CSP Code Values*, SEDM Exhibit 01.011
<https://sedm.org/Exhibits/ExhibitIndex.htm>

The above are described in:

- 1 2.7. Efforts to destroy the separation of powers by making human beings public officers simultaneously of both the
2 NATIONAL government and the STATE government. This happens in the case of:
- 3 2.7.1. Income tax. “Taxpayers” are NATIONAL public officers and STATE public officers at the same time in
4 the case of the “trade or business” franchise under 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26).⁵ It is unconstitutional and even
5 criminal in some states to simultaneously do so because it represents a criminal financial conflict of interest.
- 6 2.7.2. Driver licensing. “Drivers” must have NATIONAL identifying numbers as a NATIONAL officer, and yet
7 are subject to enforcement as STATE officers under the VEHICLE code at the same time.
- 8 2.8. Abuse of the civil statutory codes:⁶
- 9 2.8.1. Calling civil statutes which impose civil obligations “law” rather than PRIVATE LAW or SPECIAL LAW
10 or PATRONAGE that they are or treating them as if they can be enforced WITHOUT satisfying the burden
11 of proving EXPLICIT written consent in some form.
- 12 2.8.2. Enforcing any civil statute involving obligations of any kind not connected to a proven injury without proof
13 on the record of EXPLICIT written consent of the obligor BEFORE enforcement begins.
- 14 2.9. Court corruption⁷:
- 15 2.9.1. Abuse of “words of art” in court rulings or pleadings filed by government prosecutors to effectively kidnap
16 nonresident private parties into federal jurisdiction or civil statutory jurisdiction as described in:
- Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud*, Form #05.014, Sections 15 and 16
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 17 2.9.2. Hiding the law from juries by:
- 18 2.9.2.1. Barring access to the courthouse library.
- 19 2.9.2.2. Refusing to allow or even sanctioning defendants who want to read the law in front of the jury.
- 20 2.9.2.3. Refusing to allow prisoners access to the full written law in the jailhouse library to get themselves out
21 of jail.
- 22 2.9.2.4. Telling jurists who ask to see the law “We can’t allow that because the law might confuse the jury so
23 they can’t hear it”.
- 24 2.9.3. Refusing to allow jurists to rule on BOTH the FACTS and the LAW as Thomas Jefferson said they MUST
25 in cases where the judge has a criminal financial conflict of interest, such as income tax cases.
- 26 2.9.4. Federal judges not domiciled on federal territory within their district, which is a high misdemeanor per the
27 Judicial Code of 1940.
- 28 2.9.5. Federal jurists not domiciled on federal territory as they must be in order to come from the proper vicinage
29 in the case of federal civil law as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17.
- 30 2.9.6. Making any case against the government unpublished to protect government wrongdoing and even
31 encourage it to become systemic.⁸
- 32 2.9.7. Enforcing any federal civil statute in OTHER than a Constitution Article III court, such as an Article I or
33 Article IV court.
- 34 2.9.8. Invoking official, judicial, or sovereign immunity to prevent CONSTITUTIONAL or COMMON LAW
35 challenges to any of the activities documented herein or not permitting the Protected Party to assert the
36 SAME immunity against the government.
- 37 2.9.9. Allowing removals from state to federal court for any case NOT involving federal property that is the
38 subject of the proceeding under Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2. State courts are charged with protecting
39 PRIVATE property using the state constitution and the common law. Federal courts protect mainly
40 PUBLIC property that is usually legislatively created by congress.
- 41 2.10. Extraterritorial civil statutory enforcement:
- 42 2.10.1. Allowing extraterritorial nonresidents to elect to have any civil statutory status.
- 43 2.10.2. Imputing, presuming, or enforcing civil statutory statuses against nonresident parties.
- 44 2.10.3. Information returns against nonresident parties.
- 45 2.10.4. Enforcing territorial civil statutes extraterritorially.
- 46 2.10.5. Offering or enforcing any franchise or privilege in any place OTHER than on absolutely owned property
47 of the enacting power.

⁵ See: *The “Trade or Business” Scam*, Form #05.001; <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

⁶ See: *Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons*, Form #05.037; <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

⁷ For more like these, see: *How Judges Unconstitutionally “Make Law”*, Litigation Tool #01.009; <https://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>.

⁸ See <http://nonpublication.com>.

- 1 2.11. Anarchy by government or anyone government which produces a de facto government that takes any of the
2 following forms documented later in section 4.1.21:⁹
3 2.11.1. Are superior in any way to the people they govern UNDER THE LAW.
4 2.11.2. Are not directly accountable to the people or the law. They prohibit the PEOPLE from criminally
5 prosecuting their own crimes, reserving the right to prosecute to their own fellow criminals. Who polices
6 the police? THE CRIMINALS.
7 2.11.3. Enact laws that exempt themselves. This is a violation of the Constitutional requirement for equal
8 protection and equal treatment and constitutes an unconstitutional Title of Nobility in violation of Article 1,
9 Section 9, Clause 8 of the United States Constitution.
10 2.11.4. Only enforce the law against others and NOT themselves, as a way to protect their own criminal activities
11 by persecuting dissidents. This is called “selective enforcement”. In the legal field, it is also called
12 “professional courtesy”. Never kill the goose that lays the STOLEN golden eggs.
13 2.11.5. Break the laws with impunity. This happens most frequently when corrupt people in government engage
14 in “selective enforcement”, whereby they refuse to prosecute or interfere with the prosecution of anyone in
15 government. The Department of Justice (D.O.J.) or the District Attorney are the most frequent perpetrators
16 of this type of crime.
17 2.11.6. Are able to choose which laws they want to be subject to, and thus refuse to enforce laws against
18 themselves. The most frequent method for this type of abuse is to assert sovereign, official, or judicial
19 immunity as a defense in order to protect the wrongdoers in government when they are acting outside their
20 delegated authority, or outside what the definitions in the statutes EXPRESSLY allow.
21 2.11.7. Impute to themselves more rights or methods of acquiring rights than the people themselves have. In
22 other words, who are the object of PAGAN IDOL WORSHIP because they possess “supernatural” powers.
23 By “supernatural”, we mean that which is superior to the “natural”, which is ordinary human beings.
24 2.11.8. Claim and protect their own sovereign immunity, but refuse to recognize the same EQUAL immunity of
25 the people from whom that power was delegated to begin with. Hypocrites.
26 2.11.9. Abuse sovereign immunity to exclude either the government or anyone working in the government from
27 being subject to the laws they pass to regulate everyone ELSE’S behavior. In other words, they can choose
28 WHEN they want to be a statutory “person” who is subject, and when they aren’t. Anyone who has this
29 kind of choice will ALWAYS corruptly exclude themselves and include everyone else, and thereby enforce
30 and implement an unconstitutional “Title of Nobility” towards themself. On this subject, the U.S. Supreme
31 Court has held the following:

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

- 47 2.11.10. Have a monopoly on anything, INCLUDING “protection”, and who turn that monopoly into a
48 mechanism to force EVERYONE illegally to be treated as uncompensated public officers in exchange for
49 the “privilege” of being able to even exist or earn a living to support oneself.
50 2.11.11. Can tax and spend any amount or percentage of the people’s earnings over the OBJECTIONS of the
51 people.
52 2.11.12. Can print, meaning illegally counterfeit, as much money as they want to fund their criminal enterprise,
53 and thus to be completely free from accountability to the people.

⁹ See: *De Facto Government Scam*, Form #05.043; <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

- 1 2.11.13. Deceive and/or lie to the public with impunity by telling you that you can't trust anything they say, but
2 force YOU to sign everything under penalty of perjury when you want to talk to them. 26 U.S.C. §6065.
3 2.12. A refusal or omission to prosecute any of the above criminal injuries by the Department of Justice of the national
4 or state governments.

5 The above forms of criminal duress are further documented in:

- 6 1. Government Corruption, Form #11.401
7 <https://sedm.org/home/government-corruption/>
8 2. Government Corruption: Causes and Remedies Course, Form #12.026
9 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
10 3. Affidavit of Duress: Illegal Tax Enforcement by De Facto Officers, Form #02.005
11 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
12 4. Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001
13 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
14 5. Why It is Illegal for Me to Request or Use a "Taxpayer Identification Number", Form #04.205
15 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
16 6. Legal Notice of Change in Domicile/Citizenship Records and Divorce from the United States, Form #10.001
17 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
18 7. Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee, Form #06.002
19 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

20 **3 Limitations Upon Delegated Authority of Protected Party**

21 Parties are noticed that Protected Party is operating under a biblical delegation of authority order 24 hours a day 7 days a
22 week as described below:

Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/DelOfAuthority.pdf>

23 The ability to act in such a capacity derives from the First Amendment, in which acting as an agent and fiduciary of God is
24 the essence of the "practice" of religion itself. This, in fact, is what it literally means in a biblical sense to be "in Christ":

25 *"Now then, **we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God were pleading through us: we**
26 **implore you on Christ's behalf, be reconciled to God.**"
27 [2 Cor. 5:20, Bible, NKJV]*

28 *"But God, who is rich in mercy, because of His great love with which He loved us, even
29 when we were dead in trespasses, **made us alive together with Christ (by grace you have**
30 **been saved), and raised us up together, and made us sit together[domicile]**
31 **in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus,**"
32 [Eph. 2:4-6, Bible, NKJV]*

33 *"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the
34 LORD: **I will put My laws in their mind and write them on their hearts; and I will be**
35 **their God, and they shall be My people.**"
36 [Heb. 8:10, Bible, NKJV]*

37 *"**Therefore, my brethren, you also have become dead to the [secular CIVIL] law through**
38 **the body of Christ [by shifting your legal domicile to the Kingdom of Heaven], that you**
39 **may be married to another—to Him who was raised from the dead, that we should bear**
40 **fruit [as agents, fiduciaries, and trustees] to God. For when we were in the flesh, the sinful**
41 **passions which were aroused by the law were at work in our members to bear fruit to death.**
42 **But now we have been delivered from the law, having died to what we were held by, so that**
43 **we should serve in the newness of the Spirit [and newness of the law, God's law] and not**
44 **in the oldness of the letter.**"
45 [Rom. 7:4-6, Bible, NKJV]*

1 This agreement is therefore an extension of the biblical delegation of authority order executed in furtherance of that order,
2 which is also a trust indenture in which the entire Heaven and Earth are the literal corpus. See Deut. 10:14; Isaiah 45:12,
3 Psalm 89:11-13.

4 Government representatives acting within their delegation of authority order enjoy official immunity for the most part.

5 *“Government officials whose special functions or constitutional status requires complete*
6 *protection from suits for damages -- including certain officials of the Executive Branch,*
7 *such as prosecutors and similar officials, see Butz v. Economou, 438 U.S. 478, and the*
8 *President, Nixon v. Fitzgerald, ante, p. 731 -- are entitled to the defense of absolute*
9 *immunity. However, executive officials in general are usually entitled to only qualified or*
10 *good-faith immunity. The recognition of a qualified immunity defense for high executives*
11 *reflects an attempt to balance competing values: not only the importance of a damages*
12 *remedy to protect the rights of citizens, but also the need to protect officials who are*
13 *required to exercise discretion and the related public interest in encouraging the vigorous*
14 *exercise of official authority. Scheuer v. Rhodes, 416 U.S. 232. Federal officials seeking*
15 *absolute immunity from personal liability for unconstitutional conduct must bear the*
16 *burden of showing that public policy requires an exemption of that scope. Pp. 806-808.”*
17 *[Harlow Et Al. v. Fitzgerald, 457 U.S. 800 (1982)]*

18 Like government representatives, Protected Party is also operating under a delegation of authority order which is the bible,
19 rather than the enacted statutes of the secular government. God is the sovereign being represented and He wouldn't be God
20 UNLESS He had sovereign immunity. Thus, Protected Party enjoys the same sovereign immunity as his/her Principal does,
21 just as in [28 U.S.C. §2679](#) in the case of government actors.

22 The most important aspect of Protected Party's biblical delegation of authority order and trust indenture is that he/she is
23 prohibited by God from operating in any capacity OTHER than as a Merchant (U.C.C. §2-104(1)) in relation to any and every
24 so-called "government". The Merchant, in turn, is the ONLY ONE who possesses absolutely owned private property subject
25 to sale or use on terms specified only by him/her and not the Buyer (the Government Actor under U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a)). The
26 terms of the use or sale of his/her property is an extension of his/her right to "make all needful rules respecting the territory
27 and other property" owned by him or her, just like Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the USA Constitution in the case of the
28 national government. The ability to write definitions and rules that control others, in fact, DEPENDS on an ownership interest
29 in the property or right that is the subject of the definition, as described below:

- 30 1. [Ownership as the Origin of the Right to Define](https://sedm.org/ownership-as-the-origin-of-the-right-to-define/), SEDM Blog
- 31 <https://sedm.org/ownership-as-the-origin-of-the-right-to-define/>
- 32 2. [Internal Revenue Definitions are Binding Without Your Consent to the Office the Obligation Attaches To](https://sedm.org/internal-revenue-definitions-are-binding-without-your-consent-to-the-office-the-obligation-attaches-to/), SEDM
- 33 <https://sedm.org/internal-revenue-definitions-are-binding-without-your-consent-to-the-office-the-obligation-attaches->
- 34 [to/](https://sedm.org/internal-revenue-definitions-are-binding-without-your-consent-to-the-office-the-obligation-attaches-to/)

35 It is beyond the scope of authority for Protected Party to donate, incur, or transfer to any government any degree of
36 ownership or control to any government of property owned by God and managed by Protected Party as trustee under the
37 biblical delegation of authority order and trust indenture. This is also an outgrowth of the fact that PRIVATE rights that are
38 unalienable cannot be bargained away, even WITH consent of the original owner.

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

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

46 This means, for instance, that:

- 47 1. All property that is the subject of this agreement is absolutely owned and exclusively private and must REMAIN so AT
- 48 ALL TIMES. There must be ABSOLUTE separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE, because that is the main

reason for establishing government to begin with: The protection of PRIVATE property. Any attempt to break down that separation denies the main benefit of the constitution: Private property. It also violates the fiduciary duty of public officers to protect private property. See:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

2. Protected Party is exercising no degree of agency or office on behalf of the employer of Government Actor and thus is private and completely unregulated by civil statutes. No man can serve TWO masters, Matt. 6:24.
3. No civil statutes regulate or limit this agreement, because PUBLIC property or moities shared with any government are not involved.
4. Implied consent, acquiescence, equitable estoppel, or sub silentio is impossible in modifying this agreement. See:
Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "estoppel"
<https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/estoppel.htm>
5. All agreements must be in writing consistent with the delegation of authority order.
6. Choice of forum and even law used to protect the property that is the subject of this agreement is exclusively at the discretion of Private Party and never Government Actor.

This agreement cannot and does not limit liability of Protected Party for damages or consequences of violating CRIMINAL statutes enacted by any government because enforcement of such laws against a suspect do not depend on consent of the perpetrator. Thus, this agreement is not intended to promote anarchy or lawlessness in any form. In fact, it is primarily intended to ELIMINATE the GOVERNMENT lawlessness described in the following document:

1. *Your Irresponsible, Lawless, and Anarchist Beast Government*, Form #05.054
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/YourIrresponsibleLawlessGov.pdf>
2. *Government Corruption*, Form #11.401
<https://sedm.org/home/government-corruption/>
3. *Problems with Atheistic Anarchism*, Form #08.020
 - 3.1. VIDEO: <http://youtu.be/n883Ce11ML0>
 - 3.2. SLIDES: <https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/ProbsWithAtheistAnarchism.pdf>

More on the subject of unalienable rights that cannot be voluntarily surrendered by Protected Party, even WITH consent, at:

1. *Enumeration of Inalienable Rights*, Form #10.002
<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/EnumRights.pdf>
2. *Unalienable Rights Course*, Form #12.038
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/UnalienableRights.pdf>

4 Definitions and Rules of Construction and Interpretation¹⁰

This section is a defense against the following fraudulent tactics by those in government:

1. *Foundations of Freedom Course*, Form #12.021, Video 4: *Willful Government Deception and Propaganda*
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hPwMfa_oD-w
2. *Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud*, Form #05.014
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/LegalDecPropFraud.pdf>
3. *Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction*, Form #05.017
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Presumption.pdf>
4. *The Beginning of Wisdom is to Call Things By Their Proper Names*, Stefan Molyneux
<https://lbry.tv/@freedomain:b/the-beginning-of-wisdom-is-to-call>
5. *Mirror Image Rule*
<http://www.youtube.com/embed/j8pgbZV757w>

The biblical reason for this section is explained in the following videos:

¹⁰ Source: *Sovereignty and Freedom Points and Authorities*, Litigation Tool #10.018, Section 1; <https://sedm.org/Litigation/LitIndex.htm>.

1. [Oreilly Factor, April 8, 2015](https://sedm.org/Media/20150408_1958-The_O'Reilly_Factor-Dealing%20with%20slanderous%20liberals%20biblically-Everett%20Piper.mp4), John Piper of the Oklahoma Wesleyan University https://sedm.org/Media/20150408_1958-The_O'Reilly_Factor-Dealing%20with%20slanderous%20liberals%20biblically-Everett%20Piper.mp4
2. [Overcoming the World 2014 Conference: Against the World](#), Ligonier Ministries. [Click here](#) for original source, minutes 15-24. <https://sedm.org/overcoming-the-world-2014-conference-against-the-world/>
3. [Kingdom Bible Studies, Lesson 1: WHO'S WHO?-The Correct Meaning of Names](#), [Sheldon Emry Memorial Library](#) <https://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/BibleStudyCourses/KBS-1.pdf>
4. [Kingdom Bible Studies, Lesson 2: WHO's WHO?-Understanding Word Meanings](#), [Sheldon Emry Memorial Library](#) <https://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/BibleStudyCourses/KBS-2.pdf>
5. [Words are Our Enemies' Weapons, Part 1](#), [Sheldon Emry](#) <http://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/CassetteTapedMessages/1976/7603a.mp3>
6. [Words are Our Enemies' Weapons, Part 2](#), [Sheldon Emry](#) <http://sheldonemrylibrary.famguardian.org/CassetteTapedMessages/1976/7603b.mp3>
7. [Roman Catholicism and the Battle Over Words](#), Ligonier Ministries <https://youtu.be/uxmEK1RGJQc>
8. [The Keys to Freedom](#), Bob Hamp <https://youtu.be/rYIDRxDU5mw>

The legal purpose of these definitions is to prevent [GOVERNMENT crime](#) using words:

[Word Crimes](#), Al Yankovic <https://youtu.be/8Gv0H-vPoDc>

The definitions in this section are MANDATORY in any interaction between either the government or any of its agents or officers and any agent or member of this ministry. The reasons why this MUST be the case are described in:

[Path to Freedom](#), Form #09.015, Sections 5.3 through 5.8 <https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/PathToFreedom.pdf>

An itemized list of definitions found in this document is located later in the following sections.

For a frequently updated online reference tool that defines all key terms used in this document from in a legal context, see the following:

[Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online](#), Form #10.004, Cites by Topic <https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr-Cites.htm>

As far as definitions pertaining to our website, the following definitions of terms appears in our Disclaimer, Section 4¹¹:

4.1 **Definition of Specific Terms**

4.1.1 **Human**

The word "human" means a man or woman above the age of majority, which we regard as 18 years of age. Anyone below the age of 18 is considered a "child" rather than a "human".

4.1.2 **“Should”, “Shall”, “Must”, “We Recommend”**

All use of the words "should", "shall", "must", or "we recommend" on this website or in any of the interactions of this ministry with the public shall mean "may at your choice and discretion". This is similar to the government's use of the same words. See [Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014](#), Sections 12.4.13, 12.4.17, 12.4.19, and 12.4.26 for further details.

¹¹ See: [SEDM Disclaimer](#), Section 4, <https://sedm.org/disclaimer.htm>.

4.1.3 Private

The word "private" when it appears in front of other entity names such as "person", "individual", "business", "employee", "employer", etc. shall imply that the entity is:

1. In possession of absolute, exclusive ownership and control over their own labor, body, and all their property. In Roman Law this was called "dominium".
2. On an EQUAL rather than inferior relationship to government in court. This means that they have no obligations to any government OTHER than possibly the duty to serve on jury and vote upon voluntary acceptance of the obligations of the civil status of "citizen" (and the DOMICILE that creates it). Otherwise, they are entirely free and unregulated unless and until they INJURE the equal rights of another under the common law.
3. A "nonresident" in relation to the state and federal government.
4. Not a PUBLIC entity defined within any state or federal statutory law. This includes but is not limited to statutory "person", "individual", "taxpayer", "driver", "spouse" under any civil statute or franchise.
5. Not engaged in a public office, "trade or business" (per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26)). Such offices include but are not limited to statutory "person", "individual", "taxpayer", "driver", "spouse" under any civil statute or franchise.

*"PRIVATE PERSON. An individual who is not the incumbent of an office."
[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1359]*

6. Not consenting to contract with or acquire any public status, public privilege, or public right under any state or federal franchise. For instance, the phrase "private employee" means a common law worker that is NOT the statutory "employee" defined within 26 U.S.C. §3401(c) or 26 C.F.R. §301.3401(c)-1 or any other federal or state law or statute.
7. Not sharing ownership or control of their body or property with anyone, and especially a government. In other words:
 - 7.1. Ownership is not "qualified" but "absolute".
 - 7.2. There are no moities between them and the government.
 - 7.3. The government has no usufructs over any of their property.
8. Not subject to civil enforcement or regulation of any kind, except AFTER an injury to the equal rights of others has occurred. Preventive rather than corrective regulation is an unlawful taking of property according to the Fifth Amendment takings clause.
9. Not "privileged" or party to a franchise of any kind:

*"PRIVILEGE. "A right, power, franchise, or immunity held by a person or class, against or beyond the course of the law. [. . .] That which releases one from the performance of a duty or obligation, or exempts one from a liability which he would otherwise be required to perform, or sustain in common [common law] with all other persons. State v. Grosnickle, 189 Wis. 17, 206 N.W. 895, 896. A peculiar advantage, exemption, or immunity. Sacramento Orphanage & Children's Home v. Chambers, 25 Cal.App. 536, 144 P. 317, 319.
[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, pp. 1359-1360]*

"Is it a franchise? A franchise is said to be a right reserved to the people by the constitution, as the elective franchise. Again, it is said to be a privilege conferred by grant from government, and vested in one or more individuals, as a public office. Corporations, or bodies politic are the most usual franchises known to our laws. In England they are very numerous, and are defined to be royal privileges in the hands of a subject. An information will lie in many cases growing out of these grants, especially where corporations are concerned, as by the statute of 9 Anne, ch. 20, and in which the public have an interest. In 1 Strange R. (The King v. Sir William Louthier,) it was held that an information of this kind did not lie in the case of private rights, where no franchise of the crown has been invaded.

If this is so--if in England a privilege existing in a subject, which the king alone could grant, constitutes it a franchise--in this country, under our institutions, a privilege or immunity of a public nature, which could not be exercised without a legislative grant, would also be a franchise."

1 [People v. Ridgley, 21 Ill. 65, 1859 WL 6687, 11 Peck 65 (Ill., 1859)]

2 10. The equivalent to a common law or Constitutional "person" who retains all of their common law and
3 Constitutional protections and waives none.

4 "The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology
5 of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly
6 either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all
7 practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar
8 right or private law conceded to particular persons or places **whereby a certain**
9 **individual or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law.**
10 Privilege or immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim
11 to the exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular
12 advantage or exemption. "

13 [The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10;
14 SOURCE:

15 http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_im
16 [munities_of_state_c.pdf\]](http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_im)

17 See Magill v. Browne, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408; 6 Words and Phrases, 5583,
18 5584; A J. Lien, "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," in Columbia
19 University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. 54, p. 31.

20 Every attempt by anyone in government to alienate rights that the Declaration of Independence says are UNALIENABLE
21 shall also be treated as "PRIVATE BUSINESS ACTIVITY" that cannot be protected by sovereign, official, or judicial
22 immunity. So called "government" cannot make a [profitable business or franchise](#) out of alienating inalienable rights without
23 ceasing to be a classical/de jure government and instead becoming in effect an [economic terrorist and de facto government](#)
24 [in violation of Article 4, Section 4.](#)

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

29 4.1.4 Government

30 The term "government" is defined to include that group of people dedicated to the protection of purely and exclusively
31 PRIVATE RIGHTS and PRIVATE PROPERTY that are absolutely and exclusively owned by a truly free and sovereign
32 human being who is EQUAL to the government in the eyes of the law per the Declaration of Independence. It excludes the
33 protection of [PUBLIC rights or PUBLIC privileges \(franchises, Form #05.030\)](#) and [collective rights \(Form #12.024\)](#) because
34 of the tendency to subordinate PRIVATE rights to PUBLIC rights due to the CRIMINAL conflict of financial interest on the
35 part of those in the alleged "government" (18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §§144, and 455). See [Separation Between Public and](#)
36 [Private Course, Form #12.025](#) for the distinctions between PUBLIC and PRIVATE.

37 "As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the
38 people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need
39 the intervention of the officer. [1] **Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all**
40 **public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever**
41 **be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every**
42 **disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal**
43 **financial gain from a discharge of their trusts.** [2] **That is, a public officer occupies a**
44 **fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves.** [3] **and**
45 **owes a fiduciary duty to the public.** [4] **It has been said that the fiduciary responsibilities**
46 **of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual.** **Furthermore, it**
47 **has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official which tends to**
48 **weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual**
49 **[PRIVATE] rights is against public policy.** [5] "

50 [63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999)]

1
2 **FOOTNOTES:**

3 [1] *State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan*, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321; *Jersey City*
4 *v. Hague*, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.

5 [2] *Georgia Dep't of Human Resources v. Sistrunk*, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524. A public
6 official is held in public trust. *Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist)*, 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113
7 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697, app gr 117 Ill.Dec. 226, 520 N.E.2d. 387 and revd on other
8 grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145, 538 N.E.2d. 520.

9 [3] *Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc.*, 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181,
10 appeal after remand (1st Dist) 107 Ill.App.3d. 222, 63 Ill.Dec. 134, 437 N.E.2d. 783.

11 [4] *United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill)*, 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other
12 grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed. 2d 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7 Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343,
13 cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed. 2d 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds
14 by *United States v. Osser (CA3 Pa)* 864 F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other
15 grounds as stated in *United States v. Little (CA5 Miss)* 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among
16 conflicting authorities on other grounds noted in *United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass)*, 898
17 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223).

18 [5] *Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane*, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452, later
19 proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434 N.E.2d. 325.

20 [6] *Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App)*, 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App)
21 659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28, 1996).

22 Anything done CIVILLY for the benefit of those working IN the government at the [involuntary, enforced, coerced, or](#)
23 [compelled \(Form #05.003\)](#) expense of PRIVATE free humans is classified as [DE FACTO \(Form #05.043\)](#), non-
24 governmental, PRIVATE business activity beyond the core purpose of government that cannot and should not be protected
25 by official, judicial, or sovereign immunity. [Click here \(Form #11.401\)](#) for a detailed exposition of ALL of the illegal methods
26 of enforcement (Form #05.032) and [duress \(Form #02.005\)](#). "Duress" as used here INCLUDES:

- 27 1. Any type of [LEGAL DECEPTION, Form #05.014](#).
28 2. Every attempt to insulate government workers from responsibility or accountability for their false or misleading
29 statements ([Form #05.014](#) and [Form #12.021 Video 4](#)), forms, or publications ([Form #05.007](#) and [Form #12.023](#)).
30 3. Every attempt to offer or enforce civil franchise statutes against anyone OTHER than public officers ALREADY in the
31 government. Civil franchises cannot and should not be used to CREATE new public offices, but to add duties to
32 EXISTING public officers who are ALREADY lawfully elected or appointed.. See [Form #05.030](#).
33 4. Every attempt to commit identity theft by legally kidnapping [CONSTITUTIONAL state domiciled parties](#) onto federal
34 territory or into the "United States" federal corporation as public officers. [Form #05.046](#).
35 5. Every attempt to offer or enforce any kind of franchise within a CONSTITUTIONAL state. See [Form #05.030](#).
36 6. Every attempt to entice people to give up an inalienable CONSTITUTIONAL right in exchange for a franchise
37 privilege. See [Form #05.030](#).
38 7. Every attempt to use the police to enforce civil franchises or civil penalties. Police power can be lawfully used ONLY
39 to enforce the criminal law. Any other use, and especially for revenue collection, is akin to sticking people up at
40 gunpoint. See [Form #12.022](#).
41 8. Every attempt at CIVIL asset forfeiture to police in the conduct of CRIMINAL enforcement. This merely creates a
42 criminal conflict of interest in police and makes them into CIVIL revenue collectors who seek primarily their own
43 enrichment. See [Form #12.022](#).
44 9. Every attempt to compel or penalize anyone to declare a specific civil status on a government form that is signed under
45 penalty of perjury. That is criminal witness tampering and the IRS does it all the time.
46 10. Every attempt to call something voluntary and yet to refuse to offer forms and procedures to unvolunteer. This is
47 criminal FRAUD. Congressmen call income taxes voluntary all the time but the IRS refuses to even recognize or help
48 anyone who is a "nontaxpayer". See [Exhibit #05.051](#).

1 All of the above instances of duress place personal interest in direct conflict with obedience to [REAL law, Form #05.048](#).
2 They are the main source of [government corruption \(Form #11.401\)](#) in the present [de facto system \(Form #05.043\)](#). The only
3 type of enforcement by a DE JURE government that can or should be compelled and lawful is CRIMINAL or COMMON
4 LAW enforcement where a SPECIFIC private human has been injured, not [CIVIL statutory enforcement \(a franchise, Form](#)
5 [#05.030\)](#). Under the State Action Doctrine of the U.S. Supreme Court, everyone who is the target of CIVIL enforcement is,
6 by definition a public officer or agent in the government and Christians are forbidden by the Bible from becoming such public
7 officers. [Form #13.007](#).

8 Every type of DE JURE CIVIL governmental service or regulation MUST be voluntary and ALL must be offered the right
9 to NOT participate on every governmental form that administers such a CIVIL program. It shall mandatorily, publicly, and
10 NOTORIOUSLY be enforced and prosecuted as a crime NOT to offer the right to NOT PARTICIPATE in any CIVIL
11 STATUTORY activity of government or to call a service "VOLUNTARY" but actively interfere with and/or persecute those
12 who REFUSE to volunteer or INSIST on unvolunteering. All statements by any Government Actor or government form or
13 publication relating to the right to volunteer shall be treated as statements under penalty of perjury for which the head of the
14 governmental department shall be held PERSONALLY liable if false. EVERY CIVIL "benefit" or activity offered by any
15 government MUST identify at the beginning of every law creating the program that the program is VOLUNTARY and HOW
16 specifically to UNVOLUNTEER or quit the program. Any violation of these rules makes the activity NON-
17 GOVERNMENTAL in nature AND makes those offering the program into a [DE FACTO government \(Form #05.043\)](#). The
18 Declaration of Independence says that all "just powers" of government derive from the CONSENT of those governed. Any
19 attempt to [CIVILLY enforce](#) MUST be preceded by an explicit written attempt to procure consent, to not punish those who
20 DO NOT consent, and to not PRESUME consent by virtue of even submitting a government form that does not IDENTIFY
21 that submission of the form is an IMPLIED [act of consent \(Form #05.003\)](#). This ensures "justice" in a constitutional sense,
22 which is [legally defined as "the right to be left alone"](#). For the purposes of this website, those who do not consent to
23 ANYTHING civil are referred to as ["non-resident non-persons" \(Form #05.020\)](#). An example of such a human would be a
24 devout Christian who is acting in complete obedience to the word of God in all their interactions with anyone and everyone
25 in government. Any attempt by a PRIVATE human to consent to any [CIVIL STATUTORY offering by any government \(a](#)
26 [franchise, Form #05.030\)](#) is a violation of their [delegation of authority order from God \(Form #13.007\)](#) that places them
27 OUTSIDE the protection of God under the Bible.

28 Under this legal definition of "government" the IDEAL and DE JURE government is one that:

- 29 1. The States cannot offer THEIR taxable franchises within federal territory and the FEDERAL government may not
30 establish taxable franchises within the territorial borders of the states. This limitation was acknowledged by the U.S.
31 Supreme Court in the [License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462 \(1866\)](#) and continues to this day but is
32 UNCONSTITUTIONALLY ignored more by fiat and practice than by law.
- 33 2. Has the administrative burden of proof IN WRITING to prove to a common law jury of your peers that you
34 CONSENTED in writing to the CIVIL service or offering before they may COMMENCE administrative enforcement
35 of any kind against you. Such administrative enforcement includes, but is not limited to administrative liens,
36 administrative levies, administrative summons, or contacting third parties about you. This ensures that you CANNOT
37 become the unlawful victim of a [USUALLY FALSE PRESUMPTION \(Form #05.017\)](#) about your [CIVIL STATUS](#)
38 [\(Form #13.008\)](#) that ultimately leads to [CRIMINAL IDENTITY THEFT \(Form #05.046\)](#). The decision maker on
39 whether you have CONSENTED should NOT be anyone in the AGENCY that administers the service or benefit and
40 should NEVER be ADMINISTRATIVE. It should be JUDICIAL.
- 41 3. Judges making decisions about the payment of any CIVIL SERVICE fee may NOT participate in ANY of the
42 programs they are deciding on and may NOT be "taxpayers" under the I.R.C. Subtitle A Income tax. This creates a
43 criminal financial conflict of interest that denies due process to all those who are targeted for enforcement. This sort of
44 corruption was abused to unlawfully expand the income tax and the Social Security program OUTSIDE of their [lawful](#)
45 [territorial extent \(Form #05.018\)](#). See [Lucas v. Earl, 281 U.S. 111 \(1930\)](#), [O'Malley v. Woodrough, 307 U.S. 277](#)
46 [\(1939\)](#) and later in [Hatter v. U.S., 532 U.S. 557 \(2001\)](#).
- 47 4. EVERY CIVIL service offered by any government MUST be subject to choice and competition, in order to ensure
48 accountability and efficiency in delivering the service. This INCLUDES the minting of substance based currency. The
49 government should NOT have a monopoly on ANY service, including money or even the postal service. All such
50 monopolies are inevitably abused to institute duress and destroy the autonomy and sovereignty and EQUALTY of
51 everyone else.
- 52 5. CANNOT "bundle" any service with any other in order to FORCE you to buy MORE services than you want.
53 Bundling removes choice and autonomy and constitutes biblical "usury". For instance, it CANNOT:

- 1 5.1. Use "driver licensing" to FORCE people to sign up for Social Security by forcing them to provide a "franchise
- 2 license number" called an SSN or TIN in order to procure the PRIVILEGE of "driving", meaning using the
- 3 commercial roadways FOR HIRE and at a profit.
- 4 5.2. Revoke driver licenses as a method of enforcing ANY OTHER franchise or commercial obligation, including but
- 5 not limited to child support, taxes, etc.
- 6 5.3. Use funds from ONE program to "prop up" or support another. For instance, they cannot use Social Security as a
- 7 way to recruit "taxpayers" of other services or the income tax. This ensures that EVERY PROGRAM stands on
- 8 its own two feet and ensures that those paying for one program do not have to subsidize failing OTHER programs
- 9 that are not self-supporting. It also ensures that the government MUST follow the SAME free market rules that
- 10 every other business must follow for any of the CIVIL services it competes with other businesses to deliver.
- 11 5.4. Piggyback STATE income taxes onto FEDERAL income taxes, make the FEDERAL government the tax
- 12 collector for STATE TAXES, or the STATES into tax collectors for the FEDERAL government.
- 13 6. Can lawfully enforce the CRIMINAL laws without your express consent.
- 14 7. Can lawfully COMPEL you to pay for BASIC SERVICES of the courts, jails, military, and ROADS and NO
- 15 OTHERS. EVERYONE pays the same EQUAL amount for these services.
- 16 8. Sends you an ITEMIZED annual bill for CIVIL services that you have contracted in writing to procure. That bill
- 17 should include a signed copy of your consent for EACH individual CIVIL service or "social insurance". Such "social
- 18 services" include anything that costs the government money to provide BEYOND the BASIC SERVICES, such as
- 19 health insurance, health care, Social Security, Medicare, etc.
- 20 9. If you do not pay the ITEMIZED annual bill for the services you EXPRESSLY consented to, the government should
- 21 have the right to collect ITS obligations the SAME way as any OTHER PRIVATE human. That means they can
- 22 administratively lien your real or personal property, but ONLY if YOU can do the same thing to THEM for services or
- 23 property THEY have procured from you either voluntarily or involuntarily. Otherwise, they must go to court IN
- 24 EQUITY to collect, and MUST produce evidence of consent to EACH service they seek payment or collection for. In
- 25 other words, they have to follow the SAME rules as every private human for the collection of CIVIL obligations that
- 26 are in default. Otherwise, they have superior or supernatural powers and become a pagan deity and you become the
- 27 compelled WORSHIPPER of that pagan deity. See [Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016](#) for
- 28 details on all the BAD things that happen by turning government into such a CIVIL RELIGION.

29 Jesus described the above de jure government as follows. He is implying that Christians cannot consent to any government
 30 that rules from above or has superior or supernatural powers in relation to biological humans. In other words, the government
 31 Christians adopt or participate in or subsidize CANNOT function as a religion as described in [Socialism: The New American](#)
 32 [Civil Religion, Form #05.016](#):

33 *"You know that the rulers of the Gentiles [unbelievers] lord it over them [govern from*
 34 *ABOVE as pagan idols] , and those who are great exercise authority over them*
 35 *[supernatural powers that are the object of idol worship]. Yet it shall not be so among you;*
 36 *but whoever desires to become great among you, let him be your servant [serve the*
 37 *sovereign people from BELOW rather than rule from above]. And whoever desires to be*
 38 *first among you, let him be your slave—just as the Son of Man did not come to be served,*
 39 *but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many."*
 40 *[[Matt. 20:25-28](#), Bible, NKJV]*

41 For documentation on HOW to implement the above IDEAL or DE JURE government by making MINOR changes to existing
 42 foundational documents of the present government such as the Constitution, see:

Self Government Federation: Articles of Confederation, Form #13.002
<http://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/SGFArtOfConfed.pdf>

43 **4.1.5 Civil Status**

44 The term "[civil status](#)" describes the process by which human beings become "persons" under civil statutory law. It is what
 45 the courts call a "res" which gives them civil control over you under one of three different systems of civil law. Civil status
 46 is VERY important, because it is the source of civil statutory jurisdiction of courts over you and their right to "personal
 47 jurisdiction" over you. It also describes how your actions affect "choice of law" and your "status" in any court cases you
 48 bring. Human beings who are "sovereign" in fact:

- 49 1. Have no "[civil status](#)" under statutory law.

- 1 2. Only have a “civil status” under the constitution and the common law.
- 2 3. Are not party to the “social compact”, but “foreigners” among citizens. The Law of Nations, Book 1, Section 213 calls
- 3 them “inhabitants”.
- 4 4. Are not privileged “aliens”.
- 5 5. Participate in NO government franchises or privileges, but instead reserve all their PRIVATE, UNALIENABLE rights
- 6 (Form #12.038) and thereby remain exclusively private. See Form #05.030.
- 7 6. Were described as “idiots” under early Greek law. See:

Are You an “Idiot”?, Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry (SEDM)
<https://sedm.org/are-you-an-idiot-we-are/>

- 8 7. Understand the distinctions between PUBLIC and PRIVATE and maintain absolute separation between the two in all
- 9 their interactions with any so-called “government”. They ensure that all of their property remains absolutely owned and
- 10 exclusively private. Thus, they can control and dictate all uses and everyone who wants to take or control it. See:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

- 11 8. Civilly govern themselves without external interference, except possibly of common law and criminal courts.
- 12 9. Replace the civil statutory protection franchise with private contracts and franchises of their own for everyone they do
- 13 business with, thus rendering “civil services” on the part of organized governments irrelevant and unnecessary. For a
- 14 definition of “civil services”, see the definition in our Disclaimer, Section 4.6. In that sense they have FIRED the
- 15 government from a civil perspective and retain all of their God given inalienable rights. All rights reserved, U.C.C.
- 16 §1-308.
- 17 10. Are governed mainly by the “civil laws” found in the Holy Bible. This is a protected First Amendment right to practice
- 18 their religion.

Laws of the Bible, Litigation Tool #09.001
<https://sedm.org/Litigation/09-Reference/LawsOfTheBible.pdf>

19 You cannot have a “civil status” under the laws of a place WITHOUT at least one of the following conditions:

- 20 1. A physical presence in that place. The status would be under the COMMON law. Common law is based on physical
- 21 location of people on land rather than their statutory status.
- 22 2. CONSENSUALLY doing business in that place. The status would be under the common law. See the Foreign
- 23 Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97 and International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945).
- 24 3. A domicile in that place. This would be a status under the civil statutes of that place. See Federal Rule of Civil
- 25 Procedure 17(a).
- 26 4. CONSENSUALLY representing an artificial entity (a legal fiction) that has a domicile in that place. This would be a
- 27 status under the civil statutes of that place. See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b).
- 28 5. Consenting to a civil status under the laws of that place. Anything done consensually cannot form the basis for an
- 29 injury in a court of law. Such consent is usually manifested by filling out a government form identifying yourself with
- 30 a specific statutory status, such as a W-4, 1040, driver license application, etc. This is covered in:

Avoiding Traps in Government Forms Course, Form #12.023
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

31 If any of the above rules are violated, you are a victim of criminal identity theft:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf>

32 "civil status" is further discussed in:

- 33 1. *Civil Status (Important!)-SEDM*-Article under "Litigation->Civil Status (Important!)-SEDM on the SEDM menus
- 34 <https://sedm.org/litigation-main/civil-status/>
- 35 2. *Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status*, Form #13.008
- 36 <https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>
- 37 3. *Proof That There Is a “Straw Man”*, Form #05.042-SEDM
- 38 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StrawMan.pdf>
- 39 4. *Legal Fictions*, Form #09.071-SEDM
- 40 <https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/LegalFictions.pdf>

4.1.6 Civil Service

The term "civil service" or "civil service fee" relates to any and all activities of "government" OTHER than:

1. Police.
2. Military.
3. Jails.
4. Criminal court.
5. Common law court.

"civil service" and "civil service fee" includes any attempt or act to:

1. Establish or enforce a [domicile \(Form #05.002\)](#)
2. Procure [consent \(Form #05.003\)](#) of any kind to alienate rights that are supposed to be INALIENABLE per the Declaration of Independence.
3. PRESUME [consent \(Form #05.003\)](#) to surrender INALIENABLE PRIVATE RIGHTS by virtue of submitting, accepting, or receiving any application for a government benefit, license, or franchise. See [Form #12.023](#).
4. Convert PRIVATE property or PRIVATE rights to PUBLIC property, PUBLIC offices, or excise taxable franchises. See [Form #12.025](#). Government's FIRST and most important duty is to at all times maintain TOTAL separation between PRIVATE and PUBLIC and NEVER to allow them to convert one to another. Every attempt to convert one to the other represents a criminal financial conflict of interest that turns the PUBLIC trust into a SHAM trust.
5. Offer or enforce the civil statutory code.
6. Offer or enforce [civil franchises \(see Form #05.030\)](#)

4.1.7 Common Law

The term "common law" means procedures and policies used in constitutional courts in the JUDICIAL branch to provide protection for absolutely owned, constitutionally protected PRIVATE RIGHTS and PRIVATE PROPERTY of a human being who has accepted no franchises or privileges and therefore who is not subject to civil statutes, not domiciled in the forum, and who reserves all rights. These procedures may not be exercised in "legislative franchise courts" in the LEGISLATIVE or EXECUTIVE Branch which manage and adjudicate disputes over federal property, franchises, privileges, and "benefits". In the words of the U.S. Supreme Court, these organic rights are "self-executing" and not government created or owned. They may therefore NOT be limited, restrained, taxed, or regulated by statute:

*The design of the Fourteenth Amendment has proved significant also in maintaining the traditional separation of powers 524*524 between Congress and the Judiciary. **The first eight Amendments to the Constitution set forth self-executing prohibitions on governmental action, and this Court has had primary authority to interpret those prohibitions.** The Bingham draft, some thought, departed from that tradition by vesting in Congress primary power to interpret and elaborate on the meaning of the new Amendment through legislation. Under it, "Congress, and not the courts, was to judge whether or not any of the privileges or immunities were not secured to citizens in the several States." Flack, *supra*, at 64. While this separation-of-powers aspect did not occasion the widespread resistance which was caused by the proposal's threat to the federal balance, it nonetheless attracted the attention of various Members. See Cong. Globe, 39th Cong., 1st Sess., at 1064 (statement of Rep. Hale) (noting that Bill of Rights, unlike the Bingham proposal, "**provide[s] safeguards to be enforced by the courts, and not to be exercised by the Legislature**"); *id.*, at App. 133 (statement of Rep. Rogers) (prior to Bingham proposal it "was left entirely for the courts . . . to enforce the privileges and immunities of the citizens"). As enacted, the Fourteenth Amendment confers substantive rights against the States which, like the provisions of the Bill of Rights, are self-executing. Cf. [South Carolina v. Katzenbach, 383 U. S., at 325](#) (discussing Fifteenth Amendment). The power to interpret the Constitution in a case or controversy remains in the Judiciary.
[City of Boerne v. Flores, 521 U.S. 507 (1997)]*

It is the duty of all CONSTITUTIONAL courts in the JUDICIAL branch to provide remedy for the protection of such rights when violated, even if there is no statute authorizing a remedy. This is a consequence of the oath that all judges IN CONSTITUTIONAL COURTS take to "support and defend the constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic",

1 whether state or federal. Franchise judges in the LEGISLATIVE or EXECUTIVE branch don't have to take this oath and
2 often ACTIVELY INTERFERE with any attempt by private litigants to invoke or enforce constitutional rights. That sort of
3 behavior would be TREASON in a CONSTITUTIONAL court. Franchise courts act in essence as binding arbitration boards
4 for people in temporary possession, custody, or control of absolutely owned government property which is dispensed with
5 legal strings attached called "franchises". These courts preside by the CONSENT of those who accept the property or "benefit"
6 that the franchise court is charged with managing, such as "licenses", "permits", or government "benefits". Examples of
7 "legislative franchise courts" include:

- 8 1. Traffic court.
- 9 2. Family court.
- 10 3. Tax Court (see 26 U.S.C. §7441).

11 For a detailed exposition of exactly how government franchises and franchise courts operate, see:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

12 Rights are property and protecting and enforcing them is an action to protect PRIVATE property in the case of
13 CONSTITUTIONAL rights recognized but not created by the Bill of Rights. In providing judicial remedy absent statutes,
14 the courts in effect are DEFINING the common law, because statutes CANNOT define or limit such rights:

15 *"Under basic rules of construction, statutory laws enacted by legislative bodies cannot*
16 *impair rights given under a constitution. 194 B.R. at 925. "*
17 *[In re Young, 235 B.R. 666 (Bankr.M.D.Fla., 1999)]*

18 *"The very purpose of a Bill of Rights was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes*
19 *of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities [within juries] and*
20 *officials [and CIVIL STATUTES, Form #05.037] and to establish them as legal principles*
21 *to be applied by the courts [using the COMMON LAW rather than CIVIL STATUTES,*
22 *Form #05.037]. One's right to life, liberty, and property, to free speech, a free press,*
23 *freedom of worship and assembly, and other fundamental rights may not be submitted to*
24 *vote [of a JURY OR an ELECTOR]; they depend on the outcome of no elections."*
25 *[West Virginia Bd. of Ed. v. Barnett, 319 U.S. 624, 638 (1943); SOURCE:*
26 https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=8030119134463419441*]*

27 Based on the above, anything licensed, taxed, requiring a "permit", denied (the essence of ownership is the right to exclude
28 and control the use of), or regulated by civil statute or which may be voted on by a jury or an elector or which is created or
29 enforced by statute is NOT a CONSTITUTIONAL or a PRIVATE right and is not the proper subject of the common law.
30 Further, anyone who tries to convince you that there IS no such thing as the common law in the context of
31 CONSTITUTIONAL rights, or that common law proceedings can and do involve STATUTORY remedies is engaging in a
32 conspiracy to DESTROY all of your private rights and private property. This is proven in:

Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

33 A failure or refusal by a judge in the judicial department to provide CONSTITUTIONAL remedy for absolutely owned
34 PRIVATE property or PRIVATE rights is therefore, in fact and in deed:

- 35 1. An attempt to accomplish the OPPOSITE purpose for why government was created, which was to protect PRIVATE
- 36 property and PRIVATE rights.
- 37 2. An attempt to denigrate, demoralize, oppress, and enslave (Thirteenth Amendment) litigants before them who are
- 38 litigating against any government for a violation of those rights.
- 39 3. An attempt to maliciously abuse legal process to institute peonage and slavery in violation of 18 U.S.C. §1589.
- 40 4. A selective REPEAL of a portion of the CONSTITUTIONAL common law.
- 41 5. A selective REPEAL of the portion of the Bill of Rights that forms the STANDING of the party to sue in court.
- 42 6. A violation of the judicial oath to support and defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic.
- 43 7. Treason punishable by death under 18 U.S.C. §2381.
- 44 8. A violation of the Separation of Powers Doctrine, because by SELECTIVELY REPEALING a portion of the

1 constitution or constitutional common law, they in effect are acting in a “legislative capacity” as a member of the
2 Legislative or Executive Branch, not as judges.¹²

- 3 9. Destroying ANY and ALL possibility of freedom or liberty itself, according to the man who DESIGNED the three-
4 branch system of Republic Government and Separation of Powers:

5 “When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same
6 body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the
7 same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical
8 manner.

9 Again, there is no liberty, if the judiciary power be not separated from the legislative and
10 executive. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be
11 exposed to arbitrary control; for the judge would be then the legislator. Were it joined to
12 the executive power, the judge might behave with violence and oppression [sound
13 familiar?].

14 There would be an end of everything, were the same man or the same body, whether of
15 the nobles or of the people, to exercise those three powers, that of enacting laws, that of
16 executing the public resolutions, and of trying the causes of individuals.”

17 [. . .]

18 In what a situation must the poor subject be in those republics! The same body of
19 magistrates are possessed, as executors of the laws, of the whole power they have given
20 themselves in quality of legislators. They may plunder the state by their general
21 determinations; and as they have likewise the judiciary power in their hands, every
22 private citizen may be ruined by their particular decisions.”

23 [*The Spirit of Laws*, Charles de Montesquieu, 1758, Book XI, Section 6;

24 SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/Publications/SpiritOfLaws/sol_11.htm]

25 Further, Congress can only regulate or tax PRIVILEGES or PUBLIC rights that it created by statute, not PRIVATE rights
26 recognized but not created by the Constitution.

27 Although Crowell and Raddatz do not explicitly distinguish between rights created by
28 Congress [PUBLIC RIGHTS] and other [PRIVATE] rights, such a distinction underlies
29 in part Crowell's and Raddatz' recognition of a critical difference between rights created
30 by federal statute and rights recognized by the Constitution. Moreover, such a
31 distinction seems to us to be necessary in light of the delicate accommodations required
32 by the principle of separation of powers reflected in Art. III. The constitutional system
33 of checks and balances is designed to guard against “encroachment or aggrandizement”
34 by Congress at the expense of the other branches of government. Buckley v. Valeo, 424
35 U.S., at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683. But when Congress creates a statutory right [a “privilege”
36 or “public right” in this case, such as a “trade or business”], it clearly has the discretion,
37 in defining that right, to create presumptions, or assign burdens of proof, or prescribe
38 remedies; it may also provide that persons seeking to vindicate that right must do so
39 before particularized tribunals created to perform the specialized adjudicative tasks
40 related to that right. FN35 Such provisions do, in a sense, affect the exercise of judicial
41 power, but they are also incidental to Congress' power to define the right that it has
42 created. No comparable justification exists, however, when the right being adjudicated
43 is not of congressional creation. In such a situation, substantial inroads into functions
44 that have traditionally been performed by the Judiciary cannot be characterized merely
45 as incidental extensions of Congress' power to define rights that it has created. Rather,
46 such inroads suggest unwarranted encroachments upon the judicial power of the United
47 States, which our Constitution reserves for Art. III courts.

48 [*Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co.*, 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858
49 (1983)]

¹² See: *Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers*, Form #05.023; <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

1 For more details on the CIVIL (not CRIMINAL, but CIVIL) power to tax or regulate only public rights (public property) that
2 Congress created by statute and therefore ABSOLUTELY OWNS and CONTROLS as property, see:

Hierarchy of Sovereignty: The Power to Create is the Power to Tax, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/PowerToCreate.htm>

3 The basic rules of the common law are documented in the following exemplary books published near the turn of the Twentieth
4 Century and many others, and thus are WRITTEN. These rules have not been REPEALED, but rather fallen out of use
5 because of censorship by covetous Pharisee lawyers trying to convert ALL property to government property so they could
6 STEAL it and harvest it for their personal benefit¹³:

- 7 1. *Handbook of Common Law Pleading*, Benjamin Shipman (48 MB)-
8 http://famguardian.org/Publications/CommonLawPractice/Hand_book_of_Common_law_Pleading.pdf
- 9 2. *Handbook of Common Law Pleading*, Joseph Koeffler (4.8 MB).
10 http://famguardian.org/Publications/CommonLawPractice/CL_Pleading.pdf
- 11 3. *Principles of Common Law Pleading*, John McKelvey (3.5 MB)
12 http://famguardian.org/Publications/CommonLawPractice/Principles_of_Common_law_Pleading.pdf
- 13 4. *Pleadings and Practice in Actions At Common Law*, Martin Burks (90.3 MB)
14 http://famguardian.org/Publications/CommonLawPractice/Pleading_and_Practice_in_Actions_at_Comm.pdf

15 In addition to the above generally accepted rules, those owning the PRIVATE property protected by the common law may
16 ADD to these rules with their own set of rules that form the conditions of the temporary use, benefit, or control of the property
17 so granted and protected to the person SUBJECT to those rules. We call these the Grant Rules.

18 Grant Rules are CIVIL rules implemented as a contract or agreement between the GRANTOR and the GRANTEE for
19 temporarily using, controlling, or benefitting from that property. In the case of government, these rules regulating government
20 property cannot be and are not implemented with CRIMINAL statutes. They are only implemented by CIVIL statutes. They
21 are enforced against those who consent to those RULES by temporarily accepting or exercising custody, benefit, or control
22 over the property in question. These rules behave, in essence, as a franchise or an excise. The OBLIGATIONS against the
23 GRANTOR associated with the use of the granted property are the “consideration” provided by the GRANTOR and the
24 consideration they receive in return are the temporary “RIGHTS” they exercise over the granted property. All franchises are
25 based on “grants” of property with legal strings or conditions attached and ANYONE can grant or participate in such a
26 franchise or use such a franchise AGAINST a government to defend themselves against GOVERNMENT unlawfully offering
27 or enforcing THEIR franchises:

28 *“The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over*
29 *the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which*
30 *the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its*
31 *grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege,*
32 *in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege*
33 *conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the*
34 *compensation for it.”*
35 *[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]*

36 An example of the use of such rules by the government against the private rights and private property is found below:

37 *“We have repeatedly held that the Federal Government may impose appropriate*
38 *conditions on the use of [federal property](#) or [privileges \[franchises, Form #05.030\]](#) and may*
39 *require that state instrumentalities comply with [conditions \[obligations, Form #12.040\]](#)*
40 *that are reasonably related to the federal interest in particular national projects or*
41 *programs. See, e. g., *Ivanhoe Irrigation Dist. v. McCracken*, 357 U.S. 275, 294 -296*
42 *(1958); *Oklahoma v. Civil Service Comm'n*, 330 U.S. 127, 142 -144 (1947); *United States**
43 *v. *San Francisco*, 310 U.S. 16 (1940); cf. *National League of Cities v. Usery*, 426 U.S. 833,*
44 *853 (1976); *Fry v. United States*, 421 U.S. 542 (1975). A requirement that States, like all*
45 *other users, pay a portion of the costs of the [benefits \[Form #05.040\]](#) they enjoy from*

¹³ See: *Who Were the Pharisees and Saducees?*, Form #05.047; <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>.

1 federal programs is surely permissible [meaning CONSTITUTIONAL] since it is closely
2 related to the [435 U.S. 444, 462] federal interest in recovering costs from those who
3 benefit and since it effects no greater interference with state sovereignty than do the
4 restrictions which this Court has approved.”
5 [Massachusetts v. United States, 435 U.S. 444 (1978);
6 https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=16842193024599209893/]

7 Under the concept of equal protection and equal treatment, WE TOO have an EQUAL right, recognized above by the U.S.
8 Supreme Court in Munn v. Illinois, to attach conditions to the use or benefit or control of our property by any and all others,
9 INCLUDING governments. To suggest otherwise is to impute or enforce superior or supernatural powers to a government
10 and institute a civil religion in violation of the First Amendment. ALL ARE EQUAL in a free society. You are equal to the
11 government, as President Obama implied in his First Inauguration Speech, as we prove below:

Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 1: Introduction
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ikf7CcT2I8I>

12 If you are not equal to the government and cannot use YOUR absolutely owned PRIVATE property to control THEM, then
13 they can't use THEIR property to control you through civil franchises or statutes either. For more on the abuse of franchises
14 by government to oppress people they are supposed to be helping, and how to use them to DEFEND yourself against such
15 abuses, see:

- 16 1. Government Franchises Course, Form #12.012
17 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 18 2. Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
19 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

20 Anyone who asserts that the GOVERNMENT is the only one who can absolutely own property or that government SHARES
21 ownership or control of ALL property is indirectly advocating all of the following:

- 22 1. A violation of the main reason for creating government, which is the protection of PRIVATE rights and PRIVATE
23 property.
- 24 2. The establishment of a state sponsored religion in violation of the First Amendment, because the government can use
25 their control over ALL property to control ANYTHING and ANYONE. See:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 26 3. A violation of the Thirteenth Amendment, because there is no way to avoid the rules associated with buying or using
27 ANY TYPE OF PROPERTY.
- 28 4. The establishment of socialism, which is government ownership or at least control over ALL property:

29 **“Socialism** *n* (1839) **1:** any of various economic and political theories advocating
30 collective or governmental ownership and administration of the means of production and
31 distribution of goods **2 a:** a system of society or group living in which there is no private
32 property **b:** a system or condition of society in which the means of production are owned
33 and controlled by the state **3:** a stage of society in Marxist theory transitional between
34 capitalism and communism and distinguished by unequal distribution of goods and pay
35 according to work done.”

36 [Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, 1983, ISBN 0-87779-510-X, page 1118;

37 SOURCE:

38 <https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/Forms/Discovery/Deposition/Evidence/Q05.010.pdf>
39 f]

40 For more information about common misconceptions about the common law propagated mainly by MISINFORMED
41 members of the legal profession and the government, see:

Rebutted False Arguments about the Common Law, Form #08.025
<https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/RebuttedFalseArgumentsAboutCommonLaw.pdf>

4.1.8 Law

The term "law" as used on this site is constrained by the following requirements:

1. It must apply equally to ALL. It cannot compel INEQUALITY of treatment between any man or class of men. See [Form #05.033](#).
2. It cannot do collectively what people individually cannot NATURALLY do. In other words, in the words of [Frederic Bastiat](#), it aggregates the individual right of self-defense into a collective body so that it can be delegated. A single human CANNOT delegate a right he does not individually ALSO possess, which indirectly implies that no GROUP of men called "government" can have any more COLLECTIVE rights under the collective entity rule than a single human being. See the following for a video on the subject.

Philosophy of Liberty , SEDM https://sedm.org/liberty-university/liberty-university-2-2-philosophy-of-liberty/

3. It cannot punish a citizen for an innocent action that was not a crime or not demonstrated to produce measurable harm. The ability to PROVE such harm with evidence in court is called "standing".
4. It cannot compel the redistribution of wealth between two private parties. This is ESPECIALLY true if it is called a "tax".
5. It cannot interfere with or impair the right of contracts between PRIVATE parties. That means it cannot compel income tax withholding unless one or more of the parties to the withholding are ALREADY public officers in the government.
6. It cannot interfere with the use or enjoyment or CONTROL over private property, so long as the use injures no one. Implicit in this requirement is that it cannot FAIL to recognize the right of private property or force the owner to donate it to a PUBLIC USE or PUBLIC PURPOSE. In the common law, such an interference is called a "trespass".
7. The rights it conveys must attach to LAND rather than the CIVIL STATUS (e.g. "taxpayer", "citizen", "resident", etc.) of the people ON that land. One can be ON land within a PHYSICAL state WITHOUT being legally "WITHIN" that state (a corporation) as an [officer of the government or corporation \(Form #05.042\)](#) called a "citizen" or "resident". See:
 - 7.1. [Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008](#).
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>
 - 7.2. [Foundations of Freedom Course, Form #12.021, Video 4](#) covers how LAND and STATUS are deliberately confused through equivocation in order to [KIDNAP people's identity \(Form #05.046\)](#) and transport it illegally to federal territory.
(*"It is locality that is determinative of the application of the Constitution, in such matters as judicial procedure, and not the status of the people who live in it."* [Balzac v. Porto Rico, 258 U.S. 298 (1922)])
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hPwMfa_oD-w
8. It must provide a remedy AFTER an injury occurs. It may not PREVENT injuries before they occur. Anything that operates in a PREVENTIVE rather than CORRECTIVE mode is a franchise. There is no standing in a REAL court to sue WITHOUT first demonstrating such an injury to the PRIVATE or NATURAL rights of the Plaintiff or VICTIM.
9. It cannot acquire the "force of law" from the consent of those it is enforced against. In other words, it cannot be an agreement or contract. All franchises and licensing, by the way, are types of contracts.
10. It does not include compacts or contracts between private people and governments. Rights that are INALIENABLE cannot be contracted away, even WITH consent. See [Form #05.003](#).
11. It cannot, at any time, be called "voluntary". Congress and even the U.S. Supreme Court call the IRC Subtitle A "income tax" voluntary. See Exhibits [#05.025](#) and [#05.051](#).
12. It does not include franchises, licenses, or civil statutory codes, all of which derive ALL of their force of law from your consent in choosing a [civil domicile \(Form #05.002\)](#).

The above criteria derives from [What is "law"?, Form #05.048, Section 16](#). Any violation of the above rules is what the Bible calls "devises evil by law" in Psalm 94:20-23 as indicated above.

Roman statesman Cicero defined law as follows:

"True Law is right reason in agreement with Nature, it is of universal application, unchanging and everlasting; it summons to duty by its commands and averts from wrongdoing by its prohibitions. And it does not lay its commands or prohibitions upon good men in vain, although neither have any effect upon the wicked. It is a sin to try to alter this law, nor is it allowable to try to repeal a part of it, and it is impossible to abolish it entirely. We cannot be freed from its obligations by Senate or People, and we need not look outside

1 ourselves for an expounder or interpreter of it. And there will not be different laws at Rome
2 or at Athens, or different laws now and in the future, but one [eternal and unchangeable](#)
3 [law](#) will be valid for all times and all nations, and there will be one master and one rule,
4 that is God, for He is the author of [this law](#), its promulgator, and its enforcing judge.”
5 [Marcus Tullius Cicero, 106-43 B.C.]

6 “Power and law are not synonymous. In truth, they are frequently in opposition and
7 irreconcilable. There is [God’s Law](#) from which [all equitable laws of man](#) emerge and by
8 which men must live if they are not to die in oppression, chaos and despair. Divorced from
9 [God’s eternal and immutable Law](#), established before the founding of the suns, man’s
10 power is evil no matter the noble words with which it is employed or the motives urged
11 when enforcing it. Men of good will, mindful therefore of the [Law laid down by God](#), will
12 oppose governments whose rule is by men, and if they wish to survive as a nation they will
13 destroy the [\[de facto\] government](#) which attempts to adjudicate by the whim of venal
14 judges.”

15 [Marcus Tullius Cicero, 106-43 B.C.]

16 “Law” is defined to EXCLUDE any and all [civil statutory codes, franchises, or privileges](#) in relation to any and all
17 governments and to include ONLY the COMMON law, the CONSTITUTION (if trespassing Government Actors ONLY are
18 involved), and the CRIMINAL law.

19 *The Court developed, for its own governance in the cases confessedly within its*
20 *jurisdiction, a series of rules under which it has avoided passing upon a large part of all*
21 *the constitutional questions pressed upon it for decision. They are:*

22 [. . .]

23 **6. The Court will not pass upon the constitutionality of a statute at the instance of one**
24 **who has availed himself of its benefits.** [FN7 Great Falls Mfg. Co. v. Attorney General, 124](#)
25 [U.S. 581, 8 S.Ct. 631, 31 L.Ed. 527; Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U.S. 407,](#)
26 [411, 412, 37 S.Ct. 609, 61 L.Ed. 1229; St. Louis Malleable Casting Co. v. Prendergast](#)
27 [Construction Co., 260 U.S. 469, 43 S.Ct. 178, 67 L.Ed. 351.](#)

28
29 FOOTNOTES:

30 [FN7 Compare Electric Co. v. Dow, 166 U.S. 489, 17 S.Ct. 645, 41 L.Ed. 1088; Pierce v.](#)
31 [Somerset Ry., 171 U.S. 641, 648, 19 S.Ct. 64, 43 L.Ed. 316; Leonard v. Vicksburg, etc., R.](#)
32 [Co., 198 U.S. 416, 422, 25 S.Ct. 750, 49 L.Ed. 1108.](#)
33 [\[Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466 \(1936\)\]](#)

34
35 *Municipal law, thus understood, is properly defined to be "a rule of civil conduct*
36 *prescribed by the supreme power in a state, commanding what is right and prohibiting*
37 *what is wrong."*

38 [. . .]

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

1 accounts law is defined to be "a rule."
2 [Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound,
3 1925, p. 4]

5 "The words "privileges" and "immunities," like the greater part of the legal phraseology
6 of this country, have been carried over from the law of Great Britain, and recur constantly
7 either as such or in equivalent expressions from the time of Magna Charta. For all
8 practical purposes they are synonymous in meaning, and originally signified a peculiar
9 right or private law conceded to particular persons or places **whereby a certain individual
10 or class of individuals was exempted from the rigor of the common law.** Privilege or
11 immunity is conferred upon any person when he is invested with a legal claim to the
12 exercise of special or peculiar rights, authorizing him to enjoy some particular advantage
13 or exemption."

14 [The Privileges and Immunities of State Citizenship, Roger Howell, PhD, 1918, pp. 9-10;

15 SOURCE:

16 http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_im
17 [munities_of_state_c.pdf\]](http://famguardian.org/Publications/ThePrivAndImmOfStateCit/The_privileges_and_im)

18
19 FOOTNOTES:

20 See Magill v. Browne, Fed.Cas. No. 8952, 16 Fed.Cas. 408; 6 Words and Phrases, 5583,
21 5584; A J. Lien, "Privileges and Immunities of Citizens of the United States," in Columbia
22 University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. 54, p. 31.

24 "What, then, is [\[civil\] legislation](#)? It is an [assumption \[presumption\]](#) by one man, or body
25 of men, of absolute, irresponsible dominion [because of abuse of [sovereign immunity](#) and
26 the [act of "CONSENT"](#) by calling yourself a "citizen"] over all other men whom they call
27 subject to their power. It is the assumption by one man, or body of men, of a right to subject
28 all other men to their will and their service. It is the assumption by one man, or body of
29 men, of a right to abolish outright all the natural rights, all the natural liberty of all other
30 men; to make all other men their slaves; to arbitrarily dictate to all other men what they
31 may, and may not, do; what they may, and may not, have; what they may, and may not, be.
32 It is, in short, the assumption of a right to banish the [principle of human rights](#), the [principle](#)
33 [of justice itself](#), from off the earth, and set up their own personal will [society of men and
34 not law], pleasure, and interest in its place. All this, and nothing less, is involved in the
35 very idea that there can be any such thing as [human \[CIVIL\] legislation](#) that is obligatory
36 upon those upon whom it is imposed [and ESPECIALLY those who never expressly
37 consented in writing]."

38 [Natural Law, Chapter 1, Section IV, Lysander Spooner;

39 SOURCE:

40 <http://famguardian.org/PublishedAuthors/Indiv/SpoonerLysander/NaturalLaw.htm>]

41 The above methods of REMOVING the protections of the common law and the constitution from the INALIENABLE rights
42 [rights that CANNOT lawfully be given away, even WITH consent] that are protected by them has been described by the
43 U.S. Congress as the ESSENCE of [communism](#) itself! This is especially true when you add games with legal words of art to
44 remove even the STATUTORY limitations upon the conduct of the government. See [Legal Deception, Propaganda, and](#)
45 [Fraud, Form #05.014](#).

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

1 The Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States [consisting
2 of the IRS, DOJ, and a corrupted federal judiciary], although purportedly a political
3 party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the [de jure] Government
4 of the United States [and replace it with a de facto government ruled by the judiciary]. It
5 constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship [IRS, DOJ, and corrupted federal judiciary in
6 collusion] within a [constitutional] republic, demanding for itself the rights and
7 [FRANCHISE] privileges [including immunity from prosecution for their wrongdoing in
8 violation of Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution] accorded to political parties,
9 but denying to all others the liberties [Bill of Rights] guaranteed by the Constitution [Form
10 #10.002]. Unlike political parties, which evolve their policies and programs through
11 public means, by the reconciliation of a wide variety of individual views, and submit those
12 policies and programs to the electorate at large for approval or disapproval, the policies
13 and programs of the Communist Party are secretly [by corrupt judges and the IRS in
14 complete disregard of, Form #05.014, the tax franchise "codes", Form #05.001]
15 prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world Communist movement [the IRS and
16 Federal Reserve]. Its members [the Congress, which was terrorized to do IRS bidding by
17 the framing of Congressman Trafficant] have no part in determining its goals, and are not
18 permitted to voice dissent to party objectives. Unlike members of political parties, members
19 of the Communist Party are recruited for indoctrination [in the public FOOL system by
20 homosexuals, liberals, and socialists] with respect to its objectives and methods, and are
21 organized, instructed, and disciplined [by the IRS and a corrupted judiciary] to carry into
22 action slavishly the assignments given them by their hierarchical chieftains. Unlike
23 political parties, the Communist Party [thanks to a corrupted federal judiciary]
24 acknowledges no constitutional or statutory limitations upon its conduct or upon that of
25 its members [ANARCHISTS!, Form #08.020]. The Communist Party is relatively small
26 numerically, and gives scant indication of capacity ever to attain its ends by lawful political
27 means. The peril inherent in its operation arises not from its numbers, but from its failure
28 to acknowledge any limitation as to the nature of its activities, and its dedication to the
29 proposition that the present constitutional Government of the United States ultimately
30 must be brought to ruin by any available means, including resort to force and violence
31 [or using income taxes]. Holding that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile foreign
32 power [the Federal Reserve and the American Bar Association (ABA)] renders its
33 existence a clear present and continuing danger to the security of the United States. It
34 is the means whereby individuals are seduced [illegally KIDNAPPED via identity theft!,
35 Form #05.046] into the service of the world Communist movement [using FALSE
36 information returns and other PERJURIOUS government forms, Form #04.001],
37 trained to do its bidding [by FALSE government publications and statements that the
38 government is not accountable for the accuracy of, Form #05.007], and directed and
39 controlled [using FRANCHISES illegally enforced upon NONRESIDENTS, Form
40 #05.030] in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary services. Therefore,
41 the Communist Party should be outlawed

42 The above corruption of our Constitutional Republic by the unconstitutional abuse of franchises, the violation of the rules of
43 statutory construction, and interference with common law remedies was described by the U.S. Supreme Court as follows:

44 "These are words of weighty import. They involve consequences of the most momentous
45 character. I take leave to say that if the principles thus announced should ever receive
46 the sanction of a majority of this court, a radical and mischievous change in our system
47 of government will be the result. We will, in that event, pass from the era of constitutional
48 liberty guarded and protected by a written constitution into an era of legislative
49 absolutism.

50 Although from the foundation of the Government this court has held steadily to the view
51 that the Government of the United States was one of enumerated powers, and that no one
52 of its branches, nor all of its branches combined, could constitutionally exercise powers
53 not granted, or which were not necessarily implied from those expressly granted, Martin
54 y. Hunter, 1 Wheat. 304, 326, 331, we are now informed that Congress possesses powers
55 outside of the Constitution, and may deal with new territory, 380*380 acquired by treaty

1 or conquest, in the same manner as other nations have been accustomed to act with
2 respect to territories acquired by them. In my opinion, Congress has no existence and
3 can exercise no authority outside of the Constitution. Still less is it true that Congress
4 can deal with new territories just as other nations have done or may do with their new
5 territories. This nation is under the control of a written constitution, the supreme law of
6 the land and the only source of the powers which our Government, or any branch or
7 officer of it, may exert at any time or at any place. Monarchical and despotic
8 governments, unrestrained by written constitutions, may do with newly acquired
9 territories what this Government may not do consistently with our fundamental law. To
10 say otherwise is to concede that Congress may, by action taken outside of the
11 Constitution, engraft upon our republican institutions a colonial system such as exists
12 under monarchical governments. Surely such a result was never contemplated by the
13 fathers of the Constitution. If that instrument had contained a word suggesting the
14 possibility of a result of that character it would never have been adopted by the People
15 of the United States. The idea that this country may acquire territories anywhere upon
16 the earth, by conquest or treaty, and hold them as mere colonies or provinces — the
17 people inhabiting them to enjoy only such rights as Congress chooses to accord to them
18 — is wholly inconsistent with the spirit and genius as well as with the words of the
19 Constitution."

20 [Downes v. Bidwell, [182 U.S. 244](#) (1901), Justice Harlan, Dissenting]

21 Civil statutory codes, franchises, or privileges are referred to on this website as “private law”, but not “law”. The word
22 “public” precedes all uses of “law” when dealing with acts of government and hence, refers only to COMMON law and
23 CRIMINAL law that applies equally to everyone, regardless of [their consent](#). Involvement in any and all [“private law”](#)
24 [franchises or privileges](#) offered by any government ALWAYS undermines and threatens sovereignty, autonomy, and [equality](#),
25 turns government into an [unconstitutional civil religion](#), and [corrupts even the finest of people](#). This is explained in:

[Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>

26 Any use of the word "law" by any Government Actor directed at us or any member, if not clarified with the words "private"
27 or "public" in front of the word "law" shall constitute:

- 28 1. A criminal attempt and conspiracy to recruit us to be [a public officer called a "person", "taxpayer", "citizen",](#)
29 ["resident"](#), etc.
- 30 2. A solicitation of [illegal bribes called "taxes"](#) to treat us "AS IF" we are a public officer.
- 31 3. A [criminal conspiracy to convert PRIVATE rights into PUBLIC rights](#) and to violate the Bill of Rights.

32 The protection of PRIVATE rights mandated by the Bill of Rights BEGINS with and requires:

- 33 1. ALWAYS keeping PRIVATE and PUBLIC rights separated and never mixing them together.
- 34 2. Using unambiguous language about the TYPE of "right" that is being protected: PUBLIC or PRIVATE in every use of
35 the word "right". The way to avoid confusing PUBLIC and PRIVATE RIGHTS is to simply refer to PUBLIC rights as
36 "privileges" and NEVER refer to them as "rights".
- 37 3. Only converting PRIVATE rights to PUBLIC rights with the express written consent of the HUMAN owner.
- 38 4. Limiting the conversion to geographical places where rights are NOT unalienable. This means the conversion occurred
39 either abroad or on government territory not within the exclusive jurisdiction of a Constitutional state. Otherwise, the
40 Declaration of Independence, which is organic law, would be violated.
- 41 5. Keeping the rules for converting PRIVATE to PUBLIC so simple, unambiguous, and clear that a child could
42 understanding them and always referring to these rules in every interaction between the government and those they are
43 charged with protecting.
- 44 6. Ensuring that in every interaction (and ESPECIALLY ENFORCEMENT ACTION) between the government both
45 administratively and in court, that any right the government claims to civilly enforce against, regulate, tax, or burden
46 otherwise PRIVATE property is proven ON THE RECORD IN WRITING to originate from the rules documented in
47 the previous step. This BURDEN OF PROOF must be met both ADMINISTRATIVELY and IN COURT BEFORE
48 any enforcement action may be lawfully attempted by any government. It must be met by an IMPARTIAL decision
49 maker with NO FINANCIAL interest in the outcome and not employed by the government or else a criminal financial

1 conflict of interest will result. In other words, the government has to prove that it is NOT stealing before it can take
2 property, that it is the lawful owner, and expressly HOW it became the lawful owner.

- 3 7. Enforcing the following CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTION against government jurisdiction to enforce unless and until
4 the above requirements are met:

5 *“All rights and property are PRESUMED to be EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE and beyond the*
6 *control of government or the CIVIL statutory franchise codes unless and until the*
7 *government meets the burden of proving, WITH EVIDENCE, on the record of the*
8 *proceeding that:*

9 *a. A SPECIFIC formerly PRIVATE owner consented IN WRITING to convert said property*
10 *to PUBLIC property.*

11 *b. The owner was either abroad, domiciled on, or at least PRESENT on federal territory*
12 *NOT protected by the Constitution and therefore had the legal capacity to ALIENATE a*
13 *Constitutional right or relieve a public servant of the fiduciary obligation to respect and*
14 *protect the right. Those physically present but not necessarily domiciled in a constitutional*
15 *but not statutory state protected by the constitution cannot lawfully alienate rights to a*
16 *real, de jure government, even WITH their consent.*

17 *c. If the government refuses to meet the above burden of proof, it shall be CONCLUSIVELY*
18 *PRESUMED to be operating in a PRIVATE, corporate capacity on an EQUAL footing with*
19 *every other private corporation and which is therefore NOT protected by official, judicial,*
20 *or sovereign immunity.”*

21 For a detailed exposition on the mandatory separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE as indicated above, please see the
22 following course on our site:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

23 For a detailed exposition of the legal meaning of the word "law" and why the above restrictions on its definition are important,
24 see:

What is "law"?, Form #05.048
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhatIsLaw.pdf>

25 **4.1.9 Copyright**

26 The words "Copyright" or "Copyright Sovereignty Education and Defense Ministry (SEDM)" used in connection with any
27 of the intellectual property on this site shall mean the following:

- 28 1. Owned by an exclusively private, nonstatutory human and not any artificial entity, "person", "citizen", or "resident"
29 under any civil statutory law.
- 30 2. Protected only under the common law and the constitution and not subject to the statutory civil law, including any tax
31 law.
- 32 3. Not owned by this website or ministry.
- 33 4. Owned by an anonymous third party who we have an agreement with to reuse the materials on this site.
- 34 5. Not owned or controlled by any government per [17 U.S.C. §105](#). Governments are not allowed to copyright their
35 works. Any attempt to bring this ministry under the control of any government or make it the property of any
36 government therefore results in no copyright being held in the name of the government.

37 The purpose of these copyright restrictions is to ensure that no government can use legal process or tax assessment as a
38 method to censor free speech materials found on this website.

4.1.10 Franchise

The word "[franchise](#)" means a grant or rental or lease rather than a gift of specific property with legal strings or "obligations" attached.

FRANCHISE. A special privilege conferred by government on individual or corporation, and which does not belong to citizens of country generally of common right. *Elliott v. City of Eugene*, 135 Or. 108, 294 P. 358, 360. In England it is defined to be a royal privilege in the hands of a subject.

A "franchise," as used by Blackstone in defining *quo warranto*, (3 Com. 262 [4th Am. Ed.] 322), had reference to a royal privilege or branch of the king's prerogative subsisting in the hands of the subject, and must arise from the king's grant, or be held by prescription, but today we understand a franchise to be some special privilege conferred by government on an individual, natural or artificial, which is not enjoyed by its citizens in general. *State v. Fernandez*, 106 Fla. 779, 143 So. 638, 639, 86 A.L.R. 240.

In this country a franchise is a privilege or immunity of a public nature, which cannot be legally exercised without legislative grant. To be a corporation is a franchise. The various powers conferred on corporations are franchises. The execution of a policy of insurance by an insurance company [e.g. Social Insurance/Socialist Security], and the issuing a bank note by an incorporated bank [such as a Federal Reserve NOTE], are franchises. *People v. Utica Ins. Co.*, 15 Johns., N.Y., 387, 8 Am.Dec. 243. But it does not embrace the property acquired by the exercise of the franchise. *Bridgeport v. New York & N.H. R. Co.*, 36 Conn. 255, 4 Am.Rep. 63. Nor involve interest in land acquired by grantee. *Whitbeck v. Funk*, 140 Or. 70, 12 P.2d 1019, 1020. In a popular sense, the political rights of subjects and citizens are franchises, such as the right of suffrage. etc. *Pierce v. Emery*, 32 N.H. 484 ; *State v. Black Diamond Co.*, 97 Ohio St. 24, 119 N.E. 195, 199, L.R.A. 1918E, 352.

Elective Franchise. The right of suffrage: the right or privilege of voting in public elections.

Exclusive Franchise. See *Exclusive Privilege or Franchise*.

General and Special. The charter of a corporation is its "general" franchise, while a "special" franchise consists in any rights granted by the public to use property for a public use but-with private profit. *Lord v. Equitable Life Assur. Soc.*, 194 N.Y. 212, 87 N.E. 443, 22 L.R.A. (N.S.) 420.

Personal Franchise. A franchise of corporate existence, or one which authorizes the formation and existence of a corporation, is sometimes called a "personal" franchise. as distinguished from a "property" franchise, which authorizes a corporation so formed to apply its property to some particular enterprise or exercise some special privilege in its employment, as, for example, to construct and operate a railroad. See *Sandham v. Nye*, 9 Misc.ReP. 541, 30 N.Y.S. 552.

Secondary Franchises. The franchise of corporate existence being sometimes called the "primary" franchise of a corporation, its "secondary" franchises are the special and peculiar rights, privileges, or grants which it may, receive under its charter or from a municipal corporation, such as the right to use the public streets, exact tolls, collect fares, etc. *State v. Topeka Water Co.*, 61 Kan. 547, 60 P. 337; *Virginia Canon Toll Road Co. v. People*, 22 Colo. 429, 45 P. 398 37 L.R.A. 711. The franchises of a corporation are divisible into (1) corporate or general franchises; and (2) "special or secondary franchises. The former is the franchise to exist as a corporation, while the latter are certain rights and privileges conferred upon existing corporations. *Gulf Refining Co. v. Cleveland Trust Co.*, 166 Miss. 759, 108 So. 158, 160.

Special Franchisee. See *Secondary Franchises, supra*.

1 [Black's Law Dictionary, 4th Edition, pp. 786-787]

2 The definition of "privilege" in the definition above means PROPERTY, whether physical or intangible. This loan is often
3 called a "grant" in statutes, as in the case of Social Security in [42 U.S. Code Subchapter I-Grants to the States for Old-Age](#)
4 [Assistance](#). That grant is to federal territories and NOT constitutional states, as demonstrated by the definition of "State"
5 found in [42 U.S.C. §1301](#)(a)(1). Hence, Social Security cannot be offered in constitutional states, but only federal territories,
6 as proven in [Form #06.001](#).

7 *"For here, the state must deposit the proceeds of its taxation in the federal treasury, upon*
8 *terms which make the deposit suspiciously like a forced loan to be repaid only in*
9 *accordance with restrictions imposed by federal law. Title IX, §§ 903 (a) (3), 904 (a), (b),*
10 *(e). All moneys withdrawn from this fund must be used exclusively for the payment of*
11 *compensation. § 903 (a) (4). And this compensation is to be paid through public*
12 *employment offices in the state or such other agencies as a federal board may approve. §*
13 *903 (a) (1)."*

14 [[Steward Machine Co. v. Davis, 301 U.S. 548 \(1937\)](#)]

15 In the case of government franchises, property granted or rented can include one or more of the following:

- 16 1. A public right or public privilege granted by a statute that is not found in the Constitution but rather created by the
17 Legislature. This includes remedies provided in franchise courts in the Executive Branch under Article I or Article IV
18 to vindicate such rights. It does not include remedies provided in true Article III courts.

19 *"The distinction between public rights and private rights has not been definitively*
20 *explained in our precedents. Nor is it necessary to do so in the present cases, for it suffices*
21 *to observe that a matter of public rights must at a minimum arise "between the government*
22 *and others." Ex parte Bakelite Corp., supra, at 451, 49 S.Ct., at 413. In contrast, "the*
23 *liability of one individual to another under the law as defined," Crowell v. Benson, supra,*
24 *at 51, 52 S.Ct., at 292, is a matter of private rights. Our precedents clearly establish that*
25 *only controversies in the former category may be removed from Art. III courts and*
26 *delegated to legislative courts or administrative agencies for their determination. See Atlas*
27 *Roofing Co. v. Occupational Safety and Health Review Comm'n, 430 U.S. 442, 450, n. 7,*
28 *97 S.Ct. 1261, 1266, n. 7, 51 L.Ed.2d. 464 (1977); Crowell v. Benson, supra, 285 U.S., at*
29 *50-51, 52 S.Ct., at 292. See also Katz, Federal Legislative Courts, 43 Harv.L.Rev. 894,*
30 *917-918 (1930).FN24 Private-rights disputes, on the other hand, lie at the core of the*
31 *historically recognized judicial power."*

32 [. . .]

33 *Although Crowell and Raddatz do not explicitly distinguish between rights created by*
34 *Congress [PUBLIC RIGHTS] and other [PRIVATE] rights, such a distinction underlies in*
35 *part Crowell's and Raddatz' recognition of a critical difference between rights created by*
36 *federal statute and rights recognized by the Constitution. Moreover, such a distinction*
37 *seems to us to be necessary in light of the delicate accommodations required by the*
38 *principle of separation of powers reflected in Art. III. The constitutional system of checks*
39 *and balances is designed to guard against "encroachment or aggrandizement" by*
40 *Congress at the expense of the other branches of government. Buckley v. Valeo, 424 U.S.,*
41 *at 122, 96 S.Ct., at 683. But when Congress creates a statutory right [a "privilege" or*
42 *"public right" in this case, such as a "trade or business"], it clearly has the discretion, in*
43 *defining that right, to create presumptions, or assign burdens of proof, or prescribe*
44 *remedies; it may also provide that persons seeking to vindicate that right must do so before*
45 *particularized tribunals created to perform the specialized adjudicative tasks related to*
46 *that right. FN35 Such provisions do, in a sense, affect the exercise of judicial power, but*
47 *they are also incidental to Congress' power to define the right that it has created. No*
48 *comparable justification exists, however, when the right being adjudicated is not of*
49 *congressional creation. In such a situation, substantial inroads into functions that have*
50 *traditionally been performed by the Judiciary cannot be characterized merely as incidental*
51 *extensions of Congress' power to define rights that it has created. Rather, such inroads*

1 suggest unwarranted encroachments upon the judicial power of the United States, which
2 our Constitution reserves for Art. III courts.

3 [\[Northern Pipeline Const. Co. v. Marathon Pipe Line Co., 458 U.S. 50, 102 S.Ct. 2858](#)
4 [\(1983\)\]](#)

- 5 2. Any type of privilege, immunity, or exemption granted by a statute to a specific class of people and not to all people
6 generally that is not found in the Constitution. All such statues are referred to as "special law" or "private law", where
7 the government itself is acting in a private rather than a public capacity on an equal footing with every other private
8 human in equity. The U.S. Supreme court also called such legislation "class legislation" in [Pollock v. Farmers' Loan](#)
9 [and Trust, 157 U.S. 429 \(1895\)](#) and the ONLY "class" they can be talking about are public officers in the U.S.
10 government and not to all people generally. See the following for proof:

[Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a "Public Officer" for Income Tax Purposes, Form #05.008](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyThiefOrPubOfficer.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyThiefOrPubOfficer.pdf>

11 **"special law.** *One relating to particular persons or things; one made for individual cases*
12 *or for particular places or districts; one operating upon a selected class, rather than upon*
13 *the public generally. A private law. A law is "special" when it is different from others of*
14 *the same general kind or designed for a particular purpose, or limited in range or confined*
15 *to a prescribed field of action or operation. A "special law" relates to either particular*
16 *persons, places, or things or to persons, places, or things which, though not particularized,*
17 *are separated by any method of selection from the whole class to which the law might, but*
18 *not such legislation, be applied. Utah Farm Bureau Ins. Co. v. Utah Ins. Guaranty Ass'n,*
19 *Utah, 564 P.2d. 751, 754. A special law applies only to an individual or a number of*
20 *individuals out of a single class similarly situated and affected, or to a special locality.*
21 *Board of County Com'rs of Lemhi County v. Swensen, Idaho, 80 Idaho 198, 327 P.2d. 361,*
22 *362. See also Private bill; Private law. Compare General law; Public law."*
23 *[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, pp. 1397-1398]*

- 24 3. A statutory "[civil status](#)" created and therefore owned by the legislature. This includes statutory "taxpayers", "drivers",
25 "persons", "individuals", etc. All such entities are creations of Congress and public rights which carry obligations when
26 consensually and lawfully exercised. See:

[Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status, Form #13.008](https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>

- 27 4. A STATUTORY Social Security Card. The regulations at [20 C.F.R. §422.103\(d\)](#) indicates the card is property of the
28 government and must be returned upon request.
29 5. A U.S. passport. The passport indicates that it is property of the government that must be returned upon request.
30 6. A "[license](#)", which is legally defined as permission by the state to do something that would otherwise be illegal or even
31 criminal.

32 In legal parlance, such a grant makes the recipient a temporary trustee, and if they violate their trust, the property can be taken
33 back through administrative action or physical seizure and without legal process so long as the conditions of the loan allowed
34 for these methods of enforcement:

35 *"How, then, are purely equitable obligations created? For the most part, either by the acts*
36 *of third persons or by equity alone. **But how can one person impose an obligation upon***
37 ***another? By giving property to the latter on the terms of his assuming an obligation in***
38 ***respect to it. At law there are only two means by which the object of the donor could be***
39 ***at all accomplished, consistently with the entire ownership of the property passing to the***
40 ***donee, namely: first, by imposing a real obligation upon the property; secondly, by***
41 ***subjecting the title of the donee to a condition subsequent.** The first of these the law does*
42 *not permit; the second is entirely inadequate. Equity, however, can secure most of the*
43 *objects of the doner, and yet avoid the mischiefs of real obligations by imposing upon the*
44 *donee (and upon all persons to whom the property shall afterwards come without value or*
45 *with notice) **a personal obligation with respect to the property; and accordingly this is***
46 ***what equity does.** It is in this way that all trusts are created, and all equitable charges*
47 *made (i.e., equitable hypothecations or liens created) by testators in their wills. In this way,*
48 *also, most trusts are created by acts inter vivos, except in those cases in which the trustee*

1 incurs a legal as well as an equitable obligation. **In short, as property is the subject of**
2 **every equitable obligation, so the owner of property is the only person whose act or acts**
3 **can be the means of creating an obligation in respect to that property. Moreover, the**
4 **owner of property can create an obligation in respect to it in only two ways: first, by**
5 **incurring the obligation himself, in which case he commonly also incurs a legal**
6 **obligation; secondly, by imposing the obligation upon some third person; and this he**
7 **does in the way just explained.”**

8 [Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound,
9 1925, p. 543]

11 “When Sir Matthew Hale, and the sages of the law in his day, spoke of property as
12 affected by a public interest, and ceasing from that cause to be juris privati solely, that
13 is, ceasing to be held merely in private right, they referred to

14 [1] property dedicated [DONATED] by the owner to public uses, or

15 [2] to property the use of which was granted by the government [e.g. Social Security
16 Card], or

17 [3] in connection with which special privileges were conferred [licenses].

18 Unless the property was thus dedicated [by one of the above three mechanisms], or some
19 right bestowed by the government was held with the property, either by specific grant or
20 by prescription of so long a time as to imply a grant originally, the property was not
21 affected by any public interest so as to be taken out of the category of property held in
22 private right.”

23 [[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113, 139-140 \(1876\)](#)]

24 The above authorities imply that a mere act of accepting or using the property in question in effect represents "implied
25 consent" to abide by the conditions associated with the loan, as described in the California Civil Code below:

26 CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE
27 DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS
28 PART 2. CONTRACTS
29 CHAPTER 3. CONSENT
30 [Section 1589](#)

31 1589. A voluntary acceptance of the benefit of a transaction is equivalent to a consent to
32 all the obligations arising from it, so far as the facts are known, or ought to be known, to
33 the person accepting.

34 The U.S. Supreme Court further acknowledged the above mechanisms of using grants or loans of government property to
35 create equitable obligations against the recipient of the property as follows. Note that they ALSO imply that YOU can use
36 exactly the same mechanism against the government to impose obligations upon them, if they are trying to acquire your
37 physical property, your services, your labor, your time, or impose any kind of [obligation \(Form #12.040\)](#) against you without
38 your express written consent, because all such activities involve efforts to acquire what is usually PRIVATE, absolutely
39 owned property that you can use to control the GOVERNMENT as the lawful owner:

40 “The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over
41 the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which
42 the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its
43 grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege,
44 in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege
45 conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the
46 compensation for it.”

47 [[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 \(1876\)](#)]

1 The [injustice \(Form #05.050\)](#), [sophistry](#), and [deception \(Form #05.014\)](#) underlying their welfare state system is that:

- 2 1. Governments don't produce anything, but merely transfer wealth between otherwise private people (see [Separation](#)
- 3 [Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025](#)).
- 4 2. The money they are paying you can never be more than what you paid them, and if it is, then they are abusing their
- 5 taxing powers!

6 **To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and**
7 **with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build**
8 **up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law**
9 **and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.**

10 **Nor is it taxation. 'A tax,' says Webster's Dictionary, 'is a rate or sum of money assessed**
11 **on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.'**
12 **'Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to**
13 **raise money for public purposes.'** Cooley, *Const. Lim.*, 479.

14 *Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa.St. 104 says, very forcibly, 'I*
15 *think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that **taxes are a public***
16 ***imposition, levied by authority of the government for the purposes of carrying on the***
17 ***government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public***
18 ***purpose.'** See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11*
19 *Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon,*
20 *27 Ia., 47; Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra."*
21 [*Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)*]

- 22 3. If they try to pay you more than you paid them, they must make you into a public officer to do so to avoid the
- 23 prohibition of the case above. In doing so, they in most cases must illegally establish a public office and in effect use
- 24 "benefits" to criminally bribe you to illegally impersonate such an office. See [The "Trade or Business" Scam, Form](#)
- 25 [#05.001](#) for details.
- 26 4. Paying you back what was originally your own money and NOTHING more is not a "benefit" or even a loan by them
- 27 to you. If anything, it is a temporary loan by you to them! And it's an unjust loan because they don't have to pay
- 28 interest!
- 29 5. Since you are the real lender, then you are the only real party who can make rules against them and not vice versa. See
- 30 [Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution](#) for where the ability to make those rules comes from.
- 31 6. All franchises are contracts that require mutual consideration and mutual obligation to be enforceable. Since the
- 32 government isn't contractually obligated to provide the main consideration, which is "benefits" and isn't obligated to
- 33 provide ANYTHING that is truly economically valuable beyond that, then the "contract" or "compact" is
- 34 unenforceable against you and can impose no obligations on you based on mere equitable principals of contract law.

35 **"We must conclude that a person covered by the Act has not such a right in benefit**
36 **payments... This is not to say, however, that Congress may exercise its power to modify**
37 **the statutory scheme free of all constitutional restraint."**
38 [*Flemming v. Nestor, 363 U.S. 603 (1960)*]

39 **"... railroad benefits, like social security benefits, are not contractual and may be altered**
40 **or even eliminated at any time."**
41 [*United States Railroad Retirement Board v. Fritz, 449 U.S. 166 (1980)*]

42 For further details on government franchises, see:

- 43 1. [Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online](#), Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "franchise"
- 44 <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/franchise.htm>
- 45 2. [Government Franchises Course](#), Form #12.012
- 46 Slides: <https://sedm.org/LibertyU/GovFranchises.pdf>
- 47 Video: <http://youtu.be/vnDcauqlbTQ>
- 48 3. [Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises](#), Form #05.030
- 49 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>

1 For information on how to avoid franchises, quit them, or use your own PERSONAL franchises to DEFEND yourself against
2 illegal government franchise administration or enforcement, usually against ineligible parties, see:

- 3 1. *Avoiding Traps in Government Forms Course*, Form #12.023
4 <https://sedm.org/LibertyU/AvoidingTrapsGovForms.pdf>
- 5 2. *Path to Freedom*, Form #09.015, Section 5
6 <https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/PathToFreedom.pdf>
- 7 3. *Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement*, Form #06.027
8 <https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/InjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>
- 9 4. *SEDM Forms/Pubs Page*, Section 1.6: Avoiding Government Franchises
10 [https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex-](https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex-Singlepg.htm#1.6)
11 [Singlepg.htm#1.6](https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex-Singlepg.htm#1.6). AVOIDING GOVERNMENT FRANCHISES AND LICENSES
- 12 5. *The Government "Benefits" Scam*, Form #05.040 (Member Subscription form)
13 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 14 6. *Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises*, Form #05.051 (Member Subscription
15 form)
16 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

17 **4.1.11 Frivolous**

18 The word "**frivolous**" as used by the government or on other websites in referring to this website shall mean "correct" and
19 "truthful". Any attempts to call anything on this website incorrect or untruthful must be accompanied by authoritative, court-
20 admissible evidence to support such a conclusion or shall be presumed by the reader to be untrustworthy and untruthful. All
21 such evidence MUST derive EXCLUSIVELY from the consensual civil domicile of the defendant pursuant to [Federal Rule](#)
22 [of Civil Procedure 17\(b\)](#). Parties subject to this agreement stipulate that any violation of this rule is a malicious prosecution
23 and obstruction of justice in violation of [18 U.S.C. §1589\(a\)\(3\)](#). [Click here for details on domicile](#)
24 [\(https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf\)](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf).

25 **4.1.12 Federal Income Tax**

26 The term "federal income tax", in the context of this website, means the revenue scheme described in Subtitle A of the Internal
27 Revenue Code as applied specifically and only to human beings who are not statutory "persons" or "individuals" under federal
28 law and shall NOT refer to businesses or artificial entities. This website does NOT concern itself with businesses or
29 corporations or artificial entities of any description.

30 **4.1.13 Tax**

31 The term "**tax**" includes any method to collect revenues to support ONLY the operation of the government. It does NOT
32 include the abuse of taxing power to transfer wealth between ordinary citizens or residents and when it is used for this purpose
33 it is THEFT, not "taxation".

34 *"The power to tax is, therefore, the strongest, the most pervading of all powers of*
35 *government, reaching directly or indirectly to all classes of the people. It was said by*
36 *Chief Justice Marshall, in the case of McCulloch v. Md., 4 Wheat. 431, that the power*
37 *to tax is the power to destroy. A striking instance of the truth of the proposition is seen in*
38 *the fact that the existing tax of ten per cent, imposed by the United States on the circulation*
39 *of all other banks than the National Banks, drove out of existence every *state bank of*
40 *circulation within a year or two after its passage. This power can be readily employed*
41 *against one class of individuals and in favor of another, so as to ruin the one class and*
42 *give unlimited wealth and prosperity to the other, if there is no implied limitation of the*
43 *uses for which the power may be exercised.*

44 *To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and*
45 *with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build*
46 *up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law*
47 *and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.*

1 Nor is it taxation. 'A tax,' says Webster's Dictionary, 'is a rate or sum of money assessed
2 on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.'
3 'Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to
4 raise money for public purposes.' Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.

5 Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa.St. 104 says, very forcibly, 'I
6 think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that taxes are a public
7 imposition, levied by authority of the government for the purposes of carrying on the
8 government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public
9 purpose.' See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St. 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11
10 Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon,
11 27 Ia., 47; Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra."
12 [Loan Association v. Topeka, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]

13
14 "A tax, in the general understanding of the term and as used in the constitution, signifies
15 an exaction for the support of the government. The word has never thought to connote the
16 expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another."
17 [U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)]

18 "Tax" includes ONLY impositions upon PUBLIC property or franchises ([Form #05.030](#)) and not upon absolutely owned
19 PRIVATE property.

20 1. PRIVATE property must be consensually converted to PUBLIC property before it can be taxed, and the burden of
21 proof rests on the government to prove that it was lawfully converted before it can be subject to tax. See:

[Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025](https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

22 2. The "persons" spoken above are civil statutory PUBLIC "persons" and not PRIVATE humans. See:

[Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf>

23 **4.1.14 Protection**

24 The word "protection" includes only CRIMINAL, constitutional, and common law protection. It excludes every type of
25 government activity, franchise, or program that requires a [predicate civil status \(Form #13.008\) to enforce](#), such as "citizen",
26 "resident", "taxpayer", "spouse", Social Security beneficiary, etc. Every attempt to impose, acquire, or enforce a civil status
27 or to enforce duties upon a civil status NOT related to voting or jury service constitutes the following:

- 28 1. An INJURY and an [INJUSTICE \(Form #05.050\)](#).
- 29 2. [Identity Theft \(Form #05.046\)](#).

30 **4.1.15 Fact**

31 The word "fact" means that which is admissible as evidence in a court of law BECAUSE ENACTED LAW makes it
32 admissible AND because the speaker (other than us) INTENDED for it to be factual. It does NOT imply that we allege that
33 it is factual, actionable, or even truthful. Any attempt by any government to make anything published on this website or
34 anything said by members or officers of the ministry FACTUAL or ACTIONABLE in conflict with this disclaimer is hereby
35 declared and stipulated by all members to be FRAUDULENT, PERJURIOUS, and a willful act of international terrorism
36 and organized extortion.

37 **4.1.16 Statutory**

38 The term "statutory" when used as a prefix to any other term, means that the term it precedes pertains only to federal territory,
39 property, PUBLIC rights, or privileges under the exclusive jurisdiction of the national government. Includes NO private
40 property or people.

4.1.17 Statutory Citizen

The term “statutory citizen” is defined on this website to mean every reference to the word “citizen” in every act of congress OTHER than in [Title 8](#). Title 8 acts as a substitute for the Constitution for the purposes of only citizenship within territories and/or possessions OR abroad. [Fourteenth Amendment/CONSTITUTIONAL](#) citizenship is NOWHERE described or referenced in in [Title 8](#) of the U.S. Code. Statutes in [Title 8](#) are not necessary to define or authorize citizenship for people in states of the Union:

*“Finally, this Court is mindful of the years of past practice in which territorial citizenship has been treated as a statutory [PRIVILEGE!], and not a constitutional, right. In the unincorporated territories of Puerto Rico, Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands, birthright citizenship was conferred upon their inhabitants by various statutes many years after the United States acquired them. See Amicus Br. at 10-11. **If the Citizenship Clause [of the Fourteenth Amendment] guaranteed birthright citizenship in unincorporated territories, these statutes would have been unnecessary.** While longstanding practice is not sufficient to demonstrate constitutionality, such a practice requires special scrutiny before being set aside. See, e.g., *Jackman v. Rosenbaum Co.*, 260 U.S. 22, 31 (1922) (Holmes, J.) (“If a thing has been practiced for two hundred years by common consent, it will need a strong case for the [Fourteenth Amendment](#) to affect it[.]”); *Walz v. Tax Comm’n*, 397 U.S. 664, 678 (1970) (“It is obviously correct that no one acquires a vested or protected right in violation of the Constitution by long use . . . Yet an unbroken practice . . . is not something to be lightly cast aside.”). And while Congress cannot take away the citizenship of individuals covered by the Citizenship Clause [of the Fourteenth Amendment], it can bestow citizenship upon those not within the Constitution’s breadth. See [U.S. Const. art. IV, § 3, cl. 2](#) (“Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory belonging to the United States[**].”); *id.* At [art. I, § 8, cl. 4](#) (Congress may “establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization . . .”). To date, Congress has not seen fit to bestow birthright citizenship upon American Samoa, and in accordance with the law, this Court must and will respect that choice.”*
[\[Tuaua v. U.S.A., 951 F.Supp.2d. 88 \(2013\)\]](#)

Note the following in the above:

“If the Citizenship Clause [of the [Fourteenth Amendment](#)] guaranteed birthright citizenship in unincorporated territories, these statutes would have been unnecessary.”

All statutory statutes in [Title 8](#) are therefore POLITICAL statuses rather than CIVIL statuses. For the meaning of "civil status", see:

[Civil Status \(Important!\)-SEDM](#)
<https://sedm.org/litigation-main/civil-status/>

However, the political status imputed in Title 8 ("citizen" and/or "national") is not that mentioned in the Constitution. The constitution does not apply on federal territory with the exception of [Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17](#) except insofar as Congress legislatively allows it to apply. Once it is made to apply, that constitutional provision which is legislatively applied cannot be legislatively revoked, because Constitutional rights cannot be legislatively revoked and are private property.

“[T]he Constitution is applicable to territories acquired by purchase or conquest only when and so far as Congress shall so direct”
[\[Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244, 279 \(1901\)\]](#)

All titles of the U.S. Code OTHER than [Title 8](#) and which are CIVIL in nature limit themselves to domiciled parties against whom statutory civil law may lawfully be enforced per [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17\(b\)](#). The origin of civil statutory enforcement authority is domicile on federal territory or representing an entity or office domiciled there (such as "person"). Thus, all such parties must be at least domiciled on federal territory to civilly enforce. And, one can't have a domicile without physical presence there at some point in time. See:

4.1.18 Constitutional

The term "constitutional" when used as a prefix to any other term, means that the term it precedes pertains only to land, property, rights, or privileges under the exclusive jurisdiction of a state of the Union and not within the civil or criminal jurisdiction of the national government.

4.1.19 Law Practice

The terms "law practice" or "practice of law":

1. Exclude any and all statutory references to said term in any state or federal statute.
2. Exclude any use of these terms found in any rule of court.
3. Exclude any litigation in which the party "practicing" is representing either a government instrumentality or acting as an officer for said instrumentality such as a statutory "taxpayer" (under the Internal Revenue Code), "driver" (under the vehicle code), "spouse" (under the family code), or "benefit recipient" (under any entitlement program, including Social Security).
4. Include litigation involving ONLY the protection of EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE rights beyond the jurisdiction of any de jure government.

4.1.20 Sovereign

The word "sovereign" when referring to humans or governments means all the following:

1. A human being and NOT a "government". Only human beings are "sovereign" and only when they are acting in strict obedience to the laws of their religion. All powers of government are delegated from the PEOPLE and are NOT "divine rights". Those powers in turn are only operative when government PREVENTS the conversion of PRIVATE rights into PUBLIC rights. When that goal is avoided or undermined or when law is used to accomplish involuntary conversion, we cease to have a government and instead end up with [a private, de facto for profit corporation that has no sovereign immunity and cannot abuse sovereign immunity to protect its criminal thefts from the people](#).
2. EQUAL in every respect to any and every government or actor in government. All governments are legal "persons" and under our Constitutional system, ALL "persons" are equal and can only become UNEQUAL in relation to each other WITH their EXPRESS and NOT IMPLIED consent. Since our Constitutional rights are unalienable per the Declaration of Independence, then we can't become unequal in relation to any government, INCLUDING through our consent.
3. Not superior in any way to any human being within the jurisdiction of the courts of any country.
4. Possessing the EQUAL right to acquire rights over others by the same mechanisms as the government uses. For instance, if the government encourages the filing of FALSE information returns that essentially "elect" people into public office without their consent, then we have an EQUAL right to elect any and every government or officer within government into our PERSONAL service as our PERSONAL officer without THEIR consent. See:

Correcting Erroneous Information Returns, Form #04.001
<http://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/0-CorrErrInfoRtns/CorrErrInfoRtns.pdf>

5. Subject to the criminal laws of the jurisdiction they are physically situated in, just like everyone else. This provision excludes "quasi-criminal provisions" within civil franchises, such as tax crimes.
6. The origin of all authority delegated to the government per the Declaration of Independence.
7. Reserving all rights and delegating NONE to any and every government or Government Actor. U.C.C. §1-308 and its predecessor, U.C.C. §1-207.
8. Not consenting to any and every civil franchise offered by any government.
9. Possessing the same sovereign immunity as any government. Hence, like the government, any Government Actor asserting a liability or obligation has the burden of proving on the record of any court proceeding EXPRESS WRITTEN consent to be sued before the obligation becomes enforceable.
10. Claiming no civil or franchise status under any statutory franchise, including but not limited to "citizen", "resident", "driver" (under the vehicle code), "spouse" (under the family code), "taxpayer" (under the tax code). Any attempt to

1 associate a statutory status and the public rights it represents against a non-consenting party is THEFT and SLAVERY
2 and INJUSTICE.

- 3 11. Acting as a fiduciary, agent, and trustee on behalf of God 24 hours a day, seven days a week as an ambassador of a
4 legislatively foreign jurisdiction and as a public officer of "Heaven, Inc.", a private foreign corporation. God is the
5 ONLY "sovereign" and the source of all sovereignty. We must be acting as His agent and fiduciary before we can
6 exercise any sovereignty at all. Any attempt by so-called "government" to interfere with our ability to act as His
7 fiduciaries is a direct interference with our right to contract and the free exercise of religion. See:

Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/DelOfAuthority.pdf>

- 8 12. Capable of being civilly sued ONLY under the common law and equity and not under any statutory civil law. All
9 statutory civil laws are law for government and public officers, and NOT for private human beings. They are civil
10 franchises that only acquire the "force of law" with the consent of the subject. See:

Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf>

- 11 13. Protected from the civil statutory law by the First Amendment requirement for separation of church and state because
12 we Christians are the church and our physical body is the "temple" of the church. See: [1 Cor. 6:19](#).
13 14. Responsible for all the injuries they cause to every other person under equity and common law ONLY, and not under
14 civil statutory law.

15 4.1.21 Anarchy

16 The term "anarchy" implies any one or more of the following, and especially as regards so-called "governments". An
17 important goal of this site it to eliminate all such "anarchy":

- 18 1. Are superior in any way to the people they govern UNDER THE LAW.
19 2. Are not directly accountable to the people or the law. They prohibit the PEOPLE from criminally prosecuting their
20 own crimes, reserving the right to prosecute to their own fellow criminals. Who polices the police? THE
21 CRIMINALS.
22 3. Enact laws that exempt themselves. This is a violation of the Constitutional requirement for equal protection and equal
23 treatment and constitutes an unconstitutional Title of Nobility in violation of Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the
24 United States Constitution.
25 4. Only enforce the law against others and NOT themselves, as a way to protect their own criminal activities by
26 persecuting dissidents. This is called "selective enforcement". In the legal field it is also called "professional
27 courtesy". Never kill the goose that lays the STOLEN golden eggs.
28 5. Break the laws with impunity. This happens most frequently when corrupt people in government engage in "selective
29 enforcement", whereby they refuse to prosecute or interfere with the prosecution of anyone in government. The
30 Department of Justice (D.O.J.) or the District Attorney are the most frequent perpetrators of this type of crime.
31 6. Are able to choose which laws they want to be subject to, and thus refuse to enforce laws against themselves. The
32 most frequent method for this type of abuse is to assert sovereign, official, or judicial immunity as a defense in order to
33 protect the wrongdoers in government when they are acting outside their delegated authority, or outside what the
34 definitions in the statutes EXPRESSLY allow.
35 7. Impute to themselves more rights or methods of acquiring rights than the people themselves have. In other words, who
36 are the object of PAGAN IDOL WORSHIP because they possess "supernatural" powers. By "supernatural", we mean
37 that which is superior to the "natural", which is ordinary human beings.
38 8. Claim and protect their own sovereign immunity, but refuse to recognize the same EQUAL immunity of the people
39 from whom that power was delegated to begin with. Hypocrites.
40 9. Abuse sovereign immunity to exclude either the government or anyone working in the government from being subject
41 to the laws they pass to regulate everyone ELSE'S behavior. In other words, they can choose WHEN they want to be a
42 statutory "person" who is subject, and when they aren't. Anyone who has this kind of choice will ALWAYS corruptly
43 exclude themselves and include everyone else, and thereby enforce and implement an unconstitutional "Title of
44 Nobility" towards himself. On this subject, the U.S. Supreme Court has held the following:

45 **"No man in this country [including legislators of the government as a legal person] is so**
46 **high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with**
47 **impunity. All the officers of the government, from the highest to the lowest, are creatures**
48 **of the law and are bound to obey it. It is the only supreme power in our system of**
49 **government, and every man who by accepting office participates in its functions is only the**
50 **more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy, and to observe the limitations which it**

1 imposes upon the exercise of the authority which it gives," 106 U.S., at 220. "Shall it be
2 said... that the courts cannot give remedy when the Citizen has been deprived of his
3 property by force, his estate seized and converted to the use of the government **without any**
4 **lawful authority, without any process of law, and without any compensation, because the**
5 **president has ordered it and his officers are in possession? If such be the law of this**
6 **country, it sanctions a tyranny which has no existence in the monarchies of Europe, nor**
7 **in any other government which has a just claim to well-regulated liberty and the**
8 **protection of personal rights," 106 U.S., at 220, 221.**
9 [*United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 1 S.Ct. 240 (1882)*]

- 10 10. Have a monopoly on anything, INCLUDING "protection", and who turn that monopoly into a mechanism to force
11 EVERYONE illegally to be treated as uncompensated public officers in exchange for the "privilege" of being able to
12 even exist or earn a living to support oneself.
- 13 11. Can tax and spend any amount or percentage of the people's earnings over the OBJECTIONS of the people.
- 14 12. Can print, meaning illegally counterfeit, as much money as they want to fund their criminal enterprise, and thus to be
15 completely free from accountability to the people.
- 16 13. Deceive and/or lie to the public with impunity by telling you that you can't trust anything they say, but force YOU to
17 sign everything under penalty of perjury when you want to talk to them. 26 U.S.C. §6065.

18 In support of the above definition of "anarchy", here is how the U.S. Supreme Court defined it:

19 *"Decency, security, and liberty alike demand that **government officials shall be subjected***
20 ***to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the citizen.** In a government of laws,*
21 *existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously.*
22 ***Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the***
23 ***whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a***
24 ***lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto***
25 ***himself; it invites anarchy.** To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the*
26 *end justifies the means-to declare that the government may commit crimes in order to*
27 *secure the conviction of a private criminal-would bring terrible retribution. Against that*
28 *pernicious doctrine this court should resolutely set its face."*
29 [*Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438 (1928)*]

30 The above requirements are a consequence of the fact that the foundation of the United States Constitution is [EQUAL](#)
31 [protection and EQUAL treatment](#). Any attempt to undermine equal rights and equal protection described above constitutes:

- 32 1. The establishment of a state sponsored religion in violation of the First Amendment and the Religious Freedom
33 Restoration Act, 42 U.S.C. Chapter 21B. That religion is described in: [Socialism: The New American Civil Religion,](#)
34 [Form #05.016](#). The object of worship of such a religion is imputing "supernatural powers" to civil rulers and forcing
35 everyone to worship and serve said rulers as "superior beings".
- 36 2. The establishment of an unconstitutional Title of Nobility in violation of [Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the United](#)
37 [States Constitution](#).

38 For court admissible proof that your CIVIL government is the MAIN and most damaging type of anarchist in modern society,
39 both from a legal perspective and a theological perspective, see:

[Your Irresponsible, Lawless, and Anarchist Beast Government, Form #05.054](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/YourIrresponsibleLawlessGov.pdf)
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/YourIrresponsibleLawlessGov.pdf>

40 **4.1.22 Political**

41 The term "political" as used throughout our website in reference to us or our activities:

- 42 1. Excludes the endorsement of specific candidates for political office.
- 43 2. Excludes any motivation that might result in a revocation of 26 U.S.C. §501(c)(4) status.
- 44 3. Excludes activities of public officers or agents of the government.
- 45 4. Excludes those who are "persons", "individuals", "taxpayers" under any revenue law.

- 1 5. Excludes those with a domicile or residence "in this State", meaning the government.
- 2 6. Includes efforts to educate the public about the law and the legal limits upon the jurisdiction of those in the
- 3 government.
- 4 7. Includes ONLY EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE people beyond the [civil legislative control](#) of the specific government
- 5 affected by the policy.
- 6 8. Involves the protection of purely private property and private rights exclusively owned by human beings and not
- 7 businesses or artificial entities of any description.
- 8 9. Includes activities undertaken ONLY in the fulfillment of [purely religious goals as a full time fiduciary of God under](#)
- 9 [the Bible trust indenture](#).

10 **4.1.23 Non-citizen national**

11 The term "non-citizen national" MEANS a human being born in a constitutional state and domiciled or at least physically
12 present there. These people are described in [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#). They are STATUTORY "non-resident non-persons" as
13 described in [Non-Resident Non-Person Position, Form #05.020](#). It DOES NOT mean or include those who are:

- 14 1. [Domiciled](#) either abroad or on federal territory.
- 15 2. Statutory "nationals and citizens of the United States[**] at birth" per [8 U.S.C. §1401](#). These people are born in federal
- 16 territories exclusively.
- 17 3. Statutory "national but not citizen of the United States[**] at birth" per [8 U.S.C. §1408](#). These people are born in
- 18 federal possessions such as Puerto Rico.
- 19 4. Statutory "citizens of the United States[**]" per [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(22\)\(A\)](#).
- 20 5. Statutory "national of the United States [**]" per [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(22\)](#).

21 **4.1.24 State national**

22 The term "state national" means those who are:

- 23 1. Born in a Constitutional but not Statutory "State" as described in the Fourteenth Amendment or the original
- 24 constitution.
- 25 2. Standing on land protected by the Constitution and/or the organic law and therefore possessing natural and
- 26 Constitutional and PRIVATE rights as documented in:

Enumeration of Inalienable Rights, Form #10.002 https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/EnumRights.pdf
--
- 27 3. Not claiming any government statutory privilege, immunity, exemption, "benefit", domicile, or civil statutory
- 28 protection in the context of a specific interaction and reserving all rights per U.C.C. §1-308.
- 29 4. Invoking ONLY the common law, the criminal law, God's laws, and the national and state Bill of Rights or
- 30 constitutional rights for their protection in a court of law. They are therefore NOT "anarchists" who reject ALL
- 31 law. Instead, they only reject that subset of law (the CIVIL STATUTORY law) that acquires the "force of law"
- 32 from their consent in some form, whether express or implied.
- 33 5. Reject the statutory terms "citizen", "resident", or "person" and the use of the word "citizenship" in ANY context
- 34 in describing themselves. Instead, they insist on the consistent use of "nationality" and "domicile" to describe
- 35 their degree of POLITICAL and CIVIL/LEGAL membership in the communities they live in respectively.
- 36 Domicile, in turn, is VOLUNTARY and cannot be compelled, except possibly in a probate proceeding involving
- 37 a DEAD person with no rights. POLITICAL membership conveys NO civil enforcement authority. Only
- 38 CIVIL/LEGAL membership can, and it must be voluntary.
- 39 6. Owing allegiance to THE PEOPLE as individuals and sovereigns occupying the land within the state, and not to
- 40 the government that serves them under the constitution as the delegation of authority order. "State" in a political
- 41 sense always refers to PEOPLE occupying land and never to GOVERNMENTS or government corporations. In
- 42 biblical terms, that allegiance is called "love" and it is commanded by God in Matt. 22:34-40. God NEVER
- 43 commands Christians to love governments or civil rulers and often tells people to DISOBEY them when they
- 44 violate the Bible as their delegation of authority order (Form #13.007).

45 Equivalent to a "non-citizen national of the United States OF AMERICA" or a "free inhabitant" under the Articles
46 of Confederation. EXCLUDES any of the following:

1. STATUTORY "person" under [26 U.S.C. §6671](#)(b) and [§7343](#).
2. Statutory "national and citizen of the United States** at birth" as defined in [8 U.S.C. §1401](#). This is a territorial citizen rather than a state citizen.
3. "citizen of the United States**[federal zone]" under [26 U.S.C. §911](#), 26 U.S.C. §3121(e), or [26 C.F.R. §1.1-1](#)(c).
4. "National but not citizen of the United States** at birth" under [8 U.S.C. §1408](#). This is a person born in a federal possession RATHER than a state of the Union.
5. "U.S.[**] non-citizen national" under [8 U.S.C. §1452](#). This is a person born in a federal possession RATHER than a state of the Union.
6. STATUTORY "U.S. person" as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701](#)(a)(30), which is a human being born and domiciled on federal territory not within the exclusive jurisdiction of any Constitutional state.

The term is a SUBSET of the term "American National" as used by the Department of State in [8 U.S.C. §1502](#) because it:

1. Excludes citizens or nationals within territories or possessions or those born abroad.
2. Includes ONLY those born or naturalized within a constitutional state of the Union.

We make this distinction because we don't want to be in a position of "purposefully availing oneself" of commerce within the exclusive jurisdiction of the national government and thereby make ourselves a target of "selective or UNJUST enforcement". This is also consistent with the SEDM opening page, which says:

*"Our goal is to inspire, empower, motivate, and educate mainly those born or naturalized in the [USA \(and NOT "U.S."\)](#) and who are Members in how to love, honor, obey, glorify, and lift up our Sovereign Lord above every man, king, ruler, government, and [Earthly law](#) at a personal and very practical level and in every area of our lives. This is the essence of our religious worship and the essence, according to the Bible, of how we love our God."
[SEDM Opening Page; <http://sedm.org>]*

"state" for a foreign national = the country of which that person is a national. "state" for an American National is the United States of America, or just America. "state" is not defined in 8 U.S.C. although "State" is defined in [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(36\)](#) and they are NOT equivalent. See [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#) for another reference to a "state national". Remember the context of [8 U.S.C. §1101](#) is immigration and nationality. So when we speak of a state in this context, we are talking about international states. In that context, American nationality (or U.S. nationality) is what we are---nationality of California is meaningless in this context. So to say you are a national of California is to say you are a national of the United States[***] OF AMERICA or an American National.

For the purposes of "State", the following definition applies:

State

*As a noun, a people permanently occupying a fixed territory bound together by common habits and custom into one body politic exercising, through the medium of an organized government, independent sovereignty and control over all persons and things within its boundaries, capable of making war and peace and of entering into international relations with other states. The section of territory occupied by one of the United States. The people of a state, in their collective capacity, considered as the party wronged by a criminal deed; the public; as in the title of a case, "The State v. A. B." The circumstances or condition of a being or thing at a given time.
[The Free Dictionary, Farlex; SOURCE: <https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/state>]*

"State national" is NOT a statutory term and is not commonly used by courts of law. Therefore, if you invoke it in government correspondence or in litigation, you should take great care to define it BEFORE invoking it so that you do not invite charges of being "frivolous".

4.1.25 "Non-Person" or "Non-Resident Non-Person"

The term "[non-person](#)" or "[non-resident non-person](#)" ([Form #05.020](#)) as used on this site we define to be a human who is all of the following:

1. Not domiciled on federal territory and not representing a corporate or governmental office that is so domiciled under [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17](#). See [Form #05.002](#) for details.
2. Not engaged in a public office within any government. This includes the civil office of "person", "individual", "citizen", or "resident". See [Form #05.037](#) and [Form #05.042](#) for court-admissible proof that statutory "persons", "individuals", "citizens", and "residents" are public offices.
3. Not "purposefully or consensually availing themselves" of commerce with any government. Therefore, they do not waive sovereign immunity under the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act \(FSIA\), 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97](#).
4. Obligations and Rights in relation to Governments:
 - 4.1. Waives any and all privileges and immunities of any civil status and all rights or "entitlements" to receive "benefits" or "civil services" from any government. It is a maxim of law that [REAL de jure governments \(Form #05.043\)](#) MUST give you the right to not receive or be eligible to receive "benefits" of any kind. See Form #05.040 for a description of the SCAM of abusing "benefits" to destroy sovereignty. The reason is because they MUST guarantee your right to be self-governing and self-supporting:

Invito beneficium non datur.

No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 69. But if he does not dissent he will be considered as assenting. Vide Assent.

Potest quis renunciare pro se, et suis, juri quod pro se introductum est.

A man may relinquish, for himself and his heirs, a right which was introduced for his own benefit. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.

Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se inducto.

Any one may renounce a law introduced for his own benefit. To this rule there are some exceptions. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.

[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;

SOURCE:

<http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm/>

- 4.2. Because they are not in receipt of or eligible to receive property or benefits from the government, they owe no CIVIL STATUTORY obligations to that government or any STATUTORY "citizen" or STATUTORY "resident", as "obligations" are described in [California Civil Code Section 1428](#). This means they are not party to any contracts or compacts and have injured NO ONE as injury is defined NOT by statute, but by the common law. See [Form #12.040](#) for further details on the definition of "obligations".
- 4.3. Because they owe no statutory civil obligations, the definition of "justice" REQUIRES that they MUST be left alone by the government. See [Form #05.050](#) for a description of "justice".
5. For the purposes of citizenship on government forms:
 - 5.1. STATUTORY "[citizen](#)" and "[resident](#)" are PUBLIC OFFICES and fictions of law within the national government and not human beings. Whenever [CIVIL STATUTORY obligations \(Form #12.040\)](#) attach to a [civil status \(Form #13.008\)](#) such as "citizen", "resident", or "person", then the civil or legal status has to be voluntary or else unconstitutional involuntary servitude is the result in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment. President Obama even admitted that "citizen" is a public office in his Farewell Address. See [SEDM Exhibit #01.018](#) for proof. You have a RIGHT to not be an officer of the government WITHOUT even PAY! They even make you PAY for the privilege with income taxation, because the tax is imposed upon STATUTORY "[citizen](#)" and "[resident](#)" in [26 C.F.R. §1.1-1\(a\)](#). Who else can institute SLAVERY like that and why can't you do that to THEM if we are all REALLY equal ([Form #05.033](#)) as the Constitution requires?
 - 5.2. Does NOT identify as a STATUTORY "citizen" ([8 U.S.C. §1401](#) and [26 C.F.R. §1.1-1\(c\)](#)), "resident" (alien under [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#)), "U.S. citizen" (not defined in any statute), "U.S. resident" (not defined in any statute), or "U.S. person" ([26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#)).
 - 5.3. Identifies themselves as a "national" per [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#) and per common law by virtue of birth or naturalization within the CONSTITUTIONAL "United States****".
 - 5.4. Is NOT an "alien individual" in [26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1\(c\)\(3\)\(i\)](#) because a "[national](#)" under [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#) or "U.S. national" under [22 C.F.R. §51.1](#) owing allegiance to a state of the Union and not the national or federal government. Thus, they are not subject to the presence test under [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)](#) and may not lawfully be kidnapped into exclusive national government jurisdiction as a privileged alien "resident" or have a privileged "residence" ([26 C.F.R. §1.871-2\(b\)](#)) within the EITHER the statutory geographical "United States" in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#) and (a)(10) or "United States*" the COUNTRY in [26 C.F.R. §301.7701\(b\)-1\(c\)\(2\)](#).

- 1 5.5. Is legislatively but not constitutionally "[foreign](#)" and "[alien](#)" to the national government by virtue of not having a
2 [domicile](#) (for nationals under [8 U.S.C. §1101\(a\)\(21\)](#)) or "[residence](#)" (for "alien individuals" under [26 C.F.R.](#)
3 [§1.871-2\(b\)](#)) within the exclusive legislative jurisdiction of the national government. The words "[foreign](#)" and
4 "[alien](#)" by themselves are NOT defined within the Internal Revenue Code. This is MALICIOUSLY deliberate so
5 as to DECEIVE the American public in states of the Union into FALSELY declaring a [domicile](#) or [residence](#)
6 within the exclusive jurisdiction of the national government. By using "and subject to ITS jurisdiction" after the
7 word "citizen" in [26 C.F.R. §1.1-1\(c\)](#), the average American in states of the Union is deceived using equivocation
8 into VOLUNTEERING for a civil STATUTORY office under the Secretary of the Treasury called "citizen" and
9 "resident" subject to exclusive national government jurisdiction. The "citizen" in this regulation is NOT the
10 POLITICAL citizen mentioned in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, but a STATUTORY citizen
11 legislatively created and owned by Congress and thus a PRIVILEGE. Those in states of the Union who have
12 neither a [domicile](#) nor [residence](#) within the exclusive jurisdiction of the national government and are not "subject
13 to ITS jurisdiction" and who FALSELY CLAIM on a government form (Form #12.023) such as a W-9 that they
14 are STATUTORY "[U.S. persons](#)" have in practical effect VOLUNTEERED to become privileged STATUTORY
15 "[taxpayers](#)" and uncompensated officers of the national government EVERYWHERE IN THE WORLD who are
16 on duty 24 hours a day, 7 days a week per [26 C.F.R. §1.1-1\(a\)](#)! The corrupt, covetous government WANTS this
17 process of volunteering to be invisible in order to VICTIMIZE the Americans into becoming surety to pay off an
18 endless mountain of public debt that there is NO LIMIT on. That's criminal peonage in violation of [18 U.S.C.](#)
19 [§1581](#) if you knew you could unvolunteer and aren't allowed to. It's also criminal human trafficking. You can't
20 UNVOLUNTEER and leave the system until you know HOW you volunteered in the first place. See "[Hot Issues:](#)
21 [Invisible Consent](#)" for details on how your consent was procured INVISIBLY. That process of volunteering to
22 pay income tax that state nationals don't owe is exhaustively described in: [How State Nationals Volunteer to Pay](#)
23 [Income Tax](#), Form #08.024; <https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf>.
- 24 6. Earnings originate from outside:
- 25 6.1. The STATUTORY "[United States**](#)" as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\) and \(a\)\(10\)](#) (federal zone) and
26 6.2. The U.S. government federal corporation as a privileged legal fiction.
27 Thus, their earnings are expressly EXCLUDED rather than EXEMPTED from "[gross income](#)" under [26 U.S.C. §871](#)
28 and are a "foreign estate" under [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(31\)](#). See [26 U.S.C. §872](#) and [26 C.F.R. §1.872-2\(f\)](#) and [26 C.F.R.](#)
29 [§1.871-7\(a\)\(4\)](#) and [26 U.S.C. §861\(a\)\(3\)\(C\)\(i\)](#) for proof.
- 30 7. Earnings are expressly EXCLUDED rather than EXEMPTED from STATUTORY "[wages](#)" as defined in [26 U.S.C.](#)
31 [§3401\(a\)](#) because all services performed outside the STATUTORY "[United States**](#)" as defined in [26 U.S.C.](#)
32 [§7701\(a\)\(9\) and \(a\)\(10\)](#) (federal zone) and the CORPORATION "United States" as a legal fiction. Therefore, not
33 subject to "wage" withholding of any kind for such services per:
- 34 7.1. [26 C.F.R. §31.3401\(a\)\(6\)-1\(b\)](#) in the case of income tax.
35 7.2. [26 C.F.R. §31.3121\(b\)-3\(c\)\(1\)](#) in the case of Social Security.
- 36 8. Expressly EXCLUDED rather than EXEMPTED from income tax reporting under:
- 37 8.1. [26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1\(b\)\(5\)\(i\)](#).
38 8.2. [26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1\(e\)\(1\)\(ii\)\(A\)\(1\)](#).
39 8.3. [26 C.F.R. §1.6041-4\(a\)\(1\)](#).
- 40 9. Expressly EXCLUDED rather than EXEMPTED from backup withholding because earnings are not reportable by [26](#)
41 [U.S.C. §3406](#) and [26 C.F.R. §31.3406\(g\)-1\(e\)](#). Only "reportable payments" are subject to such withholding.
- 42 10. Because they are EXCLUDED rather than EXEMPTED from income tax reporting and therefore withholding, they
43 have no "taxable income".
- 44 10.1. Only reportable income is taxable.
45 10.2. There is NO WAY provided within the Internal Revenue Code to make earnings not connected to a [statutory](#)
46 ["trade or business"/public office \(Form #05.001\)](#) under [26 U.S.C. §6041](#) reportable.
47 10.3. The only way to make earnings of a nonresident alien not engaged in the "trade or business" franchise taxable
48 under [26 U.S.C. §871\(a\)](#) is therefore only when the PAYOR is lawfully engaged in a "trade or business" but the
49 PAYEE is not. This situation would have to involve the U.S. government ONLY and not private parties in the
50 states of the Union. The information returns would have to be a [Form 1042s](#). It is a crime under [18 U.S.C. §91](#) for
51 a private party to occupy a public office or to impersonate a public office, and Congress cannot establish public
52 offices within the exclusive jurisdiction of the states of the Union to tax them, according to the [License Tax](#)
53 [Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 68 S.Ct. 331 \(1866\)](#).
- 54 11. Continue to be a "[national of the United States**](#)" ([Form #05.006](#)) and not lose their CONSTITUTIONAL citizenship
55 while filing form 1040NR. See [26 U.S.C. §873\(b\)\(3\)](#). They do NOT need to "expatriate" their nationality to file as a
56 "nonresident alien" and will not satisfy the conditions in [26 U.S.C. §877](#) (expatriation to avoid tax). Expatriation is loss
57 of NATIONALITY, and NOT loss of STATUTORY "citizen" status under [8 U.S.C. §1401](#).
- 58 12. If they submit the [SEDM Form W-8SUB, Form #04.231](#) to control withholding and revoke their Form W-4, then they:

- 1 12.1. Can submit [SSA Form 7008](#) to correct your SSA earnings to zero them out. See [SEDM Form #06.042](#).
- 2 12.2. Can use [IRS Form 843](#) to request a full refund or abatement of all FICA and Medicare taxes withheld if the
- 3 employer or business associate continues to file W-2 forms or withhold against your wishes. See [SEDM Form](#)
- 4 [#06.044](#).
- 5 13. Are eligible to replace the SSN with a TEMPORARY Individual Taxpayer Identification Number (ITIN) that expires
- 6 AUTOMATICALLY every year and is therefore NOT permanent and changes. If you previously applied for an SSN
- 7 and were ineligible to participate, you can terminate the SSN and replace it with the ITIN. If you can't prove you were
- 8 ineligible for Social Security, then they will not allow you to replace the SSN with an ITIN. See:
- 9 13.1. [Form W-7](#) for the application.
- 10 <https://www.irs.gov/forms-pubs/about-form-w-7>
- 11 13.2. [Understanding Your IRS Individual Taxpayer Identification Number, Publication 1915](#)
- 12 <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p1915.pdf>
- 13 13.3. [Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001](#) for proof that no one within the exclusive
- 14 jurisdiction of a constitutional state of the Union is eligible for Social Security.
- 15 <https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/SSNotEligible.pdf>
- 16 14. Must file the paper version of IRS Form 1040NR, because there are no electronic online providers that automate the
- 17 preparation of the form or allow you to attach the forms necessary to submit a complete and accurate return that
- 18 correctly reflects your status. This is in part because the IRS doesn't want to make it easy or convenient to leave their
- 19 slave plantation.
- 20 15. Is a SUBSET of "[nonresident aliens](#)" who are not required to have or to use Social Security Numbers (SSNs) or
- 21 Taxpayer Identification Numbers (TINs) in connection with tax withholding or reporting. They are expressly excluded
- 22 from this requirement by:
- 23 15.1. [31 C.F.R. §1020.410\(b\)\(3\)\(x\)](#) .
- 24 <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/31/1020.410>
- 25 15.2. [26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1\(b\)\(2\)](#) .
- 26 <https://www.law.cornell.edu/cfr/text/26/301.6109-1>
- 27 15.3. [W-8BEN Inst. p. 1.2,4,5 \(Cat 25576H\)](#).
- 28 <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/iw8ben.pdf>
- 29 15.4. [Instructions for the Requesters of Forms W-8BEN, W-8BEN-E, W-8ECI, W-8EXP, and W-8IMY, p. 1.2,6 \(Cat](#)
- 30 [26698G\)](#).
- 31 <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/iw8.pdf>
- 32 15.5. [Pub 515 Inst. p. 7 \(Cat. No 16029L\)](#).
- 33 <https://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-pdf/p515.pdf>
- 34 More on SSNs and TINs at:
- 35 [About SSNs and TINs on Government Forms and Correspondence, Form #05.012](#)
- 36 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/AboutSSNsAndTINs.pdf>
- 37 [About SSNs and TINs on Government Forms and Correspondence, Form #04.104](#)
- 38 <https://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/1-Procedure/AboutSSNs/AboutSSNs.htm>

39 They are "non-persons" BY VIRTUE of not benefitting from any civil statutory privilege and therefore being "PRIVATE".

40 By "privilege", we mean ANY of the things described in [5 U.S.C. 553\(a\)\(2\)](#):

41 [5 U.S. Code § 553 - Rule making](#)

42 *(a) This section applies, according to the provisions thereof, except to the extent that there*

43 *is involved—*

44 *[. . .]*

45 *(2) a matter relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans,*

46 *grants, benefits, or contracts.*

47 The above items all have in common that they are PROPERTY coming under [Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2](#) of the Constitution

48 that is loaned or possessed or granted temporarily to a human being with legal strings attached. Thus, Congress has direct

49 legislative jurisdiction not only over the property itself, but over all those who USE, BENEFIT FROM, or HAVE such

50 property physically in their custody or within their temporary control. We remind the reader that Congress enjoys control

51 over their own property NO MATTER WHERE it physically is, including states of the Union, and that it is the MAIN source

52 of their legislative jurisdiction within the exclusive jurisdiction of Constitutional states of the Union!:

1 [United States Constitution](#)
2 [Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2](#)

3 *The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations*
4 *respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in*
5 *this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or*
6 *of any particular State.*

7
8 **“The Constitution permits Congress to dispose of and to make all needful rules and**
9 **regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.**
10 **This power applies as well to territory belonging to the United States within the States,**
11 **as beyond them. It comprehends all the public domain, wherever it may be. The**
12 **argument is, that the power to make ‘ALL needful rules and regulations’ ‘is a power**
13 **of legislation,’ ‘a full legislative power;’ ‘that it includes all subjects of legislation in**
14 **the territory,’ and is without any limitations, except the positive prohibitions which**
15 **affect all the powers of Congress. Congress may then regulate or prohibit slavery upon**
16 **the public domain within the new States, and such a prohibition would permanently affect**
17 **the capacity of a slave, whose master might carry him to it. And why not? Because no**
18 **power has been conferred on Congress. This is a conclusion universally admitted. But the**
19 **power to ‘make rules and regulations respecting the territory’ is not restrained by**
20 **State lines, nor are there any constitutional prohibitions upon its exercise in the**
21 **domain of the United States within the States; and whatever rules and regulations**
22 **respecting territory Congress may constitutionally make are supreme, and are not**
23 **dependent on the situs of ‘the territory.’”**
24 *[Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 U.S. 393, 509-510 (1856)]*

25 By property, we mean all the things listed in [5 U.S.C. §553\(a\)\(2\)](#) such as SSNs (property of the government per [20 C.F.R.](#)
26 [§422.103\(d\)](#)), contracts (which are property), physical property, chattel property, "benefits", "offices", [civil statuses](#),
27 privileges, civil statutory remedies, etc. A "[public office](#)" is, after all, legally defined as someone in charge of the PROPERTY
28 of the "public",

29 **“Public office. The right, authority, and duty created and conferred by law, by which for**
30 **a given period, either fixed by law or enduring at the pleasure of the creating power, an**
31 **individual is invested with some portion of the sovereign functions of government for the**
32 **benefit of the public. Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58. An agency for the**
33 **state, the duties of which involve in their performance the exercise of some portion of the**
34 **sovereign power, either great or small. Yaselli v. Goff, C.C.A., 12 F.2d. 396, 403, 56 A.L.R.**
35 **1239; Lacey v. State, 13 Ala.App. 212, 68 So. 706, 710; Curtin v. State, 61 Cal.App. 377,**
36 **214 P. 1030, 1035; Shelmadine v. City of Elkhart, 75 Ind.App. 493, 129 N.E. 878. State ex**
37 **rel. Colorado River Commission v. Frohmiller, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486. Where,**
38 **by virtue of law, a person is clothed, not as an incidental or transient authority, but**
39 **for such time as de- notes duration and continuance, with Independent power to**
40 **control the property of the public, or with public functions to be exercised in the**
41 **supposed interest of the people, the service to be compensated by a stated yearly salary,**
42 **and the occupant having a designation or title, the position so created is a public office.**
43 *State v. Brennan, 49 Ohio.St. 33, 29 N.E. 593.*
44 *[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1235]*

45 Even the public office ITSELF is property of the national government, so those claiming any civil statutory status are claiming
46 a civil office within the government. It is otherwise unconstitutional to regulate private property or private rights. The only
47 way you can surrender your private status is to voluntarily adopt an office or civil status or the "benefits", "rights", or
48 privileges attaching to said office or status, as we prove in:

- 49 1. [Civil Status \(Important!\)-SEDM](#)
50 <https://sedm.org/litigation-main/civil-status/>

- 1 2. *Your Exclusive Right to Declare or Establish Your Civil Status*, Form #13.008
2 <https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/RightToDeclStatus.pdf>
3 3. *Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons*, Form #05.037
4 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf>

5 It is custody or "benefit" or control of government/public property that grants government control over those handling or
6 using such property:

7 *“The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over*
8 *the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which*
9 *the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its*
10 *grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege,*
11 *in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege*
12 *conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the*
13 *compensation for it.”*

14 [*\[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 \(1876\)\]*](#)

15

16 *“The rich rules over the poor,*
17 *And the borrower is servant to the lender.”*
18 *[Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]*

19

20 ***Curses of Disobedience [to God’s Laws]***

21 *“The alien [[Washington, D.C. is legislatively “alien” in relation to states of the Union](#)]*
22 *who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down*
23 *lower and lower [[malicious destruction of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL](#)*
24 *TREATMENT by [abusing FRANCHISES](#)]. He shall lend to you [[Federal Reserve](#)*
25 *counterfeiting franchise], but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you*
26 *shall be the tail.*

27 *“Moreover all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you*
28 *are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the Lord your God, to [keep His](#)*
29 *commandments and His statutes which He commanded you. And they shall be upon you*
30 *for a sign and a wonder, and on your descendants forever.*

31 *“Because you did not serve [ONLY] the Lord your God with joy and gladness of heart, for*
32 *the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your [[covetous thieving lawyer](#)]*
33 *enemies, whom the Lord will send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness, and in*
34 *need of everything; and He will put a yoke of iron [[franchise codes](#)] on your neck until He*
35 *has destroyed you. The Lord will bring a nation against you from afar [[the District of](#)*
36 *CRIMINALS], from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies [[the American Eagle](#)],*
37 *a nation [whose language \[LEGALESE\] you will not understand,](#) a nation of fierce*
38 *[[coercive and fascist](#)] countenance, which does not respect the elderly [[assassinates them](#)*
39 *by denying them healthcare through bureaucratic delays on an [Obamacare waiting list](#)]*
40 *nor show favor to the young [[destroying their ability to learn in the public FOOL system](#)].*
41 *And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your land [[with “trade](#)*
42 *or business” [franchise taxes](#)], until you [and all your property] are destroyed [[or](#)*
43 *STOLEN/CONFISCATED]; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the*
44 *increase of your cattle or the offspring of your flocks, until they have destroyed you.*
45 *[[Deut. 28:43-51](#)], Bible, NKJV]*

46 You cannot MIX or comingle PRIVATE property with PUBLIC property without converting the PRIVATE property
47 ownership from absolute to qualified. You must keep them SEPARATE at all times and it is the MAIN and MOST
48 IMPORTANT role of government to maintain that separation. Governments, after all, are created ONLY to protect private

1 property and the FIRST step in that protection is to protect PRIVATE property from being converted to PUBLIC property.
2 For proof, see:

[Separation Between Public and Private Course](https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf), Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

3 What Congress is doing is abusing its own property to in effect create "de facto public offices" within the government, in
4 violation of 4 U.S.C. §72, as is proven in:

[Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union](https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf), Form #05.052
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf>

5 This is how we describe the reason why people should avoid privileges and thereby avoid possession, custody, use, or
6 "benefit" of government/public property on the opening page of our site:

7 *"People of all races, genders, political beliefs, sexual orientations, and nearly all religions*
8 *are welcome here. All are treated equally under REAL "law". The only way to remain*
9 *truly free and equal under the civil law is to avoid seeking government civil services,*
10 *benefits, property, special or civil status, exemptions, privileges, or special treatment. All*
11 *such pursuits of government services or property require individual and lawful consent*
12 *to a franchise and the surrender of inalienable constitutional rights AND EQUALITY in the*
13 *process, and should therefore be AVOIDED. The rights and equality given up are the*
14 *"cost" of procuring the "benefit" or property from the government, in fact. Nothing in life*
15 *is truly "free". Anyone who claims that such "benefits" or property should be free and*
16 *cost them nothing is a thief who wants to use the government as a means to STEAL on his*
17 *or her behalf. All just rights spring from responsibilities/obligations under the laws of a*
18 *higher power. If that higher power is God, you can be truly and objectively free. If it is*
19 *government, you are guaranteed to be a slave because they can lawfully set the cost of their*
20 *property as high as they want as a Merchant under the U.C.C. If you want it really bad*
21 *from people with a monopoly, then you will get it REALLY bad. Bend over. There are*
22 *NO constitutional limits on the price government can charge for their monopoly services*
23 *or property. Those who want no responsibilities can have no real/PRIVATE rights, but*
24 *only privileges dispensed to wards of the state which are disguised to LOOK like*
25 *unalienable rights. Obligations and rights are two sides of the same coin, just like self-*
26 *ownership and personal responsibility. For the biblical version of this paragraph, read 1*
27 *Sam. 8:10-22. For the reason God answered Samuel by telling him to allow the people to*
28 *have a king, read Deut. 28:43-51, which is God's curse upon those who allow a king above*
29 *them. Click Here*
30 *(<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm>)*
31 *for a detailed description of the legal, moral, and spiritual consequences of violating this*
32 *paragraph."*
33 *[SEDM Opening Page: <http://sedm.org>]*

34 "Non-resident Non-Person" or "non-person" are synonymous with "transient foreigner", "in transitu", and "stateless" (in
35 relation to the national government). We invented this term. The term does not appear in federal statutes because statutes
36 cannot even define things or people who are not subject to them and therefore foreign and sovereign. The term "non-
37 individual" used on this site is equivalent to and a synonym for "non-person" on this site, even though STATUTORY
38 "individuals" are a SUBSET of "persons" within the Internal Revenue Code. Likewise, the term "private human" is also
39 synonymous with "non-person". Hence, a "non-person":

- 40 1. Retains their sovereign immunity. They do not waive it under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C.
41 Chapter 97 or the longarm statutes of the state they occupy.
- 42 2. Is protected by the United States Constitution and not federal statutory civil law.
- 43 3. May not have federal statutory civil law cited against them. If they were, a violation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
44 17 and a constitutional tort would result if they were physically present on land protected by the United States
45 Constitution within the exterior limits of states of the Union.
- 46 4. Is on an equal footing with the United States government in court. "Persons" would be on an UNEQUAL, INFERIOR,
47 and subservient level if they were subject to federal territorial law.

1 Don't expect vain public servants to willingly admit that there is such a thing as a human "non-person" who satisfies the above
2 criteria because it would undermine their systematic and treasonous plunder and enslavement of people they are supposed to
3 be protecting. However, the U.S. Supreme Court has held that the "right to be left alone" is the purpose of the constitution.
4 *Olmstead v. United States*, 277 U.S. 438. A so-called "government" that refuses to leave you alone or respect or protect your
5 sovereignty and equality in relation to them is no government at all and has violated the purpose of its creation described in
6 the Declaration of Independence. Furthermore, anyone from the national or state government who refuses to enforce this
7 status, or who imputes or enforces any status OTHER than this status under any law system other than the common law is:

- 8 1. "purposefully availing themselves" of commerce within OUR jurisdiction.
- 9 2. STEALING, where the thing being STOLEN are the public rights associated with the statutory civil "status" they are
10 presuming we have but never expressly consented to have.
- 11 3. Engaging in criminal identity theft, because the civil status is associated with a domicile in a place we are not
12 physically in and do not consent to a civil domicile in.
- 13 4. Consenting to our Member Agreement.
- 14 5. Waiving official, judicial, and sovereign immunity.
- 15 6. Acting in a private and personal capacity beyond the statutory jurisdiction of their government employer.
- 16 7. Compelling us to contract with the state under the civil statutory "social compact".
- 17 8. Interfering with our First Amendment right to freely and civilly DISASSOCIATE with the state.
- 18 9. Engaged in a constitutional tort.

19 If freedom and self-ownership or "ownership" in general means anything at all, it means the right to deny any and all others,
20 including governments, the ability to use or benefit in any way from our body, our exclusively owned private property, and
21 our labor.

22 *"We have repeatedly held that, as to property reserved by its owner for private use, "the*
23 *right to exclude [others is] `one of the most essential sticks in the bundle of rights that are*
24 *commonly characterized as property.' "* [*Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419, 433 \(1982\)](#), quoting [*Kaiser Aetna v. United States*, 444 U.S. 164, 176 \(1979\)](#).
25
26

27 *[Nollan v. California Coastal Comm'n, 483 U.S. 825 (1987)]*

28
29 *"In this case, we hold that the "right to exclude," so universally held to be a fundamental*
30 *element of the property right,[11] falls within this category of interests that the*
31 *Government cannot take without compensation."*
32 *[Kaiser Aetna v. United States, 444 U.S. 164 (1979)]*

33
34 **FOOTNOTES:**

35 *[11] See, e. g., [United States v. Pueblo of San Ildefonso](#), 206 Ct.Cl. 649, 669-670, 513*
36 *F.2d. 1383, 1394 (1975); [United States v. Lutz](#), 295 F.2d. 736, 740 (CA5 1961).* As stated
37 *by Mr. Justice Brandeis, "[a]n essential element of individual property is the legal right to*
38 *exclude others from enjoying it." [International News Service v. Associated Press](#), 248 U.S.*
39 *215, 250 (1918) (dissenting opinion).*

40 If you would like a W-8 form that ACCURATELY describes the withholding and reporting status of a "non-resident non-
41 person", see:

42 W-8SUB, Form #04.231 https://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/2-Withholding/W-8SUB.pdf

43 **4.1.26 "Advice" or "legal advice"**

44 The term "advice" or "legal advice" means education about tools, facts, remedies, and options for making your own informed choice. It does not include any method of: 1. Transferring liability or responsibility from the person asking to the person

1 responding; 2. Anything that could be classified as "legal advice" or "law practice" as used in any statute or enacted law; 3.
2 Anything that could be classified as factual or a basis for belief or reliance upon the person asked in connection with
3 commercial speech subject to government protection or regulation.

4 **4.1.27 Socialism**

5 The term "socialism" means any attempt by any government to use civil legislation to abolish private property or to convert
6 private property ownership to public property, public rights, or privileges, whether by consent or by theft. "Ownership" and
7 "control" are synonymous for the purpose of this definition. Such property includes land, labor, physical objects, chattel
8 property, or constitutional rights.

9 Examples of the implementation of socialism include the following activities by the government:

10 1. Government Franchises and licensing. See:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>

11 2. Civil statutes when enforced against those not consensually serving WITHIN the government. See:

Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf>

12 3. Domicile, which is a civil statutory protection franchise. See:

Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

13 4. Income and excise taxation. See:

The "Trade or Business" Scam, Form #05.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>

14 5. Extraterritorial civil enforcement under the COLOR, but without the actual AUTHORITY of law. against parties not
15 domiciled within the jurisdiction or venue doing the enforcement. See:

Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf>

16 6. Any attempt to change the [civil status \(Form #13.008\)](#) of parties situated extraterritorially without the exclusive
17 jurisdiction of the lawmaker with or without their express or implied [consent \(Form #05.003\)](#). The result is that they
18 are made to APPEAR as parties domiciled within the civil jurisdiction or venue of the lawmaker. See:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf>

19 7. Any attempt to offer a "benefit" or franchise without recognizing or enforcing the right to NOT participate or to quit on
20 any and every form administering the program. Thus, the program is TREATED as mandatory by fiat but in fact is
21 voluntary. This violates the common law maxim that you have a right to refuse a "benefit". See:

Avoiding Traps in Government Forms Course, Form #12.023
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/AvoidingTrapsGovForms.pdf>

22 The result of implementing socialism through civil legislation is ultimately to abolish constitutional or common law
23 protections for property, and to replace them with legislatively granted civil privileges that come with obligations and a
24 corresponding surrender of said rights. Below is how we describe this process on the opening page of our website:

25 *"People of all races, genders, political beliefs, sexual orientations, and nearly all religions*
26 *are welcome here. All are treated equally under REAL "law". The only way to remain*
27 *truly free and equal under the civil law is to avoid seeking government civil services,*
28 *benefits, property, [special or civil status](#), exemptions, privileges, or special treatment. All*
29 *such pursuits of government services or property require [individual and lawful consent](#) to*
30 *[a franchise](#) and the surrender of [inalienable constitutional rights](#) AND EQUALITY in the*
31 *process, and should therefore be AVOIDED. The rights and equality given up are the*
32 *"cost" of procuring the "benefit" or property from the government, in fact. Nothing in life*
33 *is truly "free". Anyone who claims that such "benefits" or property should be free and*
34 *cost them nothing is a thief who wants to use the government as a means to STEAL on his*
35 *or her behalf. All [just rights](#) spring from responsibilities/obligations under the [laws of a](#)*
36 *[higher power](#). If that higher power is God, you can be [truly and objectively free](#). If it is*
37 *government, you are [guaranteed to be a slave](#) because they can lawfully set the cost of their*

1 *property as high as they want as a Merchant under the U.C.C. [If you want it really bad](#)*
2 *[from people with a monopoly, then you will get it REALLY bad. Bend over.](#) There are*
3 *NO constitutional limits on the price government can charge for their monopoly services*
4 *or property. Those who want no responsibilities can have no [real/PRIVATE rights](#), but*
5 *only privileges dispensed to wards of the state which are disguised to LOOK like*
6 *unalienable rights. Obligations and rights are two sides of the same coin, just like self-*
7 *ownership and personal responsibility. For the biblical version of this paragraph, read [1](#)*
8 *[Sam. 8:10-22](#). For the reason God answered Samuel by telling him to allow the people to*
9 *have a king, read [Deut. 28:43-51](#), which is God's curse upon those who allow a king above*
10 *them. [Click](#) [Here](#)*
11 *(<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm>)*
12 *for a detailed description of the legal, moral, and spiritual consequences of violating this*
13 *paragraph.”*
14 *[SEDM Website Opening Page; <http://sedm.org/>]*

15 For the purpose of this definition "socialism" does NOT include "social control over the means of production" as most
16 contemporary reference sources FALSELY identify it. Early dictionaries defined it consistent with our definition but over
17 the years, the word has fairly recently been redefined to REMOVE the mention of abolition of private property from the
18 definition. This was done so that statist would conveniently stop having to APOLOGIZE for government theft through the
19 legislative process. For examples of this phenomenon, see:

Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "socialism"
<https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/Socialism.htm>

20 It is important to emphasize here that when you want to stop public opposition to a government activity such as theft or
21 conversion of private property, the easiest way is to redefine terms so that there is no word that accurately refers to the activity
22 that is being opposed. The result is that you have eliminated vocabulary that could describe the thing being opposed, and thus
23 to eliminate the political opposition entirely. This approach, in fact, is the heart of the modern phenomenon of "[Identity](#)
24 [politics](#)": Control public opinion and public opposition by controlling language.

25 An important goal of this website is to ELIMINATE all forms of socialism as defined here, and thus to restore the supremacy
26 of individual rights over governmental rights to our political and democratic processes and institutions. For details on the
27 evils of socialism, see:

- 28 1. *Socialism: The New American Civil Religion*, Form #05.016
29 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SocialismCivilReligion.pdf>
- 30 2. *Social Security: Mark of the Beast*, Form #11.407
31 <http://famguardian.org/Publications/SocialSecurity/TOC.htm>

32 **4.1.28 “Grant” or “loan”**

33 The term "grant" or "loan", in the context of this website and especially in relation to any type of property or right or to
34 "franchises" generally, means a temporary conveyance or transfer of physical custody or possession of absolutely owned
35 property with legal strings or conditions attached by the grantor in which there are no moities or usufructs over the property
36 held or reserved by the party to whom the property is loaned or temporarily conveyed.

- 37 1. The grantor or lender is the "Merchant" under [U.C.C. §2-104](#)(1).
- 38 2. The recipient or borrower of the property conveyed is the "Buyer" under [U.C.C. §2-103](#)(1)(a).
- 39 3. The property loaned can include land, physical/chattel property, rights, or privileges.
- 40 4. The legal relation or "privity" created between the grantor and the borrower or recipient is referred to as a "franchise".
41 All franchises are contracts or agreements of one kind or another. Franchises are defined as "a privilege [meaning
42 "property"] in the HANDS of a subject". Receipt of the property by the Buyer, in fact is what MAKES them the
43 "subject"
- 44 5. The regulation of the property is done through the civil statutory code, which assigns both rights and obligations to the
45 Merchant (grantor) and the Buyer.
- 46 6. Upon voluntary acceptance of the property by the Buyer, a civil status is assigned to both the BUYER and the
47 MERCHANT fixing the relations between them under the privity. Such civil statuses might include "citizen",

1 "resident", "person" (under the civil statutory franchise code), "taxpayer" (under the income tax code), "driver" (under
2 the vehicle code), etc.

- 3 7. The CIVIL STATUTORY STATUS assigned to the MERCHANT and the BUYER after the property is accepted
4 constitutes a type of "membership". A "citizen", for instance, is a BUYER of government civil statutory protection
5 franchise services, and also a "MEMBER" of a club called "GOVERNMENT" (a corporation) that delivers said
6 services.
- 7 8. Both CIVIL STATUTORY RIGHTS (PRIVILEGES) and OBLIGATIONS attach to the civil status assigned to the
8 parties and these RIGHTS and OBLIGATIONS are the method of controlling and managing the property until it is
9 "RETURNED" or SURRENDERED by the Buyer to the GRANTOR. The civil statutory OBLIGATIONS assigned to
10 the civil status of the BUYER become corresponding RIGHTS on the part of the MERCHANT/GRANTOR and vice
11 versa.
- 12 9. If the property, benefit, or privilege was never voluntarily accepted, then the OBLIGATIONS that attach to it cannot be
13 enforced against the BUYER by the MERCHANT in court. Under the common law, you have a RIGHT to refuse to
14 accept property, "benefits", etc. in every scenario, even after you applied for them.
- 15 10. In pursuing and accepting the property of the Merchant, the Buyer surrenders ABSOLUTE ownership of a part of his
16 or her otherwise private property and is therefore subject to regulation of him or her self by the Merchant. If the
17 Merchant is a government, then they or their activities in which the granted property are used become "infected with a
18 public interest" and are subject to civil statutory regulation.

19 The above process, in fact, has been admitted by the U.S. Supreme Court and the California Supreme Court as the "very
20 essence" of CIVIL government:

21 "When one becomes a member of society, he necessarily parts with some rights or
22 privileges which, as an individual not affected by his relations to others, he might retain.
23 HN4 "A body politic," as aptly defined in the preamble of the Constitution of
24 Massachusetts, "is a social compact by which the whole people covenants with each
25 citizen, and each citizen with the whole people, that all shall be governed by certain laws
26 for the common good." This does not confer power upon the whole people to control
27 rights which are purely and exclusively private, [Thorpe v. R. & B. Railroad Co., 27 Vt.](#)
28 143; but it does authorize the establishment of laws requiring each citizen to so conduct
29 himself, and so use his own property, as not unnecessarily to injure another. This is the
30 very essence of government, and has found expression in the maxim sic utere tuo ut
31 alienum non loedas. From this source come the [HN5](#) police powers, which, as was said
32 by Mr. Chief Justice Taney in the [License Cases, 5 How. 583](#), "are nothing more or less
33 than the powers of government inherent in every sovereignty, . . . that is to say, . . . the
34 power to govern men and things." Under these powers the government regulates the
35 conduct of its citizens one towards another, and the manner in which each shall use his
36 own property, when such regulation becomes necessary for the public good. In their
37 exercise it has been customary in England from time immemorial, and in this country from
38 its first colonization, to regulate ferries, common carriers, hackmen, bakers, millers,
39 wharfingers, innkeepers, &c., and in so doing to fix a maximum of charge to be made for
40 services rendered, accommodations furnished, and articles sold. To this day, statutes are
41 to be found in many of the States upon some or all these subjects; and we think it has never
42 yet been successfully contended that such legislation came within any of the constitutional
43 prohibitions against interference with private property. With the [Fifth Amendment](#)
44 in force, Congress, in 1820, conferred power upon the city of Washington "to regulate . . . the
45 rates of wharfage at private wharves, . . . the sweeping of chimneys, and to fix the rates of
46 fees therefor, . . . and the weight and quality of bread," 3 Stat. 587, sect. 7; and, in 1848,
47 "to make all necessary regulations respecting hackney carriages and the rates of fare of
48 the same, and the rates of hauling by cartmen, wagoners, carmen, and draymen, and the
49 rates of commission of auctioneers," 9 id. 224, sect. 2."

50 "From this it is apparent that, down to the time of the adoption of the [Fourteenth](#)
51 [Amendment](#), it was not supposed that statutes regulating the use, or even the price of the
52 use, of private property necessarily deprived an owner of his property without due process
53 of law. Under some circumstances they may, but not under all. The amendment does not
54 change the law in this particular: it simply prevents the States from doing that which will
55 operate as such a deprivation."

1 "This brings us to inquire as to the principles upon which this power of regulation rests, in
2 order that we may determine what is within and what without its operative effect. Looking,
3 then, to the common law, from whence came the right which the Constitution protects, we
4 find that when private property is "affected with a public interest, it ceases to be juris
5 privati only." This was said by Lord Chief Justice Hale more than two hundred years ago,
6 in his treatise *De Portibus Maris*, 1 Harg. Law Tracts, 78, and has been accepted without
7 objection as an essential element in the law of property ever since. Property does become
8 clothed with a public interest when used in a manner to make it of public consequence, and
9 affect the community at large. When, therefore, one devotes his property to a use in which
10 the public has an interest, he, in effect, grants to the public an interest in that use, and must
11 submit to be controlled by the public for the common good, to the extent of the interest he
12 has thus created. He may withdraw his grant by discontinuing the use; but, so long as he
13 maintains the use, he must submit to the control."

14 [[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 \(1876\)](#)]

15
16 " It will be found that from the earliest periods of our history the State laws regulated the
17 privilege of the elective franchise within their respective limits, and that these laws were
18 exactly such as local interests, peculiar conditions, or supposed policy dictated, and that
19 it was never asserted that the exclusion of any class of inhabitants from the privilege of
20 voting amounted to an interference with the privileges of the excluded class as citizens. As
21 was well said by Judge Mills, of the Court of Appeals of Kentucky: "The mistake on the
22 subject arises from not attending to a sensible distinction between political and civil rights.
23 The latter constitute the citizen, while the former are not necessary ingredients. A State
24 may deny all her political rights to an individual, and yet he may be a citizen. The rights
25 of office and suffrage are political purely, and are denied by some or all the States to
26 part of their population, who are still citizens. A citizen, then, is one who owes the
27 Government allegiance, service, and money by way of taxation, and to whom the
28 Government, in turn, grants and guarantees liberty of person and of conscience, the
29 right of acquiring and possessing [PUBLIC, not PRIVATE] property [WHY?, because
30 the CONSTITUTION protects PRIVATE property ONLY, and CIVIL STATUTES
31 protect PUBLIC PROPERTY. You have to SURRENDER some portion of the
32 protections of the CONSTITUTION in order to acquire, use, or "benefit" from PUBLIC
33 property], of marriage and the social relations, of suit and defense, and security of
34 person, estate, and reputation. These, with some others which might be enumerated,
35 being guaranteed and secured by Government, constitute a citizen. To aliens we extend
36 these privileges by courtesy; to others we secure them--to male as well as female--to the
37 infant as well as the person of hoary hairs." (1 Litt. R. 342.)"

38 [[Van Valkenburg v. Brown, 43 Cal. 43 \(1872\)](#)]

39 In the context of GOVERNMENT grants of property:

- 40 1. This conveyance of property is the foundation of ALL governmental civil statutory privileges and most civil statutory
41 law, as explained in [Why Civil Statutory Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons, Form #05.037](#).
- 42 2. The constitutional authority for such grants is [Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2](#) of the U.S. Constitution, which allows
43 Congress to "dispose of and make all needful rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other property
44 belonging to the United States".
- 45 3. Those receiving the granted property and the associated privileges essentially waive their constitutional rights under
46 the Brandeis Rules of the U.S. Supreme Court, [Ashwander v. Tennessee Valley Authority, 297 U.S. 288, 56 S.Ct. 466](#)
47 [\(1936\)](#).
- 48 4. Individual agencies of the government are created to manage the SPECIFIC property and franchises and privileges
49 loaned or granted, and such agencies DO NOT have jurisdiction over PRIVATE parties NOT in receipt or eligible to
50 receive said property. These agencies are referred to as "the administrative state". [Click here](#) for details on the
51 "Administrative State".
- 52 5. Types of property that may be loaned must fit within [5 U.S.C. §553\(a\)\(2\)](#).

- 1 6. In the context of GOVERNMENT property so granted or loaned to the public, the party in temporary custody of the
2 property is legally defined as a "public officer" subject to DIRECT legislative control of Congress WITHOUT the need
3 for implementing regulations pursuant to [5 U.S.C. §553\(a\)](#), and [44 U.S.C. §1505\(a\)\(1\)](#).

4 *"**Public office.** The right, authority, and duty created and conferred by law, by which for
5 a given period, either fixed by law or enduring at the pleasure of the creating power, an
6 individual is invested with some portion of the sovereign functions of government for the
7 benefit of the public. Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58. An agency for the
8 state, the duties of which involve in their performance the exercise of some portion of the
9 sovereign power, either great or small. Yaselli v. Goff, C.C.A., 12 F.2d. 396, 403, 56 A.L.R.
10 1239; Lacey v. State, 13 Ala.App. 212, 68 So. 706, 710; Curtin v. State, 61 Cal.App. 377,
11 214 P. 1030, 1035; Shelmadine v. City of Elkhart, 75 Ind.App. 493, 129 N.E. 878. State ex
12 rel. Colorado River Commission v. Frohmiller, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486. **Where, by
13 virtue of law, a person is clothed, not as an incidental or transient authority, but for such
14 time as de- notes duration and continuance, with Independent power to control the
15 property of the public,** or with public functions to be exercised in the supposed interest of
16 the people, the service to be compensated by a stated yearly salary, and the occupant
17 having a designation or title, the position so created is a public office. State v. Brennan,
18 49 Ohio.St. 33, 29 N.E. 593.
19 [Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1235]*

- 20 7. Jurisdiction over government property extends EXTRATERRITORIALY and INTERNATIONALLY, and thus
21 grants can occur anywhere in the world and may cross state borders and reach into a Constitutional state of the Union.
22 8. There is NO CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY EXPRESSLY GRANTED that allows government to abuse
23 government property to CREATE new public offices. This is a usurpation and an invasion of the states in violation of
24 [Article 4, Section 4](#) of the Constitution.
25 9. This source of jurisdiction is the MAIN source of jurisdiction in the case of the income tax, which is an excise tax and
26 a franchise tax upon federal offices legislatively created by Congress but usually implemented ILLEGALLY and
27 UNCONSTITUTIONALLY within states of the Union, as described in [Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement
28 Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052](#).

29 *"Thus, Congress having power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the
30 several States, and with the Indian tribes, may, without doubt, provide for **granting**
31 **coasting licenses**, licenses to pilots, licenses to trade with the Indians, and any other
32 **licenses** necessary or proper for the exercise of that great and extensive power; and the
33 same observation is applicable to every other power of Congress, to the exercise of which
34 the granting of licenses may be incident. All such licenses confer authority, and give rights
35 to the licensee.*

36 *But very different considerations apply to the **internal commerce or domestic trade** of the
37 **States**. Over this commerce and trade Congress has **no power of regulation nor any direct**
38 **control**. This power belongs **exclusively** to the States. **No interference by Congress with**
39 **the business of citizens transacted within a State is warranted by the Constitution, except**
40 **such as is strictly incidental to the exercise of powers clearly granted to the legislature.**
41 *The power to authorize a business within a State is plainly repugnant to the exclusive power
42 of the State over the same subject. It is true that the power of Congress to tax is a very
43 extensive power. It is given in the Constitution, with only one exception and only two
44 qualifications. Congress cannot tax exports, and it must impose direct taxes by the rule of
45 apportionment, and indirect taxes by the rule of uniformity. Thus limited, and thus only, it
46 reaches every subject, and may be exercised at discretion. But, it reaches only existing
47 subjects. **Congress cannot authorize [e.g. LICENSE using a Social Security Number] a**
48 **trade or business within a State in order to tax it."**
49 [License Tax Cases, [72 U.S. 462](#), 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 (1866)]**

50 God vehemently forbids Christians from participating in any grants or loans of government property and warns Christians
51 that they will be CURSED if they participate. This curse is the STRONGEST and SCARRIEST curse in all the bible:

52 *Curses of Disobedience [to God's Laws]*

1 ***“The alien [Washington, D.C. is legislatively “alien” in relation to states of the Union]***
2 ***who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down***
3 ***lower and lower [malicious destruction of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL***
4 ***TREATMENT by abusing FRANCHISES]. He shall lend to you [Federal Reserve***
5 ***counterfeiting franchise], but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you***
6 ***shall be the tail.***

7 ***“Moreover all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you***
8 ***are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the Lord your God, to keep His***
9 ***commandments and His statutes which He commanded you. And they shall be upon you***
10 ***for a sign and a wonder, and on your descendants forever.***

11 ***“Because you did not serve [ONLY] the Lord your God with joy and gladness of heart, for***
12 ***the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your [covetous thieving lawyer]***
13 ***enemies, whom the Lord will send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness, and in***
14 ***need of everything; and He will put a yoke of iron [franchise codes] on your neck until He***
15 ***has destroyed you. The Lord will bring a nation against you from afar [the District of***
16 ***CRIMINALS], from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies [the American Eagle],***
17 ***a nation whose language [LEGALESE] you will not understand, a nation of fierce***
18 ***[coercive and fascist] countenance, which does not respect the elderly [assassinates them***
19 ***by denying them healthcare through bureaucratic delays on an Obamacare waiting list]***
20 ***nor show favor to the young [destroying their ability to learn in the public FOOL system].***
21 ***And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your land [with “trade***
22 ***or business” franchise taxes], until you [and all your property] are destroyed [or***
23 ***STOLEN/CONFISCATED]; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the***
24 ***increase of your cattle or the offspring of your flocks, until they have destroyed you.***
25 ***[Deut. 28:43-51, Bible, NKJV]***

26 The reason God forbids becoming and borrower of government property is that the legal relation created by the transaction,
27 being a franchise or contract or agreement, causes conflicts of interest and allegiance and sin.

28 ***“The rich rules over the poor,***
29 ***And the borrower is servant to the lender.”***
30 ***[Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]***

31

“You shall make no covenant [contract or franchise] with them [foreigners, pagans],
32 ***nor with their [pagan government] gods [laws or judges]. They shall not dwell in your***
33 ***land [and you shall not dwell in theirs by becoming a “resident” or domiciliary in the***
34 ***process of contracting with them], lest they make you sin against Me [God]. For if you***
35 ***serve their [government] gods [under contract or agreement or franchise], it will surely***
36 ***be a snare to you.”***
37 ***[Exodus 23:32-33, Bible, NKJV]***
38

39

“I [God] brought you up from Egypt [slavery] and brought you to the land of which I swore
40 ***to your fathers; and I said, ‘I will never break My covenant with you. And you shall make***
41 ***no covenant [contract or franchise or agreement of ANY kind] with the inhabitants of***
42 ***this [corrupt pagan] land; you shall tear down their [man/government worshipping***
43 ***socialist] altars.’ But you have not obeyed Me. Why have you done this?***
44

45 ***“Therefore I also said, I will not drive them out before you; but they will become as***
46 ***thorns [terrorists and persecutors] in your side and their gods will be a snare [slavery!]***
47 ***to you.”***

1 *So it was, when the Angel of the LORD spoke these words to all the children of Israel, that*
2 *the people lifted up their voices and wept.*
3 *[Judges 2:1-4, Bible, NKJV]*

4 God also says that the only thing that Christians are allowed to be in relation to any and all governments is Merchants.

5 *"For the Lord your God will bless you just as He promised you; **you shall lend to many***
6 ***nations, but you shall not borrow**; you shall reign over many nations, but they shall not*
7 *reign over you."*
8 *[Deut. 15:6, Bible, NKJV]*

9 *"The Lord will open to you His good treasure, the heavens, to give the rain to your land in*
10 *its season, and to bless all the work of your hand. **You shall lend to many nations, but***
11 ***you shall not borrow**."*
12 *[Deut. 28:12, Bible, NKJV]*

13 *"**You shall not charge interest to your brother**--interest on money or food or anything that*
14 *is lent out at interest."*
15 *[Deut. 23:19, Bible, NKJV]*

16 *"To a foreigner you may charge interest, but to your brother you shall not charge interest,*
17 *that the Lord your God may bless you in all to which you set your hand in the land which*
18 *you are entering to possess."*
19 *[Deut. 23:20, Bible, NKJV]*

20 For more information on the subject of franchises and their perils and pitfalls, see:

- 21 1. *Government Franchises Course*, Form #12.012
22 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 23 2. *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030
24 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 25 3. *How Scoundrels Corrupted Our Republican Form of Government*, Family Guardian Fellowship (OFFSITE LINK)
26 <https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm>

27 For tools and tactics to FIGHT the EXTRATERRITORIAL abuse of franchises and the UNCONSTITUTIONAL grants of
28 government property that implement them, see:

- 29 1. *Hot Issues: Laws of Property*, SEDM
30 <https://sedm.org/laws-of-property/>
- 31 2. *Authorities on Rights as Property*, SEDM Blog
32 <https://sedm.org/authorities-on-rights-as-property/>
- 33 3. *Path to Freedom*, Form #09.015, Sections 5.3 through 5.8
34 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 35 4. *Separation Between Public and Private Course*, Form #12.025
36 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 37 5. *Private Right or Public Right? Course*, Form #12.044
38 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 39 6. *Lawfully Avoiding Government Obligations Course*, Form #12.040
40 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 41 7. *Proof of Claim: Your Main Defense Against Government Greed and Corruption*, Form #09.073
42 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 43 8. *Federal Enforcement Authority Within States of the Union*, Form #05.032
44 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 45 9. *Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union*, Form #05.052
46 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 47 10. *Administrative State: Tactics and Defenses Course*, Form #12.041
48 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

1 **4.1.29 Benefit**

2 The term "Benefit" means advantage; profit; fruit; gain; interest, and real consideration associated with a specific transaction
3 which conveys a right or property interest to a specific status, class, or group lawfully requesting said "benefit" which:

- 4 1. Is not dispensed by an administrative agency of any state or federal government, but by a private individual.
- 5 2. Does not require the recipient to be an officer, agent, employee, or "personnel" within any government.
- 6 3. Is not called a "tax" or collected by the Internal Revenue Service, but is clearly identified as "private business activity
7 beyond the core purposes of government".
- 8 4. Does not confer upon the grantor any form of sovereign, official, or judicial immunity.
- 9 5. Is legally enforceable in OTHER than a franchise court or administrative agency. That is, may be heard in equity
10 within a true, Article III constitutional court and NOT a legislative franchise court.
- 11 6. True constitutional courts are provided in which to litigate disputes arising under the benefit and those with said
12 disputes are not required to exhaust administrative remedies with an executive branch agency BEFORE they may
13 litigate. These constitutional courts are required to produce evidence that they are constitutional courts with OTHER
14 than strictly legislative franchise powers when challenged by the recipients of said benefits.
- 15 7. The specific value of the consideration can be quantified at any time.
- 16 8. Monies paid in by the recipient to subsidize the program are entirely refundable if the benefits they pay for have not
17 been received or employed either partially or in full.
- 18 9. Has all contributions paid in refunded if they die and never collect any benefits.
- 19 10. Participation in the program is not also attached to any other government program. For instance, being a recipient of
20 "social insurance" does not also make the recipient liable for unrelated or other federal taxes.
- 21 11. The term "benefit" must be defined in the franchise agreement that dispenses it, and its definition may not be left to the
22 subjective whims of any judge or jury.
- 23 12. If the "benefit" is financial, then it is paid in lawful money rather than Federal Reserve Notes, which are non-interest
24 bearing promissory notes that are not lawful money and are backed by nothing.
- 25 13. The franchise must expressly state that participation is voluntary and that no one can be prosecuted or punished for
26 failure to participate.
- 27 14. The identifying numbers, if any, that administer the program may not be used for identification and may not be shared
28 with or used by any nongovernmental entity other than the recipient him or her self.
- 29 15. May not be heard by any judge, jurist, or prosecutor who is a recipient or beneficiary of the same benefit, because this
30 would cause a conflict of interest in violation of 18 U.S.C. §208, 28 U.S.C. §144, and 28 U.S.C. §455, 18 U.S.C. §597,
31 and 18 U.S.C. §201.
- 32 16. During any litigation involving the "benefit", both the grantor and the grantee share equal obligation to prove that
33 equally valuable consideration was provided to the other party. Note that Federal Reserve Notes do not constitute
34 lawful money or therefore consideration.
- 35 17. Does NOT include a return of monies UNLAWFULLY withheld against a non-taxpayer. It is not a commercial
36 "benefit" or "purposeful availment" to have property STOLEN by a corrupted government returned to me.

37 Anything offered by the government that does not meet ALL of the above criteria is herein defined as an INJURY and a
38 TORT. Compelled participation is stipulated by both parties as being slavery in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §1583, 42
39 U.S.C. §1994, and the Thirteenth Amendment.

40 Receipt and/or acceptance of any government form by any government constitutes consent by the recipient of the application
41 to use the above definition of "benefit" in any disputes that might arise over such acceptance. Government recipient and its
42 agents, employees, and assignees forfeit their right as private individuals acting in any government office to define the term
43 "benefit" and agree to use ONLY the above definition.

44 Because the Submitter is ineligible for and does not seek any kind of "benefit" by submitting any of the attached forms, the
45 Submitter and Recipient both stipulate that the perjury statement has no "materiality" or legal actionability because it cannot
46 produce any kind of injury to the Recipient.

47 Parties stipulate that this definition applies to any and all past, present, or future forms they receive by any parties concerned
48 with this disclaimer.

49 More on the subject of "benefit" can be found at:

- 50 1. *Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online*, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "benefit" -legal authorities on "benefit"

- 1 <https://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/Benefit.htm>
- 2 2. *Sovereignty and Freedom Points and Authorities*, Litigation Tool #10.018, Section 4.10: "Benefits": ALLEGED but
3 not ACTUAL public rights/property that CANNOT form lawful "consideration" in forming a lawful contract or civil
4 statutory obligation
5 <https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/PointsAuth.pdf>
- 6 3. 5 U.S.C. §553(a)(2)-Subjects those in receipt of "benefits" to DIRECT LEGISLATIVE CONTROL of congress. Watch
7 out!
8 <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/5/553>
- 9 4. *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030-Government "benefits" are illegally abused to
10 establish unconstitutional franchises in the constitutional states of the Union
11 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>
- 12 5. *The Government "Benefits" Scam*, Form #05.040 (Member Subscriptions)
13 <https://sedm.org/product/the-government-benefits-scam-form-05-040/>
- 14 6. *Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises*, Form #05.051 (Member Subscriptions)
15 <https://sedm.org/product/why-the-government-is-the-only-real-beneficiary-of-all-government-franchises-form-05-051/>
- 16 7. *Proof: How to Prove in Court that a So-Called Tax is REALLY an Illegal Extortion*** (Member Subscriptions)
17 <https://sedm.org/proof-how-to-prove-in-court-that-a-so-called-tax-is-really-an-illegal-extortion/>
- 18 8. *U.S. Constitution*, Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2- Gives Congress the authority to DIRECTLY and legislatively control
19 all those in receipt of "benefits", which are government property on loan to the recipient with legal strings attached.
20 <https://law.justia.com/constitution/us/article-4/>
- 21 9. *Why the Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property*, Form #04.404 (Member Subscriptions)-income
22 taxation is administered as a "benefit". The OFFICE of "taxpayer", "person", "individual", "citizen", and "resident" are
23 legislatively created and granted property and all those who use or invoke these statuses are in receipt of a "benefit". If
24 you doubt this, visit ID.ME and try to sign up for an account with the IRS. They are identified as a "benefit",
25 <https://sedm.org/product/why-the-federal-income-tax-is-a-privilege-tax-on-government-property-form-04-404/>

26 **4.1.30 Weaponization of Government**

27 The process by which a classically governmental function is abused as a method to destroy or war against private rights,
28 private property, common law remedies, constitutional remedies, or even personal choice and autonomy. The
29 PERPETRATOR we call the RECRUITER and the VICTIM we call the PEON, VASSAL, and SLAVE. We describe the
30 HAZARDS of participating in, NOT opposing, or benefiting from the "weaponization of government" on the opening page
31 of our site as follows:

32 *People of all races, genders, political beliefs, sexual orientations, and nearly all religions*
33 *are welcome here. All are treated equally under REAL "law". The only way to remain*
34 *truly free and equal under the civil law is to avoid seeking government civil services,*
35 *benefits, property, special or civil status, exemptions, privileges, or special treatment. All*
36 *such pursuits of government services or property require individual and lawful consent to*
37 *a franchise and the surrender of inalienable constitutional rights AND EQUALITY in the*
38 *process, and should therefore be AVOIDED. The rights and equality given up are the*
39 *"cost" of procuring the "benefit" or property from the government, in fact. Nothing in life*
40 *is truly "free". Anyone who claims that such "benefits" or property should be free and*
41 *cost them nothing is a thief who wants to use the government as a means to STEAL on his*
42 *or her behalf. All just rights spring from responsibilities/obligations under the laws of a*
43 *higher power. If that higher power is God, you can be truly and objectively free. If it is*
44 *government, you are guaranteed to be a slave because they can lawfully set the cost of their*
45 *property as high as they want as a Merchant under the U.C.C. If you want it really bad*
46 *from people with a monopoly, then you will get it REALLY bad. Bend over. There are*
47 *NO constitutional limits on the price government can charge for their monopoly services*
48 *or property. Those who want no responsibilities can have no real/PRIVATE rights, but*
49 *only privileges dispensed to wards of the state which are disguised to LOOK like*
50 *unalienable rights. Obligations and rights are two sides of the same coin, just like self-*
51 *ownership and personal responsibility. For the biblical version of this paragraph, read 1*
52 *Sam. 8:10-22. For the reason God answered Samuel by telling him to allow the people to*
53 *have a king, read Deut. 28:43-51, which is God's curse upon those who allow a king above*
54 *them. Click Here for a detailed description of the legal, moral, and spiritual consequences*
55 *of violating this paragraph.*

Below are the elements describing exactly what we mean by this term:

1. The result is:

1.1. An INVOLUNTARY conversion of PRIVATE property, PRIVATE rights, and PRIVATE civil status into PUBLIC property, PUBLIC rights, and PUBLIC civil statutory status respectively.

1.2. A destruction of the legal separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE. See:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

1.3. A government that has superior or supernatural powers in relation to the people it was created to SERVE from below rather than RULE from above.

1.4. The creation of a ALLEGED but not ACTUAL consensual connection between a fictional office (the "franchisee") in the government and an otherwise PRIVATE human OUTSIDE the government.

1.5. A destruction of equality of treatment and protection between the GOVERNORS and the GOVERNED. See:

Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment, Form #05.033
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/EqualProtection.pdf>

1.6. The establishment of a civil or governmental religion in violation of the First Amendment. See:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SocialismCivilReligion.org.pdf>

2. Such activities:

2.1. Work a purpose OPPOSITE of that of establishing government in the first place, which is EXCLUSIVELY the protection of PRIVATE property and PRIVATE rights.

2.2. Violate the Bill of Rights of the constitution of the government doing so.

2.3. Violate the oath of office of those working in the government who conspire to engage in such activities.

2.4. Result in a conversion of the government engaging in them from DE JURE to DE FACTO. See:

De Facto Government Scam, Form #05.043
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/CorpGovt.pdf>

3. The method of instituting this weaponization of government usually consists of illegal "bundling" of a WANTED service with an UNWANTED service, privilege or franchise. This makes it IMPOSSIBLE to avoid the UNWANTED service, privilege, or franchise, because:

3.1. The government has a monopoly on the WANTED aspect of the product or service.

3.2. Private industry is usually legally prohibited from offering the WANTED service. In some cases, the offering of the service is a criminal offense, in order to ENSURE and protect this criminal mafia racketeering.

4. The techniques described herein fit in the following CRIMINAL categories:

4.1. Extortion. [18 U.S.C. §872](#). They are coercing you into a public office and franchise so you become a usually ONGOING sponsor of their criminal activities.

4.2. Offer to procure appointive public office. [18 U.S.C. §210](#). Offering you the UNWANTED portion of the service, which is usually a public office, constitutes a criminal offer to procure the public office with the bribe of "benefits" that you technically aren't eligible for.

4.3. Bribery of public officials and witnesses. [18 U.S.C. §201](#). The monies paid to the government under the coerced public office or fiction occupied by the victim of this extortion constitute bribes to a public official to treat you AS IF you are a real de jure public officer and to pay you "benefits" that only public officers can collect.

4.4. Conflict of interest. [18 U.S.C. §208](#). A criminal financial conflict of interest is created in the people offering the WANTED service to market and compel the UNWANTED service to increase their revenues.

4.5. Peonage and slavery. [18 U.S.C. §1581](#) and Thirteenth Amendment. The civil statutory obligations that attach to the compelled office that the VICTIM involuntarily occupies constitute PEONAGE.

4.6. Impersonating a public officer. [18 U.S.C. §912](#). Government can only regulate its own officers. Those officers must, in turn, be lawfully elected, appointed, or hired and they NEVER are. Following proper appointment, election, or hiring protocol would, after all, inform you that you are a volunteer, and they can NEVER admit that they need your consent to regulate you.

5. Those in government engaging in such activities protect themselves from criminal consequences by:

5.1. Abusing "equivocation" of key terms to make PUBLIC and PRIVATE indistinguishable.

5.2. Playing stupid.

5.3. Ensuring that people administering the program are NOT legally responsible or accountable for anything they say, write, or publish. See:

- 1 5.4. Compartmentalizing service personnel at the bottom by telling them to learn PROCEDURES and NEVER actual
2 LAW. Thus, they can claim plausible deniability and never be prosecuted personally for their criminal activities. .
3 6. To ensure the continuation and protection of the weaponization of government, the corrupt government agents and
4 employees engaging in it will:
- 5 6.1. Hide forms for quitting the programs.
 - 6 6.2. Describe the program as "voluntary" but provide no regulations, forms, or internal procedures to QUIT.
 - 7 6.3. Not offer options on the application for the WANTED service any method of UNBUNDLING or REMOVING
8 the UNWANTED service from the transaction.
 - 9 6.4. Define no statutory or regulatory terms which recognize ANYONE who has not volunteered for the
10 UNWANTED service so that their PRIVATE rights can be legally recognized and even ADMINISTRATIVELY
11 enforced.
12 The above tactics, in a PRIVATE business context, would be referred to as "marketing".
- 13 7. To ensure that the government is never victimized by the above tactics by PRIVATE people using it against THEM,
14 the corrupted and covetous government must implement SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY in its own case but DENY it to
15 the sovereign people they serve:
- 16 7.1. Government must claim to have sovereign immunity which requires EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT to
17 surrender that sovereign immunity. By the way, the CONSTITUTION DOES NOT AUTHORIZE sovereign
18 immunity and there is therefore NO SUCH THING! See: [Najim v. CACI Premier Tech., Inc., 368 F.Supp.3d. 935](#)
19 [\(2019\)](#).
 - 20 7.2. The Sovereign People from whom that sovereign immunity was delegated DO NOT have sovereign immunity.
21 Thus, sovereign immunity is a "supernatural power" the people as the "natural" cannot and do not possess.
 - 22 7.3. All people signing up for the SCAM UNWANTED service do so through usually IMPLIED rather than
23 EXPRESS consent. Thus, they are UNAWARE that they are "electing" themself ILLEGALLY into a public
24 office and joining the government by doing so. This constitutes fraud, because they are NOT ALLOWED to
25 know that is what they are doing, and if they knew that was what they were doing, they would DEMAND the
26 ability to NOT CONSENT to the UNWANTED service connected to the office and receive only the WANTED
27 service or product. See:

- 28 8. Synonyms for this process include: adhesion contract, unconscionable contract, compelled franchise, compelled
29 privilege, SLAVERY, PEONAGE, HUMAN TRAFFICKING.

30 Examples of government programs which usually implement "weaponization of government" as described above:

- 31 1. Passports. Most people use this document mainly for INTERSTATE travel and ID to conduct commerce, neither of
32 which can be or should be "privileged" or regulated. Foreign travel use requests the PRIVILEGE of protection abroad
33 is only secondary and should be optional. The Department of State should offer TWO passports, one for INTRAsate
34 use and one for FOREIGN use, so that you have a "NONPRIVILEGED" version of the document that you can obtain
35 WITHOUT the need to collect an SSN or TIN. Forcing applicants to provide an SSN or TIN to receive ANY kind of
36 passport essentially bundles a DE FACTO public office with otherwise PRIVATE travel. That office is called
37 "STATUTORY citizen" under [8 U.S.C. §1401](#), [26 C.F.R. §1.1-1\(c\)](#), etc. See:

- 38 2. State "resident" ID. This id is intended primarily for use in commerce, and most people, if they had a choice, would
39 AVOID the STATUTORY "resident" civil status and public office bundled with it.
- 40 3. Driver licensing. This id is intended primarily for use in commerce, and most people, if they had a choice, would
41 AVOID the STATUTORY "driver" civil status and public office bundled with it.
- 42 4. Marriage licensing. Licensed marriage is a civil statutory privilege and a three party contract. A licensed marriage is
43 polygamy with the state, and the state is the only one of the three parties who can rewrite the contract at will any time
44 they wan. Thus, the state literally becomes god as the only party with superior or supernatural powers in violation of
45 the First Amendment.
- 46 5. Professional licensing. Government uses licenses to institute in effect ECONOMIC EMBARGOES on all those who
47 don't follow their rules. If you don't follow their rules and regulations, they take away the license. In the absence of a
48 license, you lose business and could literally starve in some cases. The result is GENOCIDE.
- 49 6. Building permits. It's not your property if you need permission from the government to do anything to it that doesn't
50 demonstrably injure others.

- 1 7. Property taxes. Through the Torrens Act and the building code, the state claims a shared ownership in the property and
2 acquires absolute ownership. If you don't pay the property tax, they literally STEAL your property and all your equity.
3 The absolute owner is the only party who can deprive other parties of the use of the property so they are the absolute
4 owner.
- 5 8. The Federal Reserve counterfeiting franchise. We presently have "currency", and not "money". Currency in turn is a
6 debt instrument, and the effective lender is the PRIVATE, for profit, Federal Reserve. Every attempt to regulate the use
7 of this fiat currency through money laundering statutes presupposes that those handling it are engaged in a public office
8 in the national government. See:
- 9 8.1. *The Money Scam*, Form #05.041
10 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/MoneyScam.pdf>
- 11 8.2. *The Money Laundering Enforcement Scam*, Form #05.044
12 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/MoneyLaunderingScam.pdf>
- 13 9. Criminal courts, who will insist that you must be "REPRESENTED" essentially by a public officer and officer of the
14 court with a criminal financial conflict of interest, or they won't allow litigation to proceed. See:
- Unlicensed Practice of Law*, Form #05.029
<https://sedm.org/product/unlicensed-practice-of-law-form-05-029/>

15 In the private commercial marketplace, such tactics by large corporations include the following:

- 16 1. The Google Android operating system:
- 17 1.1. If phone manufacturers what to implement on their phone, must agree to use Google Search as their default
18 search engine.
- 19 1.2. Developers who want to sell their apps in the Google Play store must run all payments through the Google Play
20 payment system and pay a commission to Google. They are NOT allowed to have their OWN private app store or
21 payment platform.
- 22 2. The Apple IOS operating system. Vendors who want to offer their apps in the Apple Store must use the Apple payment
23 platform and pay an exorbitant 30% of all revenues their app collects, even if it isn't the sale of their app initially. This
24 is extortion.
- 25 3. The Microsoft Windows operating system. For years, Microsoft mandated that the Internet Explorer browser had to be
26 installed as the default browser on all new PC's sold, or the manufacturer could not buy Windows to install on their
27 computer.
- 28 4. Amazon marketplace. Third party vendors who sell on Amazon must agree in writing when they sign up to NEVER
29 offer the products they sell on Amazon at a LOWER price than the Amazon price.
- 30 5. Banks. Most banks COMPEL you ILLEGALLY into a public office called a STATUTORY "U.S. Person" in order to
31 open a bank account, even though it is ILLEGAL to occupy or elect yourself into such an office. They do this by
32 refusing to accept the W-8 form and mandating the use of the W-9 form to open an account, even though the W-9
33 doesn't apply to most Americans. See:
- "U.S. Person" Position*, Form #05.053
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/USPersonPosition.pdf>
- 34 6. Money Service Businesses (MSBs) such as Western Union. They require you to provide an SSN in order to obtain a
35 reloadable gift card and claim that "the law" mandates this.
- 36 6.1. Their basis for doing so is usually "anti-money laundering" statutes (not "laws", but "statutes") that DO NOT
37 apply to the average American. See:
- The Money Laundering Enforcement Scam*, Form #05.044
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/MoneyLaunderingScam.pdf>
- 38 6.2. No law mandates that a state national and nonresident alien not engaged in the "trade or business" franchise must
39 have or use an SSN or TIN, but they ILLEGALLY refuse to allow prospective cardholders to claim this status or
40 avoid the SSN/TIN requirement. See:
- About IRS Form W-8BEN*, Form #04.202
<https://sedm.org/Forms/04-Tax/2-Withholding/W-8BEN/AboutIRSFormW-8BEN.htm>
- 41 7. Private employers accepting job applicants. They say you MUST fill out a W-4 and will not accept a W-8 in order to
42 obtain a job, NOT as an "employee", but simply as a "worker" who is NOT a statutory government "employee". See
- Federal and State Withholding Options for Private Employers*, Form #09.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/09-Procs/FedStateWHOptions.pdf>

43 The European Union has previously SANCTIONED large corporations to the tune of billions of dollars of penalties connected
44 with the above tactics, which they label in court as "anti-competitive behavior". Why aren't they applying the SAME tactics
45 to THEMSELVES, as far as the MONEY system? For instance, why aren't PRIVATE companies allowed to have private

1 money systems and not connect those who use them into a public office illegally? Every time someone tries to do this, they
2 get RAIDED illegally under the guise of "know your customer rules" that don't apply to private people. This has happened
3 with eGold, Bitclub, Liberty Dollar, National Commodity and Barter Association (NCBA), and MANY others. Litigating
4 against these entities can only have one purpose: Protect a de facto monopoly on money that the Constitution does NOT
5 EXPRESSLY authorize and which is therefore FORBIDDEN. See:

- 6 1. *The Money Scam*, Form #05.041
7 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/MoneyScam.pdf>
- 8 2. *Why It is Illegal for You to Enforce Money Laundering Statutes In My Specific Case*, Form #06.046
9 <https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/MonLaundEnfIllegal.pdf>
- 10 3. *Money Laundering Enforcement Scam*, Form #05.044
11 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/MoneyLaunderingScam.pdf>

12 The main purpose of ELIMINATING all "weaponization of government" as described above is to:

- 13 1. Pursue "justice", which is legally defined as the "right to be left alone" by everyone, INCLUDING and ESPECIALLY
14 government. See:
15

<i>What is "Justice"?</i> , Form #05.050 https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhatIsJustice.pdf

- 16 2. Restore the constitutional separation between PUBLIC and PRIVATE. The Constitution is a TRUST indenture, and the
17 main "benefit" it delivers, in fact, is PRIVATE PROPERTY! See:
18

<i>Separation Between Public and Private Course</i> , Form #12.025 https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf

- 19 3. Restore government to it's DE JURE functions and eliminate all DE FACTO practices. See:
20

<i>De Facto Government Scam</i> , Form #05.043 https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/DeFactoGov.pdf

- 21 4. Eliminate the "Administrative State" that depends for its entire existence upon the ILLEGAL creation of the public
22 offices that animate and implement the above FRAUD upon the people. See:
23

<i>Administrative State: Tactics and Defenses Course</i> , Form #12.041 https://sedm.org/LibertyU/AdminState.pdf
--
- 24 5. To eliminate the criminal activities and criminal financial conflicts of interest in both the judiciary and the legal
25 profession created by the above.

26 4.1.31 Natural law

27 For the purposes of this website and ministry, the term "natural law" is synonymous with the following behavior by civil
28 government:

- 29 1. ALL property is absolutely owned.
- 30 2. The protection of private property is not regarded by anyone in government as "making law" ([Litigation Tool](#)
31 [#01.009](#)), but rather a fulfillment of the main purpose of establishing government and the oath that all public officers
32 take when accepting office. The CIVIL statutes DO NOT protect PRIVATE property, but PUBLIC property that
33 became public by donating PRIVATE property to a public use, a public purpose, and/or a public office. In that sense,
34 the current civil government ONLY PROTECTS ITSELF and its own PUBLIC property, and NEVER YOU or ANY
35 HUMAN BEING at least from a CIVIL perspective! See:
36

<i>Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises</i> , Form #05.051** https://sedm.org/product/why-the-government-is-the-only-real-beneficiary-of-all-government-franchises-form-05-051/

- 37 3. [Civil statutes \(Form #05.037\)](#) are not called "law", but civil service franchise contracts.
4. Only voting and jury service are privileges that can be CIVILLY regulated by default. Any other thing that is a
voluntary privilege must be expressly signed up for and PAID for in writing on the annual tax return filed at the
beginning of each year and only lasts for one year.
5. Government ID's are NOT used to change your civil status to a "resident" or "domiciliary". You remain PRIVATE
when using government ID. See:

<i>Hot Issues: Identification*</i> , SEDM https://sedm.org/identification/
--

- 1 6. No other [franchise or privilege \(Form #05.030\)](#) is or can be bundled with voting or jury service, such as [civil](#)
- 2 [DOMICILE \(Form #05.002\)](#).
- 3 7. All government “civil services” must be requested IN WRITING at the beginning of each year and you only pay for
- 4 what you ask for. The purpose of filing tax returns is to CONSENT to specific civil services you want and to pay for
- 5 them in advance. Those who didn’t pay for them may not receive them. See [SEDM Disclaimer, Section 4.6](#) for a
- 6 definition of “civil service”.
- 7 8. Everyone is subject to the criminal and common law, whether they consent or not.
- 8 9. Civil courts may not enforce civil statutory law upon any party UNLESS they expressly consented in writing to receive
- 9 its benefits as public property. If they didn’t, only the common law and criminal law applies. That consent shall appear
- 10 on the tax return filed annually.
- 11 10. Administrative tax enforcement is NOT permitted and not necessary, since all civil services consumed are prepaid
- 12 annually in advance. If you don’t prepay, you don’t get the service.
- 13 11. Every government agent is personally accountable for the accuracy and truthfulness of EVERYTHING he or she
- 14 communicates to the public that might have an adverse affect on PRIVATE property or PRIVATE rights. Thus, they
- 15 are PRESUMED to be communicating under penalty of perjury at all times. If they lie, they are civilly penalized.
- 16 ANONYMOUS communication or collection letters are FORBIDDEN. All must be signed by a human being.
- 17 12. All government “benefits” are regarded as “civil services” that must be 100% paid annually for by those who consume
- 18 them AS THEY ARE USED. Use of public funds for charity is FORBIDDEN.
- 19 13. The filing of [information returns \(Form #04.001\)](#) such as the W-2 and 1099 are forbidden and a criminal offense of
- 20 impersonating a public office. They are unnecessary if civil services are consented to and paid for annually and you
- 21 don’t need to BE a public officer to consume civil services. Being a sponsor is sufficient to consume said services.
- 22 14. Consent must always be OVERT and in writing, and NEVER COVERT or implied through actions of any kind. See:
- | |
|---|
| <i>Hot Issues: Invisible Consent*</i> , SEDM
https://sedm.org/invisible-consent/ |
|---|

23 For a system of government that implements the above and builds upon existing organic and statutory law, and which requires
24 the least possible changes to the current system to implement, see:

<i>Self Government Federation: Articles of Confederation</i> , Form #13.002 https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/SGFArtOfConfed.pdf
--

25 **4.2 Rules for interpreting words or terms that are not expressly defined**

26 ***Other than the words defined above, all words used on this website and in the materials on it shall:***

- 27 **1. Have only the common meaning ascribed to them.**
- 28 **2. Be associated with the EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE status beyond the reach of civil statutory law.**
- 29 **3. NOT be construed in any way to have the statutory meaning found in any federal or state law.**
- 30 **4. NOT be associated with a "public office", "publici juris", or "public interest", or anything within the**
- 31 **CIVIL jurisdiction of any state or federal court.**
- 32 **5. Be subject to enforcement only in the context of the common law where perfect equity and equality is**
- 33 **enforced between the government and any and every human being.**

34 The only exception to this rule is that when a word is surrounded in quotation marks and preceded or succeeded by an
35 indication of the legal definition upon which it is based, then and only then will it assume the legal definition.

36 The legal or statutory definitions for words used by this ministry in turn:

- 37 1. Shall be based FIRST upon statutory definitions provided.
- 38 2. Shall conclusively be presumed to EXCLUDE the ordinary or EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE civil context for the
- 39 meaning of words. This is because the ability to regulate EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE conduct is REPUGNANT TO
- 40 THE CONSTITUTION as held by the U.S. Supreme Court.
- 41 3. Shall rely FIRST on the [Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites By Topic](#) for the statutory
- 42 definitions.
- 43 <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/FormsInstr-Cites.htm>

4. May not ADD anything not EXPRESSLY appearing in any statute in which they are defined, if a statutory definition is provided. Any attempt to do so shall be interpreted as TREASON by the judge or government prosecutor who attempts it.

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

The purpose of this requirement is to eliminate ALL presumptions from any legal proceeding about what we might write or say so that such false and unauthorized presumptions *cannot* be used to discredit or slander us or prejudice our rights or sovereignty. For instance, here are two examples:

<i>Statement from this website</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
Wages are not taxable	Earnings from labor of a human being that <i>do not</i> fit the description of "wages" defined in 26 U.S.C. §3401(a) and 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3 are not taxable without the consent of the subject.
" <u>Wages</u> " are taxable	Wages as defined in 26 U.S.C. §3401(a) and 26 C.F.R. §31.3401(a)-3 ARE taxable because they fit the legal description of " <u>wages</u> ".

4.3 Terms in quotation marks


Whenever a term appears in quotation marks, we are using the statutory or regulatory definition of the term *instead* of the layman's or dictionary definition. We do this to clarify which definition we mean and to avoid creating the kind of confusion with definitions that the federal government and the unethical lawyers who work in it are famous for. For instance, when we use say "employee", we mean the statutory definition of that term found in [26 U.S.C. §3401\(c\)](#) and [26 C.F.R. §31.3401\(c\)](#)-1 rather than the common definition everyone uses, which means anyone who receives compensation for their labor. "Employees" are much more narrowly defined in the Internal Revenue Code to mean elected or appointed officers of the U.S. government only. We also put terms in quotation marks if they are new or we just introduced the term, to emphasize that we are trying to explain what the word means.

4.4 Geographical Definitions and Conventions

4.4.1 Background Information

1. *What is Federal Land?* (federal enclave)-SEDM
<https://sedm.org/what-is-federal-land-federal-enclave/>
2. *American Empire*-SEDM
<https://sedm.org/american-empire/>
3. *Why the Federal Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property*, Form #04.404
<https://sedm.org/product/why-the-federal-income-tax-is-a-privilege-tax-on-government-property-form-04-404/>

1 **4.4.2 Geographical definitions**



2
3 A very frequent point of confusion and misunderstanding even within the legal profession is the definition of geographical
4 terms in the various contexts in which they are used. The table below is provided to clear up this confusion in order that
5 people do not misinterpret geographical terms by applying them outside their intended context. Using this page is VERY
6 important for those who will be reading and researching state and federal law. The differences in meaning within the various
7 contexts are primarily a consequence of the Separation of Powers Doctrine.

Law	Federal constitution	Federal statutes	Federal regulations	State constitutions	State statutes	State regulations
Author	Union States/ "We The People"	Federal Government		"We The People"	State Government	
"state"	Foreign country	Union state or foreign country	Union state or foreign country	Other Union state or federal government	Other Union state or federal government	Other Union state or federal government
"State"	Union state	Federal state	Federal state	Union state	Union state	Union state
"in this State" or "in the State" ¹¹	NA	NA	NA	NA	Federal enclave within state	Federal enclave within state

Law	Federal constitution	Federal statutes	Federal regulations	State constitutions	State statutes	State regulations
Author	Union States/ "We The People"	Federal Government		"We The People"	State Government	
"State" ^[2] (State Revenue and taxation code only)	NA	NA	NA	NA	Federal enclave within state	Federal enclave within state
"several States"	Union states collectively ^[3]	Federal "States" collectively	Federal "States" collectively	Federal "States" collectively	Federal "States" collectively	Federal "States" collectively
"United States"	states of the Union collectively	Federal United States**	Federal United States**	United States* the country	Federal United States**	Federal United States**

1 What the above table clearly shows is that the word "State" in the GENERAL context of MOST federal statutes and
2 regulations means (not includes!) federal States only under Title 48 of the U.S. Code^[4], and these areas do not include any of
3 the 50 Union States. This is true in most cases and especially in the Internal Revenue Code. There are four exceptions to
4 this rule that we are aware of, and these subject matters include (are limited to):

5 **SOURCES OF EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION**

- 6 1. A military or foreign affairs function of the United States. 5 U.S.C. §553(a)(1). This includes:
7 1.1. Making or executing war. This is the Department of Defense (DOD), Title 50 of the U.S. Code, and the Uniform
8 Code of Military Justice (U.C.M.J.), 10 U.S.C. Chapter 47.
9 1.2. Regulating aliens within the country. The presence test at 26 U.S.C. §7701(b) implements the tax aspect of this.
10 1.3. Protecting VOLUNTARY STATUTORY citizens (not constitutional citizens) abroad. This is done through
11 passports, 26 U.S.C. §911 which pays for the protection, the Department of State (DOS), and the military.
12 1.4. International commerce with foreign nations. This is done through the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA),
13 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97, U.S.C.I.S., Department of Homeland Security (DHS), and the foreign affairs supervision of
14 the federal courts.
15 1.5. Economic sanctions on foreign countries and political rulers imposed by the Department of the Treasury.
16 2. A matter relating to agency management or personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts. 5
17 U.S.C. §553(a)(2). Note that:
18 2.1. " Taxes" do NOT fall in the category of "public property, loans, grants, or benefits" , but the U.S. supreme court
19 identified them as a "quasi-contract" in Milwaukee v. White, 296 U.S. 268 (1935).
20 2.2. In the case of "agency management or personnel", they are talking about public officers serving within the
21 national government as EXPRESSLY GEOGRAPHICALLY authorized by 4 U.S.C. §72 and NOT elsewhere.
22 We'll give you a HINT, there IS not "express legislative authorization" for "taxpayer" offices to be exercised
23 outside the District of Columbia as required, so all those serving in such an office extraterritorially are DE
24 FACTO officers (Form #05.043). The income tax is an excise tax upon the "trade or business" franchise, which is
25 defined in in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(26) as "the functions of a public office", but those offices may not lawfully be
26 exercised outside the District of Columbia. That is why the statutory geographical "United States" defined in 26
27 U.S.C. §7701(a)(9) and (a)(10) is defined as the District of Columbia and NOWHERE expressly extended outside
28 the District of Columbia or the Federal statutory "State" defined in 4 U.S.C. §110(d).
29 2.3. Civil statutory statuses such as "taxpayer", "citizen", "resident", and "person" AND the PUBLIC RIGHTS and
30 privileged that attach to them are PROPERTY legislatively created and therefore owned by the national
31 government. Those claiming these statuses are in receipt, custody, or "benefit" of federal privileges no matter
32 where they physically are, and thus are subject to Congress power to "make all needful rules respecting the
33 Territory and other property" granted by Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.
34 3. Federal agencies or persons in their capacity as officers, agents, or employees thereof. 44 U.S.C. §1505(a)(1).
35 4. EXPRESS and INFORMED consent or comity in some form. Note that NO ONE can consent FOR YOU. YOU have
36 to consent YOURSELF. Presently, "comity" is legally defined as "willingness to grant a privilege". It USED to be
37 defined as MUTUAL consent or agreement of both parties. This has the INSIDIOUS effect that it is OK for a judge to
38 consent FOR YOU, or you to consent sub silentio or by acquiescence. The RESULT is that you are treated AS IF you

1 are a privileged agent or officer of the state, which we call a "straw man", often without compensation. This
2 is [CRIMINAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING](#) and [CRIMINAL IDENTITY THEFT \(Form #05.046\)](#) if you didn't
3 KNOWINGLY consent. The purpose of this [SOPHISTRY](#) is to procure your consent INVISIBLY, so they don't have
4 to recognize or respect your sovereignty or autonomy. After all, they think they know better than you about what is
5 good for you. See:

- 6 4.1. [Hot Issues: Invisible Consent*, SEDM](#)
7 <https://sedm.org/invisible-consent/>
- 8 4.2. [How State Nationals Volunteer to Pay Income Tax](#), Form #08.024
9 <https://sedm.org/Forms/08-PolicyDocs/HowYouVolForIncomeTax.pdf>

10 The above four items collectively are referred to as "[extraterritorial jurisdiction](#)". Extraterritorial jurisdiction is defined as
11 SUBJECT MATTER jurisdiction over [PUBLIC property \(Form #12.025\)](#) physically situated OUTSIDE of the EXCLUSIVE
12 jurisdiction of the national government under [Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution](#). Congress has jurisdiction
13 over its property and the offices it creates no matter WHERE they physically reside or are lawfully exercised, INCLUDING
14 within the exclusive jurisdiction of a constitutional state as confirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court in [Dred Scott v. Sandford,](#)
15 [60 U.S. 393 \(1857\)](#), which ironically was about SLAVES. Those who CONSENT to be statutory "taxpayers" would fall in
16 this same category of "slave" and are treated literally as CHATTEL of the national government. HOWEVER, the Constitution
17 confers NO EXPRESS authorization for Congress to use TACIT and PERSONAL BRIBES or GRANTS of its physical or
18 chattel PUBLIC property or "benefits" to CREATE NEW public offices or appoint new officers to de facto offices that are
19 NOT created by an EXPRESS lawful oath or appointment. Any attempts to do so are CRIMINAL OFFENSES under [18](#)
20 [U.S.C. §§201, 210, 211](#). More about public offices and officers in:

- 21 1. [The "Trade or Business" Scam](#), Form #05.001
22 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>
- 23 2. [Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You Are a "Public Officer" for Income Tax Purposes](#), Form #05.008
24 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyThiefOrPubOfficer.pdf>
- 25 3. [Proof That There Is a "Straw Man"](#), Form #05.042
26 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StrawMan.pdf>

27 For the purposes of this discussion, Sovereign States of the Union are NOT "[territory](#)" of the national government. Also, the
28 Sixteenth Amendment did NOT confer EXTRATERRITORIAL jurisdiction to levy an UNAPPORTIONED direct tax upon
29 labor as property within the exclusive jurisdiction of a constitutional state of the Union either. In fact, the U.S. Supreme Court
30 declared that it "conferred NO NEW power of taxation" in [Stanton v. Baltic Mining, 240 U.S. 103 \(1916\)](#). Thus, the income
31 tax HAS ALWAYS been a tax upon officers of the national government called statutory "taxpayer", "citizens", and "persons".
32 This is ENTIRELY consistent with the legislative intent of the proposed sixteenth amendment proposed to Congress by
33 President Taft himself:

34 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD - SENATE - JUNE 16, 1909
35 [From Pages 3344 – 3345]

36 The Secretary read as follows:

37 To the Senate and House of Representatives:

38 It is the constitutional duty of the President from time to time to recommend to the
39 consideration of Congress such measures, as he shall judge necessary and expedient. In
40 my inaugural address, immediately preceding this present extraordinary session of
41 Congress, I invited attention to the necessity for a revision of the tariff at this session, and
42 stated the principles upon which I thought the revision should be affected. I referred to the
43 then rapidly increasing deficit and pointed out the obligation on the part of the framers of
44 the tariff bill to arrange the duty so as to secure an adequate income, and suggested that if
45 it was not possible to do so by import duties, new kinds of taxation must be adopted, and
46 among them I recommended a graduated inheritance tax as correct in principle and as
47 certain and easy of collection.

48 The House of Representatives has adopted the suggestion, and has provided in the bill it
49 passed for the collection of such a tax. In the Senate the action of its Finance Committee
50 and the course of the debate indicate that it may not agree to this provision, and it is now

1 proposed to make up the deficit by the imposition of a general income tax, in form and
2 substance of almost exactly the same character as, that which **in the case of Pollock v.**
3 **Farmer's Loan and Trust Company (157 U.S., 429) was held by the Supreme Court**
4 **to be a direct tax, and therefore not within the power of the Federal Government to**
5 **Impose unless apportioned among the several States according to**
6 **population.** [Emphasis added] This new proposal, which I did not discuss in my inaugural
7 address or in my message at the opening of the present session, makes it appropriate for
8 me to submit to the Congress certain additional recommendations.

9 Again, it is clear that by the enactment of the proposed law the Congress will not be
10 bringing money into the Treasury to meet the present deficiency. The decision of the
11 Supreme Court in the income-tax cases **deprived the National Government of a power**
12 **which, by reason of previous decisions of the court, it was generally supposed that**
13 **government had.** It is undoubtedly a power the National Government ought to have. It
14 might be indispensable to the Nation's life in great crises. Although I have not considered
15 a constitutional amendment as necessary to the exercise of certain phases of this power, a
16 mature consideration has satisfied me that an amendment is the only proper course for its
17 establishment to its full extent.

18 I therefore recommend to the Congress that both Houses, by a two-thirds vote, **shall**
19 **propose an amendment to the Constitution conferring the power to levy an income**
20 **tax upon the National Government** without apportionment among the States in
21 proportion to population.

22 This course is much to be preferred to the one proposed of reenacting a law once judicially
23 declared to be unconstitutional. For the Congress to assume that the court will reverse
24 itself, and to enact legislation on such an assumption, will not strengthen popular
25 confidence in the stability of judicial construction of the Constitution. It is much wiser
26 policy to accept the decision and remedy the defect by amendment in due and regular
27 course.

28 Again, it is clear that by the enactment of the proposed law the Congress will not be
29 bringing money into the Treasury to meet the present deficiency, but by putting on the
30 statute book a law already there and never repealed will simply be suggesting to the
31 executive officers of the Government their possible duty to invoke litigation.

32 If the court should maintain its former view, no tax would be collected at all. If it should
33 ultimately reverse itself, still no taxes would have been collected until after protracted
34 delay.

35 It is said the difficulty and delay in securing the approval of three-fourths of the States will
36 destroy all chance of adopting the amendment. Of course, no one can speak with certainty
37 upon this point, but I have become convinced that a great majority of the people of this
38 country are in favor of investing the National Government with power to levy an income
39 tax, and that they will secure the adoption of the amendment in the States, if proposed to
40 them.

41 Second, **the decision in the Pollock case left power in the National Government to levy**
42 **an excise tax, which accomplishes the same purpose as a corporation income tax** and
43 is free from certain objections urged to the proposed income tax measure.

44 I therefore recommend an **amendment to the tariff bill Imposing upon all corporations**
45 **and joint stock companies for profit, except national banks (otherwise taxed), savings**
46 **banks, and building and loan associations, an excise tax measured by 2 per cent on the net**
47 **income of such corporations. This is an excise tax upon the privilege of doing business**
48 **as an artificial entity and of freedom from a general partnership liability enjoyed by**
49 **those who own the stock.** [Emphasis added] I am informed that a 2 per cent tax of this
50 character would bring into the Treasury of the United States not less than \$25,000,000.

1 The decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Spreckels Sugar Refining Company
2 against McClain (192 U.S., 397), seems clearly to **establish the principle that such a tax**
3 **as this is an excise tax upon privilege and not a direct tax on property**, and is within
4 the federal power without apportionment according to population. The tax on net income
5 is preferable to one proportionate to a percentage of the gross receipts, because it is a tax
6 upon success and not failure. It imposes a burden at the source of the income at a time
7 when the corporation is well able to pay and when collection is easy.

8 Another merit of this tax is the federal supervision, which must be exercised in order to
9 make the law effective over the annual accounts and business transactions of all
10 corporations. While the faculty of assuming a corporate form has been of the utmost utility
11 in the business world, it is also true that substantially all of the abuses and all of the evils
12 which have aroused the public to the necessity of reform were made possible by the use of
13 this very faculty. If now, by a perfectly legitimate and effective system of taxation, we are
14 incidentally able to possess the Government and the stockholders and the public of the
15 knowledge of the real business transactions and the gains and profits of every corporation
16 in the country, we have made a long step toward that supervisory control of corporations
17 which may prevent a further abuse of power.

18 I recommend, then, first, the adoption of a joint resolution by two-thirds of both Houses,
19 proposing to the States an amendment to the Constitution granting to the Federal
20 Government the right to levy and collect an income tax without apportionment among the
21 several States according to population; and, second, the enactment, as part of the pending
22 revenue measure, either as a substitute for, or in addition to, the inheritance tax, of an excise
23 tax upon all corporations, measured by 2 percent of their net income.

24 Wm. H. Taft

25 Some people have asserted that it is deceptive to claim that the phrase above "**shall propose an amendment to the Constitution**
26 **conferring the power to levy an income tax upon the National Government**" implies it is a tax upon the government. In retort,
27 the following proves we are not only correct, but that the only real DECEPTIVE one was Taft Himself:

- 28 1. Taft could have said "**shall propose an amendment to the Constitution conferring upon the national government**
29 **the power to levy an income tax**" but DID NOT state it more correctly this way.
- 30 2. The legislative implementation of what he proposed he described as an excise and a privilege tax ONLY upon
31 corporations, which even after the Sixteenth Amendment was ratified, is EXACTLY and ONLY what the Sixteenth
32 Amendment currently authorizes. These corporations are NATIONAL corporations, not STATE corporations, by the
33 way.

34 ***"Income" has been taken to mean the same thing as used in the Corporation Excise Tax Act of 1909,***
35 ***in the Sixteenth Amendment, and in the various revenue acts subsequently passed. Southern Pacific***
36 ***Co. v. Lowe, 247 U.S. 330, 335; Merchants' L. & T. Co. v. Smietanka, 255 U.S. 509, 219. After full***
37 ***consideration, this Court declared that income may be defined as gain derived from capital, from***
38 ***labor, or from both combined, including profit gained through sale or conversion of capital.***
39 ***Stratton's Independence v. Howbert, 231 U.S. 399, 415; Doyle v. Mitchell Brothers Co., 247 U.S.***
40 ***179, 185; Eisner v. Macomber, 252 U.S. 189, 207. And that definition has been adhered to and***
41 ***applied repeatedly. See, e.g., Merchants' L. & T. Co. v. Smietanka, supra; 518; Goodrich v.***
42 ***Edwards, 255 U.S. 527, 535; United States v. Phellis, 257 U.S. 156, 169; Miles v. Safe***
43 ***Deposit Co., 259 U.S. 247, 252-253; United States v. Supplee-Biddle Co., 265 U.S. 189, 194;***
44 ***Irwin v. Gavit, 268 U.S. 161, 167; Edwards v. Cuba Railroad, 268 U.S. 628, 633. In***
45 ***determining what constitutes income, substance rather than form is to be given controlling***
46 ***weight. Eisner v. Macomber, supra, 206. [271 U.S. 175]"***
47 ***[Bowers v. Kerbaugh-Empire Co., 271 U.S. 170, 174, (1926)]***

- 48 3. The U.S. Supreme Court in Downes v. Bidwell agreed that the income tax extends wherever the GOVERNMENT
49 extends, rather than where the GEOGRAPHY extends. Notice it says "without limitation as to place" and "places over
50 which the GOVERNMENT extends".

1 "Loughborough v. Blake, 18 U.S. 317, 5 Wheat. 317, 5 L.Ed. 98, was an action of trespass (or,
2 as appears by the original record, replevin) brought in the Circuit Court for the District of
3 Columbia to try the right of Congress to impose a direct tax for general purposes on that District.
4 3 Stat. 216, c. 60, Fed. 17, 1815. It was insisted that Congress could act in a double capacity: in
5 [***32] one as legislating [*260] for the States; in the other as a local legislature for the
6 District of Columbia. **In the latter character, it was admitted that the power of levying direct
7 taxes might be exercised, but for District purposes only, as a state legislature might tax for
8 state purposes; but that it could not legislate for the District under Art. I, sec. 8, giving to
9 Congress the power "to lay and collect taxes, imposts and excises," which "shall be uniform
10 throughout the [CONSTITUTIONAL] United States[***]," inasmuch as the District was no
11 part of the [CONSTITUTIONAL] United States[***]. It was held that the grant of this power
12 was a general one without limitation as to place, and consequently extended to all places over
13 which the government extends; and that it extended to the District of Columbia as a constituent
14 part of the United States[****]. The fact that Art. I, sec. 20, declares that "representatives and
15 direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States . . . according to their respective
16 numbers," furnished a standard by which taxes were apportioned; but not to exempt any part of
17 the country from their operation. "The words used do not mean, that direct taxes shall be imposed
18 on States only which are [***33] represented, or shall be apportioned to representatives; but
19 that direct taxation, in its application to States, shall be apportioned to numbers." That Art. I,
20 sec. 9, P4, declaring that direct taxes shall be laid in proportion to the census, was applicable to
21 the District of Columbia, "and will enable Congress to apportion on it its just and equal share of
22 the burden, with the same accuracy as on the respective States. If the tax be laid in this
23 proportion, it is within the very words of the restriction. It is a tax in proportion to the census or
24 enumeration referred to." It was further held that the words of the ninth section did not "in terms
25 require that the system of direct taxation, when resorted to, shall be extended to the territories,
26 as the words of the second section require that it shall be extended to all the [**777] States. They
27 therefore may, without violence, be understood to give a rule when the territories shall be taxed
28 without imposing the necessity of taxing them."**

29 [[Downes v. Bidwell, 182 U.S. 244 \(1901\)](#)]

- 30 4. The fact that when former President and then Chief Justice Taft heard the FIRST case in the Supreme court after
31 ratification, he stated that the liability for an income tax had NOTHING TO DO with one's nationality or domicile!
32 Cook, American national abroad in Mexico and domiciled there was outside the statutory geographical "United States".
33 Recall that the U.S. Supreme Court in [Lawrence v. State Tax Commission, 286 U.S. 276 \(1932\)](#) held that domicile was
34 the SOLE basis for income tax so Cook technically could NOT owe an income tax. But his litigation related to a 1040
35 return he previously filed in which he INCORRECTLY declared his status as that of a "U.S individual". Thus, he made
36 an ELECTION (consent) to be treated as a statutory "U.S. person" and thus ELECTED himself into a voluntary
37 "taxpayer" office to procure protection of the national government while abroad. Notice he calls "protection" a
38 BENEFIT, and thus a VOLUNTARY EXCISE TAXABLE FRANCHISE! Notice he says the SOLE BASIS in this
39 case was the STATUTORY STATUS under the Internal Revenue Code of "citizen", and not "domicile". That civil
40 statutory status and NOT Constitutional or Fourteenth Amendment status, we prove in [How State Nationals Volunteer
41 to Pay Income Tax, Form #08.024](#), is an OFFICE within the Department of Treasury who works for the Secretary of
42 the Treasury.

43 *"The contention was rejected that a citizen's property without the limits of the United States
44 derives no benefit from the United States. The contention, it was said, came from the
45 confusion of thought in "mistaking the scope and extent of the sovereign power of the
46 United States as a nation and its relations to its citizens and their relations to it." **And that
47 power in its scope and extent, it was decided, is based on the presumption that
48 government by its very nature benefits the citizen and his property wherever found, and
49 that opposition to it holds on to citizenship while it "belittles and destroys its advantages
50 and blessings by denying the possession by government of an essential power required***

to make citizenship completely beneficial." In other words, the principle was declared that the government, by its very nature, benefits the citizen and his property wherever found and, therefore, has the power to make the benefit complete. Or to express it another way, the basis of the power to tax was not and cannot be made dependent upon the situs of the property in all cases, it being in or out of the United States, and was not and cannot be made dependent upon the domicile of the citizen, that being in or out of the United States, but upon his relation as citizen to the United States and the relation of the latter to him as citizen. The consequence of the relations is that the native citizen who is taxed may have domicile, and the property from which his income is derived may have situs, in a foreign country and the tax be legal — the government having power to impose the tax."

[[Cook v. Tait, 265 U.S. 47 \(1924\)](#)]

5. The definition of "person" in [26 U.S.C. §6671\(b\)](#) and [26 U.S.C. §7343](#) for the purposes of penalty and criminal enforcement purposes limits itself to government employees and instrumentalities of the government. The rules of statutory construction and interpretation forbid adding anything to these definitions not expressly provided, such as PRIVATE constitutionally protected men and women. Thus, anyone who doesn't fall within the ambit of these definitions is, by definition, a VOLUNTEER because not a proper target of enforcement.

[TITLE 26 > Subtitle F > CHAPTER 68 > Subchapter B > PART I > Sec. 6671](#)
[Sec. 6671.](#) - Rules for application of assessable penalties
(b) Person defined

The term "person", as used in this subchapter, includes an officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee, or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs.

[TITLE 26 > Subtitle F > CHAPTER 75 > Subchapter D > Sec. 7343.](#)
[Sec. 7343.](#) - Definition of term "person"

The term "person" as used in this chapter [[Chapter 75](#)] includes an officer or employee of a corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who as such officer, employee, or member is under a duty to perform the act in respect of which the violation occurs

6. The following memorandum of law proves that the only proper target of IRS enforcement are public officers WITHIN the government.

[Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a "Public Officer" for Income Tax Purposes](#), Form #05.008
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyThiefOrPubOfficer.pdf>

7. The fact that "[United States](#)" is geographically defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#) and (a)(10) as the District of Columbia and the CONSTITUTIONAL states of the Union are never mentioned. That place is synonymous with the GOVERNMENT in [4 U.S.C. §72](#) and not any geography.
8. The fact that the ACTIVITY that is subject to excise taxation within the Internal Revenue Code is legally defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as "the functions of a public office", meaning an office WITHIN the national and not state government. For exhaustive details on this subject, see:

[The "Trade or Business" Scam](#), Form #05.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>

9. The fact that the Federal Register Act and the Administrative Procedures act both limit the TARGET of direct STATUTORY enforcement to the following groups, none of which include most people in states of the Union and which primarily consist of government employees only:
- 9.1. A military or foreign affairs function of the United States. [5 U.S.C. §553\(a\)\(1\)](#) .
- 9.2. A matter relating to agency management or personnel or **to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts**. [5 U.S.C. §553\(a\)\(2\)](#).
- 9.3. Federal agencies or persons in their capacity as officers, agents, or employees thereof. [44 U.S.C. §1505\(a\)\(1\)](#).
You can find more on the above in:

[Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union](#), Form #05.052
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf>

- 1 10. The fact that they can only tax legislatively created offices who work for them. See:
2 [Hierarchy of Sovereignty: The Power to Create is the Power to Tax](https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/PowerToCreate.htm), Family Guardian Fellowship
3 <https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Remedies/PowerToCreate.htm>
- 4 11. The idea that governments are created to PROTECT private property, not steal it, and that taxation involves the
5 institutionalized process of converting PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property without the express consent of the
6 owner. Thus, the process of PAYING for government protection involves the OPPOSITE purpose for which
7 governments are created—converting PRIVATE property to PUBLIC property, often without the consent of the owner,
8 for the purposes of delivering the OPPOSITE, which is PREVENTING PRIVATE property from being converted to
9 PUBLIC property! The Declaration of Independence declares that all just powers derive from the consent of the
10 governed, and yet we make an EXCEPTION to that requirement when it comes to taxation? Absurd. So they HAVE to
11 procure your consent to occupy a civil statutory office BEFORE they can enforce against you or else they are violating
12 the Thirteenth Amendment and engaging in criminal human trafficking. For a description of just how absurd it is to
NOT require consent to this office and to convert (STEAL) private property without the consent of the owner, see:
[Separation Between Public and Private Course](https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf), Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>
- 12 12. A query of the ChatGPT-4 AI Chatbot confirms our analysis is correct:

In the phrase " shall propose an amendment to the Constitution conferring the power to levy an income tax upon XYZ", was this a tax upon xyz or upon people OTHER than xyz?

✓ Searching for: what is the meaning of "levy an income tax upon XYZ" in the constitution

✓ Generating answers for you...

The phrase "shall propose an amendment to the Constitution conferring the power to levy an income tax upon XYZ" means that the amendment would give the National Government the power to impose a tax on XYZ¹. Therefore, the income tax would be imposed on XYZ and not on people other than XYZ.

Learn more:

1. [merriam-webster.com](https://www.merriam-webster.com)

2. [merriam-webster.com](https://www.merriam-webster.com)

3. [britannica.com](https://www.britannica.com) — see less

1

2 So what the President proposed was an excise tax on the government itself, and nothing more. This is important. More on
3 the history of the Sixteenth Amendment at:

- 4 1. [Taxation Page](https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/taxes.htm), Section 13: 16th Amendment, Family Guardian Fellowship
5 <https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/taxes.htm>
6 2. [Great IRS Hoax](https://famguardian.org/Publications/GreatIRSHoax/GreatIRSHoax.htm), Form #11.302, Sections 3.8.11 and 3.8.12
7 <https://famguardian.org/Publications/GreatIRSHoax/GreatIRSHoax.htm>
8 3. [Great IRS Hoax](#), Form #11.302, Section 6.7.1: 1925: William H. Taft's Certiori Act of 1925. President Taft's SCAM to
9 make the income tax INTERNATIONAL in scope by DENYING all appeals relating to it so the Supreme Court
10 wouldn't have to rule on the illegal enforcement of the income tax.

1 <https://famguardian.org/Publications/GreatIRSHoax/GreatIRSHoax.htm>

- 2 4. The Law that Never Was, William Benson. Book about the FRAUDULENT ratification of the Sixteenth Amendment.
3 5. Congressional Debates on the Sixteenth Amendment, Family Guardian Fellowship
4 <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/History/Congress/1909-16thAmendCongrRecord.pdf>

5 EVEN in the case of item 2 of the extraterritorial jurisdiction list entitled "A matter relating to agency management or
6 personnel or to public property, loans, grants, benefits, or contracts" above, legislative control over property is limited to
7 public offices, and NOT to private state nationals. A "public officer", after all, is legally defined in Black's Law Dictionary
8 as someone in charge of the PROPERTY of the public. We have never seen any case hold that merely possessing physical
9 property of the national government while physically present within a constitutional state confers DIRECT, PERSONAL
10 legislative jurisdiction over the person whose hands that property is physically in.

11 The above exceptions are discussed in:

- 12 1. Hot Issues: Laws of Property, SEDM
13 <https://sedm.org/laws-of-property/>
14 2. Why the Federal Income Tax is a Privilege Tax Upon Government Property, Form #04.404
15 <https://sedm.org/product/why-the-federal-income-tax-is-a-privilege-tax-on-government-property-form-04-404/>
16 3. Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union, Form #05.052
17 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf>
18 4. Federal Enforcement Authority Within States of the Union, Form #05.032
19 <https://sedm.org/reference/mbr-sub-area/>
20 5. IRS Due Process Meeting Handout, Form #03.008
21 <https://sedm.org/Forms/03-Discovery/IRSDueProcMtgHandout.pdf>

22 The lower case word "state" in the context of federal statutes and regulations means one of the 50 union states, which are
23 "foreign states", and "foreign countries" with respect to the federal government as clearly explained in section 5.2.11 of the
24 Great IRS Hoax, Form #11.302 (OFFSITE LINK) book. In the context of the above, a "Union State" means one of the 50
25 Union states of the United States* (the country, not the federal United States**) mentioned in the Constitution for the United
26 States of America.

27 If you would like to know all the implications of the separation of powers reflected in the above table, as well as a history of
28 unconstitutional efforts to destroy this separation, see the following references:

- 29 1. Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023
30 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SeparationOfPowers.pdf>
31 2. Sovereignty Forms and Instructions Online, Form #10.004, Cites by Topic: "Separation of Powers" (OFFSITE LINK)
32 <http://famguardian.org/TaxFreedom/CitesByTopic/SeparationOfPowers.htm>
33

34 FOOTNOTES:

35 ^[1] See California Revenue and Taxation Code, section 6017.

36 ^[2] See California Revenue and Taxation Code, section 17018.

37 ^[3] See, for instance, U.S. Constitution Article IV, Section 2.

38 ^[4] See <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/48>

39 **4.4.3 Capitalization within Statutes and Regulations**

40 Whenever you are reading a particular law, including the U.S. Constitution, or a statute, the Sovereign referenced in that law,
41 who is usually the author of the law, is referenced in the law with the first letter of its name capitalized. For instance, in the
42 U.S. Constitution the phrase "We the People", "State", and "Citizen" are all capitalized, because these were the sovereign
43 entities who were writing the document residing in the States. This document formed the federal government and gave it its
44 authority. Subsequently, the federal government wrote statutes to implement the intent of the Constitution, and it became the
45 Sovereign, but only in the context of those territories and lands ceded to it by the union states. When that federal government
46 then refers in statutes to federal "States", for instance in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(10) or 4 U.S.C. §110(d), then these federal
47 "States" are Sovereigns because they are part of the territory controlled by the Sovereign who wrote the statute, so they are
48 capitalized. Foreign states referenced in the federal statutes then must be in lower case. The sovereign 50 union states, for

1 example, must be in lower case in federal statutes because of this convention because they are foreign states. *Capitalization*
2 *is therefore always relative to who is writing the document, which is usually the Sovereign and is therefore capitalized.* The
3 exact same convention is used in the [Bible](#), where all appellations of God are capitalized because they are sovereigns: “**J**esus”
4 ”, “**G**od”, “**H**im”, “**H**is”, “**F**ather”. These words aren’t capitalized because they are proper names, but because the entity
5 described is a sovereign or an agent or part of the sovereign. The only exception to this capitalization rule is in state revenue
6 laws, where the state legislators use the same capitalization as the Internal Revenue Code for “State” in referring to federal
7 enclaves within their territory because they want to scam money out of you. In state revenue laws, for instance in the
8 [California Revenue and Taxation Code \(R&TC\)](#) sections 17018 and 6017, “State” means a federal State within the boundaries
9 of California and described as part of the Buck Act of 1940 found in [4 U.S.C. §§105-113](#).

10 **4.4.4 Legal Status of Federal Enclaves within the States**

11 SOURCE: *State Income Taxes*, Form #05.031, Section 5; <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StateIncomeTax.pdf>.

- 12 1. Federal enclaves are land subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the national government within the exterior limits of a
13 Constitutional state of the Union.
- 14 2. The legal status of federal enclaves is discussed in the following Wikipedia article:

15 [Wikipedia: Federal Enclave](#)

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal_enclave

- 15 3. Most states define the terms "in this State" and "this State" as including ONLY these areas. See:

16 *State Income Taxes*, Form #05.031, Section 10.6

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StateIncomeTax.pdf>

- 16 4. It is a VIOLATION of the separation of powers doctrine and a crime in many CONSTITUTIONAL states for an
17 officer of a state to simultaneously serve in a FEDERAL office and a STATE office at the same time. This is because it
18 creates a conflict of interest. The I.R.C. Subtitle A and C income tax is a PRIVILEGE tax upon public offices within
19 the NATIONAL and NOT STATE government. See:

20 *The "Trade or Business" Scam*, Form #05.001

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/TradeOrBusScam.pdf>

- 20 5. Those in state government who pay STATE income tax, if that tax PIGGYBACKS on the federal tax, are committing
21 the CRIME and UNCONSTITUTIONAL act of simultaneously serving in a STATE office and a FEDERAL office at
22 the SAME time!

- 23 6. The [Buck Act, 4 U.S.C. §§105-110](#) governs what happens in federal areas, which it defines as property owned by the
24 national government WITHIN A FEDERAL TERRITORY OR POSSESSION, but NOT a Constitutional state. We
25 have found NO authority that makes "federal enclaves" and "federal areas" equivalent.

- 26 7. Application of the Bill of Rights to federal enclaves is discussed in:

27 *Catalog of U.S. Supreme Court Doctrines*, Litigation Tool #10.020, Section 5.5

<https://sedm.org/Litigation/10-PracticeGuides/SCDoctrines.pdf>

- 27 8. Supreme court doctrines dealing with federal enclaves/areas include:

- 28 8.1. Friction not Fiction Doctrine, [Howard v. Commissioners, 344 U.S. 624, 626, 73 S.Ct. 465, 97 L.Ed. 617 \(1953\)](#).

- 29 9. [Howard v. Commissioners, 344 U.S. 624, 626, 73 S.Ct. 465, 97 L.Ed. 617 \(1953\)](#) is what authorized state income tax
30 within federal enclaves.

31 9.1. There is no actual LAW that allows this. Congress couldn't pass such a law because it would violate the
32 separation of powers.

33 9.2. The U.S. Supreme Court did cite the Buck Act in this case, but this act does not apply to constitutional states
34 because of the separation of powers.

35 9.3. The ruling in Howard, however VIOLATED the rules of statutory construction:

36 **“Expressio unius est exclusio alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that**
37 **the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another.** *Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456,*
38 *169 S.W.2d. 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100. Mention of*
39 *one thing implies exclusion of another. When certain persons or things are specified in*
40 *a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be*
41 *inferred. Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes*
42 *to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded.”*

43 *[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581]*

1 **"When a statute includes an explicit definition, we must follow that definition, even if**
2 **it varies from that term's ordinary meaning.** *Meese v. Keene*, 481 U.S. 465, 484-485
3 (1987) ("It is axiomatic that the statutory definition of the term excludes unstated meanings
4 of that term"); *Colautti v. Franklin*, 439 U.S. at 392-393, n. 10 ("As a rule, `a definition
5 which declares what a term "means" . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated"); *Western*
6 *Union Telegraph Co. v. Lenroot*, 323 U.S. 490, 502 (1945); *Fox v. Standard Oil Co. of*
7 *N.J.*, 294 U.S. 87, 95-96 (1935) (Cardozo, J.); see also 2A N. Singer, *Sutherland on Statutes*
8 *and Statutory Construction* § 47.07, p. 152, and n. 10 (5th ed. 1992) (collecting cases).
9 That is to say, the statute, read "as a whole," post at 998 [530 U.S. 943] (THOMAS, J.,
10 dissenting), leads the reader to a definition. That definition does not include the Attorney
11 General's restriction -- "the child up to the head." Its words, "substantial portion," indicate
12 the contrary."

13 [*Stenberg v. Carhart*, 530 U.S. 914 (2000)]

14 9.4. By violating the rules of statutory construction in this case, the U.S. Supreme Court in effect "legislated from the
15 bench" by adding things to the definition of "State" in [4 U.S.C. §110\(d\)](#) that do not expressly appear, and thus
16 CONFLATED "federal enclaves" with "federal areas" mentioned in the [Buck Act, 4 U.S.C. §§105-110](#). Thus, it
17 violated the separation of powers by in effect "legislating from the bench", and in so doing, also violated the
18 separation of powers between the states and the national government. THE SUPREME COURT COMMITTED
19 TREASON IN THIS CASE, PUNISHABLE BY DEATH according to [18 U.S.C. §2381!](#)

20 9.5. On the subject of U.S. Supreme Court TREASON in expanding the definition of "State" found in [4 U.S.C.](#)
21 [§110\(d\)](#), the [ChatGPT AI Chatbot](#) said:

22 *QUESTION: In Howard, however, they completely glossed over the meaning of "State" in*
23 [4 U.S.C. §110\(d\)](#), so they SILENTLY and by PRESUMPTION "legislated from the bench".

24 *ANSWER: It is important to note that I am an AI language model and cannot provide real-*
25 *time analysis of specific court cases or access case-specific details beyond what is*
26 *available in publicly accessible sources up to September 2021. Consequently, I cannot*
27 *delve into the specific details or reasoning of the Howard v. Commissioners case.*

28 *However, I understand your concern regarding the interpretation of the term "State" in*
29 [4 U.S.C. 110\(d\)](#) and the potential implications of the Court's ruling in *Howard v.*
30 *Commissioners. In general, when courts interpret statutes, they aim to give effect to the*
31 *intent of the legislature and consider the context and purpose of the law.*

32 *While it is possible to argue that the Court's interpretation in Howard v. Commissioners*
33 *involved a broadening of the term "State" beyond its explicit statutory definition, it is*
34 *ultimately the role of the judiciary to interpret laws and resolve legal disputes. Judicial*
35 *interpretation can sometimes involve filling gaps or making inferences to ensure the law is*
36 *applied appropriately in specific cases.*

37 *If you have specific concerns or seek a more comprehensive analysis of the case, it would*
38 *be advisable to consult legal experts or scholarly sources that have thoroughly examined*
39 *the details and implications of Howard v. Commissioners. They can provide a more*
40 *nuanced perspective on the court's reasoning and the impact of the decision.*

41 Do you think a LEGAL EXPERT they recommend above whose livelihood and his next meal and Mercedes
42 payment comes from MISREPRESENTING the law to expand his client base is going to be any less duplicitous
43 than the U.S. Supreme court on this issue? NOT! It has NEVER been the proper role of ANY de jure judiciary to
44 MALICIOUSLY destroy the [separation of powers](#). The Supreme Court is now a [DE FACTO institution \(Form](#)
45 [#05.043\)](#) because of what it did in this case.

46 10. For more on the "separation of powers doctrine", see:

Government Conspiracy to Destroy the Separation of Powers, Form #05.023 https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SeparationOfPowers.pdf
--

1 The DE FACTO ruling in [Howard v. Commissioners, 344 U.S. 624, 626, 73 S.Ct. 465, 97 L.Ed. 617 \(1953\)](#) is HUGELY
2 important, because:

- 3 1. This ruling is the basis of ALL state income taxation!
- 4 2. Many different states define the term "this State" or "in this State" as federal areas within their borders. For a list of
5 them, see:

[State Income Taxes](#), Form #05.031, Section 10.6
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StateIncomeTax.pdf>

- 6 3. The U.S. Supreme Court in [Lawrence v. State Tax Commission, 286 U.S. 276 \(1932\)](#), declared that in the case of a
7 CONSTITUTIONAL state, DOMICILE is the SOLE basis for income taxation. See:

[Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent](#), Form #05.002, Section 1
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

- 8 4. You can only have ONE domicile at a SINGLE geographical place at a time.
- 9 5. In order to have a STATE income liability, you must ALSO have a FEDERAL liability, which means these two
10 jurisdictions must PHYSICALLY OVERLAP. Two sovereigns cannot have civil or exclusive jurisdiction over the
11 SAME physical place at the SAME time.
- 12 6. That GEOGRAPHICAL overlap is FORBIDDEN by the [separation of powers](#). If you file as a "[nonresident alien](#)" at
13 the federal level, then you must file as a "[nonresident alien](#)" at the state level. If you owe nothing federal, then you can
14 owe nothing to the state, even if you are domiciled WITHIN the CONSTITUTIONAL state and outside of federal
15 enclaves within that state!

16 So we have a [LYING, DE FACTO government \(Form #05.043\)](#), thanks to the U.S. Supreme Court in this case, which made
17 itself into a LEGISLATOR by EXPANDING the definition of "State" in [4 U.S.C. §110\(d\)](#). AND they did it because of the
18 love of money. CRIMINALS! Here is what the DESIGNER of the three branch separation of powers built into our
19 Constitution said about the EFFECT of this CRIMINAL behavior by the U.S. Supreme Court:

20 **"When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the same**
21 **body of magistrates, there can be no liberty; because apprehensions may arise, lest the**
22 **same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws, to execute them in a tyrannical**
23 **manner.**

24 **Again, there is no liberty, if the judiciary power be not separated from the legislative and**
25 **executive. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be**
26 **exposed to arbitrary control; for the judge would be then the legislator. Were it joined to**
27 **the executive power, the judge might behave with violence and oppression [sound**
28 **familiar?].**

29 **There would be an end of everything, were the same man or the same body, whether of**
30 **the nobles or of the people, to exercise those three powers, that of enacting laws, that of**
31 **executing the public resolutions, and of trying the causes of individuals."**

32 [. . .]

33 **In what a situation must the poor subject be in those republics! The same body of**
34 **magistrates are possessed, as executors of the laws, of the whole power they have given**
35 **themselves in quality of legislators. They may plunder the state by their general**
36 **determinations; and as they have likewise the judiciary power in their hands, every**
37 **private citizen may be ruined by their particular decisions."**

38 [*The Spirit of Laws, Charles de Montesquieu, Book XI, Section 6, 1758;*

39 SOURCE: http://famguardian.org/Publications/SpiritOfLaws/sol_11.htm]

40 If you would like more information about the interplay between STATE taxation and FEDERAL taxation, see:

[State Income Taxes](#), Form #05.031
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StateIncomeTax.pdf>

4.4.5 Relationship of Citizenship Terms to Geographical Definitions

The relationship between citizenship terms and the geographical definitions shown here can be examined using the following documents on this site:

1. Citizenship Status v. Tax Status, Form #10.011-very important!
<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipStatusVTaxStatus/CitizenshipVTaxStatus.htm>
2. Citizenship Diagrams, Form #10.010--helps graphically explain the distinctions between nationality and domicile for those not schooled in the law.
<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitizenshipDiagrams.pdf>
3. Citizenship, Domicile, and Tax Status Options, Form #10.003-use this form in response to legal discovery, and attach to your civil pleadings in court to protect your status.
<https://sedm.org/Forms/10-Emancipation/CitDomTaxStatusOptions.pdf>
4. Why You Are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen, Form #05.006
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyANational.pdf>

5 Significance of Identifying Numbers Used in Correspondence between Protected Party and either Government or Government Actor

Parties to this agreement stipulate the following facts in connection with all of their interactions:

1. Pursuant to 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3), all "individuals" are "taxpayers" and statutory "aliens". Consequently, SSNs may only lawfully be used as a substitute for TINs in the case of a statutory but not constitutional alien. Since Protected Party is NOT a statutory alien or statutory "individual" in relation to the national government as a person born within and/or domiciled within the constitutional but not statutory "United States", then Protected Party would be committing fraud to either obtain or to use a Taxpayer Identification Number from the IRS or to use an SSN in place of a TIN.
2. Statutory "Nonresident aliens" not engaged in the "trade or business"/public office franchise such as myself are not required to have or to use Taxpayer Identification Numbers or Social Security Numbers in connection with any financial arrangement or transaction pursuant to the following:

31 C.F.R. §306.10

*² Taxpayer identifying numbers are not required for foreign governments, nonresident aliens not engaged in **trade or business** within the United States, international organizations and foreign corporations not engaged in **trade or business** and not having an office or place of business or a financial or paying agent within the United States, and other persons or organizations as may be exempted from furnishing such numbers under regulations of the Internal Revenue Service.*

3. The terms "Social Security Number", "SSN", "Employer Identification Number", "EIN", "Taxpayer Identification Number", or "TIN" as used on any government forms and all correspondence means "Nontaxpayer Identification Number (NIN)", signifying that the Protected party is a "nontaxpayer" who does not meet the definition of "taxpayer" found in 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14), who is not subject to any provision within the Internal Revenue Code, who is a "nonresident alien" not engaged in a "trade or business", and who has no earnings from within the "United States" as described in 26 U.S.C. §871.
4. The term "Social Security Number" or "SSN" as used on the attached government forms ***IS NOT*** the number issued under the authority of 20 C.F.R. §422.104, which can only lawfully be issued to federal employees, agents, and benefit recipients, none of which describe the Protected Party. See and rebut the following if you disagree:

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

5. The term "Employer Identification Number" or "EIN" as used on all government forms ***IS NOT*** the number issued under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6109 or any other Act of Congress. Instead, it means a "Nontaxpayer Identification Number" or "NIN" as defined above.
6. The term "Taxpayer Identification Number" or "TIN" as used on the All government forms and correspondence ***IS NOT*** the number issued under the authority of either 26 U.S.C. §6109 or any other Act of Congress. Instead it means a "Nontaxpayer Identification Number" or "NIN" as defined above.

- 1 7. All “Nontaxpayer Identification Numbers” or “NINs”, or any other synonym described in this section and included in
2 any form or attachment included herein or submitted on any previous government form are the exclusive, licensed,
3 copyrighted intellectual property of the Protected Party. They are protected by the Copyright Act codified in [Title 17 of](#)
4 [the U.S. Code](#) and this license agreement. Any use by the government of this property for any commercial or government
5 purpose, including tax collection, is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. Each unauthorized use is punishable by a penalty of
6 \$100,000 per incident plus any tax or penalty assessment associated with the unauthorized use.
- 7 8. Providing any kind of identifying number on any government form shall NOT be evidence of consent to engage in a
8 privileged “trade or business” franchise as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#). Instead, it shall be evidence of NON-
9 consent to engage in said franchise and a formal request to criminally prosecute the company, financial institution, and/or
10 government entity associated with the submission for criminal racketeering in violation of [18 U.S.C. §1956](#) and
11 “extortion under the color of law” for compelling the use of said identifying number in violation of [42 U.S.C. §408](#).

12 **WARNING!:** You may not lawfully use any government issued identifying number in connection with the Protected Party,
13 such as a Social Security Number (SSN) as defined in 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d), Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) as
14 defined in [26 U.S.C. §6109](#), or Employer Identification Number (EIN) as defined in [26 U.S.C. §6109](#). Protected Party:

- 15 1. Does not participate and is not lawfully eligible to participate in Social Security or the “trade or business” excise
16 taxable franchise described in 26 U.S.C. Subtitle A.
- 17 2. Is not a statutory “U.S. person” ([26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(30\)](#)) for which a “Taxpayer Identification Number” may lawfully
18 be used pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §6109](#) and 26 C.F.R. §301.6109-1.
- 19 3. May not lawfully use or possess any government identifying number because it is “public property” which belongs to
20 the government pursuant to 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d). Only “public officers” on official business may lawfully use public
21 property, and only in strict accordance with law for the benefit of the government and not them as private individuals.
- 22 4. Is appearing here as a PRIVATE HUMAN BEING and not a PUBLIC OFFICER. If you compel me to use a
23 government identifying number, you are an accessory to criminal conversion of private property to a public use and a
24 public purpose if you connect me or my assets with a public number in violation of [18 U.S.C. §654](#). You could end up
25 in jail for up to ten years if you put an identifying number on any records pertaining to me or my property, assets, or
26 my earnings from PRIVATE employment.
- 27 5. Has been a victim of identity theft, compelled association, and conversion by the government and its agents in banks
28 and financial institutions in the past by unlawfully and involuntarily connecting him/her with knowingly false and
29 fraudulent identifying numbers in criminal violation of [18 U.S.C. §1028\(a\)\(7\)](#), [18 U.S.C. §1028A](#), and a civil violation
30 of [42 U.S.C. §408\(a\)\(7\)](#) and [42 U.S.C. §405\(c\)\(2\)\(C\)\(i\)](#). He/she would like to prevent a recurrence of this behavior
31 again.
- 32 6. Will file a criminal complaint in connection with the use of any government issued identifying number connected with
33 his exclusively PRIVATE life, property, and liberty and vociferously prosecute all those who unlawfully compel him
34 to use a knowingly false number or any number at all in order to obtain any service or product in violation of [42 U.S.C.](#)
35 [§408](#).

36 If the number “000-00-0000” appears in the TIN or SSN block on the attached government form, then it means that Protected
37 Party doesn’t have a validly issued STATUTORY SSN or TIN. Consequently, Protected Party is not “federal personnel” as
38 indicated in [5 U.S.C. §552a\(a\)\(13\)](#).

39 If a number other than “000-00-0000” for the SSN/TIN was provided on the attached government form:

- 40 1. It was provided under unlawful duress because the agent accepting the form threatened to withhold issuance of the
41 passport if Protected Party would not provide a number. It is a CRIME to compel the use of such numbers per [42 U.S.C.](#)
42 [§408\(a\)\(8\)](#).
- 43 2. The number shall be treated AS IF it were “000-00-0000”, regardless of what it says.
- 44 3. The acceptance agent, by instituting duress in compelling the use of government numbers, is attempting to convert
45 constitutional rights into statutory privileges and franchises, which is a CRIMINAL CONSPIRACY against my rights
46 punishable under [18 U.S.C. §241](#). Anyone who does any of the following is party to said conspiracy:
47 3.1. Anyone he or she talked to about how to circumvent my attempts to avoid enumeration is party to said conspiracy.
48 3.2. Anyone who fails or omits deliberately to prosecute the crimes indicated herein.
- 49 4. The number provided is NOT the number described in [26 U.S.C. §6109](#), [20 C.F.R. §422.103\(d\)](#), or any other federal
50 law, statute, or regulation. Hence, it is not subject to being either true, false, factual, or consistent with any record in
51 possession of any government. The clerk said it was their “POLICY” (not LAW, but POLICY) to require a number and
52 could show me no law. Well, if he or she can invent such policy, then Protected Party can INVENT a Nonstatutory
53 number that conforms with the POLICY but also is equally not subject to or susceptible to the requirements of the law.

The constitution protects the equality of ALL PERSONS, and hence, Protected Party has the EQUAL right to make "POLICY" to counteract the DOS's policy to prevent injury to his/her own private rights.

5. The applicant, being under unlawful, criminal duress, does not vouch for the accuracy of said number. Instead, it is:
 - 5.1. NONFACTUAL political beliefs and opinions that are not admissible as evidence in any legal proceeding and not legally actionable in any manner.
 - 5.2. NOT the "Social Security Number" defined in [20 C.F.R. §422.103](#).
 - 5.3. NOT the "Taxpayer Identification Number" (TIN) described in [26 U.S.C. §6109](#).
6. The applicant does not "have" a number described in [26 U.S.C. §6109](#), [20 C.F.R. §422.103](#)(d) and cannot legally "have" such a number. One can only "have" something that they own and control. Protected Party doesn't control the number because if he/she did, he/she could tell the government they CANNOT use it, so it must not be mine. The notion of "property" implies the right to FORBID other people from using or benefitting from something so I must not "OWN" a government number. Both the Social Security Card and [20 C.F.R. §422.103](#)(d) say the card and the number belong to the GOVERNMENT and not the applicant, and therefore it is a legal and rational impossibility for me to "have" government property unless the Protected Party is a public officer managing government property and serving in an official capacity. In fact, Protected Party DOES NOT consent to represent a public office in the government and it is a crime to unilaterally elect or appoint myself into such an office. Furthermore, filling out an SS-5 form or W-9 form and asking for such a number cannot and does not CREATE any public office in the government and any attempt to use it for that purpose is a violation of [18 U.S.C. §912](#). It is acknowledged as a CRIME to use government property such as a statutory SSN or TIN for a private purpose or personal benefit. Hence, the number provided MUST be described herein as NOT corresponding with anything described in any federal law and NOT to be used for any enforcement or government purpose because not connected with any existing application the government has ever received.
7. The power to create is the power to define, and since Protected Party created the form being processed, then Protected Party is the only one who can define both the meaning or the intended meaning of every word or phrase on the form. I must do so in order to avoid being victimized by the self-serving and usually FALSE presumptions of others or conferring undue discretion to a government bureaucrat or judge to INVENT a meaning I didn't intend.

If a Social Security Number (SSN) or Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN) other than "000-00-0000" was provided on the application, the recipient of this form is requested to prosecute the acceptance agent for:

1. Compelled use of Social Security Numbers under [42 U.S.C. §408](#)(a)(8).
2. Identity theft under the following for the commercial abuse of my identity for personal gain without my consent:
 - 2.1. [42 U.S.C. §405](#)(c)(2)(C)(i)
 - 2.2. [42 U.S.C. §408](#)(a)(7)
 - 2.3. [18 U.S.C. §1028](#)(a)(7)
 - 2.4. [18 U.S.C. §1028A](#).
 - 2.5. Equivalent state statutes indicated in:
<https://sedm.org/litigation-main/sedm-jurisdiction-online/>

6 Significance of Perjury statements signed by Protected Party on All Government Forms

6.1 Specific information validated as true on all government forms signed with a perjury statement

Courts have repeatedly held that no one can trust anything a government employee says:

"It is unfortunately all too common for government manuals, handbooks, and in-house publications to contain statements that were not meant or are not wholly reliable. If they go counter to governing statutes and regulations of the highest or higher dignity, e.g. regulations published in the Federal Register, they do not bind the government, and persons relying on them do so at their peril." Caterpillar Tractor Co. v. United States, 589 F.2d. 1040, 1043, 218 Ct.Cl. 517 (1978) (A Handbook for Exporters, a Treasury publication). Dunphy v. United States [529 F.2d. 532, 208 Ct.Cl. 986 (1975)], supra (Navy publication entitled All Hands). In such cases it is necessary to examine any informal publication to see if it was really written to fasten legal consequences on the government. Dunphy, supra. See also Donovan v. United States, 139 U.S. App. D.C. 364, 433 F.2d. 522 (D.C.Cir.), cert. denied, 401 U.S. 944, 91 S.Ct. 955, 28 L.Ed. 2d 225 (1971). (Employees

1 Performance Improvement Handbook, an FAA publication)(merely advisory and directory
2 publications do not have mandatory consequences). *Bartholomew v. United States*, 740
3 F.2d. 526, 532 n. 3 (7th Cir. 1984)(quoting *Fiorentino v. United States*, 607 F.2d. 963,
4 968, 221 Ct.Cl. 545 (1979), cert. denied, 444 U.S. 1083, 100 S.Ct. 1039, 62 L.Ed. 2d 768
5 (1980).

6 *Lecroy's* proposition that the statements in the handbook were binding is inapposite to the
7 accepted law among the circuits that publications are not binding.*fn15 We find that the
8 Commissioner did not abuse his discretion in promulgating the challenged regulations.
9 First, *Farms and International* did not justifiably rely on the Handbook. Taxpayers who
10 rely on Treasury publications, which are mere guidelines, do so at their peril. *Caterpillar*
11 *Tractor Co. v. United States*, 589 F.2d. 1040, 1043, 218 Ct.Cl. 517 (1978). Further, the
12 Treasury's position on the sixty-day rule was made public through proposed section 1.993-
13 2(d)(2) in 1972, before the taxable years at issue. *Charbonnet v. United States*, 455 F.2d.
14 1195, 1199-1200 (5th Cir.1972). See also *Wendland v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*,
15 739 F.2d. 580, 581 (11th Cir.1984). Second, whatever harm has been suffered by *Farms*
16 *and International* resulted from a lack of prudence. As even the *Lecroy* 751 F.2d. at 127.
17 See also 79 T.C. at 1069. "
18 [*CWT Farms Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 755 F.2d. 790 (11th Cir.
19 03/19/1985)]

20 In addition, the court in *Boulez v. C.I.R.*, 258 U.S.App. D.C. 90, 810 F.2d. 209 (1987) ruled that IRS is not responsible for
21 oral agreements or statements.

22 The Internal Revenue Service furthermore indicates on its website that it is NOT RESPONSIBLE for the accuracy of anything
23 they publish:

24 "IRS Publications explain the law in plain language for taxpayers and their advisors. They
25 typically highlight changes in the law, provide examples illustrating IRS positions, and include
26 worksheets. Publications are nonbinding on the IRS and do not necessarily cover all positions
27 for a given issue. While a good source of general information, publications should not be cited
28 to sustain a position."
29 [*Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.)*, Section 4.10.7.2.7; https://www.irs.gov/irm/part4/irm_04-010-007]
30

31 To put one last nail in the coffin of this issue, below is a quote from a book entitled *Tax Procedure and Tax Fraud*, Patricia
32 Morgan, 1999, ISBN 0-314-06586-5, West Group:

33 p. 21: "As discussed in §2.3.3, the IRS is not bound by its statements or positions in
34 unofficial pamphlets and publications."

35 p. 34: "6. IRS Pamphlets and Booklets. The IRS is not bound by statements or positions
36 in its unofficial publications, such as handbooks and pamphlets."

37 p. 34: "7. Other Written and Oral Advice. Most taxpayers' requests for advice from the
38 IRS are made orally. Unfortunately, the IRS is not bound by answers or positions stated
39 by its employees orally, whether in person or by telephone. According to the procedural
40 regulations, 'oral advice is advisory only and the Service is not bound to recognize it in the
41 examination of the taxpayer's return.' 26 C.F.R. §601.201(k)(2). In rare cases, however,
42 the IRS has been held to be equitably estopped to take a position different from that stated
43 orally to, and justifiably relied on by, the taxpayer. The Omnibus Taxpayer Bill of Rights
44 Act, enacted as part of the Technical and Miscellaneous Revenue Act of 1988, gives
45 taxpayers some comfort, however. It amended section 6404 to require the Service to abate
46 any penalty or addition to tax that is attributable to advice furnished in writing by any IRS
47 agent or employee acting within the scope of his official capacity. Section 6404 as
48 amended protects the taxpayer only if the following conditions are satisfied: the written
49 advice from the IRS was issued in response to a written request from the taxpayer; reliance
50 on the advice was reasonable; and the error in the advice did not result from inaccurate

1 *or incomplete information having been furnished by the taxpayer. Thus, it will still be*
2 *difficult to bind the IRS even to written statements made by its employees. As was true*
3 *before, taxpayers may be penalized for following oral advice from the IRS."*

4 If the IRS isn't held accountable in a court of law for what they say or even what they write, then they are, by implication,
5 totally unaccountable to the public that they were put into existence to "serve". The Internal Revenue SERVICE, therefore,
6 only SERVES the interests of itself and not the public at large. Furthermore, we believe the same rules should apply to
7 Americans submitting their tax returns as those that apply to the IRS: not liable or responsible for what is written on the
8 return. For instance, the "I declare under penalty of perjury" should be replaced with "I declare that this return as accurate
9 and trustworthy as the advice and writings of the IRS". That is equivalent to saying that it is *untrue* and NOT trustworthy,
10 and that will get you off the hook and also point out the hypocrisy and lawlessness of the IRS! What is good for the goose is
11 good for the gander. Any other approach would be to condone hypocrisy and lawlessness and tyranny on the part of our
12 government. Why aren't IRS agents required to sign their correspondence under penalty of perjury like all of the
13 communication coming from the "taxpayer" so they CAN be held accountable? Here is what the U.S. Supreme Court had to
14 say about this kind of hypocrisy and lawlessness. You be the judge!:

15 *"Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or ill, it teaches the*
16 *whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a*
17 *lawbreaker [or a hypocrite with double standards], it breeds contempt for the law; it invites*
18 *every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. To declare that in the*
19 *administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means...would bring terrible*
20 *retribution. Against that pernicious doctrine this Court should resolutely set its face."*
21 *[Justice Brandeis, Olmstead v. United States, 277 U.S. 438, 485 (1928)]*

22 It may also interest you to learn that even though YOU don't have to give any credence to IRS Publications, the I.R.C. says
23 that IRS employees MUST follow published administrative guidance.

24 [TITLE 26 > Subtitle F > CHAPTER 80 > Subchapter A > § 7811](#)
25 [§ 7811. TAXPAYER ASSISTANCE ORDERS](#)

26 *(a) Authority to issue*

27 *[. . .]*

28 ***(3) Standard where administrative guidance not followed***

29 *In cases where any Internal Revenue Service employee is not following applicable*
30 *published administrative guidance (including the Internal Revenue Manual), the National*
31 *Taxpayer Advocate shall construe the factors taken into account in determining whether*
32 *to issue a Taxpayer Assistance Order in the manner most favorable to the taxpayer.*

33 The IRS Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998, Section 1102, 112 Stat. 704 mimics the above by requiring the IRS to follow
34 published administrative guidance, including the Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.).

35 During legal discovery, government attorneys often object to questions asked with the phrase:

36 *"Objection: Calls for a legal conclusion."*

37 Government attorneys are usually protected by judges when they make this objection, and I claim the SAME right in
38 submitting any and all government forms to NOT make "legal conclusions", choice of law decisions, or impose obligations
39 upon myself by making such conclusions in submitting government forms. The requirement for equal protection and equal
40 treatment DEMANDS that I must have this SAME right as all government attorneys in any legal dispute or enforcement
41 proceeding arising from or employing evidence produced by me on government forms.

42 Consequently, the following limitations apply to all perjury statements contained on any government form signed by the
43 Protected Party and all information verified by such perjury statements:

- 44 1. None of the terms PREPRINTED on any attached GOVERNMENT SUPPLIED forms therefore:

- 1.1. Are to be construed or interpreted by the Protected Party, Government Actor, or RECIPIENT in a CIVIL STATUTORY context.
- 1.2. Are to be used to enforce any CIVIL STATUTORY or QUASI-CRIMINAL obligation upon the SUBMITTER. By “quasi-criminal”, we mean a PENAL provision that has a predicate civil statutory status, such as “person”, “citizen”, “resident”, “individual”, etc that owes an obligation to do something CIVIL in nature. An example is the definition of “person” found in 26 U.S.C. §6671(b) and 26 U.S.C. §7343. For an explanation of how the quasi-criminal SCAM works, see:

Withdrawal of Plea-Federal, Litigation Tool #03.007
<https://sedm.org/product/withdrawal-of-plea-federal-litigation-tool-03-007/>
- 1.3. Are to be used or construed as an act of “election”, political association, or consent in any form which might give rise to rights on the part of the Recipient. This includes, but is not limited to any of the following statutory civil statuses:
 - 1.3.1. “Person”.
 - 1.3.2. “Individual”.
 - 1.3.3. “Taxpayer”.
 - 1.3.4. “Citizen”.
 - 1.3.5. “U.S. citizen”.
 - 1.3.6. “U.S. resident”.
2. The only legal context and choice of law in which the statements of the Protected Party may be interpreted is the common law, the Constitution (Bill of Rights), and the criminal law (not penal or quasi-criminal) of the place he or she was physically standing on at the time the form was filled out.
3. All RIGHTS RESERVED: U.C.C. §1-308; <https://www.law.cornell.edu/ucc/1/1-308>.
4. The perjury statement on any attached government form(s) verifies ONLY information ADDED to the form, and not information PREPRINTED on the form by the government. If the government isn’t accountable for preprinted information, then under the concept of equal protection and equal treatment, neither can I be, and it would be STUPID of me to surrender my equality in relation to any government in court, since it would in effect create an unconstitutional civil religion in violation of the First Amendment to do so.
5. This statement does not INVALIDATE or limit the perjury statement, but merely controls the SPECIFIC information that is verified under penalty of perjury on the PREPRINTED form and USE and legal CONTEXT of the information provided. As you probably know, CONTEXT of words is EVERYTHING in the legal field: CONSTITUTION v. STATUTORY.

More on the subject of this section at:

1. *Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability*, Form #05.007
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/ReasonableBelief.pdf>
2. *Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud*, Form #05.014
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/LegalDecPropFraud.pdf>
3. *On Why you MUST define Franchise “words of art” on all government forms and how to do it*, SEDM Blog
<https://sedm.org/on-why-you-must-define-franchise-words-of-art-on-all-government-forms-and-how-to-do-it/>

6.2 Materiality of any perjury statements in the context of criminal enforcement by Government Actor

In order for a perjury statement to be material and result in successful criminal enforcement against the party who signed it, there must be a provable physical injury, property damage, or property loss that results from reliance upon it which can form the basis for standing to sue.

MATERIAL EVIDENCE. *Such as is relevant and goes to the substantial matters in dispute, or has a legitimate and effective influence or bearing on the decision of the case. Porter v. Valentine, 18 Misc. 213, 41 N.Y.S. 507; Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. v. George, 52 Okl. 432, 153 P. 116, 119. "Materiality," with reference to evidence does not have the same signification as "relevancy." Pangburn v. State, Tex.Cr.App., 56 S.W. 72, 73.*

MATERIAL FACT. *(In contracts.) One which constitutes substantially the consideration of the contract, or without which it would not have been made. Lyons v. Stephens, 45 Ga. 143.*

1 (In pleading and practice.) One which is essential to the case, defense, application, etc.,
2 and without which it could not be supported. *Sandheger v. Hosey*, 26 W.Va. 223; *Davidson*
3 *v. Hackett*, 49 Wis. 186, 5 N.W. 459; *Hansen v. Sandvik*, 128 Wash. 60. 222 P. 205. 207.
4 One which tends to establish any of issues raised. *Sherwood Bros. v. Yellow Cab Co. of*
5 *Philadelphia*, 283 Pa. 488, 129 A. 563. 564. The "material facts" of an issue of fact are
6 such as are necessary to determine the issue. *Woolman Const. Co. v. Sampson*, 219 Mich.
7 125, 188 N.W. 420. 422.

8 (In insurance.) A fact which, if communicated to the agent or insurer, would induce him
9 either to decline the - .. insurance altogether, or not accept it unless a higher premium is
10 paid. *Berry v. Equitable Fire & Marine Ins. Co.*, Mo.ADD, 263 S.W. 884 886; *Franklin*
11 *Life Ins. Co. v. Dossett*, Tex.Civ.App., 265 S.W. 259, 262. One which necessarily has some
12 bearing on the subject-matter. *Wittels Loan & Mercantile Co. v. American Cent. Ins. Co.*,
13 Mo. APP., 273 S.W. 1084, 1086. A fact which increases the risk, or which, if disclosed,
14 would have been a fair reason for demanding a higher premium: any fact the knowledge
15 or ignorance of which would naturally influence the insurer in making or refusing the
16 contract, or in estimating the degree and character of the risk, or in fixing the rate. *Boaes*
17 *v. Insurance Co.*, 30 Mo. 68; *Clark v. Insurance Co.*, 40 N.H. 338, 77 Am.Dec. 721; *Murphy*
18 *v. Insurance Co.*, 205 Pa. 444, 55 A. 19; *Penn Mut. L. Ins. Co. v. Mechanics' Sav. Bank*,
19 19 C.C.A. 286, 72 F. 413, 38 L.R.A. 33.
20 [*Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1128*]

21 Parties hereby stipulate the following conditions in all their interactions which make both injury to the government and
22 materiality of a false perjury statement by the Protected Party impossible in the context of all their legal interactions:

- 23 1. In all interactions between Protected Party and Government Actor and his /her employer, Protected Party shall be the
24 ONLY "Merchant" (U.C.C. §2-104(1)) and the Government shall at all times be the "Buyer" (U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a)).
25 2. As an agent of his/her Creator 24 hours a day, seven days a week, Protected Party has NO DELEGATED
26 AUTHORITY to consent to be anything BUT a Merchant in relation to any and all governments per their delegation of
27 authority order as described below.¹⁴ Any attempt to violate that delegation of authority order shall constitute
28 malicious interference with First Amendment protections and criminal damage to religious property:

¹⁴ Below are the commandments preventing God's followers from being anything other than a Merchant and NEVER a Buyer in relation to any and every government. The term "nations" means GOVERNMENTS, not individual people:

"For the Lord your God will bless you just as He promised you; **you shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow**; you shall reign over many nations, but they shall not reign over you." [Deut. 15:6, Bible, NKJV]

"The Lord will open to you His good treasure, the heavens, to give the rain to your land in its season, and to bless all the work of your hand. **You shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow.**" [Deut. 28:12, Bible, NKJV]

"**You shall not charge interest to your brother**--interest on money or food or anything that is lent out at interest." [Deut. 23:19, Bible, NKJV]

"To a foreigner you may charge interest, but to your brother you shall not charge interest, that the Lord your God may bless you in all to which you set your hand in the land which you are entering to possess." [Deut. 23:20, Bible, NKJV]

God even warned His followers in the Bible what would happen if they DIDN'T follow the above commandments:

Curses of Disobedience [to God's Laws]

"The alien [[Washington, D.C. is legislatively "alien" in relation to states of the Union](#)] who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down lower and lower [[malicious destruction of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL TREATMENT by abusing FRANCHISES](#)]. He shall lend to you [[Federal Reserve counterfeiting franchise](#)], but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail.

"Moreover **all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the LORD your God, to keep His commandments and His statutes which He commanded you.** And they shall be upon you for a sign and a wonder, and on your descendants forever.

"Because you did not serve [ONLY] the LORD your God with joy and gladness of heart, for the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your [covetous thieving lawyer] enemies, whom the LORD will send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness, and in need of everything; and He will put a yoke of iron [[franchise codes](#)] on your neck until He has destroyed you. The LORD will bring a nation against you from afar [the District of CRIMINALS], from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies [the American Eagle], a nation [whose language \[LEGALESE\] you will not understand](#), a nation of fierce [coercive and fascist] countenance, which does not respect the elderly [assassinates them by denying them healthcare through bureaucratic delays on an Obamacare waiting list] nor show favor to the young [destroying their ability to learn in the public FOOL system]. And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your land [[with "trade or business" franchise taxes](#)], until you [and all your property] are destroyed [[or](#)

Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007

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

- 1 3. No civil statutes which might impose any kind of duty or transfer of property from Protected Party to Government may
2 be cited as authority for any type of enforcement or legal action initiated against Protected Party by Government.
- 3 4. Any legal actions by the Protected Party against Government Actor or his/her employer for recovery of sums owed
4 under this agreement shall be filed as a qui tam action on behalf of the God he or she represents, and not in their own
5 private person.
- 6 5. All government forms shall not be relied upon as evidence of a legal obligation owed to any government because the
7 government itself says you can't trust and should not rely on any and all government forms, statements, and
8 publications. This is true EVEN after the forms are signed under penalty of perjury by Protected Party. Hence, they
9 are of no evidentiary value in any proceeding beyond that assigned to them here, even if signed under penalty of
10 perjury. See:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007

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

- 11 6. Any and all government forms, regardless of what they say, shall therefore be interpreted ONLY as a request by
12 Protected Party for the immediate return all monies paid to the Government Actor and his/her employer by Protected
13 Party plus compound interest in the amount of twice the inflation rate compounded annually. These monies are a
14 repayment of a temporary loan at interest of property and services by the Protected Party to the Government. They are
15 not a loan of property
- 16 7. Government Actor and his/her employer may NOT pay back more than the amount in item 6 above and if they do, that
17 amount becomes a GIFT with no conditions or legal strings or "quid pro quo" attached.
- 18 8. The net result is that it is impossible to interpret any monies or services received by the Protected Party from the
19 Government Actor his/her employer as anything more than repayment of a temporary loan from the Protected Party to
20 the Government.
- 21 9. Parties stipulate that because these monies are repayment of a loan, they can never form standing by Government Actor
22 or his/her employer for fraud, theft, or injury against any government.

23 **7 Parties**

24 The two parties to this agreement include:

- 25 1. The private party, hereinafter called the Protected Party, who sent the Government Actor this franchise and agreement
26 or referenced it in their correspondence with Government Actors. This person is the ONLY Merchant under U.C.C.
27 §2-104(1) in the context of any and every interaction with any or every government.
- 28 2. The government officer or agency, hereinafter called the Government Actor. This legal person is the Buyer under
29 U.C.C. §2-103(1)(a) in relation to the Protected Party. This party fits one or more of the following criteria:
30 2.1. Initiated communication with the Protected Party requiring a response or ..
31 2.2. Made any demands upon the time or property of the Protected Party. or..
32 2.3. Made the Protected Party the target of enforcement for any government franchise, including but not limited to
33 Income taxes under Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A through C, Social Security, Vehicle Code, Family Code,
34 or any other government franchise or debt. . . .or
35 2.4. Is acting as a withholding agent pursuant to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(16) or filing any kind of information return
36 against the Protected Party. Information returns include those submitted under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6041.

37 **8 Consideration**

- 38 1. Consideration provided by Protected Party to Government Actor:
39 1.1. Responses to unwelcome correspondence sent by Government Actor.
40 1.2. The use of any information from, to, or about the Protected Party, and especially involving anything having a
41 commercial consequence.
42 1.3. Services of Protected Party to effect actions required to enforce this agreement.
43 1.4. Receiving temporary use, custody, and control of any and all monies withheld by anyone from my earnings and
44 paid ultimately to the government. I am a man or woman or entity that is: 1. A nonresident not engaged in the
45 "trade or business" franchise; 2. With no statutory "income" from the statutory "United States"; 3. Who never

STOLEN/CONFISCATED]; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the increase of your cattle or the offspring of your
flocks, until they have destroyed you. [Deut. 28:43-51, Bible, NKJV]

1 consented to withholding; 4. And against whom all information return reporting is FALSE. As such, any
2 withholdings or reportings are under protest, under duress, are the product of constructive FRAUD and
3 CRIMINAL misconduct on the part of the government, and are unlawfully withheld and paid. FRAUD has
4 occurred because this franchise makes all statements of the recipient and/or government factual and material
5 relating to tax reporting and withholding, and omissions and misfeasance by the government cause conduct that is
6 inconsistent with and a violation of the written law. These monies may therefore not lawfully be retained either
7 by you or the government without you being guilty of criminal money laundering and being an accessory after the
8 fact to the crimes documented herein. I don't have to become a privileged franchisee called a "taxpayer" or
9 pursue a statutory "refund" in order to get these monies back, because they are *laundered monies* resulting from
10 CRIMINAL RACKETEERING, EXTORTION, and FRAUD that are due back WITHOUT even requesting them
11 back.

12 *"A claim against the United States is a right to demand money from the United States.¹⁵*
13 *Such claims are sometimes spoken of as gratuitous in that they cannot be enforced by suit*
14 *without statutory consent.¹⁶ **The general rule of non-liability of the United States does***
15 ***not mean that a citizen cannot be protected against the wrongful governmental acts that***
16 ***affect the citizen or his or her property.**¹⁷ **If, for example, money or property of an***
17 ***innocent person goes into the federal treasury by fraud to which a government agent was***
18 ***a party, the United States cannot [lawfully] hold the money or property against the claim***
19 ***of the injured party.**¹⁸"*
20 *[American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45 (1999)]*

21
22 *"When the Government has illegally received money which is the property of an innocent*
23 *citizen and when this money has gone into the Treasury of the United States, there arises*
24 *an implied contract on the part of the Government to make restitution to the rightful owner*
25 *under the Tucker Act and this court has jurisdiction to entertain the suit.*

26 [*90 Ct.Cl. at 613, 31 F.Supp. at 769.*](#)
27 [*\[Gordon v. U. S., 227 Ct.Cl. 328, 649 F.2d. 837 \(Ct.Cl., 1981\)\]*](#)
28

29 *California Civil Code*
30 *Section 2224*

31 *"One who gains a thing by fraud, accident, mistake, undue influence, the violation of a*
32 *trust, or other wrongful act, is, unless he or she has some other and better right thereto, an*
33 *involuntary trustee of the thing gained, for the benefit of the person who would otherwise*
34 *have had it."*
35

36 ***"The United States, we have held, cannot, as against the claim of an innocent party, hold***
37 ***his money which has gone into its treasury by means of the fraud of its agent. While here***
38 ***the money was taken through mistake without element of fraud, the unjust retention is***
39 ***immoral and amounts in law to a fraud of the taxpayer's rights. What was said in the State***
40 ***Bank Case applies with equal force to this situation. 'An action will lie whenever the***
41 ***defendant has received money which is the property of the plaintiff, and which the***
42 ***defendant is obligated by natural justice and equity to refund. The form of the***
43 ***indebtedness or the mode in which it was incurred is immaterial."***

¹⁵ United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 A.F.T.R. 4628 (holding that a claim against the Secretary of State for money awarded under a treaty is a claim against the United States); Hobbs v. McLean, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870; Manning v Leighton, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A. 258, motion dismd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A 630 and (disapproved on other grounds by Button's Estate v. Anderson, 112 Vt. 531, 28 A.2d. 404, 143 A.L.R. 195).

¹⁶ Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.

¹⁷ Wilson v. Shaw, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233.

¹⁸ Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 U.S.T.C. ¶ 9346, 15 A.F.T.R. 1069; United States v. State Bank, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto. 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.

1 [\[Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 261, 55 S.Ct. 695, 700, 79 L.Ed. 1421\]](#)

2 2. Consideration provided by Government Actor:

3 2.1. Obedience to this franchise contract.

4 2.2. Implementation of the goals of their oath as a public officer to support and defend the Constitution against
5 domestic enemies, which their employer constitutes by either:

6 2.2.1. Offering or enforcing franchises outside of federal territory or within the borders of a state of the Union.

7 2.2.2. Instituting any of the behaviors associated with the definition of “de facto government” found earlier in
8 section 4.1.4, the definitions section.

9 **9 Authority and even OBLIGATION for Establishment of this Agreement**

10 The origin of ALL of the national government’s authority to enact civil legislation regulating or controlling otherwise
11 PRIVATE property is if the property is either absolutely owned by them or ownership is shared with them. This is made
12 clear by the language of Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2:

13 *United States Constitution*

14 *Article 4, Section 3*

15 **The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations**
16 **respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing**
17 **in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States,**
18 **or of any particular State.**

19 The above process goes BOTH ways. PRIVATE people can make rules for the government if it is in temporary possession
20 of THEIR property, and ESPECIALLY if that possession was never expressly consented to. The government of the United
21 States is a government of delegated powers ALONE.

22 *“The Government of the United States is one of delegated powers alone. Its authority is*
23 *defined and limited by the Constitution. All powers not granted to it by that instrument are*
24 *reserved to the States or the people.”*

25 *[United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)]*

26 The people AS INDIVIDUALS cannot delegate to a collective called “government” any power that they personally do not
27 also individually possess:

28 *“Derativa potestas non potest esse major primitive. Wing. Max. 36; Pinch. Law, b.1. c.3,*
29 *p.11.*

30 *The power [sovereign immunity in this case] which is derived cannot be greater than that*
31 *from which it is derived.”*

32 *[Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2131]*

33 *“Nemo potest facere per obliquum quod non potest facere per directum.1 Eden 512.*

34 *No one can do that indirectly which cannot be done directly.”*

35 *[Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2147]*

36 *“Quod per me non possum, nec per alium..4 Co. 24 b: 11 id. 87a.*

37 *What I cannot do in person, I cannot do through the agency of another.”*

38 *[Bouvier’s Law Dictionary Unabridged, 8th Edition, pg. 2159]*

39 The power to make rules for property that the government has an absolute or qualified interest in is such a delegated power,
40 for instance. As such, if they can use THEIR power to make rules to control YOUR property, then YOU can do the same
41 thing to them under the concept of equal protection and equal treatment.

1 To impute this power ONLY to government and deprive the people as natural humans of it is to, in effect, enforce “superior
2 or supernatural” powers to the government, meaning to make them ABOVE you as the “natural”, to implement religious
3 idolatry, and to establish the “state” as a civil religion as described below:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4 The purpose of establishing government is to protect PRIVATE property. The FIRST step in that protection is to prevent it
5 from being converted to PUBLIC property or PUBLIC rights without the EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT of the original
6 absolute human owner, as described in:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/LibertyU/SeparatingPublicPrivate.pdf>

7 Since a covetous mafia of thieves/plunderers masquerading as “government” or “de facto government”¹⁹ REFUSES to do the
8 ONLY job it was created to do of protecting PRIVATE property and keeping it separate from PUBLIC property, then I have
9 a CONSTITUTIONAL and BIBLICAL obligation to ensure they do it by enacting this agreement as a precondition to the
10 use or “benefit” of my PRIVATE property. Below is WHY I must do this and even HOW to do this, DIRECT from the actual
11 literal physical AUTHOR of the Constitution from whose notes the Constitution was assembled:

12 *“With respect to the words general welfare, I have always regarded them as qualified by
13 the detail of powers connected with them. To take them in a literal and unlimited sense
14 would be a metamorphosis of the Constitution into a character which there is a host of
15 proofs was not contemplated by its creator.”*

16 ***“If Congress can employ money indefinitely to the general welfare, and are the sole and
17 supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their own
18 hands; they may appoint teachers in every State, county and parish and pay them out of
19 their public treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children,
20 establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may assume the
21 provision of the poor; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post-
22 roads; in short, every thing, from the highest object of state legislation down to the most
23 minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress.... Were the power
24 of Congress to be established in the latitude contended for, it would subvert the very
25 foundations, and transmute the very nature of the limited Government established by the
26 people of America.”***

27 *“If Congress can do whatever in their discretion can be done by money, and will promote
28 the general welfare, the government is no longer a limited one possessing enumerated
29 powers, but an indefinite one subject to particular exceptions.”*

30 *[James Madison. House of Representatives, February 7, 1792, On the Cod Fishery Bill,
31 granting Bounties; More quotes like this later in Form #05.016, Section 5.1]*

32 Below is the mechanism for doing that explained by a famous law professor:

33 *“How, then, are purely equitable obligations created? For the most part, either by the acts
34 of third persons or by equity alone. **But how can one person impose an obligation upon
35 another? By giving property to the latter on the terms of his assuming an obligation in
36 respect to it. At law there are only two means by which the object of the donor could be
37 at all accomplished, consistently with the entire ownership of the property passing to the
38 donee, namely: first, by imposing a real obligation upon the property; secondly, by
39 subjecting the title of the donee to a condition subsequent.** The first of these the law does
40 not permit; the second is entirely inadequate. Equity, however, can secure most of the
41 objects of the doner, and yet avoid the mischiefs of real obligations by imposing upon the*

¹⁹ See: *De Facto Government Scam*, Form #05.043; <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/DeFactoGov.pdf>.

1 donee (and upon all persons to whom the property shall afterwards come without value or
2 with notice) **a personal obligation with respect to the property; and accordingly this is**
3 **what equity does.** It is in this way that all trusts are created, and all equitable charges
4 made (i. e., equitable hypothecations or liens created) by testators in their wills. In this
5 way, also, most trusts are created by acts inter vivos, except in those cases in which the
6 trustee incurs a legal as well as an equitable obligation. **In short, as property is the subject**
7 **of every equitable obligation, so the owner of property is the only person whose act or**
8 **acts can be the means of creating an obligation in respect to that property. Moreover, the**
9 **owner of property can create an obligation in respect to it in only two ways: first, by**
10 **incurring the obligation himself, in which case he commonly also incurs a legal**
11 **obligation; secondly, by imposing the obligation upon some third person; and this he**
12 **does in the way just explained.”**

13 [*Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound,*
14 *1925, p. 543]*

15 The only requirement that Protected Party therefore has to meet in order to lawfully impose a duty upon Government Actor
16 is that he/she/it:

- 17 1. Conveys rights or property to a Government Actor.
- 18 2. Gives Government Actor formal, timely, and reasonable notice of the terms and conditions under which Government
19 Actor receives the property or rights constituting the consideration specified in this agreement.

20 This agreement shall therefore and henceforth serve as “reasonable notice” of the terms of receipt of said PRIVATE property
21 in the temporary custody of Government Actor and/or his agents or assigns. Notice to the agent shall also serve as notice to
22 the principal. This means that:

- 23 1. If you are working for a government in corresponding or interacting with me, you also implicitly agree to notify all
24 others who might interact with me in that same government that they are similarly bound by the terms of this franchise
25 and agreement.
- 26 2. In the event that you do not, you also agree to act as personal surety and an officer for any and all other human beings
27 who also communicate or interact with me beyond the point that you have initiated this contact or interaction.

28 The above tactic is the same tactic the government uses against private people, whereby they use the tax system franchise to
29 make innocent and unaware person into surety for endless and irresponsible deficit spending and public debt by career
30 politicians. Hence, I am entitled to equal protection and equal treatment.

31 This franchise agreement operates the same as the federal government’s franchises: and Protected Party is entitled to equal
32 protection and equal treatment:

- 33 1. Income tax “trade or business” franchise:
 - 34 1.1. The agreement operates as a “quasi-contract”, like the income tax itself. See *Milwaukee v. White*, [296 U.S. 268](#)
35 (1935).
 - 36 1.2. Consent to the franchise agreement codified in Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A is based upon unsigned, hearsay
37 third party evidence called an “information return” (W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099) that is usually false because the
38 subject is not engaged in the “public office” franchise and receives no “benefits” thereby. In the case of my/this
39 franchise, such third party hearsay reports consist of any and all administrative correspondence sent by you to me
40 as well as legal pleadings filed in this case containing licensed information about me or relating to commercial/tax
41 transactions, such as my name, address, facts about my conduct, or information illegally seized from a place outside
42 of federal territory.
 - 43 1.3. Using government property called a “Social Security Number” or “Taxpayer Identification Number” in association
44 with someone, which 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) identifies as property of the Social Security Administration and NOT
45 the user, constitutes constructive consent by the person so associated to the terms of the franchise agreement. In
46 that sense, associating the subject with specific information owned by another in the form of an identifying number
47 acts as a prima facie license number to engage in the franchise. In the case of MY franchise, information about me
48 is MY PRIVATE PROPERTY and use of this licensed information makes those using or abusing it into my private
49 officers and agents. In law, all rights are “property”, and the Fourth Amendment protects my right to privacy and
50 thereby makes all information about me into “property” which I have a right to exclusive use and control over as
51 “property”.

1 1.4. The government's "trade or business" franchise confers a "benefit", which is a reduced or graduated rate of tax
2 under [I.R.C. §1](#), earned income credit under [I.R.C. §32](#), and "trade or business" deductions under [I.R.C. §162](#).
3 Likewise, my/this franchise confers a similar "benefit", which is the right to invade my privacy, engage in
4 commercial relationships with me, and impose involuntary uncompensated duties upon me by abusing a legal
5 system against me that otherwise has no jurisdiction over me as a human being and not a legal "person" not
6 domiciled or resident on federal territory.

7 1.5. The franchise is based on an "activity", which is that of a "public office" in the U.S. government ([I.R.C.](#)
8 [§7701\(a\)\(26\)](#)). The result is agency on behalf of the government by the de facto licensee. Likewise, my franchise
9 agreement also creates agency and fiduciary duty on your part towards me as a private party, which I describe as a
10 "private office" representing my wishes as documented herein.

11 2. Social Security Franchise:

12 2.1. The SSA Form SS-5 is an application for a "card" and associated number, not for "benefits".

13 2.2. The SS card is identified in 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) as property of the government and not the holder, even AFTER
14 it is received. The back of the card also affirms this relationship and says it must be returned upon request.

15 2.3. The back of the card and the regulations governing its use say that use of the card constitutes effective consent to
16 the statutes regulating the use of the property, including penalties.

17 If in defense Government Actor claims any of the following:

- 18 1. That Protected Party may not acquire rights by the same method as the government, as in Social Security or the "trade
19 or business" franchise...OR
20 2. That Government Actor has no delegated authority to waive sovereign immunity or to consent by anything other than
21 by an act of legislation.

22 . . . then Protected Party invokes and claims the SAME EQUAL right and therefore cannot be and is not subject to any
23 government franchise, nor can he or she become the lawful subject of any enforcement action under said franchise.
24 Furthermore, any and all funds contributed to any such franchise also shall constitute a LOAN and not a GIFT of any kind.
25 All such loans of property also constitute consideration under the terms of this anti-franchise franchise.

26 Further, Christians such as myself are forcefully commanded by [God's Holy Law \(Deut. 15:6, Exodus 23:32-33, Judges 2-1-](#)
27 [4, Deut. 28:43-51\)](#) to act ONLY as "Merchants" ([U.C.C. §2-104\(1\)](#)) under the [Uniform Commercial Code \(U.C.C.\)](#) and
28 NEVER as "Buyers" ([U.C.C. §2-103\(1\)](#)) in the context of all "[commerce](#)" or "intercourse" with any and every government.
29 Any other approach makes us a harlot in God's eyes ([Isaiah 1:1-26](#)). Black's Law Dictionary defines "[commerce](#)" as
30 "intercourse". The Bible defines "the Beast" as the "kings of the earth"/political rulers in [Rev. 19:19](#):

31 "Commerce. ...Intercourse by way of trade and traffic between different peoples or
32 states and the citizens or inhabitants thereof, including not only the purchase, sale, and
33 exchange of commodities, but also the instrumentalities [governments] and agencies by
34 which it is promoted and the means and appliances by which it is carried on..."
35 [Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 269]

36
37 "Come, I will show you the judgment of the great harlot [the atheist totalitarian
38 democracy] who sits on many waters [which are described as seas and multitudes of
39 people in [Rev. 17:15](#)], with whom the kings of the earth [political rulers of today]
40 committed fornication [intercourse], and the inhabitants of the earth were made
41 drunk with the wine of her fornication [intercourse, usurious and harmful
42 commerce]."

43 *So he carried me away in the Spirit into the wilderness. And I saw a woman sitting on a*
44 *scarlet beast which was full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. The*
45 *woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet, and adorned with gold and precious stones and*
46 *pearls, having in her hand a golden cup full of abominations and the filthiness of her*
47 *fornication [intercourse]. And on her forehead a name was written: MYSTERY,*
48 *BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND OF THE ABOMINATIONS*
49 *OF THE EARTH.*

1 I saw the woman, drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of
2 Jesus. And when I saw her, I marveled with great amazement."
3 [[Rev. 17:1-6](#), Bible, NKJV]

4
5 "And I saw the beast, the kings [heathen political rulers and the unbelieving democratic
6 majorities who control them] of the earth [controlled by Satan], and their armies, gathered
7 together to make war against Him [God] who sat on the horse and against His army."
8 [[Revelation 19:19](#), Bible, NKJV]

9 For an article on what happens to nations and people who do NOT follow this requirement of God's Law, see:

[How Scoundrels Corrupted Our Republican Form of Government](https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm), Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm>

10 This admonition by God is consistent with the [Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act](#) found in [28 U.S.C. §1605\(a\)\(2\)](#), which
11 says that those who conduct "[commerce](#)" with the "[United States](#)" federal corporation within its legislative jurisdiction thereby
12 surrender their sovereignty.

13 **10 Evidence of Consent to this Offer/Agreement**

14 The following subsections deal with conditions in which the Protected Party is a target of criminal activity by specific
15 public servants and the result of the activity is the ILLEGAL CONVERSION of PRIVATE property to public use or
16 control by civil statutes or a government officer against the consent of the owner. For the purposes of this discussion, the
17 term "private" is that defined earlier in section 4.1.3 and the term "private property" is that protected by the following
18 mandatory presumption:

19 "All rights and property are PRESUMED to be EXCLUSIVELY PRIVATE and beyond the
20 control of government or the CIVIL statutory franchise codes unless and until the
21 government meets the burden of proving, WITH EVIDENCE, on the record of the
22 proceeding that:

23 1. A SPECIFIC formerly PRIVATE owner consented IN WRITING to convert said property
24 to PUBLIC property.

25 2. The owner was either abroad, domiciled on, or at least PRESENT on federal territory
26 NOT protected by the Constitution and therefore had the legal capacity to ALIENATE a
27 Constitutional right or relieve a public servant of the fiduciary obligation to respect and
28 protect the right. Those physically present but not necessarily domiciled in a constitutional
29 but not statutory state protected by the constitution cannot lawfully alienate rights to a
30 real, de jure government, even WITH their consent.

31 3. If the government refuses to meet the above burden of proof, it shall be
32 CONCLUSIVELY PRESUMED to be operating in a PRIVATE, corporate capacity on an
33 EQUAL footing with every other private corporation and which is therefore NOT protected
34 by official, judicial, or sovereign immunity."

35 As a consequence of the illegal use or control over PRIVATE property, Government Actors or the government itself is subject
36 to control or regulation of the rightful owner under the terms of this agreement, which is a LOAN agreement.

37 "How, then, are purely equitable obligations created? For the most part, either by the acts
38 of third persons or by equity alone. **But how can one person impose an obligation upon**
39 **another? By giving property to the latter on the terms of his assuming an obligation in**
40 **respect to it. At law there are only two means by which the object of the donor could be**
41 **at all accomplished, consistently with the entire ownership of the property passing to the**
42 **donee, namely: first, by imposing a real obligation upon the property; secondly, by**

1 subjecting the title of the donee to a condition subsequent. The first of these the law does
2 not permit; the second is entirely inadequate. Equity, however, can secure most of the
3 objects of the doner, and yet avoid the mischiefs of real obligations by imposing upon the
4 donee (and upon all persons to whom the property shall afterwards come without value or
5 with notice) a personal obligation with respect to the property; and accordingly this is
6 what equity does. It is in this way that all trusts are created, and all equitable charges
7 made (i.e., equitable hypothecations or liens created) by testators in their wills. In this way,
8 also, most trusts are created by acts inter vivos, except in those cases in which the trustee
9 incurs a legal as well as an equitable obligation. In short, as property is the subject of
10 every equitable obligation, so the owner of property is the only person whose act or acts
11 can be the means of creating an obligation in respect to that property. Moreover, the
12 owner of property can create an obligation in respect to it in only two ways: first, by
13 incurring the obligation himself, in which case he commonly also incurs a legal
14 obligation; secondly, by imposing the obligation upon some third person; and this he
15 does in the way just explained.”

16 [Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound,
17 1925, p. 543]

18 “Cujus est commodum ejus debet esse incommodum.

19 He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage.”

20 “Que sentit commodum, sentire debet et onus.

21 He who derives a benefit from a thing, ought to feel the disadvantages attending it. 2 Bouv.
22 Inst. n. 1433.”

23 [Bouvier’s Maxims of Law, 1856;

24 SOURCE:

25 <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMaxims.htm>]

26 “The rich rules over the poor,

27 And the borrower is servant to the lender.”

28 [Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]

29 “When the Government has illegally received money which is the property of an innocent
30 citizen and when this money has gone into the Treasury of the United States, there arises
31 an implied contract on the part of the Government to make restitution to the rightful
32 owner under the Tucker Act and this court has jurisdiction to entertain the suit.
33 90 Ct.Cl. at 613, 31 F.Supp. at 769.”

34 [[Gordon v. U. S., 227 Ct.Cl. 328, 649 F.2d. 837 \(Ct.Cl., 1981\)](#)]

35 “The United States, we have held, cannot, as against the claim of an innocent party, hold
36 his money which has gone into its treasury by means of the fraud of its agent. While here
37 the money was taken through mistake without element of fraud, the unjust retention is
38 immoral and amounts in law to a fraud of the taxpayer’s rights. What was said in the State
39 Bank Case applies with equal force to this situation. ‘An action will lie whenever the
40 defendant has received money which is the property of the plaintiff, and which the
41 defendant is obligated by natural justice and equity to refund. The form of the
42 indebtedness or the mode in which it was incurred is immaterial.”

43 [[Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 261, 55 S.Ct. 695, 700, 79 L.Ed. 1421](#)]

44 All government franchises are based upon loans of government property with conditions as described in:

[Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises](#), Form #05.030

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

45 Since the United States government is one of delegated powers ALONE, according to the U.S. Supreme Court, then the
46 PRIVATE humans delegating this NATURAL power such as the Protected Party must also have the SAME power to create
47 franchises and use them against the government as a defense against illegal enforcement of government franchises against
48 them. Such franchises include the Internal Revenue Code Subtitle A “public officer”/“trade or business” franchise, Social
49 Security, and every other government benefit.

1 Every attempt by anyone in government to alienate rights that the Declaration of Independence says are UNALIENABLE is
2 hereby stipulated under this agreement as "PRIVATE BUSINESS ACTIVITY" that cannot be protected by sovereign,
3 official, or judicial immunity. So called "government" cannot make a [profitable business or franchise](#) out of alienating
4 inalienable rights without ceasing to be a classical/de jure government and instead becoming in effect an [economic terrorist](#)
5 [and de facto government in violation of Article 4, Section 4.](#)

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

10 For a detailed exposition of the rules of lawfully converting property from PRIVATE to PUBLIC, see and rebut:

[Separation Between Public and Private Course](#), Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

11 **10.1 Generally**

12 Pursuant to U.C.C. §1-303, Course of Usage and Trade, evidence of unconditional consent to this agreement shall include
13 any one or more of the following actions in a general sense:

- 14 1. Signing this agreement.
- 15 2. Making any demands upon the valuable time, resources, or property of the Protected Party.
- 16 3. Claiming a right or interest to any of the property of the Protected Party.
- 17 4. Adversely affecting constitutionally protected rights of the Protected Party.
- 18 5. Treating Protected Party as a "citizen", "resident", or domiciliary under any federal law and thus moving his identity to
19 the District of Columbia under any franchise agreement, such as that codified at [26 U.S.C. §7408\(d\)](#) and [26 U.S.C.](#)
20 [§7701\(a\)\(39\)](#).
- 21 6. Engaging in or attempting to engage in any kind of commercial relationship with Protected Party or using his/her/its
22 name in connection with a commercial obligation, which thereby causes an implied surrender of sovereign, official,
23 and judicial immunity of the Government Actor in relation to the Protected Party pursuant to [28 U.S.C. §1605](#). This
24 includes instituting penalties, sending bills, or making any kind of financial demands upon the Protected Party.

25 CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE
26 DIVISION 3. OBLIGATIONS
27 PART 2. CONTRACTS
28 CHAPTER 3. CONSENT
29 [Section 1589](#)

30 *1589. A voluntary acceptance of the benefit of a transaction is equivalent to a consent to*
31 *all the obligations arising from it, so far as the facts are known, or ought to be known, to*
32 *the person accepting.*

- 33 7. Associating the Protected Party with a statutory status under any government franchise, including but not limited to:
 - 34 7.1. "driver" under the vehicle code of any state of the Union.
 - 35 7.2. "spouse" under the family code of any state of the Union.
 - 36 7.3. "taxpayer", "person", or "individual" under the revenue code of any state of the Union.
 - 37 7.4. "taxpayer", "person", "individual", "citizen", or "resident" under the Internal Revenue Code, Title 26 of the
38 United States Code.
 - 39 7.5. "citizen of the United States" under 8 U.S.C. §1401, 26 U.S.C. §3121(e), or 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c).
 - 40 7.6. "person" or "individual" under the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. Chapter 7.
 - 41 7.7. "person" or "individual" under any government healthcare or tax law.
- 42 8. Claiming that any aspect of the interactions between Protected Party and Government Actor is a "benefit" as legally
43 defined or characterizing any aspect of the relationship between parties as falling within the ambit of 5 U.S.C.
44 §553(a)(2), which permits direct legislative regulation of the Protected Party. The definition of "benefit" is limited to
45 that provided herein. It does not include any attempt by Government Actor or his employer to define or REDEFINE
46 such a term. See:

[The Government "Benefits" Scam](#), Form #05.040
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

1 All the above activities are hereby stipulated by all parties concerned to be an act of CRIMINAL identity theft as documented
2 in:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf>

3 This document shall serve as the equivalent of a “license” to engage in such activities against the Protected Party. A “license”,
4 after all, is legally defined as permission to engage in that which would otherwise be harmful or illegal.

5 **10.2 Attorneys**

6 The following activities by attorneys litigating against the Protected Party constitute consent to this franchise and
7 agreement:

- 8 1. Acting as a fact witness in any dispute in court. Attorneys are NOT authorized to act as fact witnesses.
- 9 2. Expunging or removing or striking pleadings filed by the Protected Party from the record of any legal proceeding, and
10 especially at the request or under the direction of any government officer such as the judge or opposing counsel. This
11 is criminal obstruction of legal justice.
- 12 3. Citing irrelevant caselaw against the Protected Party as a point and authority. By “irrelevant” we mean case law
13 involving a party who was not “similarly situated” in terms of legal status to that of the Protected Party. For instance,
14 citing rulings involving “taxpayers” against the Protected Party, who is a NONTAXPAYER not subject to the Internal
15 Revenue Code. The result is CRIMINAL identity theft as described in:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf>

16 **10.3 Judges**

17 Any of the following activities by judges are beyond their delegated authority and shall therefore constitute consent to this
18 agreement:

- 19 1. Ignoring or refusing to address any issue raised by the Protected Party that would result in a judgment against the
20 government in litigation involving the government. This is criminal obstruction of legal justice by omission. Any and
21 all factual statements made by the Protected Party verified under penalty of perjury and not expressly denied by either
22 the judge or the opposing party WITH admissible evidence are stipulated by all parties concerned to be:
 - 23 1.1. Truthful under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(b)(6).
 - 24 1.2. Admitting into evidence for examination by the jury in any litigation involving the Protected Party.
- 25 2. Holding the Protected Party legally accountable for the consequences of a false statement submitted to the government
26 under the influence of duress indicated in this agreement.

27 *“An agreement [consensual contract] obtained by duress, coercion, or intimidation is*
28 *invalid, since the party coerced is not exercising his free will, and the test is not so much*
29 *the means by which the party is compelled to execute the agreement as the state of mind*
30 *induced.* ²⁰ *Duress, like fraud, rarely becomes material, except where a contract or*
31 *conveyance has been made which the maker wishes to avoid. As a general rule, duress*
32 *renders the contract or conveyance voidable, not void, at the option of the person coerced,*
33 *²¹ and it is susceptible of ratification. Like other voidable contracts, it is valid until it is*
34 *avoided by the person entitled to avoid it.* ²² *However, duress in the form of physical*

²⁰ Brown v. Pierce, 74 U.S. 205, 7 Wall 205, 19 L.Ed. 134

²¹ Barnette v. Wells Fargo Nevada Nat’l Bank, 270 U.S. 438, 70 L.Ed. 669, 46 S.Ct. 326 (holding that acts induced by duress which operate solely on the mind, and fall short of actual physical compulsion, are not void at law, but are voidable only, at the election of him whose acts were induced by it); Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962); Carroll v. Fetty, 121 W.Va. 215, 2 S.E.2d. 521, cert den 308 U.S. 571, 84 L.Ed. 479, 60 S.Ct. 85.

²² Faske v. Gershman, 30 Misc.2d. 442, 215 N.Y.S.2d. 144; Heider v. Unicume, 142 Or. 416, 20 P.2d. 384; Glenney v. Crane (Tex Civ App Houston (1st Dist)), 352 S.W.2d. 773, writ ref n r e (May 16, 1962)

1 *compulsion, in which a party is caused to appear to assent when he has no intention of*
2 *doing so, is generally deemed to render the resulting purported contract void.* ²³
3 *[American Jurisprudence 2d, Duress, §21 (1999)]*

- 4 3. Identifying a return of PRIVATE property rightfully owned by the Protected Party as a “benefit”. Justice cannot be a
5 franchise or it is an INJUSTICE as legal “justice” is defined in section 2 of this document.
6 4. Attempting to judge the law in cases where the judge has a financial conflict of interest as described in 28 U.S.C.
7 §§144 or 455 or 18 U.S.C. §208 and refuses to recuse him or herself. This includes judges ruling on tax matters as
8 statutory “taxpayers”, whereby they can have their salary effectively reduced by those before them who refuse to pay
9 their “fair share”, even though being a NONTAXPAYER is perfectly lawful. In such a case, the Founding Fathers held
10 that the only proper approach is to allow an IMPARTIAL jury NOT receiving government “benefits” to rule on both
11 the law AND the facts and to ensure that they are not told that they will have to pay the taxes that the defendant or
12 plaintiff refuses to pay:

13 **"It is left... to the juries, if they think the permanent judges are under any bias whatever**
14 **in any cause, to take on themselves to judge the law as well as the fact. They never**
15 **exercise this power but when they suspect partiality in the judges; and by the exercise of**
16 **this power they have been the firmest bulwarks of English liberty."**
17 *[Thomas Jefferson to Abbe Arnoux, 1789. ME 7:423, Papers 15:283]*

- 18 5. Refusing to identify whether the SPECIFIC capacity in which the Protected Party is acting is a public office or
19 government agency when he or she is the target of civil statutory enforcement by the government. Only those who are
20 agents and officers of the government may lawfully become the target of such enforcement. The government has the
21 burden of proving with evidence that the Protected Party was lawfully elected or appointed to government office and is
22 acting as an agent of government before it may lawfully enforce civil statutes against him/her. Failure to do so
23 constitutes aiding or abetting criminal identity theft. For proof, see:
24 5.1. *Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons*, Form #05.037
25 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf>
26 5.2. *Proof That There Is a “Straw Man”*, Form #05.042
27 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StrawMan.pdf>
28 5.3. *Why Your Government is Either a Thief or You are a “Public Officer” for Income Tax Purposes*, Form #05.008
29 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/WhyThiefOrPubOfficer.pdf>
30 5.4. *Government Identity Theft*, Form #05.046
31 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf>
32 6. Interfering with, sanctioning, convicting, or penalizing Protected Party for any activity that the government can and
33 does lawfully do to him or her or it. This includes but is not limited to administrative liens and levies under his/her
34 own franchise agreement such as this one, just like the IRS does under the “trade or business”/public officer franchise.
35 All such activities are a violation of the constitutional requirement for equal protection and equal treatment as
36 described in:
37

Requirement for Equal Protection and Equal Treatment, Form #05.033
38 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

39 7. Proceeding with a summary judgment where the party litigating against the government has ANY dispute with the
40 government counsel over the facts.
41 8. In cases against the government, telling the party opposing the government or the jury that they may NOT talk about or
42 quote the law to the jury.
43 9. Sealing the court record or making it unpublished in cases against the government, and especially where the party
44 opposing the government won the case. This prejudices further litigation against the government on the same subject
45 matter.
46 10. Refusing to recognize or discuss violations of private property rights by the government in cases against the
47 government involving illegal enforcement or taking of property of any kind. See:
48

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

11. Excluding evidence of parties litigating against the government who are the target of government enforcement. All
such parties are public officers according to the State Action Doctrine and therefore, their evidence CANNOT lawfully
be excluded under Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8).

²³ Restatement 2d, Contracts §174, stating that if conduct that appears to be a manifestation of assent by a party who does not intend to engage in that conduct is physically compelled by duress, the conduct is not effective as a manifestation of assent.

12. Acting as a fact witness by, for instance, representing anything BUT written positive law as “law” to a jury.
13. Legal deception, including:
 - 13.1. Equivocation of geographical terms.
 - 13.2. Refusing to allow jurors to hear the definition of terms.
 - 13.3. Interfering with the admission of evidence of the definition of a statutory term by parties litigating against the government.
 - 13.4. Expanding the statutory definition of terms beyond what is clearly stated.
 - 13.5. Making presumptions about the definitions of terms.
 - 13.6. Using the ORDINARY definition of the term instead of the STATUTORY definition of terms in cases against the government.
 - 13.7. Violating the rules of statutory construction.

For details on the above, see:

Legal Deception, Propaganda, and Fraud, Form #05.014
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

14. Interfering with jurors reading or hearing the statutory law being enforced EXACTLY AS WRITTEN by, for instance:
 - 14.1. Preventing them from visiting the courthouse law library or any law library.
 - 14.2. Refusing requests by the jury panel to receive the written statutes being enforced.
15. Representing any government publication that is NOT published in the government statutes as “law” to the jury. This unconstitutionally delegates legislative power to the judge. See:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

16. Entering a plea on behalf of a criminal defendant who is challenging jurisdiction BEFORE he or she makes a plea. This constitutes unlawfully “practicing law” while on the bench.
17. Tampering with the court record by ordering the court clerk to modify written testimony.
18. Compelling or enticing the surrender of rights in exchange for privileges or perks. This is a violation of the Unconstitutional Conditions Doctrine as described in:

Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises, Form #05.030, Section 28.2
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Franchises.pdf>

19. Expunging or removing or striking pleadings filed by the Protected Party from the record of any legal proceeding, and especially at the request or under the direction of any government officer such as the judge or opposing counsel. This is criminal obstruction of legal justice.
20. Citing irrelevant caselaw against the Protected Party as a point and authority. By “irrelevant” we mean case law involving a party who was not “similarly situated” in terms of legal status to that of the Protected Party. For instance, citing rulings involving “taxpayers” against the Protected Party, who is a NONTAXPAYER not subject to the Internal Revenue Code. The result is CRIMINAL identity theft as described in:

Government Identity Theft, Form #05.046
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/GovernmentIdentityTheft.pdf>

10.4 Government employees

*“As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised in behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer.”²⁴ **Furthermore, the view has been expressed that all public officers, within whatever branch and whatever level of government, and whatever be their private vocations, are trustees of the people, and accordingly labor under every disability and prohibition imposed by law upon trustees relative to the making of personal financial gain from a discharge of their trusts.**²⁵ **That is, a public officer occupies a fiduciary relationship to the political entity on whose behalf he or she serves.**²⁶ **and owes a fiduciary duty to the public.**²⁷ **It has been said that the fiduciary responsibilities***

²⁴ State ex rel. Nagle v. Sullivan, 98 Mont. 425, 40 P.2d. 995, 99 A.L.R. 321; Jersey City v. Hague, 18 N.J. 584, 115 A.2d. 8.

²⁵ Georgia Dep’t of Human Resources v. Sistrunk, 249 Ga. 543, 291 S.E.2d. 524. A public official is held in public trust. Madlener v. Finley (1st Dist), 161 Ill.App.3d. 796, 113 Ill.Dec. 712, 515 N.E.2d. 697, app gr 117 Ill.Dec. 226, 520 N.E.2d. 387 and revd on other grounds 128 Ill.2d. 147, 131 Ill.Dec. 145, 538 N.E.2d. 520.

²⁶ Chicago Park Dist. v. Kenroy, Inc., 78 Ill.2d. 555, 37 Ill.Dec. 291, 402 N.E.2d. 181, appeal after remand (1st Dist) 107 Ill.App.3d. 222, 63 Ill.Dec. 134, 437 N.E.2d. 783.

²⁷ United States v. Holzer (CA7 Ill), 816 F.2d. 304 and vacated, remanded on other grounds 484 U.S. 807, 98 L.Ed.2d. 18, 108 S.Ct. 53, on remand (CA7 Ill) 840 F.2d. 1343, cert den 486 U.S. 1035, 100 L.Ed.2d. 608, 108 S.Ct. 2022 and (criticized on other grounds by United States v. Osser (CA3 Pa) 864

1 of a public officer cannot be less than those of a private individual. ²⁸ Furthermore, it
2 has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official which tends to
3 weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual
4 [PRIVATE] rights is against public policy.²⁹
5 [63C American Jurisprudence 2d, Public Officers and Employees, §247 (1999)]

6 Government employees consent to this agreement by any of the following activities that are beyond their delegated
7 authority:

- 8 1. Performing acts outside their written delegation order.
- 9 2. Refusing to recognize or discuss the legal or constitutional limits upon their authority, which the Congress defines as
10 the essence of COMMUNISM itself:

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

13 *The Congress finds and declares that the Communist Party of the United States [consisting*
14 *of the IRS, DOJ, and a corrupted federal judiciary], although purportedly a political*
15 *party, is in fact an instrumentality of a conspiracy to overthrow the [de jure] Government*
16 *of the United States [and replace it with [a de facto government ruled by the judiciary](#)]. It*
17 *constitutes an authoritarian dictatorship [IRS, DOJ, and corrupted federal judiciary in*
18 *collusion] within a [constitutional] republic, demanding for itself the rights and*
19 *[FRANCHISE] privileges [including immunity from prosecution for their wrongdoing in*
20 *violation of [Article 1, Section 9, Clause 8 of the Constitution](#)] accorded to political parties,*
21 *but denying to all others the liberties [Bill of Rights] guaranteed by the Constitution [Form*
22 *#10.002]. Unlike political parties, which evolve their policies and programs through*
23 *public means, by the reconciliation of a wide variety of individual views, and submit those*
24 *policies and programs to the electorate at large for approval or disapproval, the policies*
25 *and programs of the Communist Party are secretly [by corrupt judges and the IRS in*
26 *complete disregard of, Form #05.014, the tax franchise "codes", Form #05.001]*
27 *prescribed for it by the foreign leaders of the world Communist movement [the IRS and*
28 *Federal Reserve]. Its members [the Congress, which was terrorized to do IRS bidding by*
29 *the framing of [Congressman Traficant](#)] have no part in determining its goals, and are not*
30 *permitted to voice dissent to party objectives. Unlike members of political parties, members*
31 *of the Communist Party are recruited for indoctrination [in [the public FOOL system](#) by*
32 *homosexuals, liberals, and socialists] with respect to its objectives and methods, and are*
33 *organized, instructed, and disciplined [by the IRS and a corrupted judiciary] to carry into*
34 *action slavishly the assignments given them by their hierarchical chieftains. Unlike*
35 *political parties, the Communist Party [thanks to a [corrupted federal judiciary](#)]*
36 *acknowledges no constitutional or statutory limitations upon its conduct or upon that of*
37 *its members [ANARCHISTS!, Form #08.020]. The Communist Party is relatively small*
38 *numerically, and gives scant indication of capacity ever to attain its ends by lawful political*
39 *means. The peril inherent in its operation arises not from its numbers, but from its failure*
40 *to acknowledge any limitation as to the nature of its activities, and its dedication to the*
41 *proposition that the present constitutional Government of the United States ultimately*
42 *must be brought to ruin by any available means, including resort to; force and violence*
43 *[or using income taxes]. Holding that doctrine, its role as the agency of a hostile foreign*
44 *power [the Federal Reserve and the American Bar Association (ABA)] renders its*
45 *existence a clear present and continuing danger to the security of the United States. It*
46 *is the means whereby individuals are seduced [illegally KIDNAPPED via identity theft!,*
47 *Form #05.046] into the service of the world Communist movement [using FALSE*

F.2d. 1056) and (superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in United States v. Little (CA5 Miss) 889 F.2d. 1367) and (among conflicting authorities on other grounds noted in United States v. Boylan (CA1 Mass), 898 F.2d. 230, 29 Fed.Rules.Evid.Serv. 1223).

²⁸ Chicago ex rel. Cohen v. Keane, 64 Ill.2d. 559, 2 Ill.Dec. 285, 357 N.E.2d. 452, later proceeding (1st Dist) 105 Ill.App.3d. 298, 61 Ill.Dec. 172, 434 N.E.2d. 325.

²⁹ Indiana State Ethics Comm'n v. Nelson (Ind App), 656 N.E.2d. 1172, reh gr (Ind App) 659 N.E.2d. 260, reh den (Jan 24, 1996) and transfer den (May 28, 1996).

information returns and other PERJURIOUS government forms, Form #04.001], trained to do its bidding [by FALSE government publications and statements that the government is not accountable for the accuracy of, Form #05.007], and directed and controlled [using FRANCHISES illegally enforced upon NONRESIDENTS, Form #05.030] in the conspiratorial performance of their revolutionary services. Therefore, the Communist Party should be outlawed

3. Penalizing or attempting illegally to penalize Protected Party illegally when he or she does NOT satisfy the statutory definition of “person”, such as in 26 U.S.C. §6671(b). For details, see:

Why Penalties are Illegal for Anything But Government Franchisees, Employees, Contractors, or Agents, Form #05.010

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

4. Enforcing or attempting to enforce the penal or criminal statutes illegally against Protected Party when he or she does NOT satisfy the statutory definition of “person”, such as in 26 U.S.C. §7343.
5. Refusing to provide their delegation order.
6. Refusing to sign all correspondence under penalty of perjury, as required by 26 U.S.C. §6065. Government cannot exempt itself from this rule without attributing to itself in effect an unconstitutional “Title of Nobility” not available to ordinary Americans and erecting an illegal civil religion where they are the object of worship.
7. Interfering with administrative or legal discovery useful in cases against the government.
8. Refusing to authenticate documents obtained through FOIA or Privacy Act discovery as a way to make the data inadmissible in pending or actual litigation.
9. Using any written publication OTHER than positive law and the regulations implementing it in taking an action that adversely affects the private property of the Submitter. See:

Reasonable Belief About Income Tax Liability, Form #05.007

<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/ReasonableBelief.pdf>

10. Taking any action adversely affecting the private property interest of the Submitter in the presence of financial conflict of interest that violates 18 U.S.C. §208.
11. Ignoring or suppressing from evidence any correspondence dealing with violations of law by government workers that jeopardizes the private property interests of someone litigating against the government.

11 Agreement is NOT an “unjust enrichment” or an Adhesion Contract, like everything the GOVERNMENT Offers³⁰

11.1 Introduction

Parties agree that this agreement:

1. Is NOT an unjust enrichment of Protected Party or an attempt to escape responsibility to pay for services requested and received from any government by Protected Party.
2. Is instead intended to enforce the rules of equity to show that there is unjust enrichment and an unconscionable contract in the case of the civil statutory law offered as a franchise by the government.
3. Is not an attempt to merely throw rocks at the status quo, but a sincere attempt to provide a better and much more humane alternative.
4. Is an attempt to show that the ONLY equitable solution for all the problems with the social compact documented herein is to:
 - 4.1. Have people sign up annually for the “civil services” as defined earlier in section 4.1.6 that they want in the coming year and agree to pay for. This, then, becomes the MAIN and only purpose of filing an annual “tax return”. It is a voluntary “subscription” model for providing “civil services”. If private businesses deliver services by this method and civil services are defined herein as non-essential services, then those services become PRIVATE business activity beyond the core purpose of government in which the government must behave and be treated just like any other private business that offers voluntary services. It may not assert official, judicial, or sovereign immunity to evade responsibility to deliver exactly and ONLY what was explicitly asked for, consented to, and paid for.
 - 4.2. Have consumers pay during the coming year for those “civil services” as they are consumed.

³⁰ Adapted from: Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051, Section 2; <https://sedm.org/product/why-the-government-is-the-only-real-beneficiary-of-all-government-franchises-form-05-051/>

4.3. Provide an administrative method to terminate services for nonpayment without the need to litigate. All of the above are provided by the following improvements to the CURRENT social compact that fixes all its defects and yet respects the need to pay for services that are consumed. It would also eliminate most of the in-fighting of identity politics over who gets the excess taxes collected for OVERPAYMENTS of services because all services were bundled together as part of the “weaponization of government” defined in section 4.1.30 earlier. This would eliminate the current polarization of the political process that is breaking this country apart.

Self Government Federation: Articles of Confederation, Form #13.002
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/SGFArtOfConfed.pdf>

5. Establishes that the CIVIL STATUTORY law itself behaves as the “adhesion contract” and “unconscionable contract” which acquires the “force of law” through in effect SLAVERY and identity theft upon Protected Party in a process called “weaponization of the government”:

*“Cases of abandonment of residence, as applied to homesteads, or as to residence, where it is not essential that [*278] one have a homestead at all, or a definite residence, for the purposes of the case, are not applicable to **such controversies as this, where a man must have a residence or domicile somewhere. Courts endeavor to construe revenue laws so that each one will share his just burden of taxation; and he should pay his taxes somewhere. Hence it is the universal rule, in construing revenue statutes, that, as a man must have a domicile or taxing residence somewhere, his old residence will be deemed his present one until a new one is acquired. If this were not the rule, a man might escape taxation altogether.** Assuming, for the purposes of argument, as we must, that the laws of California are the same as our own, Barhydt would escape all taxation for the year 1910, were he successful in this appeal; for he could not, under the record, be taxed in California. Our own cases, with possibly one exception, sustain this view, and, as we shall see, this is the holding elsewhere. Of our own cases supporting the conclusion [***11] here reached, see Tuttle v. Wood, 115 Iowa 507 at 509, 88 N.W. 1056; Glottelty v. Brown, 148 Iowa 124, 126 N.W. 797; In re Titterington, 130 Iowa 356 at 358, 106 N.W. 761; Nugent v. Bates, 51 Iowa 77 at 79, 50 N.W. 76; Cover v. Hatten, 136 Iowa 63 at 65, 113 N.W. 470. [Barhydt v. Cross, 156 Iowa 271, 277-278 (1912)]*

The above case in effect FORCES people to choose a civil statutory protector SOMEWHERE, which in itself is involuntary servitude of the party does not want it given that the common law alone is sufficient to provide protection and is not voluntary. The civil statutory code therefore behaves as a COMPELLED franchise the FORCES people to become “customers” of government civil services that they do not want. See:

- 5.1. Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>
- 5.2. Proof that Involuntary Income Taxes on Your Labor are Slavery, Form #05.055
<https://sedm.org/product/proof-that-involuntary-income-taxes-on-your-labor-are-slavery-form-05-055/>
6. Establishes that if there ever was “The Matrix”, the social compact itself IS that matrix, as documented in:
- 6.1. How Scoundrels Corrupted Our Republican Form of Government, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/Taxes/Evidence/HowScCorruptOurRepubGovt.htm>
- 6.2. The Bible:

*“The rich rules over the poor,
And **the borrower is servant to the lender.**”
[Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]*

Curses of Disobedience [to God’s Laws]

“The alien [Washington, D.C. is legislatively “alien” in relation to states of the Union] who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down lower and lower [malicious destruction of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL TREATMENT by abusing FRANCHISES]. He shall lend to you [Federal Reserve counterfeiting franchise], but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail.

1 “Moreover **all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you**
2 **are destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the Lord your God, to **keep His****
3 **commandments and His statutes which He commanded you.** And they shall be upon you
4 for a sign and a wonder, and on your descendants forever.

5 “Because you did not serve [ONLY] the Lord your God with joy and gladness of heart, for
6 the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your [covetous thieving lawyer]
7 enemies, whom the Lord will send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness, and in
8 need of everything; and He will put a yoke of iron [franchise codes] on your neck until He
9 has destroyed you. The Lord will bring a nation against you from afar [the District of
10 CRIMINALS], from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies [the American Eagle],
11 a nation whose language [LEGALESE] you will not understand, a nation of fierce
12 [coercive and fascist] countenance, which does not respect the elderly [assassinates them]
13 by denying them healthcare through bureaucratic delays on an Obamacare waiting list]
14 nor show favor to the young [destroying their ability to learn in the public FOOL
15 system]. And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your land
16 [with “trade or business” franchise taxes], until you [and all your property] are destroyed
17 [or STOLEN/CONFISCATED]; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the
18 increase of your cattle or the offspring of your flocks, until they have destroyed you.
19 [Deut. 28:43-51, Bible, NKJV]

- 20 7. Establishes that under the concept of equality of treatment that is the foundation of all law, the RULES OF EQUITY
21 permit me to use the same tactics against them that they use to create and implement their adhesion contract, which
22 then is the authority for implementing this contract:

23 “The State in such cases exercises no greater right than an individual may exercise over
24 the use of his own property when leased or loaned to others. The conditions upon which
25 the privilege shall be enjoyed being stated or implied in the legislation authorizing its
26 grant, no right is, of course, impaired by their enforcement. The recipient of the privilege,
27 in effect, stipulates to comply with the conditions. It matters not how limited the privilege
28 conferred, its acceptance implies an assent to the regulation of its use and the
29 compensation for it.”
30 [Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 (1876)]

- 31 8. Establishes the fact that the GOVERNMENT and Government Actor are the ONLY real beneficiary of every service
32 they offer, and thus CANNOT offer REAL or TANGIBLE or DIRECT consideration, benefit, or absolutely owned
33 private property to the Protected Party. Thus, government can only realistically protect their own property or officers
34 and you have to volunteer to join the government as a public officer or agent to get ANY civil protection at all. See:

Why Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051

<https://sedm.org/product/why-the-government-is-the-only-real-beneficiary-of-all-government-franchises-form-05-051/>

35 **11.2 The PROBLEM with the “Social Compact” (CIVIL STATUTORY LAW) as explained by** 36 **a legal expert that got 90% on the Bar Exam**

37 The following interchange with the Openai ChatGPT-4 AI Chatbot explains the problem with the social compact that this
38 agreement intends to NULLIFY. The ChatGPT-4 AI Chatbot got a 90% on the Bar Exam. This discussion presupposes
39 that “the social compact” and the CIVIL STATUTORY LAW are equivalent, because both are the only components of the
40 legal system that are, in fact, based on CONSENT in some form as far as government is concerned. The abuse of the
41 “social compact” and the VOLUNTARY civil statutory law that it implements is defined earlier 4.1.30 as “weaponization
42 of government”. The interchange begins after the horizontal line.

43 You can ask your own questions at:

44 <http://chat.openai.com>
45

1 **QUESTION:** If a judge compels or assigns someone a civil domicile, isn't he in fact compelling them to become a party to
2 the social compact? You cannot register to vote without a domicile, and voting is a privilege, so isn't the judge forcing the
3 party to contract at that point?

4 **ANSWER:** The concept of civil domicile refers to a person's legal residence or permanent address for various legal and
5 administrative purposes. It is typically determined based on factors such as where a person resides or intends to make their
6 home. However, civil domicile is not directly equivalent to the social compact.

7 While civil domicile may be a factor in determining a person's eligibility to exercise certain privileges, such as voting, it does
8 not necessarily mean that a judge is compelling someone to enter into a contract or the social compact.

9 Voting is indeed considered a privilege in many jurisdictions, and it is often linked to residency or domicile requirements.
10 These requirements aim to ensure that individuals who participate in the democratic process have a sufficient connection to
11 the jurisdiction in question.

12 The role of a judge in assigning or determining civil domicile may vary depending on the legal system and the specific
13 circumstances. However, it is generally within the authority of the judiciary to interpret and apply the laws regarding
14 residency or domicile requirements, including for purposes of voter registration.

15 It is important to note that while the exercise of certain privileges, like voting, may be conditioned upon meeting certain
16 requirements, this does not necessarily mean that individuals are being compelled to enter into a contract or the social
17 compact. Rather, it reflects the legal framework and eligibility criteria established by the relevant jurisdiction for the exercise
18 of those privileges.

19 In summary, while civil domicile and voting privileges may be connected, it does not necessarily mean that a judge
20 compelling someone to establish a civil domicile is equivalent to forcing them to enter into a contract or the social compact.
21 The requirements and conditions associated with voting and residency are established by the legal system and are subject to
22 legal interpretation and application.

23 **QUESTION:** Could a compact accurately be described as a contract in which consent is implied through specific actions
24 defined by the government offering the compact?

25 **ANSWER:** Yes, a compact can be accurately described as a contract in which consent is implied through specific actions
26 defined by the government offering the compact. In this context, consent is typically understood as being implied through the
27 actions or conduct of the parties involved.

28 A compact, or social contract, is a theoretical construct that explains the relationship between individuals and the government.
29 It posits that individuals implicitly consent to be governed and abide by the rules and laws of the society in exchange for the
30 protection of their rights and the benefits provided by the government.

31 While the consent in a compact is often not explicitly expressed through a signed document or formal agreement, it is
32 considered to be implied based on the individual's actions or behaviors that demonstrate their acceptance of the social contract.
33 By residing within a particular jurisdiction, enjoying the benefits and protections provided by the government, and
34 participating in societal activities, individuals are seen as consenting to the compact or contract.

35 This concept of implied consent through actions aligns with the idea that by actively participating in society, individuals agree
36 to the terms and obligations set forth by the government.

37 It is worth noting that the interpretation and application of the social contract theory can vary, and different philosophers and
38 legal theorists may have different perspectives on the nature of consent and the implications of implied consent within the
39 social contract framework.

40 **QUESTION:** Doesn't the ability to even offer a compact of this nature derive from the fact that a benefit or consideration
41 of some kind offered by the government and that the consideration offered is implicitly not free and must be paid for?

42 **ANSWER:** In the context of the social contract theory, it is often understood that the government offers certain benefits and
43 protections to individuals as part of the compact. These benefits can include security, the rule of law, public services,
44 infrastructure, and various other goods and services provided by the government.

1 The idea is that these benefits come at a cost, and individuals are expected to fulfill certain obligations or responsibilities in
2 return. These obligations can include paying taxes, obeying laws, serving on juries, or participating in the democratic process,
3 among others.

4 In this sense, it can be argued that the consideration offered by the government is not explicitly "free" and that individuals
5 are expected to contribute or pay for the benefits they receive. This contribution is seen as part of the social contract and is
6 necessary for the functioning and sustainability of the society and government.

7 However, it's important to note that the exact nature of the consideration and the obligations may vary depending on the
8 specific society, legal system, and cultural context. The terms and conditions of the social contract are typically defined by
9 laws, regulations, and other legal instruments established by the government.

10 It's also worth mentioning that the concept of the social contract is a philosophical and theoretical construct used to explain
11 the legitimacy and basis of government authority. Different interpretations and perspectives on the social contract exist, and
12 there may be debates and variations in how individuals perceive and fulfill their obligations within this framework.

13 **QUESTION:** So what we are really talking about, then, is technically a "quid pro quo". Is that correct?

14 **ANSWER:** Yes, the concept of a "quid pro quo" can be applicable in the context of the social contract. A "quid pro quo"
15 refers to the exchange of something valuable or beneficial in return for something else. In the case of the social contract,
16 individuals are seen as entering into a mutual agreement with the government where they receive certain benefits and
17 protections in exchange for fulfilling certain obligations and responsibilities.

18 This exchange can be seen as a form of "quid pro quo" where individuals contribute through their actions, such as paying
19 taxes or obeying laws, in order to receive the benefits and protections provided by the government.

20 However, it's important to note that the social contract is not necessarily a transactional agreement in the same way a contract
21 is in a commercial context. The social contract is a theoretical construct that aims to explain the relationship between
22 individuals and the government, and the exchange is often more implicit and based on the ongoing functioning of society
23 rather than a direct negotiation or explicit agreement.

24 Nonetheless, the concept of "quid pro quo" can provide a useful framework for understanding the reciprocal nature of the
25 social contract and the expectations of mutual obligations and benefits between individuals and the government.

26 **QUESTION:** What legal authorities useful in court might support the position that you have a right to not receive a benefit
27 or privilege and may reject all such quid pro quo offers?

28 **ANSWER:** In legal proceedings, several authorities and legal principles could potentially support the position that an
29 individual has the right to refuse or reject certain benefits or privileges offered as part of a quid pro quo arrangement. Here
30 are a few legal authorities that might be relevant:

31 **Right to Liberty:** The right to liberty, enshrined in various national and international legal frameworks, protects an individual's
32 freedom to make choices and decisions regarding their own life and well-being. This right can provide a basis for arguing
33 that individuals have the freedom to decline or reject certain benefits or privileges without being compelled to accept them.

34 1. **Right to Privacy:** The right to privacy, recognized in many legal systems, safeguards an individual's autonomy and
35 control over personal decisions and information. It can be invoked to support the idea that individuals have the right
36 to refuse benefits or privileges that may require the disclosure of personal information or impinge on their privacy
37 interests.

38 2. **Freedom of Association:** The freedom of association, a fundamental right protected by many constitutions and
39 human rights instruments, allows individuals to choose their associations and affiliations freely. This freedom can
40 be invoked to argue that individuals have the right to decline participation in certain groups or organizations,
41 including those that offer benefits or privileges.

42 3. **Right to Equal Protection:** The right to equal protection under the law, guaranteed by many legal systems, ensures
43 that individuals are treated fairly and without discrimination. This right can be relevant when arguing that individuals
44 should have the freedom to refuse benefits or privileges without facing unfair or discriminatory treatment.

- 1 4. Contract Law Principles: In certain circumstances, contract law principles may come into play. Depending on the
2 specific situation, contractual concepts such as offer, acceptance, consideration, and consent could be invoked to
3 support the argument that individuals have the right to reject a quid pro quo arrangement if they have not willingly
4 and voluntarily entered into such an agreement.

5 It is important to note that the specific legal authorities and arguments that may be applicable can vary depending on the
6 jurisdiction, the specific facts of the case, and the legal framework in question. Consulting with a legal professional who is
7 familiar with the relevant laws and jurisprudence is advisable for a comprehensive analysis of the situation and the most
8 appropriate legal authorities to rely on in court.

9 **QUESTION**: What legal authorities within the United states of America support the proposition that you have a right to NOT
10 be domiciled ANYWHERE, and to not be eligible to receive any benefit or civil statutory protection?

11 **ANSWER**: In the United States, there is no specific legal authority that grants individuals the right to not be domiciled
12 anywhere or to not be eligible to receive any benefit or civil statutory protection. The concept of domicile is a fundamental
13 aspect of legal systems, and individuals are typically required to have a legal residence or domicile for various purposes,
14 including jurisdictional matters, tax obligations, and the exercise of certain rights and privileges.

15 However, it is important to note that the U.S. legal system does recognize certain rights and principles that can provide some
16 support for individual autonomy and freedom of choice. These include:

- 17 1. Right to Privacy: The U.S. Constitution does not explicitly mention a right to privacy, but it has been recognized by
18 the U.S. Supreme Court as an implied right derived from various constitutional provisions. The right to privacy can
19 be invoked to argue against forced domicile or unwanted government intrusion into one's personal affairs.
- 20 2. Freedom of Movement: The U.S. Constitution protects the right of individuals to travel and move freely within the
21 country. While this right does not necessarily extend to the complete avoidance of domicile requirements, it can
22 support arguments for individual mobility and the ability to choose one's place of residence within the United States.
- 23 3. Due Process and Equal Protection: The Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the U.S. Constitution provide
24 protections of due process and equal protection under the law. These provisions can be invoked to argue against
25 arbitrary or discriminatory treatment related to domicile requirements or the denial of benefits.
- 26 4. First Amendment Freedoms: The First Amendment protects several fundamental freedoms, including freedom of
27 speech, religion, assembly, and the right to petition the government. While these freedoms may not directly address
28 the issue of domicile, they contribute to the overall principles of individual autonomy and choice within the United
29 States.

30 It is important to note that the legal authorities mentioned above may provide some support for arguments related to individual
31 autonomy and freedom of choice. However, they do not establish an absolute right to not be domiciled anywhere or to refuse
32 all benefits or civil statutory protections. The legal framework within the United States generally requires individuals to have
33 a legal residence or domicile for various legal purposes.

34 **QUESTION**: Is the idea behind the social compact as a "quid pro quo", that no individual may draw more property or value
35 out of the public fisc than they put in, so that they don't become a burden to society or take property from others by means of
36 the tax system?

37 **ANSWER**: The idea behind the social compact is a broad concept that varies depending on the philosophical and theoretical
38 perspectives one adopts. It is not solely centered on the concept of a "quid pro quo" or ensuring that no individual draws more
39 property or value out of the public fisc than they put in.

40 The social compact theory, rooted in the works of political philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-
41 Jacques Rousseau, seeks to explain the basis of government authority and the relationship between individuals and the state.
42 It posits that individuals willingly enter into a social contract or compact with the government, surrendering certain freedoms
43 or rights in exchange for the protection of their remaining rights and the benefits provided by the government.

44 The specific terms and conditions of the social compact can vary depending on the philosophical perspective. It may include
45 concepts such as mutual obligations, responsibilities, and rights of both individuals and the government.

1 While the idea of fairness and not burdening society unduly can be relevant to discussions of the social compact, it is not the
2 sole or exclusive focus. The social compact also addresses issues such as the protection of individual rights, the establishment
3 of rule of law, the provision of public goods and services, and the creation of a system for collective decision-making and
4 governance.

5 The operation of the tax system and the allocation of resources within society can be considered part of the broader framework
6 of the social compact, but it is not the sole determinant of the social compact itself. The principles of fairness, equity, and
7 avoiding undue burden can inform discussions around taxation and public finance, but they are not the sole objectives or
8 components of the social compact theory.

9 **QUESTION:** Doesn't the social compact function as an unconscionable "adhesion contract", in that the government that
10 writes it is the Merchant and the only one who can define its terms, and that you are only left with two choices: Accept it
11 and lose whatever natural or constitutional rights they happen to want to take from you, or literally be ostracized and starved
12 to death because unable to get government ID connecting you to membership? You can't conduct most important financial
13 transactions without government id connecting you to a domicile and membership in the social compact, right?

14 **ANSWER:** The concept of the social compact does not typically function as an unconscionable "adhesion contract" in the
15 legal sense. The social compact is a theoretical construct used to explain the relationship between individuals and the
16 government, and it is not a legally binding contract in the same way a commercial contract operates.

17 An adhesion contract typically refers to a contract in which one party has significantly more bargaining power than the other,
18 leading to an unfair or unequal agreement. In the context of the social compact, it is true that the government holds significant
19 power in defining the terms and conditions of governance. However, the social compact is not a contract entered into by
20 individuals in the same way that parties voluntarily enter into commercial contracts.

21 The social compact is often seen as a foundational concept in political philosophy, describing the theoretical agreement or
22 understanding between individuals and the government regarding the governance of society. It is based on principles of
23 consent, mutual obligations, and the protection of individual rights. While the government plays a crucial role in defining and
24 implementing the social compact, it is ultimately a reflection of the collective will and participation of the governed.

25 Regarding your question about government ID and membership in the social compact, it is true that government-issued
26 identification and proof of residence are often required for various purposes, including financial transactions, voting, and
27 accessing certain services. These requirements are generally in place to establish legal identity, maintain security, and ensure
28 compliance with legal and regulatory obligations.

29 However, it is important to note that the specific requirements and procedures for obtaining government ID and connecting
30 to the social compact can vary depending on the jurisdiction. Governments typically provide avenues for individuals to
31 establish their identity and fulfill the necessary requirements for participation in society.

32 While there may be debates and discussions about the extent of identification requirements and their impact on individual
33 rights, it is generally recognized that some level of identification is necessary for various purposes in modern societies.

34 It's also worth noting that individuals have avenues to challenge and seek redress if they believe their rights have been violated
35 or if they disagree with specific policies or requirements. Legal systems provide mechanisms, such as courts and
36 administrative processes, for addressing grievances and ensuring the protection of individual rights within the framework of
37 the social compact.

38 **QUESTION:**

39 Doesn't the domicile function as an unconscionable "adhesion contract", in that the government that establishes the terms of
40 acquiring government identification is the Merchant and the only one who can define its terms, and that you are only left with
41 two choices: Accept it and lose whatever natural or constitutional rights they happen to want to take from you, or literally be
42 ostracized and starved to death because unable to get government ID connecting you to membership? You can't conduct
43 most important financial transactions without government id connecting you to a domicile and membership in the social
44 compact, right?

1 **ANSWER:** The concept of domicile, as it pertains to legal residence or the establishment of a fixed place of abode, is an
2 important aspect of legal systems. It is typically used for various purposes, including identification, taxation, voting, and
3 accessing certain rights and benefits.

4 While the acquisition of government identification and the establishment of domicile are typically regulated by the
5 government, it does not necessarily make it an unconscionable adhesion contract. An adhesion contract is a type of contract
6 where one party has significantly more bargaining power and dictates the terms of the contract to the other party, often
7 resulting in an unfair or unequal agreement.

8 In the case of domicile, it is true that the government plays a role in defining the requirements and procedures for establishing
9 legal residence and obtaining government identification. However, the establishment of domicile is not a contract entered
10 into voluntarily in the same way as a commercial contract.

11 Domicile requirements are generally in place to establish legal identity, maintain social order, ensure compliance with legal
12 obligations, and facilitate the functioning of various aspects of society. While individuals are subject to these requirements,
13 they also receive certain rights and benefits from the government, such as protection under the law, access to public services,
14 and participation in the political process.

15 While it is true that government identification and domicile are often necessary for conducting important financial
16 transactions and accessing certain rights and benefits, the specific requirements and procedures can vary depending on the
17 jurisdiction and the purpose for which identification is needed.

18 It is important to recognize that legal systems typically provide avenues for individuals to establish their identity, fulfill
19 necessary requirements, and seek redress if they believe their rights have been violated. If you have concerns about specific
20 requirements or believe your rights have been infringed, it may be advisable to consult with a legal professional who can
21 provide guidance based on the laws and regulations of your jurisdiction.

22 **QUESTION:** But what if I only want to be able to conduct financial transactions but do NOT want the protection or benefit
23 of any government other than CRIMINAL protection? Domicile implies civil protection that I don't want. Doesn't bundling
24 things I don't want, such as civil statutory protection, with things that I do want, being a physical ID ONLY and nothing
25 more, constitute an adhesion contract?

26 **ANSWER:** I understand your perspective, but it's important to note that the establishment of domicile and the associated
27 legal requirements serve various purposes beyond civil protection. Domicile is typically used to determine legal residence
28 for purposes of taxation, voting, accessing certain rights and benefits, and establishing jurisdiction for legal matters.

29 While it may not be possible to separate the aspects of domicile that you desire (such as a physical ID for financial
30 transactions) from other associated legal requirements, it doesn't necessarily constitute an adhesion contract. Adhesion
31 contracts typically involve unfair or unequal terms, where one party has significantly more bargaining power and dictates the
32 terms to the other party. In the case of domicile, the requirements and procedures are generally established by the government
33 to ensure the functioning of various aspects of society, maintain order, and protect the rights of individuals.

34 However, it's worth noting that legal systems differ among jurisdictions, and specific laws and regulations may vary. If you
35 have concerns about specific requirements or believe your rights are being infringed upon, it is advisable to consult with a
36 legal professional who can provide guidance based on the laws and regulations of your jurisdiction. They can help you
37 understand your options and rights within the legal framework that applies to your specific situation.

38 **QUESTION:** A monopolistic business practice or "anticompetitive behavior" is one in which there is bundling of things
39 people want with what they don't want. Large corporations have been routinely sanctioned by governments for doing this.
40 Don't governments do EXACTLY the same thing with the government ID they offer: bundling a domicile and obligations I
41 don't want, with what I do want, which is ONLY a physical ID with no legal strings attached?

42 **ANSWER:** I understand your analogy to bundling practices in the business world, where certain products or services are
43 packaged together. However, it's important to note that governments have a distinct role and responsibility in providing
44 identification documents and establishing legal requirements for residence and identification.

45 Governments establish legal frameworks to ensure public order, protect individual rights, and facilitate the functioning of
46 society. In this context, the requirement of establishing a domicile is often tied to various legal obligations, such as taxation,

1 voting, and access to certain rights and benefits. These requirements are established to maintain social order, provide
2 governance, and ensure compliance with legal and regulatory obligations.

3 While it may be your preference to have a physical ID without any legal obligations or strings attached, the reality is that
4 governments have established legal frameworks and requirements that accompany identification documents. These
5 frameworks serve various purposes, including security, public administration, and the provision of services and benefits to
6 citizens.

7 It's important to recognize that the legal system and the associated requirements, including domicile, are products of the social
8 and political framework in which governments operate. If you have concerns about specific requirements or believe your
9 rights are being infringed upon, it is advisable to consult with a legal professional who can provide guidance based on the
10 laws and regulations of your jurisdiction. They can help you understand the legal framework and explore potential options
11 within that framework.

12 **QUESTION:** I told you I don't want any benefits, strings, or obligations. Just a goddam piece of paper that accurately
13 identifies me but doesn't make me an agent of the issuer who can be regulated. You're saying essentially that government
14 violates its own monopoly laws in the issuance of IDs by bundling other things with them, and that this monopoly literally
15 can impose any obligation whatsoever that they want, even if it makes you a slave with no rights. Is that correct?

16 **ANSWER:** I apologize if my previous responses did not address your specific concerns. Let me clarify the points I made:

- 17 1. **Government Identification:** Governments issue identification documents for various purposes, including
18 establishing legal identity and facilitating participation in society. These identification documents often come with
19 certain obligations and requirements based on the legal framework established by the government.
- 20 2. **Legal Framework:** Governments have the authority to establish legal frameworks and requirements for
21 identification and residence. These frameworks serve purposes such as maintaining public order, protecting
22 individual rights, and ensuring compliance with legal and regulatory obligations.
- 23 3. **Rights and Obligations:** The legal framework sets out rights and obligations for individuals within a given
24 jurisdiction. While individuals may have preferences regarding the scope of their rights and obligations, the legal
25 framework is determined by the laws and regulations of the respective government.

26 It is important to recognize that the laws and regulations regarding identification and residence vary among jurisdictions. If
27 you have specific concerns or questions about the laws and regulations in your jurisdiction, it is advisable to consult with a
28 legal professional who can provide guidance based on the specific legal framework that applies to your situation.

29 My role is to provide general information, and I am not equipped to provide legal advice tailored to your specific
30 circumstances. Consulting with a legal professional is the best course of action for addressing your concerns within the legal
31 framework of your jurisdiction.

32 **QUESTION:** By "legal framework" do you mean the "choice of law" in resolving disputes? For instance, the choice between
33 the common law and the civil statutory law?

34 **ANSWER:** When I refer to the "legal framework," I am referring to the overall system of laws, regulations, and legal
35 principles that govern a particular jurisdiction. It encompasses a range of elements, including statutory laws, common law
36 precedents, administrative regulations, constitutional provisions, and judicial interpretations.

37 The legal framework determines how disputes are resolved, the rights and obligations of individuals, the procedures for legal
38 processes, and the overall structure of the legal system. It includes the choice of law principles, which guide courts in
39 determining which laws apply to a particular case when multiple jurisdictions or legal systems are involved.

40 In terms of the choice between common law and civil statutory law, it is a distinction between two major legal systems.
41 Common law is a legal system primarily based on judicial decisions and precedent, while civil statutory law is a legal system
42 primarily based on written codes and statutes. The choice of law principles can vary depending on the jurisdiction and the
43 specific circumstances of a case.

1 It's important to note that the choice of law principles and the legal framework are established by the legislative and judicial
2 branches of government. They define the applicable laws and determine how disputes are resolved within the legal system.
3 Consulting with a legal professional familiar with the laws and regulations of your jurisdiction is recommended for specific
4 legal advice and guidance tailored to your circumstances.

5 **QUESTION:** The legislature can't force anyone to abandon invoking ONLY the common law and the constitution for their
6 protection, can they? If that were true, we wouldn't need a bill of rights, would we?

7 **ANSWER:** You are correct that the legislature cannot force individuals to abandon invoking the common law or the
8 constitutional protections that apply to them. The Bill of Rights, as part of the United States Constitution, guarantees certain
9 fundamental rights and protections to individuals, and these rights cannot be taken away or abridged by the legislature.

10 The purpose of the Bill of Rights is to safeguard individual liberties and ensure that the government respects and upholds
11 certain fundamental rights, such as freedom of speech, religion, and due process. These rights serve as a check on government
12 power and provide individuals with legal protections.

13 While the legislature has the authority to enact laws, those laws must comply with the constitutional framework and respect
14 the rights guaranteed by the Constitution. If a law violates constitutional rights or is inconsistent with the principles of the
15 common law, individuals have the right to challenge its constitutionality through legal means, such as by bringing a lawsuit
16 or pursuing legal remedies.

17 It is through the legal system, including the courts, that disputes regarding the interpretation and application of laws, including
18 the constitution, are resolved. The courts play a crucial role in interpreting laws and ensuring that they comply with the
19 constitutional framework.

20 Ultimately, the Bill of Rights and the legal system exist to protect individual rights and provide recourse for those who believe
21 their rights have been violated. If you believe your rights have been infringed upon, it is advisable to consult with a legal
22 professional who can provide guidance based on the specific circumstances and legal framework that applies to your situation.

23 **11.3 Circumstances of the government's usual offer of CIVIL STATUTORY protection to the** 24 **Protected Party**

25 It is a maxim of law that you have an absolute RIGHT to reject any and all "benefits", "privileges", "franchises", and
26 government property and the obligation to pay for them. Below are some examples:

27 *"Cujus est commodum ejus debet esse incommodum.*
28 *He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage."*

29 *"Que sentit commodum, sentire debet et onus.*
30 *He who derives a benefit from a thing, ought to feel the disadvantages attending it. 2*
31 *Bouv. Inst. n. 1433."*

32 *Commodum ex injuri su non habere debet.*
33 *No man ought to derive any benefit of his own wrong. Jenk. Cent. 161.*

34 *Invito beneficium non datur.*
35 *No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 69. But if he does*
36 *not dissent he will be considered as assenting. Vide Assent.*

37 *Potest quis renunciare pro se, et suis, juri quod pro se introductum est.*
38 *A man may relinquish, for himself and his heirs, a right which was introduced for his*
39 *own benefit. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.*

40 *Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se inducto.*
41 *Any one may renounce a law introduced for his own benefit. To this rule there are some*
42 *exceptions. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.*

1 *[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856;*

2 *SOURCE:*

3 <http://fanguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviereMaxims.htm>]

4 The above are principles of EQUITY that all maxims of law implement. We talk about the above principles in the following
5 link on our opening page, in fact:

Hot Issues: Common Law and Equity Litigation, SEDM

<https://sedm.org/common-law-litigation/>

6 But HOW exactly might one invoke these principles in a common law or equity setting to in effect COMPEL the court to
7 respect them and which might be easy to explain to a common law jury? That is the focus of this article.

8 To answer that question, we must first focus on when and where we would most likely need to do this. Most often, this
9 approach would be needed in tax litigation relating to civilly or criminally enforcing the payment or non-payment of a tax.
10 We must remember that all taxes have the following characteristics in common:

- 11 1. The tax relates to your obligation to pay for a specific “benefit” or “privilege”.
- 12 2. The obligation to pay the tax covers a specific defined period of time such as a year.
- 13 3. You acquired the obligation to pay from a CIVIL perspective by joining a specific class, group, or civil status that has the
14 obligation.
- 15 4. The government has the burden of proving that you voluntarily joined the group that is the only proper object of enforcement
16 authority. If not, slavery and human trafficking are involved on their part.
- 17 5. The government attempting to enforce disguises the ORIGIN of the obligation to pay by calling it a “quasi-contract”. This is
18 a code word for a voluntary act you engaged in that is excise taxable and which constituted CONSTRUCTIVE consent to
19 join the civil legal group or class that is the only proper object of the civil obligation to pay.
- 20 6. The group or class that has the obligation is ALWAYS an OFFICE within the government that is legislatively created by
21 civil legislation enacted by the government.
- 22 7. By claiming the status defined in the legislation creating the office, you in effect are deemed to VOLUNTEER for the
23 obligations attached to the civil office by accepting the juridical privileges ([franchises, Form #05.030](#)) that are ALSO
24 attached to it.
- 25 8. By invoking or accepting the civil statutory juridical PRIVILEGES and public rights ([franchises, Form #05.030](#)) attached
26 to the office, you also implicitly accept the obligations that make the delivery of those rights possible. Thus, the government
27 is a Merchant offering you its PUBLIC property, you are the Buyer, and there is a “tacit procurement” or “sub silentio”
28 purchase of their property or services by seeking or invoking those property or services in an administrative or judicial
29 setting.
- 30 9. The authority to force you to PAY for the benefit or privilege you are seeking originates not only from the above maxims of
31 law, but the common law principle of unjust enrichment.

32 Unjust enrichment is described below:

33 **unjust enrichment.** (1897) 1. *The retention of a benefit conferred by another not as a gift,*
34 *but instead in circumstances where compensation is reasonably expected. 2. A benefit*
35 *obtained from another, not intended as a gift and not legally justifiable, for which the*
36 *beneficiary must make restitution or recompense. • Unjust enrichment is a basis of civil*
37 *liability involving a claim for recovery that sometimes also goes by the name restitution.*
38 *Instances of unjust enrichment typically arise when property is transferred by an act of*
39 *wrongdoing (as by conversion or breach of fiduciary duty), or without the effective consent*
40 *of the transferor (as in a case of mistake), or when a benefit is conferred deliberately but*
41 *without a contract, and the court concludes that the absence of a contract is excusable as*
42 *when the benefit was provided in an emergency, or when the parties once seemed to have*
43 *a contract but it turns out to be invalid.; The resulting claim of unjust enrichment seeks to*
44 *recover the defendant's gains. 3. The area of law dealing with unjustifiable benefits of this*
45 *kind.*

46 *[Black's Law Dictionary, Eleventh Edition, pp. 1849-1850]*

47 The U.S. Supreme Court describes the concept of unjust enrichment in the context of taxation as follows by calling it
48 “indebitatus assumpsit”, meaning an “assumed debt” on your part. The obligation it calls “quasi-contractual”:

1 *“Even if the judgment is deemed to be colored by the nature of the obligation whose validity*
2 *it establishes, and we are free to re-examine it, and, if we find it to be based on an*
3 *obligation penal in character, to refuse to enforce it outside the state where rendered, see*
4 *Wisconsin v. Pelican Insurance Co., [127 U.S. 265](#), 292, et seq. 8 S.Ct. 1370, compare*
5 *Fauntleroy v. Lum, [210 U.S. 230](#), 28 S.Ct. 641, still the obligation to pay taxes is not penal.*
6 **It is a statutory liability, quasi contractual in nature, enforceable, if there is no exclusive**
7 **statutory remedy, in the civil courts by the common-law action of debt or indebitatus**
8 **assumpsit. United States v. Chamberlin, [219 U.S. 250](#), 31 S.Ct. 155; Price v. United States,
9 [269 U.S. 492](#), 46 S.Ct. 180; Dollar Savings Bank v. United States, 19 Wall. 227; and see
10 [Stockwell v. United States, 13 Wall. 531, 542; Meredith v. United States, 13 Pet. 486, 493.](#)
11 **This was the rule established in the English courts before the Declaration of**
12 **Independence. Attorney General v. Weeks, Bunbury’s Exch. Rep. 223; Attorney General**
13 **v. Jewers and Batty, Bunbury’s Exch. Rep. 225; Attorney General v. Hatton, Bunbury’s**
14 **Exch. Rep. [296 U.S. 268, 272] 262; Attorney General v. _ _ , 2 Ans.Rep. 558; see**
15 **Comyn’s Digest (Title ‘Dett,’ A, 9); 1 Chitty on Pleading, 123; cf. Attorney General v.**
16 **Sewell, 4 M.&W. 77. “**
17 **[\[Milwaukee v. White, 296 U.S. 268 \(1935\)\]](#)****

18 Therefore, in all unjust enrichment scenarios, someone is offering PROPERTY or SERVICES (which is also property) as a
19 Merchant which cost money to produce or deliver and are implicitly NOT free. Although the property or services don’t come
20 to you with a price schedule and they don’t specifically identify themselves as a Merchant, the courts inevitably will refer to
21 the person offering as a Merchant and you as a Buyer under the U.C.C. You will therefore be treated AS IF you were Buyer
22 under the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) whether you know it or not and whether you wanted to be or not. By the
23 government merely making the property or services available to you as a Buyer to ASK for on a government application
24 constitutes an OFFER in commerce, and you applying for or accepting the property or sometimes even being ELIGIBLE to
25 receive it constitutes an acceptance. The above scenario is sometimes referred to as:

- 26 1. Implied consent.
- 27 2. Quid pro quo.
- 28 3. Tacit procuration.
- 29 4. Sub silentio.
- 30 5. Excise taxable privilege.

31 So there is an INVISIBLE (in most cases) and IMPLIED commercial process at work whenever you deal with the government
32 and ask them for their property, services, or privileges, whether they expressly communicate that to you or not. The U.S.
33 Supreme Court even identified this as a “concession”. A “concession” is a process where someone is SELLING something
34 to you and BY YOUR ACTIONS ALONE YOU BECOME A BUYER from a legal perspective:

35 *“The compensation which the owners of property, not having any special rights or privileges*
36 *from the government in connection with it, may demand for its use, or for their own services*
37 *in union with it, forms no element of consideration in prescribing regulations for that*
38 *purpose.*

39 [. . .]

40 *“It is only where some right or privilege [which are GOVERNMENT PROPERTY] is*
41 *conferred by the government or municipality upon the owner, which he can use in*
42 *connection with his property, or by means of which the use of his property is rendered more*
43 *valuable to him, or he thereby enjoys an advantage over others, that the compensation to be*
44 *received by him becomes a legitimate matter of regulation. Submission to the regulation of*
45 *compensation in such cases is an implied condition of the grant, and the State, in exercising*
46 *its power of prescribing the compensation, only determines the conditions upon which its*
47 *concession shall be enjoyed. When the privilege ends, the power of regulation ceases.”*
48 **[\[Munn v. Illinois, 94 U.S. 113 \(1876\)\]](#)**

49 Unjust enrichment is an [equitable and common law principle](#). That means it applies EQUALLY to EVERYONE, not just the
50 government. NO ONE can use it unless EVERYONE can use it. This also means that you CAN and even SHOULD use it
51 against the government, and especially when they are trying to use it against you to justify or defend their authority to enforce

1 against you. This approach is an implementation of the Sun Tzu proverbs of war, which say that you can defeat your enemy
2 by using their greatest strength against them.

3 SEDM gives a high level overview on the opening page of their site about the above conundrum that most people often
4 UNKNOWINGLY volunteer for with the following succinct summary of how it operates:

5 *People of all races, genders, political beliefs, sexual orientations, and nearly all religions*
6 *are welcome here. All are treated equally under REAL "law". The only way to remain truly*
7 *free and equal under the civil law is to avoid seeking government civil services, benefits,*
8 *property, special or civil status, exemptions, privileges, or special treatment. All such*
9 *pursuits of government services or property require individual and lawful consent to a*
10 *franchise and the surrender of inalienable constitutional rights AND EQUALITY in the*
11 *process, and should therefore be AVOIDED. The rights and equality given up are the*
12 *"cost" of procuring the "benefit" or property from the government, in fact. Nothing in life*
13 *is truly "free". Anyone who claims that such "benefits" or property should be free and*
14 *cost them nothing is a thief who wants to use the government as a means to STEAL on his*
15 *or her behalf. All just rights spring from responsibilities/obligations under the laws of a*
16 *higher power. If that higher power is God, you can be truly and objectively free. If it is*
17 *government, you are guaranteed to be a slave because they can lawfully set the cost of their*
18 *property as high as they want as a Merchant under the U.C.C. If you want it really bad*
19 *from people with a monopoly, then you will get it REALLY bad. Bend over. There are NO*
20 *constitutional limits on the price government can charge for their monopoly services or*
21 *property. Those who want no responsibilities can have no real/PRIVATE rights, but only*
22 *privileges dispensed to wards of the state which are disguised to LOOK like unalienable*
23 *rights. Obligations and rights are two sides of the same coin, just like self-ownership and*
24 *personal responsibility. For the biblical version of this paragraph, read 1 Sam. 8:10-22.*
25 *For the reason God answered Samuel by telling him to allow the people to have a king,*
26 *read Deut. 28:43-51, which is God's curse upon those who allow a king above them. Click*
27 *Here for a detailed description of the legal, moral, and spiritual consequences of violating*
28 *this paragraph.*
29 *[SEDM Website Opening Page; <http://sedm.org>]*

30 Essentially then, the entire income tax system operates entirely under equity, is not expressly authorized by the constitution,
31 and abuses "benefits" and "franchises" to unconstitutionally invade the states in violation of the Article 4, Section 4 of the
32 Constitution:

33 *"Thus, Congress having power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the*
34 *several States, and with the Indian tribes, may, without doubt, provide for granting*
35 *coasting licenses, licenses to pilots, licenses to trade with the Indians, and any other*
36 *licenses necessary or proper for the exercise of that great and extensive power; and the*
37 *same observation is applicable to every other power of Congress, to the exercise of which*
38 *the granting of licenses may be incident. All such licenses confer authority, and give rights*
39 *to the licensee. But very different considerations apply to the internal commerce or*
40 *domestic trade of the States. Over this commerce and trade Congress has no power of*
41 *regulation nor any direct control. This power belongs exclusively to the States. No*
42 *interference by Congress with the business of citizens transacted within a State is*
43 *warranted by the Constitution, except such as is strictly incidental to the exercise of powers*
44 *clearly granted to the legislature. The power to authorize a business within a State is*
45 *plainly repugnant to the exclusive power of the State over the same subject. It is true that*
46 *the power of Congress to tax is a very extensive power. It is given in the Constitution, with*
47 *only one exception and only two qualifications. Congress cannot tax exports, and it must*
48 *impose direct taxes by the rule of apportionment, and indirect taxes by the rule of*
49 *uniformity. Thus limited, and thus only, it reaches every subject, and may be exercised at*
50 *discretion. But, it reaches only existing subjects. **Congress cannot authorize a trade or***
51 ***business within a State in order to tax it.**"*
52 *[[License Tax Cases, 72 U.S. 462, 18 L.Ed. 497, 5 Wall. 462, 2 A.F.T.R. 2224 \(1866\)](#)]*

53 The advantage you have in your favor when you invoke this process against the government is that:

1. Most of the money the government spends is actually just PRINTED or BORROWED into existence. There is no “benefit” to you in them doing that and a LOT of injury to future generations who will have to foot the bill to service that debt.
2. The government ALWAYS charges WAY more for their property and services than it costs to deliver them. This is because they have to ADD the cost of the borrowing and printing of money spent on things OTHER than the “benefit” that often aren’t even constitutionally authorized. Thus, the UNAUTHORIZED spending usually dwarfs the cost of the actual “benefit” they DO deliver.
3. The inflation they invoke by printing the money erodes the actual benefit received, which often isn’t received until DECADES after it is paid for, as in the case of Social Security.
4. Most of the money the government spends is for service on the national debt. It doesn’t in actuality pay for the delivery of the product or service you are often seeking. This was one of the principles established by Ronald Reagan’s Grace Commission Report.
5. The time period for which a tax owes almost NEVER overlaps with WHEN the benefit or service is actually delivered. Thus, no matter what time period you are talking about, if you attempted to equitably BALANCE the cost with the payment, the government would ALWAYS lose in the accounting process and thereby ultimately be the ONLY party who in actuality would actually engage in an “unjust enrichment”.
6. Any calculations that might be done to reconcile the account under equitable principles must consider the Net Present Value adjusted for inflation of what was contributed and what is actually paid. The government always loses on that accounting as well, because their money printing in effect behaves as a INVISIBLE tax. That “tax” should be accounted for in the calculations as well in order to be truly equitable.
7. The government corruptly tries to deny their responsibility under rules of equity by invoking sovereign immunity unlawfully. It is unlawful because all their powers are delegated by THE SOVEREIGN people and you can’t delegate it unless YOU have it and can use it against them AS WELL. Thus, the government are HYPOCRITES and elitists who deny the use of unjust enrichment against THEM but want to use it against you.
8. In most cases, the benefit delivered is not even expressly authorized by the written law. Social Security and income tax BOTH are never expressly authorized to be offered or paid in the constitutional state. See Form #06.002. Thus, the government in an unjust enrichment claim is abusing it to BENEFIT from an activity they have NO CONSTITUTIONAL authority to even engage in within the exclusive jurisdiction of a constitutional state. It is also a principal of equity that NO ONE should be allowed to BENEFIT from an unlawful, injurious, or criminal act and the government loses on this one as well.
9. The tax obligation being enforced is often, as in the case of statutory “wages” bundled with other obligations. On this site and [section 4.30 of our Disclaimer](#), we call this “weaponization of the government”. For instance, you can’t earn statutory “wages” under the Social Security Act without ALSO earning “wages” that are taxable under the Internal Revenue Code, even though THAT obligation is not a “benefit”. Thus, you are in effect being asked to pay an ADDITIONAL tax beyond SSI deductions for something that is not literally a “benefit” and which no one in their right mind would ever perceive as a “benefit”

Therefore, if you invoke an equitable proceeding against the government to enforce an unjust enrichment AGAINST THEM, and actually quantify the value they can prove they delivered over the taxing period in question and compare that with what you actually paid for it, THEN NO MATTER WHAT, the government would ultimately and INEVITABLY LOSE and be the only one who actually should pay ANYTHING to ANYONE in that legal proceeding. We prove this in:

Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051

<https://sedm.org/product/why-the-government-is-the-only-real-beneficiary-of-all-government-franchises-form-05-051/>

The next section is sample language that Parties agree on to ensure the court and the jury must enforce your right to NOT receive the benefit, privilege, public right, or property of the government that gives rise to the civil obligation being enforced and which does not make you look irresponsible or narcissistic to the jury, but rather RESPONSIBLE, conscientious, and seeking to behave in a respectful and equitable manner that is more likely to help you win your case.

11.4 Mandatory closing statements to the jury relating to this agreement that prove this is NOT an unjust enrichment

“Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, there is no question that all those who consume the services of others should pay for them, including me. This includes both the government as a Merchant offering property and services to me, as well as me offering property and services to the government. Any attempt to apply these principles unequally to either party to this controversy ultimately results in an abuse of you the jury to participate in, condone, and even commit a THEFT on the part of the government. Under principles of the [common law and equity](#), this scenario is called ‘unjust enrichment’, which gives rise to

1 an implied obligation to always pay for whatever you ask someone else for. If we didn't run the government the government
2 this way, then people could abuse their power to vote and serve on jury duty to use the government as a thief and a Robinhood
3 to equalize OUTCOMES rather than merely OPPORTUNITY and treatment. On this subject, the U.S. Supreme Court has
4 held:

5 *"... A tax, in the general understanding of the term and as used in the constitution, signifies*
6 *an exaction for the support of the government. The word has never thought to connote the*
7 *expropriation of money from one group for the benefit of another. . ."*
8 *[U.S. v. Butler, 297 U.S. 1 (1936)]*

9
10 **To lay, with one hand, the power of the government on the property of the citizen, and**
11 **with the other to bestow it upon favored individuals to aid private enterprises and build**
12 **up private fortunes, is none the less a robbery because it is done under the forms of law**
13 **and is called taxation. This is not legislation. It is a decree under legislative forms.**

14 **Nor is it taxation. 'A tax,' says Webster's Dictionary, 'is a rate or sum of money assessed**
15 **on the person or property of a citizen by government for the use of the nation or State.'**
16 **'Taxes are burdens or charges imposed by the Legislature upon persons or property to**
17 **raise money for public purposes.' Cooley, Const. Lim., 479.**

18 *Coulter, J., in Northern Liberties v. St. John's Church, 13 Pa.St. 104 says, very forcibly, 'I*
19 *think the common mind has everywhere taken in the understanding that **taxes are a public***
20 ***imposition, levied by authority of the government for the purposes of carrying on the***
21 ***government in all its machinery and operations—that they are imposed for a public***
22 ***purpose.'** See, also Pray v. Northern Liberties, 31 Pa.St., 69; Matter of Mayor of N.Y., 11*
23 *Johns., 77; Camden v. Allen, 2 Dutch., 398; Sharpless v. Mayor, supra; Hanson v. Vernon,*
24 *27 Ia., 47; Whiting v. Fond du Lac, supra."*
25 *[Loan Association v. Topeka, 87 U.S. 655, 20 Wall. 655 (1874)]*

26 This case involves nonpayment of an alleged "tax" for the specific years ____ to _____. A proper accounting under
27 equitable principles requires us to consider the "benefits", services, or property dispensed to me personally by the government
28 over that period with what I actually paid. Any other approach would violate the principles of equity and unjust enrichment
29 and make this jury in an instrument of THEFT.

30 A "tax", in this case is legally defined by the U.S. Supreme Court as a sum of money that supports ONLY the government or
31 people working in or for the government. That means it cannot be paid to private, constitutionally protected parties in states
32 of the Union, and if it IS, it ceases to be a classical "tax" as legally defined and devolves merely into a purely commercial
33 activity conducted for profit like any private business, in which BOTH parties are treated NOT as a "government" but merely
34 equals under equitable principles under the Clearfield Doctrine of the U.S. Supreme Court.

35 In the instant case, I have not sought, do not want, and do not want to pay for any "benefit", privilege, or exemption offered by
36 any government. The ability to do so is my right under principles of equity, in fact:

37 *"Cujus est commodum ejus debet esse incommodum.*
38 *He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage."*

39 *"Que sentit commodum, sentire debet et onus.*
40 *He who derives a benefit from a thing, ought to feel the disadvantages attending it. 2*
41 *Bouv. Inst. n. 1433."*

42 *Commodum ex injuri su non habere debet.*
43 *No man ought to derive any benefit of his own wrong. Jenk. Cent. 161.*

44 *Invito beneficium non datur.*
45 *No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. Dig. 50, 17, 69. But if he does*
46 *not dissent he will be considered as assenting. Vide Assent.*

1 *Potest quis renunciare pro se, et suis, juri quod pro se introductum est.*
2 *A man may relinquish, for himself and his heirs, a right which was introduced for his*
3 *own benefit. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.*

4 *Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se inducto.*
5 *Any one may renounce a law introduced for his own benefit. To this rule there are some*
6 *exceptions. See 1 Bouv. Inst. n. 83.*
7 *[Bouvier's Maxims of Law, 1856; SOURCE:*
8 <http://famguardian.org/Publications/BouvierMaximsOfLaw/BouviersMaxims.htm>]

9 Paying or rendering a “benefit”, property, or service to someone who does not WANT it, has communicated that objection
10 timely to the person offering, and who has identified any attempt to provide it against their will is not as a GRANT of a
11 “benefit” but a GIFT by the provider, cannot therefore produce any equitable obligation whatsoever. Further, it is beyond the
12 authority delegated to me by my principal, who is God under the Bible trust indenture, to ask for, accept, or pay for ANY
13 benefit, property, or civil service that any so-called “government” might attempt to abuse to enslave me to them:

14 ***Curses of Disobedience [to God's Laws]***

15 ***“The alien [Washington, D.C. is legislatively “alien” in relation to states of the Union]***
16 ***who is among you shall rise higher and higher above you, and you shall come down lower***
17 ***and lower [malicious destruction of EQUAL PROTECTION and EQUAL TREATMENT by***
18 ***abusing FRANCHISES]. He shall lend to you [Federal Reserve counterfeiting franchise],***
19 ***but you shall not lend to him; he shall be the head, and you shall be the tail.***

20 ***“Moreover all these curses shall come upon you and pursue and overtake you, until you are***
21 ***destroyed, because you did not obey the voice of the Lord your God, to keep His***
22 ***commandments and His statutes which He commanded you.*** *And they shall be upon you*
23 *for a sign and a wonder, and on your descendants forever.*

24 *“Because you did not serve [ONLY] the Lord your God with joy and gladness of heart, for*
25 *the abundance of everything, therefore you shall serve your [covetous thieving lawyer]*
26 *enemies, whom the Lord will send against you, in hunger, in thirst, in nakedness, and in*
27 *need of everything; and He will put a yoke of iron [franchise codes] on your neck until He*
28 *has destroyed you. The Lord will bring a nation against you from afar [the District of*
29 *CRIMINALS], from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies [the American Eagle],*
30 *a nation whose language [LEGALESE] you will not understand, a nation of fierce*
31 *[coercive and fascist] countenance, which does not respect the elderly [assassinates them*
32 *by denying them healthcare through bureaucratic delays on an Obamacare waiting list]*
33 *nor show favor to the young [destroying their ability to learn in the public FOOL system].*
34 *And they shall eat the increase of your livestock and the produce of your land [with “trade*
35 *or business” franchise taxes], until you [and all your property] are destroyed [or*
36 *STOLEN/CONFISCATED]; they shall not leave you grain or new wine or oil, or the*
37 *increase of your cattle or the offspring of your flocks, until they have destroyed you.*
38 *[Deut. 28:43-51, Bible, NKJV]*

39
40
41 ***“The rich rules over the poor,***
42 ***And the borrower is servant to the lender.”***
43 ***[Prov. 22:7, Bible, NKJV]***

44 When a government actor is sued for wrongdoing under the constitution, they can only be sued if the Plaintiff can prove they
45 acted outside their delegated authority of their “principal” and “employer”, the U.S. Inc. federal corporation. The same
46 principle applies here, except that the Plaintiff is a de facto government and the principal is different because MY principal,
47 being God, is superior to that of any government. In the capacity of this proceeding, I am acting as an agent and fiduciary of
48 God 24 hours a day, 7 days a week and have not stepped out of the protections of the Bible trust indenture that is my delegation
49 of authority order, as documented in:

Delegation of Authority Order from God to Christians, Form #13.007
<https://sedm.org/Forms/13-SelfFamilyChurchGovnce/DelOfAuthority.pdf>

1 My delegation of authority order also forbids me from seeking the protection of anything but His laws, the common law, the
2 criminal law, and the Constitution and NEVER the civil statutory franchise protection contract called “domicile”, as proven
3 in:

Why Domicile and Becoming a “Taxpayer” Require Your Consent, Form #05.002
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/Domicile.pdf>

4 Therefore, we must settle this matter under equitable rather than civil statutory terms, and to treat both parties absolutely
5 equally. A failure by you the jury or this court will have the practical effect of turning the government into an unconstitutional
6 civil religion in violation of the First Amendment, make the judge into the priest, make you into the apostle of the priest,
7 make this courtroom into a church, make the attorneys into deacons of the church, and impute or enforce superior and
8 supernatural powers to a [collective corporation called “U.S. Inc” \(Form #05.024\)](#) that I as the natural am not allowed to have.
9 That unlawful establishment of religion in violation of the First Amendment is documented below in:

Socialism: The New American Civil Religion, Form #05.016
<https://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/SocialismCivilReligion.pdf>

10 Over the tax period in question, a deduction of what I received from what I paid results in a net negative balance to the
11 government. That means under principles of equity that:

- 12 1. The government has no standing to sue, because they cannot demonstrate an actual injury.
- 13 2. The government is the only one in this case engaging in “unjust enrichment”.
- 14 3. The government is the ONLY one receiving a net “benefit” or privilege from ME rather than the other way around. In that
15 scenario, I am the only “Merchant” under the U.C.C. and I am the ONLY one who can define the terms of my offer of the
16 privilege involved as its absolute owner. See:

Why the Government is the Only Real Beneficiary of All Government Franchises, Form #05.051
<https://sedm.org/product/why-the-government-is-the-only-real-beneficiary-of-all-government-franchises-form-05-051/>

- 17 4. The government has a moral and implied legal duty to correct this inequity by paying me the DIFFERENCE to me as a
18 Merchant offering MY property, services, and “benefits” to them.

19 Since I am the only Merchant involved in this interaction offering property for sale, I am the ONLY one allowed to write the
20 terms of procuring my services. Those terms are documented below:

Injury Defense Franchise and Agreement, Form #06.027
<https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/InjuryDefenseFranchise.pdf>

21 Further, the so-called “benefits” being enforced in this case cannot even lawfully be offered or enforced within a constitutional
22 state of the union as described in:

- 23 1. *Why You Aren’t Eligible for Social Security*, Form #06.001
24 <https://sedm.org/Forms/06-AvoidingFranch/SSNotEligible.pdf>
- 25 2. *Challenge to Income Tax Enforcement Authority Within Constitutional States of the Union*, Form #05.052
26 <https://sedm.org/Forms/05-Memlaw/ChallengeToIRSEnforcementAuth.pdf>

27 It is a maxim of law and equity that one should not be allowed to “benefit” from illegal, injurious, or non-consensual acts
28 against anyone. Thus, there is NO BENEFIT whatsoever delivered by the government to me AT ALL. Further, it is a crime
29 for the government to try to BRIBE me illegally to create an office with a bribe of “benefits” that are not lawfully available
30 to me. See [18 U.S.C. §§201](#) and [210](#), and [18 U.S.C. §912](#).

31 Therefore, you, the jury and this court have a moral obligation to:

- 32 1. Dismiss the government’s action against me.
- 33 2. Sanction them for the criminal and illegal and even unconstitutional conduct in this case per the terms of the above
34 agreement, Form #06.027 equitably governing this relationship.

12 Rights acquired by Protected Party Against Government Actor

Parties acquire the following private rights and private property against the other party under the terms of this franchise and agreement.

12.1 Return of Any and all Property of Protected Party Acquired by Government Actor or his Employer

Government Actor agrees to be responsible to return any and all property of Protected Party acquired through enforcement or collection activity of any government franchise by either the Government Actor or his/her employer. Property must be returned within 30 days upon receipt and upon written notice to the Government Actor. Failure to return property of Protected Party collected by Government Actor or his/her Employer shall incur a financial liability of TEN TIMES the value of said property.

Parties agree that any and all property of Protected Party collected by the Government Actor or his/her employer:

1. Shall be characterized as a temporary grant or loan AT INTEREST by Protected Party to Government Actor.
2. Shall make the property custodian into a bailee and transferee over property of Protected Party. This is similar to how the Internal Revenue Code works, in which all “taxpayers” are, in fact, public officers and transferees over public property per 26 U.S.C. §6901.
3. Shall subject any and all government custodians of the loaned property into agents and officers and consenting parties under this agreement. Government Actor agrees to give timely notice of the existence of this agreement to any and all OTHER Government Actors who may be in temporary possession of property of the Protected Party.

Protected Party shall have the authority to exercise any and all means necessary to secure the return of his/her/its property under this section as indicated later in section 12.8. This includes, but is not limited to, filing non-judicial liens against Government Actor to include both administrative notices and U.C.C. 1 Financing Statements, with both the county recorder and the secretary of state.

Authority for this provision of law is the SAME authority as that used in the issuance of Social Security Cards. The Card itself and the regulations thereunder at 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) both confirm that even after the card is sent to someone, it continues to be government property, and that possession and use of said card is the authority for instituting penalties and subjecting the applicant to the regulations governing Social Security. The following additional authority confirms this:

*“How, then, are purely equitable obligations created? For the most part, either by the acts of third persons or by equity alone. **But how can one person impose an obligation upon another? By giving property to the latter on the terms of his assuming an obligation in respect to it. At law there are only two means by which the object of the donor could be at all accomplished, consistently with the entire ownership of the property passing to the donee, namely: first, by imposing a real obligation upon the property; secondly, by subjecting the title of the donee to a condition subsequent.** The first of these the law does not permit; the second is entirely inadequate. Equity, however, can secure most of the objects of the doner, and yet avoid the mischiefs of real obligations by imposing upon the donee (and upon all persons to whom the property shall afterwards come without value or with notice) **a personal obligation with respect to the property; and accordingly this is what equity does.** It is in this way that all trusts are created, and all equitable charges made (i.e., equitable hypothecations or liens created) by testators in their wills. In this way, also, most trusts are created by acts inter vivos, except in those cases in which the trustee incurs a legal as well as an equitable obligation. **In short, as property is the subject of every equitable obligation, so the owner of property is the only person whose act or acts can be the means of creating an obligation in respect to that property. Moreover, the owner of property can create an obligation in respect to it in only two ways: first, by incurring the obligation himself, in which case he commonly also incurs a legal obligation; secondly, by imposing the obligation upon some third person; and this he does in the way just explained.**”*

[Readings on the History and System of the Common Law, Second Edition, Roscoe Pound, 1925, p. 543]

1 Parties to this agreement also stipulate that any use of identifying numbers in connection with their relationship shall NOT
2 mean any number issued under the authority of any federal statute, but instead shall be the license issued from the Protected
3 Party to the Government Actor under the authority of this agreement. This includes “Taxpayer Identification Numbers”,
4 “Social Security Numbers”, etc.

5 **12.2 Agency Established**

6 This agreement establishes agency on the part of both parties in relation to the other party in delivering the consideration
7 promised by the agreement. This agency supersedes any and all other agency exercised by either party. In the case of the
8 Government Agent, that agency shall be referred to as an “anti-public office” under the terms of this anti-franchise franchise.

9 **12.3 Waiver of Full Payment Rule, Anti-Injunction Act, Exceptions to Declaratory Judgment** 10 **Act, Need to Exhaust Administrative Remedies, and ability to remove to Federal Court**

11 For the purposes of this interaction, the parties stipulate that all of the following ordinary requirements are waived for the
12 purposes of their interactions in administering this agreement:

- 13 1. The Anti-Injunction Act, 26 U.S.C. §7421, does not apply to the recovery of any damages or property by the Protected
14 Party against Government Actor. Parties stipulate that monies collected are not “taxes” as legally defined. See Section
15 4.1.13 earlier for the definition of “taxes”.
- 16 2. The exceptions to the Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201 relating to taxation do not apply to the settlement
17 of any disputes between the parties. Parties stipulate that monies collected are not “taxes” as legally defined. See
18 Section 4.1.13 earlier for the definition of “taxes”.
- 19 3. The Full Payment Rule established in [Flora v. United States, 357 U.S. 63, 78 S.Ct. 1079, 2 L.Ed.2d. 1165 \(1958\)](#) and
20 described in [Laing v. U.S., 423 U.S. 161, 96 S.Ct. 473 \(U.S.Ky. 1976\)](#) does not apply. Parties stipulate that monies
21 collected are not “taxes” as legally defined. See Section 4.1.13 earlier for the definition of “taxes”.
- 22 4. The requirement to exhaust administrative remedies do not apply to the Protected Party in suits against the Government
23 Actor. This only administrative remedy available to a non-resident non-person not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction
24 of Congress is to notify them to return absolutely owned private property or its equivalent value STOLEN by
25 Government Actor. This document accomplishes that. Beyond that constitutionally required reasonable notice, suit
26 can immediately commence against Government Actor.
- 27 5. Government Actor also agrees per this agreement NOT to remove any suit brought against him or her or it to a federal
28 court if it was first filed in a state court by the Protect Party. If Government Actor files a Notice of Removal, that
29 notice shall be interpreted as a stipulation to agree to everything in the complaint filed against him or her or it in the
30 state court and a demand for summary judgment.

31 Any similar statutes or court doctrines which operate similar to the above at the state level are also to be treated the SAME
32 for the purposes of this agreement.

33 **12.4 Information about Protected Party is PRIVATE Property Subject to Non-Disclosure**

34 Any and all information about Protected Party shall be considered private property which shall:

- 35 1. Not be subject to retention by not subject to disclosure to any government.
- 36 2. Not be shared outside the agency which received it.
- 37 3. Shall be purged in its entirety from all government records upon written notice and demand sent by Protected Party to
38 either Government Actor or his/her employer.
- 39 4. May not be employed for any purpose which could directly or indirectly benefit Government Actor financially, or
40 his/her employer.

41 **12.5 Waiver of Government Agency, Official, and Judicial Immunity on the Part of** 42 **Government Actor**

43 Parties stipulate that their duty and allegiance to abide by this agreement is *superior to* their employment duties and any other
44 agency they may claim to be exercising on behalf of any other entity or government. All parties to this agreement hereby

1 perpetually waive judicial, sovereign, or official immunity associated with any government position or agency they may
2 otherwise occupy in the context of enforcing any provision of this franchise and/or agreement.

3 Protected Party shall have witness immunity pursuant to [18 U.S.C. §6002](#) for all interactions with any government.

4 Parties hereby stipulate to grant the SAME sovereign immunity to the Protected Party as the government asserts in any
5 litigation between either the recipient or the government and the Protected Party pursuant to the Foreign Sovereign Immunities
6 Act, [28 U.S.C. §1603](#) et seq.

7 **12.6 Waiver of Sovereign Immunity**

8 Parties stipulate the following facts and agreements affecting sovereign immunity under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities
9 Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97:

- 10 1. The parties stipulate that everything in the following documents relating to civil franchises is true:
- 11 1.1. *Government Franchises Course*, Form #12.012
12 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 13 1.2. *Government Instituted Slavery Using Franchises*, Form #05.030
14 <https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 15 2. The United States government is not exempted from the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act, 28 U.S.C. Chapter 97, for
16 the purposes of their interactions with states of the Union.
- 17 3. Any attempt to offer or enforce any kind of civil franchise within a constitutional state is an attempt to alienate
18 PRIVATE rights that the Declaration of Independence says are UNALIENABLE, meaning that those who possess
19 them are legally incapable of consenting to surrender them to a real de jure government. See Form #05.043.
- 20 4. Any attempt to offer or enforce any kind of civil franchise within a constitutional state is stipulated to be strictly
21 commercial activity that results in a waiver of sovereign immunity.
- 22 5. The ONLY place where civil franchises can lawfully be offered WITHOUT alienating rights that are unalienable is:
- 23 5.1. Among those domiciled and physically present abroad.
- 24 5.2. Among those domiciled on federal territory where the protections of the Constitution do not apply.

25 For details on the above, see:

Unalienable Rights Course, Form #12.038
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

26 6. The following subject matters are commercial franchises subject to waiver of sovereign immunity by the national
27 government in relation to the states of the Union:

28 6.1. Social Security. See

Why You Aren't Eligible for Social Security, Form #06.001
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

29 6.2. Income tax. See:

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

30 6.3. Driver licensing compacts between the states. See Form #06.010.

31 6.4. Disability insurance.

32 6.5. Medicare.

33 7. Government identifying numbers including but not limited to Social Security Numbers and Taxpayer Identification
34 Numbers:

35 7.1. Are what the Federal Trade Commission (F.T.C.) calls a "franchise mark":

36 "*. . . a commercial business arrangement is a "franchise" if it satisfies three definitional*
37 *elements. Specifically, the franchisor must:*

38 *(1) promise to provide a trademark or other commercial symbol;*

39 *(2) promise to exercise significant control or provide significant assistance in the operation*
40 *of the business; and*

41 *(3) require a minimum payment of at least \$500 during the first six months of operations."*

42 *[FTC Franchise Rule Compliance Guide, May 2008, p. 1;*

43 *SOURCE: <http://business.ftc.gov/documents/bus70-franchise-rule-compliance-guide>]*

- 1 7.2. Are property of the government issuer.
 2 7.3. Because they are property, the issuer is liable in state court for their use in alienating, converting to public, or
 3 damaging any constitutional or PRIVATE right. This is a consequence of the same criteria applied by the
 4 government against private companies called “product liability”.
 5 7.4. Anyone using or benefitting in any way from the use of said numbers is a Government Actor and a public officer.
 6 The definition of “public office” confirms that a public officer is someone in charge of the property of the public,
 7 including government identifying numbers.

8 *“Public office. The right, authority, and duty created and conferred by law, by which for*
 9 *a given period, either fixed by law or enduring at the pleasure of the creating power, an*
 10 *individual is invested with some portion of the sovereign functions of government for the*
 11 *benefit of the public. Walker v. Rich, 79 Cal.App. 139, 249 P. 56, 58. An agency for the*
 12 *state, the duties of which involve in their performance the exercise of some portion of the*
 13 *sovereign power, either great or small. Yaselli v. Goff, C.C.A., 12 F.2d. 396, 403, 56 A.L.R.*
 14 *1239; Lacey v. State, 13 Ala.App. 212, 68 So. 706, 710; Curtin v. State, 61 Cal.App. 377,*
 15 *214 P. 1030, 1035; Shelmadine v. City of Elkhart, 75 Ind.App. 493, 129 N.E. 878. State ex*
 16 *rel. Colorado River Commission v. Frohmiller, 46 Ariz. 413, 52 P.2d. 483, 486. **Where, by***
 17 ***virtue of law, a person is clothed, not as an incidental or transient authority, but for such***
 18 ***time as de- notes duration and continuance, with Independent power to control the***
 19 ***property of the public,** or with public functions to be exercised in the supposed interest of*
 20 *the people, the service to be compensated by a stated yearly salary, and the occupant*
 21 *having a designation or title, the position so created is a public office. State v. Brennan,*
 22 *49 Ohio.St. 33, 29 N.E. 593.*

23 *[Black’s Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, p. 1235]*

- 24 7.5. Because private and constitutional rights are unalienable within a constitutional state, any use of government
 25 identifying numbers to alienate private or constitutional rights shall be deemed:
 26 7.5.1. Private commercial activity by the government.
 27 7.5.2. Not consensual on the part of the non-governmental party using said number. This is especially true if the
 28 status of the number cannot be changed to reflect the fact that the participant is NOT a franchisee or a public
 29 officer and is immune from the civil jurisdiction of the national government under the terms of any and
 30 every civil franchise.
 31 7.5.3. Not within the delegated authority of the Government Actor requesting or compelling their use. Therefore
 32 28 U.S.C. §2679 does NOT apply and the Department of Justice has NO delegated authority to determine
 33 otherwise.
 34 7.5.4. A criminal attempt to solicit a bribe to a Government Actor to treat the otherwise private party compelled to
 35 use them as a de facto public officer in criminal violation of 18 U.S.C. §§210 and 211.
 36 7.5.5. A criminal attempt to tamper with a witness, because most government forms have perjury statements and
 37 are signed under penalty of perjury and constitute testimony of a witness. A failure to use a number on a
 38 government form or a refusal to accept a form without a number is tampering with the witness by
 39 compelling them to procure a public office in order to have their form accepted or processed. 18 U.S.C.
 40 §1512.
 41 7.5.6. Not a government function but an ANTI-GOVERNMENT function of a de facto government. See:

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

- 42 8. Any attempt to offer or enforce taxable or regulatable civil franchises within states of the Union is stipulated by the
 43 parties to be an “invasion” within the meaning of Article 4, Section 4 of the United States Constitution:

44 *United States Constitution*
 45 *Section 4. Obligations of United States to States*

46 *The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of*
 47 *Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the*
 48 *Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against*
 49 *domestic Violence.*

1 The first and most important function of any government is to maintain a perpetual and inviolable separation between
2 PUBLIC and PRIVATE. All of the above criminal tactics by de facto Government Actors break down that separation, as
3 described in:

Separation Between Public and Private Course, Form #12.025
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

4 **12.7 Presumptions Established and Stipulated by All Parties**

5 For the purposes of any dispute relating to this or any other government franchise or civil law:

- 6 1. Parties stipulate that any attempt to enforce this agreement by Protected Party and against the Government Actor shall
7 NOT be classified and IS NOT classified as:
 - 8 1.1. Criminal obstruction of justice of any kind.
 - 9 1.2. Any form of witness tampering, if the Government Actor is a witness in the action.
10 Any claim to the contrary by Government Actor or any third party is hereby stipulated by parties to this agreement to
11 be FALSE, PERJURIOUS, and FRAUDULENT. If any government attempts to prosecute the above types of crimes
12 against the Protected Party and in conflict with the above, then the Government Actor agrees to become the substitute
13 Defendant in such an action and hold the Protected Party harmless..
- 14 2. All parties shall be presumed to be innocent until proven guilty with physical evidence and not presumption. This
15 means that they are presumed to be all the following until evidence of consent to acquire a different status is introduced
16 on the record of the proceeding:
 - 17 2.1. “nontaxpayer” and other than a statutory “taxpayer” per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14).
 - 18 2.2. “national” under 8 U.S.C. §1101(a)(21) but not a statutory “citizen” under 8 U.S.C. §1401.
 - 19 2.3. Equal in every respect in rights in relation to every state and federal government until evidence of consent to
20 become UNEQUAL is established on the record of the proceeding.
- 21 3. All government tax forms sent by Protected Party to Government Agent and/or his employer shall be subject to the
22 terms and conditions described in the following form and the definitions appearing in section 0 earlier:

Tax Form Attachment, Form #04.201
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 23 4. All parties are presumed to be equal under the law with the following exceptions:
 - 24 4.1. Parties may only become UNEQUAL through their EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT.
 - 25 4.2. All parties are human beings protected by the Bill of Rights and state Constitutions. Government as an artificial
26 being has no constitutional rights.
 - 27 4.3. All parties have no delegated authority to consent to government franchises and therefore may not have any
28 government franchise enforced against them in the context of these proceedings. Even written evidence of an
29 application shall not constitute consent. Franchises include income tax, Social Security, Medicare,
30 Unemployment insurance, government healthcare, driver’s licenses, marriage licenses, vehicle registration,
31 contractor’s licenses, and professional licenses.
- 32 5. Any right or method of acquiring rights asserted by any government shall also be possessed by all parties to this
33 agreement. For instance:
 - 34 5.1. If the government claims the right to assert sovereign, judicial, or official immunity, then parties shall also have
35 the same right as an officer and fiduciary of God’s government and his family’s government under the Holy Bible
36 trust indenture and the family private articles of incorporation.
 - 37 5.2. If the government claims the right to allow third parties to elect either party into a public office within a franchise
38 without the express written consent of the Party, then that Party retains the same right against the government and
39 all parties representing the government as individual human beings. An example of this phenomenon is the filing
40 of information returns such as IRS Forms W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099.
 - 41 5.3. If the government claims the right to reclassify his/her speech from nonfactual to factual and actionable, then the
42 Parties shall have the same right and may classify the court’s orders or the statements of government as
43 nonfactual, political, and IRRELEVANT.
 - 44 5.4. If the government alleges or asserts any of the following, then the Parties assert the same EQUAL right to make
45 the government into a consenting party and therefore “resident” under this franchise.
 - 46 5.4.1. That the Protected Party is a “resident” or “citizen” under any federal or state law.
 - 47 5.4.2. That the Protected Party “purposefully availed” themselves of commerce within the jurisdiction of any
48 federal or state court.
 - 49 5.4.3. That the Protected Party availed themselves of any alleged commercial “benefit” or privilege offered by any
50 government.

1 5.4.4. Government or court or judge redefines any word within used by the Protected Party on any government
2 form or commercial correspondence to mean anything OTHER than that expressly defined here.

- 3 6. The declared nationality and domicile status declared by either party shall not be challenged or disputed by the other
4 party. It shall be presumed to be accurate, correct, and conclusive as they declare it.
- 5 7. All property of the Protected Party shall be presumed to be absolutely owned PRIVATE property until evidence is
6 introduced into the record that:
- 7 7.1. The Protected Party, IN WRITING, expressly consented to donate said private property to a public use, public
8 purpose, and public office in the mode that he/she/it and not the court or the opposing party, specifies. . .AND
- 9 7.2. The Protected Party was domiciled outside of land protected at the time he or she or it consented. Rights
10 protected by the Constitution are unalienable, according to the Declaration of Independence, and therefore one
11 CANNOT lawfully consent to give them away.
- 12 8. All human beings shall be presumed to be sovereign and not amenable to civil suit or judgment under anything other
13 than the common law and the constitution. Human beings are the fountain and source of ALL political and legal power
14 in the American form of government, as declared by the U.S. Supreme Court. If the other party to the litigation is the
15 government, then:
- 16 8.1. The government must prove that the Protected Party EXPRESSLY CONSENTED to suit IN WRITING in the
17 mode that he and not the court specifies.
- 18 8.2. No implied contracts may be presumed.
- 19 8.3. No right documented in the state or federal constitutions may be contracted away, alienated, or surrendered, even
20 with the consent of the Protected Party, because all such rights are identified in the Declaration of Independence
21 as "unalienable", meaning that they cannot lawfully be sole, bargained away, or transferred in relation to a REAL,
22 de jure government.
- 23 9. Protected Party is a Christian who is acting as an agent, fiduciary, and trustee over God's property, which is him/her
24 self and all the Earth, and has no delegated authority to either contract or consent to contract with any Earthly
25 government.

26 *"Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? **Whoever therefore**
27 **wants to be a friend** [**"citizen", "resident", "taxpayer", "inhabitant", or "subject" under**
28 **a king or political ruler**] **of the world [or any man-made kingdom other than God's**
29 **Kingdom**] **makes himself an enemy of God.** "
30 [[James 4:4](#), Bible, NKJV]*

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

39 *"Pure and undefiled religion before God and the Father is this: to visit orphans and widows*
40 *in their trouble, and **to keep oneself unspotted from the world [the obligations and***
41 ***concerns of the world]**."*
42 [[James 1:27](#), Bible, NKJV]

44 *"You shall have no other gods [including political rulers, governments, or Earthly laws]*
45 *before Me [or **My commandments**]."*
46 [[Exodus 20:3](#), Bible, NKJV]

48 *"Then all the elders of Israel gathered together and came to Samuel [the priest in a*
49 *Theocracy] at Ramah, and said to him, 'Look, you [the priest within a theocracy] are old,*
50 *and your sons do not walk in your ways. **Now make us a king [or political ruler] to judge***
51 ***us like all the nations** [and be OVER them]'.*

1 *"But the thing displeased Samuel when they said, 'Give us a king [or political ruler] to*
2 *judge us.' So Samuel prayed to the Lord. And the Lord said to Samuel, 'Heed the voice*
3 *of the people in all that they say to you; for they have rejected Me [God], that I should*
4 *not reign over them. According to all the works which they have done since the day that I*
5 *brought them up out of Egypt, even to this day—with which they have forsaken Me [God*
6 *as their ONLY King, Lawgiver, and Judge] and served other gods—so they are doing to*
7 *you also [government or political rulers becoming the object of idolatry]."*
8 *[1 Sam. 8:4-8, Bible, NKJV]*
9

10 *"Do not walk in the statutes of your fathers [the heathens], nor observe their judgments,*
11 *nor defile yourselves with their [pagan government] idols. I am the LORD your God: Walk*
12 *in My statutes, keep My judgments, and do them; hallow My Sabbaths, and they will be a*
13 *sign between Me and you, that you may know that I am the LORD your God."*
14 *[Ezekial 20:10-20, Bible, NKJV]*
15

16 *"And have no fellowship [or association] with the unfruitful works of [government]*
17 *darkness, but rather reprove [rebuke and expose] them."*
18 *[Eph. 5:11, Bible, NKJV]*
19

20 *"But if you are led by the Spirit, you are not under the law [man's law]."*
21 *[Gal. 5:18, Bible, NKJV]*
22

23 *"Shall the throne of iniquity [the U.S. Congress and the federal judiciary], which devises*
24 *evil by [obfuscating the] law [to expand their jurisdiction and consolidate all economic*
25 *power in their hands by taking it away from the states], have fellowship with You? They*
26 *gather together against the life of the righteous, and condemn innocent blood [of*
27 *"nontaxpayers" and persons outside their jurisdiction, which is an act of extortion and*
28 *racketeering]. But the Lord has been my defense, and my God the rock of my refuge. He*
29 *has brought on them their own iniquity, and shall cut them off in their own wickedness; the*
30 *Lord our God [and those who obey Him and His word] shall cut them off [from power*
31 *and from receiving illegal bribes cleverly disguised by an obfuscated law as legitimate*
32 *"taxes"]."*
33 *[Psalm 94:20-23, Bible, NKJV. QUESTION FOR DOUBTERS: Who else BUT Congress*
34 *and the judiciary can devise "evil by law"?)*
35

36 *"Come out from among them [the unbelievers and government idolaters]*
37 *And be separate, says the Lord.*
38 *Do not touch [or contract with] what is unclean,*
39 *And I will receive you.*
40 *I will be a Father to you,*
41 *And you shall be my sons and daughters,*
42 *Says the Lord Almighty."*
43 *[2 Corinthians 6:17-18, Bible, NKJV]*
44

45 *"Nevertheless, God's solid foundation stands firm, sealed with this inscription: 'The Lord*
46 *knows those who are His,' and, 'Everyone who confesses the name of the Lord must turn*
47 *away from [not associate with or subsidize] wickedness [wherever it is found, and*
48 *especially in government].'"*
49 *[2 Tim. 2:19, Bible, NKJV]*

50 Not "walking in the statutes of your fathers" means not participating in government franchises or statutory law that is
51 for GOVERNMENT and its officers only, but rather proceeding ONLY under the common law and in EQUITY. The

1 government does the same thing, wherein it asserts “sovereign immunity” and requires “express written consent to be
2 sued” before a suit against it can be entertained.

3 The above are the same requirements that governments impose upon those who wish to sue it/them.

4 **12.8 Enforcement Authority of Protected Party Against Government Actor**

5 Government Actor consents to allow Protected Party or his agents or assigns to take any one or more of the following actions
6 to enforce this franchise and agreement for any liabilities which might result from violations of the franchise and agreement:

- 7 1. File an administrative lien upon real property owned by Government Actor in the county recorder of any county.
- 8 2. Place a UCC lien against the name of Government Actor in one or more states of the Union.
- 9 3. Make withdrawals from any and all financial accounts in the name of the Government Actor.
- 10 4. Place an administrative lien against the government pay and benefits of the Government Actor.

11 Legal evidence of authority to take any of the enforcement above actions indicated above shall consist in the presentation all
12 of the following proofs:

- 13 1. Receipt of correspondence signed by the Government Actor or indicating the name of the Government Actor.
- 14 2. Presentation of a Certificate of Service showing that this signed agreement was served upon the Government Actor.

15 **12.9 Issues not subject to dispute, default answers stipulated**

16 Government Actor agrees not to accuse Protected Party of making or relying upon any of flawed arguments identified in the
17 following publications or raise them as an issue in any dispute between the parties:

- 18 1. *Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments Against This Website*, Form #08.011
19 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 20 2. *Policy Document: Rebutted False Arguments About Sovereignty*, Form #08.018
21 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 22 3. *Flawed Tax Arguments to Avoid*, Form #08.004
23 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 24 4. *Rebutted Version of the IRS “The Truth About Frivolous Tax Arguments”*, Form #08.005
25 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 26 5. *Rebutted Version of “Tax Resister Frequently Asked Questions”*, Form #08.007
27 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 28 6. *Rebutted Version of CRS Report 97-59A: “Frequently Asked Questions Concerning the Federal Income Tax”*, Form
29 #08.006
30 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

31 Parties stipulate that any allegation about Protected Party that is inconsistent with any of the above shall be interpreted as
32 actionable fraud and slander.

33 Government Actor agrees not to impute or allege any obligation to any government or de facto government on the part of
34 Protected Party, including any government, that the Protected Party did not expressly request and consent to in writing in the
35 manner that Protected Party and no one else specifies.

36 Government Actor furthermore stipulates to the default answer to any and all admissions provided at the end of the
37 Memorandums of Law appearing in the following:

<i>SEDM Forms Page</i> , Section 1.5, Memorandums of Law http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm

38 Government Actor may dispute the default answer to any of the above by providing evidence consistent with that permitted
39 under this agreement.

12.10 Authority conferred by Government Actor upon Protected Party

1. Government Actor delegates exclusive authority to Protected Party to declare and determine whether any government franchise or private law to which Protected Party is alleged to be a party is in fact a “benefit”. If Protected Party deems that it is not, no provision of the specific franchise may or shall lawfully be enforced against him or her. Such franchises include Social Security, income taxes, Medicare, unemployment compensation, welfare, etc.
2. Power of Attorney to Correct False Information Returns Filed Against Protected Party by Government Actor. Government Actor consents to allow Protected Party of this form to submit corrected information returns to the IRS or state revenue agencies which zero out any report of “trade or business” earnings and to sign said forms under power of attorney from the Government Actor. This includes, but is not limited to IRS Forms W-2C, W-3, 1042-S, 1096, 1098, 1099, and 8300.
3. Power of Attorney to Execute IRS Form 56: Government Actor consents to allow the Protected Party of this form to submit [IRS Form 56](#) on their behalf and under power of attorney, making the Government Actor liable and surety for all debts or obligations created by the unauthorized use, or abuse of information about him in the possession of Government Actor or his/her agents or assigns, including any attempts to use such information for a commercial or governmental purpose. This will make the Government Actor into the target for all collection notices directed at the “public office” fraudulently created by the duress, coercion, and unlawful actions of the Government Actor of this notice. Government Actor waives any right to disclaim liability for the [IRS Form 56](#) so filed and agrees NOT to file an IRS Form 56 making Protected Party of this Notice liable for any of the taxes, debts, or other obligations that arise out of this correspondence, any of the attachments, or any of the alleged obligations that might arise out of the franchise established herein. If Government Actor files an IRS Form 56 to remove responsibility for his unlawful actions, he agrees to reimburse Protected Party for TWICE any monetary damages or injuries sustained by filing such a form.
4. Power of Attorney to Execute IRS Form 8822: Government Actor consents to allow the Protected Party to complete an IRS Form 8822 changing the address to his/her/its address, making the Government Actor liable and surety for collection notices and actions in connection with any tax liabilities that may be enforced against the Protected Party as a consequence of reports, actions, or omissions filed against Protected Party by Government Actor. This will make the Government Actor into the target for all collection notices directed at the “public office” fraudulently created by the duress, coercion, and unlawful actions of the Government Actor of this notice. Government Actor waives any right to disclaim liability for the [IRS Form 8822](#) so filed and agrees NOT to file an IRS Form 8822 making Protected Party of this Notice liable for any of the taxes, debts, or other obligations that arise out of this correspondence, any of the attachments, or any of the alleged obligations that might arise out of the franchise established herein. If Government Actor files an IRS Form 8822 to remove responsibility for his unlawful actions, he agrees to reimburse Protected Party for TWICE any monetary damages or injuries sustained by filing such a form.
5. Limitations upon all litigation between Government Actor and Protected Party:
 - 5.1. Government Actor agrees to allow Protected Party to act on his or her or its behalf under limited power of attorney in the case of any and all litigation in which:
 - 5.1.1. He/she/it is a Plaintiff against Protected Party of the Ministry he or she represents.
 - 5.1.2. He/she/it is a witness or informant in a case involving the Protected Party.
 - 5.2. Government Actor agrees to allow this limited power of attorney to include authority to:
 - 5.2.1. Petition to dismiss any case against the Protected Party.
 - 5.2.2. Complete and submit voluntary payroll withholding forms so as to garnish his pay in satisfaction of liabilities incurred in violating any aspect of this agreement.
 - 5.2.3. Act as an exclusive witness on behalf of the prosecution in any trial directed against the Protected Party or any ministry or other entity to which he is connected or associated as a result of the litigation.
 - 5.2.4. Make withdrawals from the personal financial accounts of the Government Actor to satisfy liabilities incurred in violating this agreement.
 - 5.2.5. Submit resignation papers to the private or government employer of Government Actor.
 - 5.2.6. Accept, cash, and take ownership of payments from Fellowship to the Prosecution for any monetary liabilities resulting from litigation directed against Protected Party or any group or ministry or other efforts he is or may be connected with.
 - 5.3. Government Actor authorizes that this Limited Power of Attorney shall constitute the only authority needed by any receiving court clerk, financial company, employer, or receiving organization in order to effect whatever actions that Protected Party or Ministry deems needful at the time to satisfy the requirements of this agreement. It shall be prima facie good for all intents and purposes without question or delay of any kind.
 - 5.4. Government Actor also agrees that no signature by Government shall be necessary to this contract if Government Actor, as a litigant, quotes anything off of the above website in any litigation pleading he files against Protected Party or his/her associates, agents, or entities he is involved with. All that shall be needed to perfect and authorize Limited Power of Attorney described in this agreement are the following three things:

- 5.4.1. A pleading signed by User mentioning copyrighted information off this website and provided as a certified copy by the clerk of the court where the lawsuit was filed against the Fellowship.
- 5.4.2. This agreement with a signed, notarized signature of Protected Party on this agreement.
- 5.4.3. A printout of the web page where the information quoted in the pleading is indicated, and which shows the web address where obtained and the date downloaded.

12.11 Stipulations regarding communications between Protected Party and Government Actor

1. All Statements Made by Government Actor are Material, Factual, Truthful, and Actionable Under Penalty of Perjury: Pursuant to [18 U.S.C. §1001](#), Materiality, the Government Actor of this form agrees to take complete, private, personal, and exclusive responsibility for the truthfulness and accuracy of the entire content of any correspondence sent by him or her or his or her employer as true, correct, and complete UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY. This provision thereby circumvents the disclaimer found on the IRS website and makes it of no effect: [Internal Revenue Manual \(I.R.M.\), Section 4.10.7.2.8](#). The Government Actor described in this document as a private party, by virtue of accepting the “benefits” of this franchise, instead agrees to exercise their right to contract under this franchise agreement as a means to make their employer, the IRS, IRRELEVANT and agrees that all correspondence from them or their employer becomes their exclusive, personal, and private responsibility under this contract or agreement. This will prevent judicial tribunals from protecting and rewarding IRS agents and those representing the government such as “withholding agents” from telling lies or untruths to those they are supposed to have a fiduciary duty to help and protect the rights of. Your “trade or business” franchise turns me into a “public officer” without my consent, and likewise, my franchise changes YOU from a public officer into a private individual so you can be sued and have to take personal responsibility for your actions and cannot claim immunity of any kind. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.
2. Consent to recording of all audio conversations. Government Actor consents to recording of all audio communications, including but not limited to IRS summons hearings, examinations, visitations, court appearances, and telephonic communication, and recording mentioned in 26 U.S.C. §7521(a). This correspondence shall also constitute an advanced notification that all such recording shall be done in satisfaction of ten day period identified in 26 U.S.C. §7521. Protected Party is NOT the “taxpayer” mentioned in this statute, however, and is a “nontaxpayer” NOT subject to ANY provision of the Internal Revenue Code, Subtitles A through C.

12.12 Use of Information About Protected Party

Any unauthorized use and especially commercial use of information pertaining to the Protected Party and contained on this form, any attached form, or any information previously submitted to the government is subject to a \$100,000 penalty per incident plus any tax or penalty liability that might result from the unauthorized use of said information. Authority to store or use all such information for any purpose MUST be procured in a writing signed by the Protected Party in advance of the disclosure or it does not exist. Unauthorized uses include:

1. Mailing any kind of notices other than abatement notices.
2. Sharing information with ANY agency or bureau OTHER than the one the Government Actor works for.
3. Performing tax or penalty assessment with the information.
4. Conveying any “benefit” to the Protected Party that might make him/her/it subject to any type of government franchise, license, or “public right”, including but not limited to the following:
 - 4.1. A graduated or reduced rate of tax pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §1](#).
 - 4.2. Earned income credits pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §32](#).
 - 4.3. [“Trade or Business”](#) deductions pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §162](#). I am NOT engaged and never have voluntarily engaged in a “trade or business”, which is defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(26\)](#) as “the functions of a public office”.
 - 4.4. Treaty benefits under an income tax treaty with a foreign country.
 - 4.5. Any benefit, privilege, or immunity conferred by any provision within the Internal Revenue Code.
 - 4.6. A statutory refund pursuant to any provision within the Internal Revenue Code. There is no provision within the Internal Revenue Code that authorizes refunds of unlawfully withheld taxes or taxes paid under protest of “nontaxpayers” who are not subject to the Internal Revenue Code. All monies paid to the government have been paid ILLEGALLY and UNDER PROTEST and therefore are not as “taxes”. These unlawfully collected monies are therefore due back NOT because of any provision within the Internal Revenue Code, but ONLY under principles of justice and equity. It is NOT a “privilege” or “franchise” or “public right” to expect the government to RETURN money that was UNLAWFULLY STOLEN and sent to the government and which the government is not lawfully entitled to hold as the “transferee” or “fiduciary” over other people’s money. Keeping such proceeds would cause the government to be engaging in criminal money laundering and make the government into a protection racket rather than a protector.

1 “A claim against the United States is a right to demand money from the United States.³¹
2 Such claims are sometimes spoken of as gratuitous in that they cannot be enforced by suit
3 without statutory consent.³² **The general rule of non-liability of the United States does**
4 **not mean that a citizen cannot be protected against the wrongful governmental acts that**
5 **affect the citizen or his or her property.**³³ **If, for example, money or property of an**
6 **innocent person goes into the federal treasury by fraud to which a government agent was**
7 **a party, the United States cannot [lawfully] hold the money or property against the claim**
8 **of the injured party.**³⁴”
9 [American Jurisprudence 2d, United States, §45 (1999)]

10 4.7. An “election” to be treated as a “resident alien” and obtain a reduced tax liability pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §](#)
11 [7701\(b\)\(4\)\(B\)](#), or [6013\(g\)](#) or (h).

12 5. Initiating civil or criminal litigation against the Protected Party.

13 6. Associating the Protected Party with any federally issued identifying number, including but not limited to Social Security
14 Numbers as described in 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d), Taxpayer Identification Numbers as described in [26 U.S.C. §6109](#), or
15 Employer Identification Numbers as described in [26 U.S.C. §6109](#). Protected Party does not consent to take custody of
16 these forms of public property, which 20 C.F.R. §422.103(d) says belongs to the government and not Protected Party.
17 This would represent compelled association in violation of the First Amendment and involuntary servitude in violation
18 of the Thirteenth Amendment. Government Actor is reminded that Protected Party does not possess, voluntarily use,
19 nor have a Social Security Number or Taxpayer Identification Number and never lawfully requested one.

20 **12.13 Other Terms and Conditions**

21 Government Actor consents and agrees to:

22 1. Abide by this agreement in its entirety.

23 2. Produce evidence of consent to the surrender of the rights conveyed *in writing* with the signature of the Protected Party
24 to any and all franchises or contracts sought to be enforced by the Government Actor as against the Protected Party and
25 to dismiss all legal actions where this requirement is not met.

26 3. Accept, pay, and not remove from county records private contractual liens upon his real property, wherever situated
27 when filed by Protected Party in order to enforce this agreement. These private contractual liens shall be filed by
28 Protected Party under power of attorney as against the Government Actor.

29 4. Accept, pay, and not remove UCC contractual liens against the chattel property of Government Actor in order to enforce
30 this agreement. These secured transactions shall be filed by Protected Party under power of attorney as against the
31 Government Actor.

32 5. Respect all the provisions and constraints of the following two documents submitted previously to the recipient and the
33 government. Proof of service upon the government is available upon request:

34 5.1. *Legal Notice of Change in Domicile/Citizenship Records and Divorce from the United States*, Form #10.001
35 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

36 5.2. *Resignation of Compelled Social Security Trustee*, Form #06.002
37 <http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

38 **13 Dispute Resolution**

39 Parties stipulate all of the following terms and conditions governing disputes under this agreement.

³¹ United States ex rel. Angarica v. Bayard, 127 U.S. 251, 32 L.Ed. 159, 8 S.Ct. 1156, 4 A.F.T.R. 4628 (holding that a claim against the Secretary of State for money awarded under a treaty is a claim against the United States); Hobbs v. McLean, 117 U.S. 567, 29 L.Ed. 940, 6 S.Ct. 870; Manning v. Leighton, 65 Vt. 84, 26 A. 258, motion dismd 66 Vt. 56, 28 A 630 and (disapproved on other grounds by Button’s Estate v. Anderson, 112 Vt. 531, 28 A.2d. 404, 143 A.L.R. 195).

³² Blagge v. Balch, 162 U.S. 439, 40 L.Ed. 1032, 16 S.Ct. 853.

³³ Wilson v. Shaw, 204 U.S. 24, 51 L.Ed. 351, 27 S.Ct. 233.

³⁴ Bull v. United States, 295 U.S. 247, 79 L.Ed. 1421, 55 S.Ct. 695, 35-1 U.S.T.C. ¶ 9346, 15 A.F.T.R. 1069; United States v. State Bank, 96 U.S. 30, 96 Otto. 30, 24 L.Ed. 647.

13.1 Agency and Status of Parties

Parties under this franchise consent to be treated as all of the following in respect to federal civil jurisdiction:

1. Nonresident.
2. "Stateless person" because domiciled AND resident outside the statutory but not constitutional "United States".
3. If the parties are domiciled in different states of the Union or foreign jurisdictions, Constitutional diversity shall apply under Article III, Section 2 and NOT statutory diversity under 28 U.S.C. §1332.
4. That described in the following:

<p><u>Tax Form Attachment</u>, Form #04.201 http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm</p>

Protected Party has not consented and has no delegated authority to consent to represent an enfranchised or privileged government entity of any kind, including but not limited to all of the following kinds, and therefore has no option but to proceed ONLY under the common law and equity:

1. Public officer of state or national governments.
2. Instrumentality or agent of any kind of state or federal governments.
3. Statutory "taxpayer" per 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(14).
4. Statutory "driver" under state motor vehicle code.
5. Statutory "spouse" under state family code.
6. Social security participant under the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. Chapter 7.
7. Statutory "U.S. citizens" as described in [8 U.S.C. §1401](#) or 26 C.F.R. §1.1-1(c) or any other federal statute.
8. Statutory "U.S. resident" as described in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#) or any other federal statute.
9. Statutory "U.S. persons" as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701](#)(a)(30) or any other federal statute.
10. Statutory "person" as defined in [26 U.S.C. §6671](#)(b) or [26 U.S.C. §7343](#) or any other federal law.
11. Statutory "individual" as defined in [5 U.S.C. §552a](#)(a)(2) and 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3) or any other federal statute.
12. Statutory "nonresident alien individual" per 26 C.F.R. §1.1441-1(c)(3).
13. Statutory "federal personnel" as defined in [5 U.S.C. §552a](#)(a)(13).

Parties stipulate that any attempt to assign or presume or declare any of the above statuses or conditions to the Protected Party shall constitute:

1. FRAUD.
2. Unlawful duress.
3. Perjury, if such assertion appears in any pleading filed or evidence entered in a court of law.
4. Identity theft.
5. Compelled association.
6. Compelled contacting and/or involuntary servitude.

. . . with the state or federal governments.

Parties stipulate that neither Protected Party nor Government Actor were or are acting as an officer or "public officer" within any government or corporation in the context of their interactions or with any obligations associated with their relationship, including tax obligations.

"Private person. Term sometimes used to refer to persons other than those holding public office or in military services."
[Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1196]

Parties stipulate that any of the following actions on the part of the Government Actor shall constitute criminal impersonation of a public officer (per 18 U.S.C. §912) by the Government Actor, criminal conversion of private property to a public use, and theft against the Protected Party by the Government Actor:

1. Filing any kind of information return against the protected party under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6041, including but not limited to IRS Forms W-2, 1042-S, 1098, and 1099. All such returns shall be deemed to be false and a criminal violation of 26 U.S.C. §7206 and/or 7207.

2. Requiring the disclosure or use of:
 - 2.1. A Taxpayer Identification Number (T.I.N.) as defined in 26 U.S.C. §6109.
 - 2.2. Social Security Number (SSN) as defined in the Social Security Act in connection with their relationship as a precondition of engaging in a relationship or under threat of terminating said relationship. See 42 U.S.C. §408(a)(8).
3. Requiring that the Protected Party declare or represent his/her/its status as being anything other than that described herein as a condition of engaging in a relationship or under threat of terminating said relationship.
4. Honoring an IRS Levy or state levy under the authority of 26 U.S.C. §6331. Protected Party is not acting and does not consent to act as an agency or instrumentality of the national government subject to levy as described in 26 U.S.C. §6331(a) and it is a crime for him to act in said capacity.

Government Actor agrees to become the substitute defendant who is exclusively responsible for all penalty and tax assessments, or court judgments instituted against Protected Party.

Government Actor furthermore agrees NOT to either complain or prosecute any party to any dispute under this agreement for the “unauthorized practice of law”, and agrees to become the substitute defendant if any third party such as a government or Government Actor attempts to or succeeds in prosecuting any party to this agreement for the unauthorized practice of law. The term “practice of law” or “law practice” shall have the meaning prescribed earlier in section 4.1.19 of this franchise agreement.

13.2 Choice of Law

This section prescribes the choice of law which applies to all past, present, and future interactions between the Protected Party and the Government Actor. It also governs and controls all litigation in any court of justice between Protected Party and the Government Actor in both civil and criminal matters pertaining to this specific transaction:

1. Parties stipulate the following document into evidence governing choice of law involving disputes between them. It is designed to ensure that common law and equity is enforced between the parties and thereby avoid enforcing or imputing superior powers to any government or government actor in violation of the First Amendment:

Choice of Law, Litigation Tool #01.010
<https://sedm.org/Litigation/01-General/ChoiceOfLaw.pdf>

2. Parties stipulate that the common law, the Bill of Rights, and equity and this agreement ALONE shall dictate the choice of law in any dispute between the parties.
3. Pursuant to [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17\(b\)](#), the choice of law which applies is ONLY the law from the domicile of each party and NOT the laws of the “United States” or any “State” as used in any federal law. [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17\(b\)\(2\)](#) and [\(b\)\(3\)](#) do NOT apply to this proceeding.
4. Parties stipulate that neither are party to any government franchise, “benefit”, or privilege, including but not limited to government employment, Social Security, Medicare, unemployment insurance, or the [Internal Revenue Code, Subtitle A](#) income tax (“[trade or business](#)” franchise).
5. Parties stipulate that their relationship does not involve a “federal question” or any property of the national government coming under Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 and may therefore not be removed to a federal court and must be litigated only in a state court.
6. Parties stipulate that they are not and were not domiciled or “resident” within and did not occupy any of the following during any of their interactions:
 - 6.1. Any United States judicial district as described in [28 U.S.C. Chapter 5](#).
 - 6.2. Any Internal Revenue District mentioned in [26 U.S.C. §7601](#).
 - 6.3. Any federal territory or possession.
7. Parties stipulate that they were not present in any of the following during any aspect of their interactions:
 - 7.1. The “State” defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(10\)](#) or [4 U.S.C. §110\(d\)](#) or any other federal law.
 - 7.2. The “United States” as defined in [26 U.S.C. §7701\(a\)\(9\)](#) and [\(a\)\(10\)](#).
8. Parties stipulate NOT to apply any provision of federal law, including but not limited to 26 U.S.C. §7701(a)(39), 26 U.S.C. §7408(d), or Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(b) to kidnap or transport his/her/its legal identity to the District of Columbia. He does NOT consent to represent any entity covered by these statutes.
9. Government Actor consents to be treated as a “resident” within whatever court, tribunal, or district that Protected Party files suit against him.

Parties stipulate that this agreement has no illegal or injurious purpose whatsoever and therefore may not be invalidated by any court. Its sole purpose is to avoid compelled association with or contracting with ALL governments, which is protected

1 by the First Amendment and Article 1, Section 10 of the Constitution. In the event that any part of this agreement is found
2 to be unenforceable, it is the intent of the parties that all remaining provisions shall be legally binding.

3 **13.3 Venue**

4 All disputes under this agreement shall proceed under the common law and equity RATHER than civil statutory law. A
5 common law "court of record" shall be established and convened for the purposes of hearing this matter of PRIVATE and
6 not PUBLIC rights:

7 **Courts of record and courts not of record.** *The former being those whose acts and judicial*
8 *proceedings are enrolled, or recorded, for a perpetual memory and testimony, and which*
9 *have power to fine or imprison for contempt. Error lies to their judgments, and they*
10 *generally possess a seal. , Courts not of record are those of inferior dignity, which have no*
11 *power to fine or imprison, and in which the proceedings are not enrolled or recorded. 3*
12 *Bl. Comm. 24; 3 Steph. Comm. 383; The Thomas Fletcher, C.C.Ga., 24 F. 481; Ex parte*
13 *Thistleton, 52 Cal. 225; Erwin v. U. S., D.C.Ga., 37 F. 488, 2 L.R.A. 229; Heininger v.*
14 *Davis, 96 Ohio.St. 205, 117 N.E. 229, 231.*

15 **A "court of record" is a judicial tribunal having attributes and exercising functions**
16 **independently of the person of the magistrate designated generally to hold it, and**
17 **proceeding according to the course of common law, its acts and proceedings being**
18 **enrolled for a perpetual memorial.** *Jones v. Jones, 188 Mo.App. 220, 175 S.W. 227, 229;*
19 *Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Metc. Mass., 171, per Shaw, C. J. See, also, Ledwith v. Rosalsky, 244*
20 *N.Y. 406, 155 N.E. 688, 689.*

21 *Courts may be at the same time of record for some purposes and not of record for others.*
22 *Lester v. Redmond, 6 Hill, N.Y., 590; Ex parte Gladhill, 8 Melc., Mass., 168.*
23 *[Black's Law Dictionary, Fourth Edition, pp. 425-426]*

24 Note that the distinguishing characteristic of a "court of record" is that it proceeds independently of the person of the judge
25 or magistrate. The Sovereign who initiates the suit, who is the Plaintiff, executes the functions of the court and represents
26 the court and the suit independent of the magistrate or judge. Final judgment is reserved for ONLY the jury, who are the
27 ONLY true sovereigns and "the court".

28 *"The words 'people of the United States' and 'citizens,' are synonymous terms, and mean*
29 *the same thing. **They both describe the political body who, according to our republican***
30 ***institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the government***
31 ***through their representatives.** They are what we familiarly call the 'sovereign people,' and*
32 *every citizen is one of this people, and a constituent member of this sovereignty. ..."*

33 *[[Boyd v. State of Nebraska, 143 U.S. 135 \(1892\)](#)]*

34 The distinguishing feature of a common law court is that it is convened for the enforcement of private rights and is done
35 under equity and NOT statutory law. Parties stipulate that statutory civil law, in fact, only regulates public conduct of public
36 officers within the government. See:

[Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons](#), Form #05.037
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

37 **13.4 No Statutes of Limitation**

38 No statutes of limitations shall be enforced to protect against any violations of this agreement. All statutory civil law, in fact,
39 is for government public officers and not private parties such as the Protected Party, as exhaustively proven in the following:

[Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons](#), Form #05.037
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

1 The following U.S. Supreme Court ruling establishes why statutes of limitations cannot undermine the protection of private
2 rights and private property.

3 *The police power cannot go beyond the limit of what is necessary and reasonable for*
4 *guarding against the evil which injures or threatens the public welfare in the given case,*
5 *and the legislature, under the guise of that power, cannot strike down innocent occupations*
6 *and destroy private property, the destruction of which is not reasonably necessary to*
7 *accomplish the needed reform; and this, too, although the legislature is the judge in each*
8 *case of the extent to which the evil is to be regulated or prohibited. Where the occupation*
9 *is in itself immoral, there can be no question as to the right of the legislature. 2 Kent,*
10 *Comm. 340. Nor is it denied that every one holds his property subject to the proper exercise*
11 *of the police power. Dill. Mun. Corp. 136; Tied. Lim. Police Power, 122, 122a; Com. v.*
12 *Tewksbury, 11 Metc. 55. Nor that the legislature can destroy vested rights in the proper*
13 *exercise of this power. Coates v. Mayor of New York, 7 Cow. 585. But the unqualified*
14 *statement that when the legislature has exercised its right of judging, by the enactment of*
15 *a [626-Continued.] prohibition, all other departments of the government are bound by the*
16 *decision, which no court has a right to review, (Bish. St. Cr. 995,) cannot be true. The*
17 *legislative power cannot authorize [OR PROTECT THROUGH A STATUTE OF*
18 *LIMITATIONS] manifest injustice by positive enactment, or take away security for*
19 *personal liberty or private property, for the protect on whereof government was*
20 *established. Calder v. Bull, 3 Dall. 386. The state cannot deprive the citizen of the lawful*
21 *use of his property if it does not injuriously effect others. Lake View v. Cemetery Co., 70*
22 *Ill. 191. The state cannot enact laws, not necessary to the preservation of the health and*
23 *safety of the community, that will be oppressive and burdensome to the citizen. Railway*
24 *Co. v. City of Jacksonville, 67 Ill. 37. The constitutional guaranty of life, liberty, and*
25 *pursuit of happiness is not limited by the temporary caprice of a present majority, and*
26 *can be limited only by the absolute necessities of the public.* Intoxicating Liquor Cases,
27 (BREWER, J.), 25 Kan. 765; Tenement- House Cigar Case, 98 N. Y. 98; Cooley, Const.
28 Lim. (5th Ed.) 110, 445, 446. No proposition is more firmly established than that the citizen
29 has the right to adopt and follow such lawful and industrial pursuit, not injurious to the
30 community, as he may see fit. People v. Marx, 99 N.Y. 377, 386, 2 N.E. Rep. 29. The mere
31 existence of a brewery in operation, or of beer therein in vats, or packages not intended
32 for consumption in the state is not in any way detrimental to the safety, health, or morals
33 of the people of Kansas; nor can it be said that there is anything immoral in the business
34 of brewing, or in beer itself, as in gambling or lotteries. Stone v. Mississippi, [101 U.S. 814](#)
35 .

36 *There is no question that this enactment does in the sense of the law deprive appellees of*
37 *their property. Pumpelly v. Green Bay Co., 13 Wall. 177; Munn v. Illinois, [94 U.S. 141](#).*

38 *It is a fundamental principle that where a nuisance is to be abated, the abatement must be*
39 *limited by its necessities, and no wanton injury must be committed. The remedy is to stop*
40 *the use to which the building is put, not to tear down or destroy the structure itself. Babcock*
41 *v. City of Buffalo, 56 N. Y. 268, affirming 1 Sheld. 317; Bridge Co. v. Paige, 83 N. Y. 188-*
42 *190; Wood, Nuis. 738. The nuisance here is sale within the state. To that extent alone can*
43 *the legislature authorize the nuisance to be abated or the property destroyed.*
44 [\[Mugler v. Kansas, 123 U.S. 623 \(1887\)\]](#)

45 Consequently, parties stipulate that the statutes of limitations apply ONLY to the situation where BOTH the party injured
46 AND the party injuring are public officers and also parties to the “social compact” sought to be enforced. Neither party in
47 this case agrees to act on behalf of the government for the purposes of this agreement. If the injured party is a PRIVATE
48 party and not a public officer, a statute of limitations can only serve to:

- 49 1. Undermine the security and protection of PRIVATE rights, property, and persons.
- 50 2. Protect and even promote wrongdoing by Government Actors.
- 51 3. Violate the fiduciary duty of a REAL de jure government in fulfilling the ONLY purpose of its creation, which is the
52 protection of PRIVATE rights to life, liberty, and property.

1 **13.5 All governments excluded from suit, joinder of parties**

- 2 1. Government Actor agrees not to request the involvement of any government in any lawsuit against Protected Party, and
3 to object and not consent to any involvement by any government in any suit between the two parties.
- 4 2. Government Actor agrees to disclose in full and in writing the nature and details of any and all written and verbal
5 communication between his/her/it self and any government or Government Actor within one week of any such contact
6 that might relate to or affect any dispute existing with Protected Party.
- 7 3. If Government Actor is serving on behalf of the United States Government in any capacity, he/she agrees not to allow
8 the Attorney General to substitute the “United States” as defendant in the context of any dispute relating to the
9 enforcement of this franchise under the authority of 28 U.S.C. §2679. Government Actor shall instead defend the case
10 personally and out of their own funds.
- 11 4. Government Actor waives the right of reimbursement from the Secretary of the Treasury for any judgments against
12 Government Actor by the Protected Party pursuant to [26 U.S.C. §7423](#).
- 13 5. If Government Actor is serving on behalf of any state of the Union or county government in any capacity, he/she
14 agrees not to allow the Attorney General of his/her state or the District Attorney of his/her municipality to substitute
15 the respective state or municipality as defendant in the context of any dispute relating to the enforcement of this
16 franchise.

17 For the purposes of this section, parties stipulate that the following entities are presumed NOT to be part of any government,
18 but instead to be PRIVATE commercial corporations interacting with the public in equity:

- 19 1. Internal Revenue Service (IRS).
20 2. State revenue agencies and department of revenue in those states participating in the federal income tax.
21 3. Social Security Administration, in the context of activities within constitutional but not statutory states of the Union.

22 The reason for the above is explained below:

Origins and Authority of the Internal Revenue Service, Form #05.005
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

23 Lastly, Parties to this agreement stipulate that any of the following activities by any Government Actor or his/her employer
24 shall render all such activities as PRIVATE BUSINESS ACTIVITIES undertaken in equity and which may NOT be protected
25 by any governmental law:

- 26 1. Enforcing federal civil law within the borders of a constitutional state of the Union on OTHER than federal territory.
27 See:

Federal Enforcement Authority Within States of the Union, Form #05.032
<http://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

- 28 2. Offering or enforcing any government franchise, license, or tax within the borders of a constitutional state of the Union
29 on OTHER than federal territory. All such activities are hereby stipulated by the Parties to this agreement to be an
30 “invasion” within the meaning of Article 4, Section 4 of the United States Constitution. See:

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

- 31 3. Any attempt to alienate PRIVATE rights that the Declaration of Independence declares to be UNALIENABLE. All
32 such activities are OPPOSITE to the purpose for which governments are established. That purpose is to protect
33 PRIVATE rights. The first step in such protection is to prevent them from being converted into PUBLIC RIGHTS,
34 with or without the consent of the owner.
- 35 4. Any franchise or public right offered extraterritorially which:
36 4.1. Is offered to those not domiciled on the territory of the sovereign offering the franchise.
37 4.2. Is only available to those domiciled on the territory of the sovereign offering the franchise, but which is
38 administered in such a way that the domicile or residence prerequisite is waived as a matter of policy and fiat and
39 in contradiction to what the law permits.
- 40 5. Any franchise or public right which is implemented with that which is not “positive law”, and therefore which can
41 therefore only acquire the “force of law” and the status of “legal evidence” with the CONSENT of those who are
42 subject.
- 43 6. Any public right that is vindicated or protected in any court without a jury present or with a jury occupied by anyone
44 with a commercial relation with the government. All courts that operate without the supervision of the ONLY true

sovereigns, an impartial jury of We The People, are legislative franchise courts that do not operate in equity and whose officers always have a criminal and financial conflict of interest that ensures an unjust result.

“franchise court. Hist. A privately held [meaning NON-GOVERNMENTAL] court that (usu.) exists by virtue of a royal grant [franchise privilege], with jurisdiction over a variety of matters, depending on the grant and whatever powers the court acquires over time. In 1274, Edward I abolished many of these feudal courts by forcing the nobility to demonstrate by what authority (quo warrant) they held court. If a lord could not produce a charter reflecting the franchise, the court was abolished. - Also termed courts of the franchise.

Dispensing justice was profitable. Much revenue could come from the fees and dues, fines and amercements. This explains the growth of the second class of feudal courts, the Franchise Courts. They too were private courts held by feudal lords. Sometimes their claim to jurisdiction was based on old pre-Conquest grants ... But many of them were, in reality, only wrongful usurpations of private jurisdiction by powerful lords. These were put down after the famous Quo Warranto enquiry in the reign of Edward I.” W.J.V. Windeyer, Lectures on Legal History 56-57 (2d ed. 1949).” [Black’s Law Dictionary, Seventh Edition, p. 668]

13.6 Stipulations Applying to all Litigation

The following rules shall apply to all disagreements, whether administrative, or judicial, between parties:

1. Duress:

Parties stipulate that the following actions by any Government Actor shall constitute unlawful duress, theft, FRAUD, and perjury by said actor.

1.1. Imputing any statutory status to the Protected Party absent their express written consent.

1.2. Quoting or enforcing any federal civil statute against the Protected Party.

1.3. Where terms are not defined, presuming that the definition includes or affects private rights or private property. Rather, parties hereby stipulate that ALL civil statutes can and do affect ONLY PUBLIC rights and PUBLIC property and exclude private rights and private property. This is a rebuttable presumption, and the presumption can be rebutted by producing a statute that EXPRESSLY identifies PRIVATE rights and “human beings” rather than “individuals” as its intended target. By default, the term “individual” is hereby stipulated to include ONLY public officers and public entities within the government.

1.4. Adding any thing or class of thing to the statutory definition of any word that does not EXPRESSLY appear in the statute itself.

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

“Expressio unius est exclusio alterius. A maxim of statutory interpretation meaning that the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another. Burgin v. Forbes, 293 Ky. 456, 169 S.W.2d. 321, 325; Newblock v. Bowles, 170 Okl. 487, 40 P.2d. 1097, 1100. Mention of one thing implies exclusion of another. When certain persons or things are specified in a law, contract, or will, an intention to exclude all others from its operation may be

1 ***inferred.** Under this maxim, if statute specifies one exception to a general rule or assumes*
2 *to specify the effects of a certain provision, other exceptions or effects are excluded.”*
3 *[Black’s Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 581]*

4 1.5. Reaching any inference or conclusion not based upon admissible evidence or which is based upon that which is
5 not “positive law” and therefore legal evidence.

6 2. Judgments:

7 2.1. Summary judgments are not permitted because they lack impartiality. Everything will be decided by an
8 IMPARTIAL jury panel.

9 2.2. Court MUST address all issues raised by either party in the final order, and especially issues relating to the
10 jurisdiction of the government over either party.

11 2.3. Parties stipulate that they will not invoke exclusions within the Declaratory Judgments Act, 28 U.S.C. §2201(a),
12 as an excuse for the Court NOT to rule on any issue before the court that might affect the protection of PRIVATE
13 rights. All such exemptions can and do only pertain to public rights and public officers and cannot and do not
14 constrain the court from protecting PRIVATE rights. The ONLY type of rights the Protected Party has or may
15 exercise, consistent with his delegation of authority order from God, are PRIVATE rights.

16 2.4. If judge indicates that the Declaratory Judgments Act constrains him from ruling, the jury can and will still rule
17 and parties stipulate that said jury will NOT be so constrained. Parties stipulate that disallowing the jury from
18 ruling on any issue that might protect PRIVATE rights shall be construed both by the Jury and by all parties as a
19 conspiracy against PRIVATE rights and a tort.

20 3. Court Officers:

21 3.1. The judge shall have NO private meetings or in camera meetings with the attorneys. Everything he or she says to
22 counsel, if during trial, must ALSO be heard by the jury and submitted into evidence for the jury to examine.

23 3.2. Attorneys for the government shall not be regarded as the real party in interest, but rather someone from the
24 executive branch of the government shall be the real party in interest in a case where the opposing party is a
25 government.

26 4. Evidence:

27 4.1. No government publication shall be admitted into evidence in the resolution of any dispute between the parties,
28 and especially any IRS Publication, which the IRS itself says in Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section
29 4.10.7.2.8 says is untrustworthy and unreliable.

30 4.2. Evidence admitted shall not be filtered or redacted in any way. Any publication from which any excerpt is made
31 shall be admitted IN ITS ENTIRETY with nothing lined out or redacted or censored. For instance, if an excerpt
32 from any document available from either of the following two website is made, then THE ENTIRE website and
33 the ENTIRE DOCUMENT from which the excerpt is made shall ALSO be admitted into evidence:

34 4.2.1. <http://sedm.org>

35 4.2.2. <http://famguardian.org>

36 4.3. No judicial proceeding from any District or Circuit Court involving the enforcement of any government franchise
37 shall be:

38 4.3.1. Admitted as evidence of any obligation on the part of the Protected Party.

39 4.3.2. Used as a means to establish what the Protected Party knew or should have known about his/her obligations.

40 4.3.3. Used as precedent to establish any obligation on the part of the Protected Party.

41 Instead, parties stipulate that there is no federal common law applying to those domiciled within a constitutional
42 state of the Union. They also stipulate that no aspect of the arbitration of the relationship between the parties
43 relate to a question under any federal statutory law. All U.S. District and Circuit Courts shall be regarded as
44 franchise courts that can only hear federal questions relating to federal franchises and property, and this
45 relationship does not involve either, but rather constitutes a PRIVATE franchise.

46 4.4. All correspondence sent by Government Actor or his/her employer to either Protected Party or to third parties but
47 relating to Protected Party shall be deemed to be signed under penalty of perjury and actionable against the
48 Government Actor if false, even if:

49 4.4.1. Government Actor did not prepare the correspondence or notice.

50 4.4.2. Employer of Government Actor disclaims responsibility for the accuracy of their publications, forms, or
51 correspondence. Example: Internal Revenue Manual (I.R.M.), Section 4.10.7.2.8.

52 4.5. Litigants shall not be prohibited or prevented from discussing ANY statute, regulation, or case law in the
53 courtroom or in front of the jury.

54 4.6. A failure to deny any assertion by either party shall constitute evidence of a conclusive admission of the thing not
55 expressly denied. This rule shall apply to the government AS WELL as the Protected Party because inequality
56 would result if it didn't.

- 1 4.7. All denials must be signed under penalty of perjury by the real party in interest. In case of disputes under the
2 Internal Revenue Code, this is mandated by 26 U.S.C. §6065.
- 3 4.8. No statute or law or regulation or constitutional provision shall be prevented from being entered into evidence or
4 prevented from being viewed by the jury.
- 5 4.9. No “experts” in law shall be admitted to direct the jury about what the law means or implies. The jury is the only
6 party that may both READ and INTERPRET what any given legal provision means. Law is supposed to be
7 written to be understandable by the common man sitting on a jury, and if it is not, then:
8 4.9.1. It is void for vagueness.
9 4.9.2. Shall be treated as unenforceable.
10 4.9.3. Turns the judge into a priest of a civil religion within a state-sponsored church.
- 11 4.10. All evidence gathered during discovery shall be admitted at trial and in the record and NOTHING shall be filtered
12 or restricted from viewing by the jury.
- 13 4.11. Parties stipulate to admit the following evidence in any judicial dispute between them involving their interactions
14 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 29. They furthermore stipulate that all evidence listed shall be
15 deemed truthful, accurate, and consistent with prevailing law except that which they individually and specifically
16 rebut with court-admissible evidence from ONLY the written law itself.
17 4.11.1. This document and all attached documents.
18 4.11.2. All correspondence between the parties.
19 4.11.3. Anything the Protected Party desires from the following website: <http://sedm.org>; <http://famguardian.org>.
20 4.11.4. All information and attachments submitted to the government by the Protected Party in any civil or criminal
21 dispute arising between the Protected Party and either the recipient or the entity he or she works for pursuant
22 to [Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 19](#) and the [Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure](#). This information must
23 also be presented to any and all grand juries that might convene about the Protected Party which are initiated
24 by either the Government Actor or his or her employer.

25 5. Materiality of Evidence

- 26 5.1. None of the forms submitted by Protected Party under any franchise at any time to any government shall be
27 regarded as being material or actionable under the original statutory franchise agreement. They shall NOT be
28 considered as having ANY commercial consequence or form the basis for any injury because the Protected Party
29 does NOT consent to participate and defines and describes any and all “benefits” as gifts rather than the product
30 of any statutory relationship of the parties. This includes but is not limited to:
31 5.1.1. Social Security.
32 5.1.2. Income Taxes.
33 5.1.3. Property Taxes.
34 5.1.4. Government healthcare.
35 5.1.5. Vehicle code.
36 5.1.6. Family code.
- 37 5.2. The only written thing that is both factual and actionable are:
38 5.2.1. The terms of this anti-franchise franchise.
39 5.2.2. Statements of the Government Actor meant to COMPEL or unlawfully impose participation in the above
40 franchises against the Protected Party.
41 5.2.3. Any and all statements by Protected Party and Government Actor responding to his or her duties or the
42 enforcement of those duties in a court of law.

43 6. Discovery:

- 44 6.1. None of the persons called as witnesses by either side at any trial involving this Ministry may:
45 6.1.1. Work for the federal or state government.
46 6.1.2. Receive retirement benefits from the government.
47 6.1.3. Receive financial benefits of any kind from the government.
48 6.1.4. Be statutory "taxpayers", "U.S. citizens", or "U.S. residents".
49 This will ensure that the all witnesses called will be completely objective, neutral, and unbiased.
- 50 6.2. Each party shall pay for the cost of their own discovery and not ask the court to have the other party pay for their
51 discovery under any circumstances.
- 52 6.3. There will be no limit upon the number of admissions, interrogatories, or Request for the Production of
53 Documents (RFPDs), that may be served by either party against the other party. State or federal limitations such
54 as the “Rule of 31”, for instance, shall NOT apply. All such discovery shall be timely and completely answered
55 by either party and the answer shall be signed under penalty of perjury as required by 26 U.S.C. §6065 by a party
56 who has legal authority to represent or obligate the government, if the party answering is the government.
- 57 6.4. All depositions prior to trial shall be conducted by deposition upon written questions and NOT using a court
58 reporter. Responses shall be submitted under penalty of perjury by the party deposed. If the Government Actor

1 is a federal worker, the authority for such a deposition shall be Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 31. This
2 requirement is intended to minimize the cost of enforcing this agreement and to facilitate gathering of written
3 evidence useful in prosecuting violations of law by Government Actor and his/her coworkers within the
4 government he/she serves within.

5 6.5. Neither party to any dispute may request or receive any kind of sanctions relating to discover, excepting those
6 involved in failure to provide information.

7 7. Parties who may participate as judges or jurists in litigation between the parties. None of the following criminal or
8 unconstitutional conflicts of interest or injustices shall be permitted during any litigation between the parties:

9 7.1. Denying justice as a service to specific classes or groups of people based on some arbitrary criteria such as
10 ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, religious beliefs, etc.

11 7.2. Charging so much for the service that the people at the bottom of the economic ladder can't afford it. Thus, the
12 poor are discriminated against and can easily be abused by the rich without legal consequence.

13 7.3. Prosecuting people for failing to pay taxes that pay for police protection, while not prosecuting officers who fail
14 to render the protection paid for. See:

Why Domicile and Becoming a "Taxpayer" Require Your Consent, Form #05.002, Section 8
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

15 7.4. Appointing and paying a court-appointed and court-selected attorney who is licensed and therefore beholden to
16 the court at the expense of the best interests of the client. See:

Petition for Admission to Practice, Family Guardian Fellowship
<https://famguardian.org/Subjects/LawAndGovt/LegalEthics/PetForAdmToPractice-USDC.pdf>

17 7.5. The judge orders the court reporter to withhold the court transcript and then orders the text changed to remove
18 something that he said that would undermine the government, or get him in trouble. That way, you as the litigant
19 discriminated upon or treated illegally by the judge do not have proof that he is doing it. This is criminal
20 obstruction of justice and also criminally tampers with the court reporter as a witness.

21 7.6. Allowing judges to serve over both CONSTITUTIONAL issues and FRANCHISE issues and to decide which of
22 the two types of law to apply. That choice is called "choice of law" and it is discussed in Form #05.018, Section
23 3. Judges whose pay and benefit derives from franchises will always try to switch the choice of law from
24 CONSTITUTIONAL to STATUTORY FRANCHISE as a way to increase their own revenues or lower the taxes
25 they pay for those franchises. For instance, allowing a state criminal judge whose revenues or commissions
26 derive from traffic tickets to preside over a case involving unlicensed driving against someone who is PRIVATE
27 and not a franchisee and who has CONSTITUTIONAL rights but wants not STATUTORY PRIVILEGES. This
28 causes the judge to PRETEND that the party is subject to the statute when they are not in order to unlawfully
29 enlarge government revenue and his own pay and benefits.

30 7.7. Instituting a commission program to reward police officers for writing tickets that produce revenue. This is an
31 illegal abuse of the police power for civil or revenue purposes. See:

Sovereignty for Police Officers Course, Form #12.022
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>

32 7.8. Censoring the court record by:

33 7.8.1. Telling you what to say in a pleading.

34 7.8.2. Denying the filing of specific types of pleadings.

35 7.8.3. Rejecting the pleading because it is too long.

36 7.9. Hearing a case where one of the litigants before the court is a friend of the judge or has a commercial relationship
37 with him/her. Judges are required to recuse themselves in such a case.

38 7.10. Sanctioning people OTHER than licensed attorneys for any of their activities in the court other than contempt
39 relating to disobeying court orders. Court rules pertain only to officers of the court, including those relating to
40 sanctions. Private humans are not officers of the court. See Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

41 7.11. Causing a surrender of any right, and especially constitutional right, against the government or a specific
42 Government Actor in exchange for the ability to file suit. Examples might include:

43 7.11.1. Waiving the right of trial by jury in exchange for the PRIVILEGE of being able to file a suit. Traffic
44 court, Tax Court, and Family Court don't have a jury or a jury box and you aren't even allowed to request
45 one. You are presumed to have waived those rights when you signed up for the franchise, even though
46 those rights are UNALIENABLE, according to the Declaration of Independence.

47 7.11.2. Making the rules of court arbitrary or not publishing them. This deprives litigants of the constitutional
48 requirement for "reasonable notice" of what is expected of them and allows court officers to arbitrarily
49 discriminate. See Form #05.022.

50 7.12. Instituting a conflict of interest, usually financial, among those judging the case, acting as witnesses, or serving as
51 jurists. This would include:

- 7.12.1. Allowing judges or jurors to serve on trials involving taxes where they are either taxpayers or tax consumers.
- 7.12.2. Allowing judges to preside over trials involving companies they invested in.
- 7.12.3. Subsidizing judges with financial incentives for a specific outcome of the case, such as commissions for convictions.
- 7.12.4. Subsidizing court witnesses to testify in a way that produces a specific outcome of the case. For instance, paying witnesses a money award if their testimony produces a conviction.
- 7.12.5. Tampering with or bribing jurists by telling them, for instance, that they will or will not be audited by the IRS for testifying in a certain way.
- 7.12.6. Telling juries hearing tax cases that their tax bill will go up if they don't convict the defendant and thereby FORCE him or her to "pay their fair share".
- 7.12.7. Recruiting witnesses against you who are in jail and who are told they will be released if they testify in a certain way.
- 7.12.8. Telling a party among a group of people being convicted that they will get immunity and not be prosecuted if they testify against their cohorts.
- 7.13. Destroying all constitutional rights and replacing them with privileges by:
 - 7.13.1. Forcing you to invoke the statutory law in order to get a remedy INSTEAD of the Constitution. See Form #05.037.
 - 7.13.2. Dismissing or penalizing cases that invoke the Constitution as a remedy INSTEAD of the statutes. See Form #05.010.
 - 7.13.3. Refusing to hear cases of people present on land but not domiciled on that land. See Form #05.002.
- 7.14. Censoring people from filing future actions in court. This happens all the time with people who use arguments in court that the courts don't want to deal with and which expose and prosecute government corruption.
- 7.15. Making the ruling unpublished in cases against the government where the government loses. Thus, you and other litigants may not use the win as an authority to win in future cases. This prejudices all cases in favor of the government and usually involves criminal obstruction of justice by the judge who made his ruling unpublished. See:

<http://Nonpublication.com>

- 7.16. Making presumptions about the litigant or his/her status without evidence on the record of the proceeding which prejudices the litigant and favors the government. For instance, PRESUMING that they are a statutory "U.S. citizen" instead of a non-resident state national, thus making them liable for every act of Congress instead of immune from acts of Congress. See:
 - 7.16.1. *Why You Are a "national", "state national", and Constitutional but not Statutory Citizen*, Form #05.006
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 7.16.2. *Presumption: Chief Weapon for Unlawfully Enlarging Federal Jurisdiction*, Form #05.017
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
 - 7.16.3. *Non-Resident Non-Person Position*, Form #05.020
<https://sedm.org/Forms/FormIndex.htm>
- 8. Stipulations Relating to Court Record of Proceeding: Parties stipulation that all motions, judgments, discovery, case transcripts of the court relating to disputes between them:
 - 8.1. MUST become a public record.
 - 8.2. May not go unpublished.
 - 8.3. May not contain any statement indicating that the case may not be relied upon to sustain a position.
 - 8.4. May not contain a statement that none of the pleadings or court record are nonfactual, nonactionable, or not admissible as evidence in other cases.
 - 8.5. May not have anyone excluded from the audience, or heard in secret.
 - 8.6. Must be entered in the same public case databases that statutory proceedings are entered in, including but not limited to:
 - 8.6.1. Pacer.
 - 8.6.2. Lexis.
 - 8.6.3. Westlaw.
 - 8.6.4. Fastcase.
 - 8.6.5. Vlex
 - 8.6.6. Federal Depository Libraries
 - 8.6.7. Findlaw.
 - 8.6.8. Casetext
 - 8.6.9. Google Scholar
 - 8.6.10. Versuslaw.

- 1 8.6.11. Casemaker
- 2 8.6.12. Accesslaw.
- 3 8.6.13. Federal Reporters.
- 4 8.6.14. Supreme Court reporters.

5 **13.7 Burden of Proof Upon All Government Officers**

- 6 1. If either Government Actor or his/her employer wishes to assert consent by the Protected Party to a waiver of any
7 constitutional right, it shall have the burden of proving that:
 - 8 1.1. The Protected Party was domiciled and physically present on federal territory not protected by the Constitution
9 and that therefore, the Protected Party had no unalienable rights but only privileges.
 - 10 1.2. The Protected Party expressly consented in writing to waive the right indicated in the mode he specifies.
 - 11 1.3. All the rights conveyed through the consent given are fully disclosed in the actual writing that was signed by the
12 Protected Party.
- 13 2. All property held in the name of the Protected Party shall conclusively be presumed to be PRIVATE property beyond
14 the control of any government or any government civil or tax statute. Government Actor may only assert otherwise by
15 satisfying the following burden of proof:
 - 16 2.1. That the Protected Party consented in writing to donate the formerly private property to a public use, public
17 purpose or public office.
 - 18 2.2. That the domicile of the Protect Party was on federal territory not protected by the United States Constitution at
19 the time consent was given.

20 The provisions of this section are intended to enforce the requirement for equal protection and equal treatment by placing the
21 Protected Party on an equal footing with any and every government. Those who wish to civilly sue any government must
22 provide evidence of consent to be civilly sued. The above provisions ensure that any government suing the Protected Party
23 must meet the same requirement when trying to sue the Protected Party in a civil court.

24 If the Government Actor uses the word “law” to describe a statutory civil obligation by either party, the word “law” shall
25 mean a voluntary civil franchise available only to those domiciled within the exclusive jurisdiction of the government grantor
26 of the civil franchise. The government as moving party enforcing any obligation under such “law” agrees to meet the burden
27 of proof that the party against which they are enforcing said obligation:

- 28 1. Is lawfully serving in a public office in the government granting the franchise.
- 29 2. Is either consensually domiciled on federal territory or representing an entity so domiciled under [Federal Rule of Civil](#)
30 [Procedure 17](#).
- 31 3. Has the capacity to alienate Constitutional rights because either physically present on federal territory OR abroad OR
32 occupying an office that is executed ONLY where EXPRESSLY authorized per [4 U.S.C. §72](#). They furthermore agree
33 to provide the statute EXPRESSLY authorizing the exercise of the office in the PLACE they are trying to enforce.

34 In the absence of EXPRESSLY satisfying the above burden of proof with admissible evidence signed under penalty of
35 perjury, both parties to any enforcement action stipulate that there is CONCLUSIVE PRESUMPTION against any civil
36 enforcement authority of that civil statutory provision which is referred to with the term “law”. Parties also acknowledge
37 that any attempt to enforce an obligation UNDER said franchise without the requirement of domicile is a PRIVATE
38 contracting exercise that is NOT a government function and which may therefore NOT lawfully be protected with sovereign,
39 official, or judicial immunity. For details, see and rebut:

[Why Statutory Civil Law is Law for Government and Not Private Persons](http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf), Form #05.037
<http://sedm.org/Forms/05-MemLaw/StatLawGovt.pdf>

40 **13.8 Service of Process**

41 Government Actor agrees to accept service of legal process by any one or more of the following means:

- 42 1. By certified mail to the address that Government Actor last sent correspondence.
- 43 2. By Certificate/Proof/Affidavit of service to the address that Government Actor last sent correspondence.
- 44 3. By personal service upon the employer of the Government Actor.

1 Government Actor consents to provide a copy of their passport and driver’s license and dwelling place on all correspondence
2 with Protected Party and when requested by Protected Party in order to effect proper service of process.

3 **14 Method of Amendment**

4 This franchise and agreement may only be amended by making a written request signed under penalty of perjury in the full
5 legal birth name of the requesting party and submitted to the Contact Us page of SEDM (<https://sedm.org/about/contact/>).

6 Parties stipulate to be subject to all future published versions of this franchise without notice by Protected Party or SEDM
7 when or if they become available. Protected Party shall have discretion to modify, amend, or add any provision he or she
8 sees fit to this agreement at any time without notice to the Government Actor, just like the government does with its franchise.

9 ***“We must conclude that a person covered by the Act has not such a right in benefit***
10 ***payments... This is not to say, however, that Congress may exercise its power to modify***
11 ***the statutory scheme free of all constitutional restraint.”***
12 *[Flemming v. Nestor, [363 U.S. 603](#) (1960)]*

13
14 **15 Severability and Affirmation**

15 In the event that any part of this agreement is found to be unenforceable, it is my intent and the intent of the parties that all
16 remaining provisions shall be legally binding.

17 I acknowledge that the obligations of this agreement are perpetual, supersede enacted law, and are superior to it. I voluntarily
18 waive any and all benefit or immunity resulting from any statute of limitations, official, judicial, or sovereign immunity that
19 might limit or destroy remedies or damages that could be claimed under this agreement in any court of law.

20 I voluntarily declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state I am domiciled in and from without the “United
21 States” identified in [26 U.S.C. §7701](#)(a)(9) and (a)(10) and under [28 U.S.C. §1746](#)(1) that the foregoing facts are true and
22 correct to the best of my knowledge and belief, so help me God.

PROTECTED PARTY	
Signature:	Date:
Phone:	Email address:
GOVERNMENT ACTOR	
Signature:	Date:
Phone:	Email address:

23