

# **FOOLISH AMERICANS?**

By Rick Martin

You don't have time to waste and I don't want to waste your time. The system is rigged, the sucker doesn't get an even break, and those you were told to trust are liars or pretend ignorance when you pin them down.

I got pulled into the study of law by having my "ox gored" and found that not only could I not get free legal help, nor afford it, but that help was woefully ignorant of the law. Absurd as it may sound, B.A.R. Attorneys don't know law. They know procedure and what will work under the current system.

When arrested via a capias warrant that failed to comply with the fourth amendment, the court appointed liar -ahem- B.A.R. Attorney aka. lawyer had no clue as to the problem. I asked him what the fourth amendment stated. He arrogantly stated that he had been practicing law for over 11 years, and it was not germane to the case. I replied, that their capias warrant failed to comply with federal rules of criminal procedure and the fourth amendment. Again, what does the fourth amendment say? He said he did not know. I paraphrased: no warrant shall issue unless upon probable cause supported by sworn oath or affirmation – that is to say "under penalty of perjury" – and the capias warrant had no such probable cause, nor even a judge's signature as required. It only had a clerk's signature. So no one put their necks on the chopping block when they had me arrested. That, to me, was unAmerican.

Technically, he was both right -and- wrong. If I had consented to be governed, such niceties as a constitutional warrant can be waived. This is nothing new. It's been part of the law since 1776.... or 1777, thereabouts. But no one told me that. In fact, I sincerely doubt that 1 in 100,000 Americans can accurately define the republican form of government, its source and origin.

What has the republican form have to do with anything? Well, for one thing, it's the foundation of all American law. That 99.999% of Americans are pig ignorant of their law is a bad sign. They think they're in a democracy, an indirect democracy, a constitutional republic, or a socialist democratic republic or other such nonsense.

This may shock you to learn that you've been lied to by the world's greatest propaganda ministry. Not only was I fooled, when I thought I found contrary evidence, that, too, was tampered with so I was doubly fooled. (Often called "patriot mythology" and involves "State Citizens", militias, strawman, name in all capital letters, State nationals, commercialization of the birth certificate, "Sovereign Citizens," and often supported by reams of bogus references that appear to be legitimate. Generally involves arcane and complex arguments, by those "who are in the know" and insinuate that "you do not know." They plead: "Trust me!")

Yet all facts are in the public record, available at any county courthouse law library. Thus we cannot charge them with conspiracy because they're hiding the culprits in plain sight. We just can't perceive reality. Don't believe me – go read the law yourself. If I told you what you will find in the law, you wouldn't believe me. Shucks, if I went back in time to 1989, and told myself, I wouldn't believe me, either. But if you do go to the courthouse, remember to wear knee pads and "Depends"... you may fall to your knees, weeping, or pee yourself.

## What is reality?

In the Declaration of Independence, paraphrased, all men are born equal – before the law – none higher; and all men have Creator endowed rights that **governments were instituted to secure – not tax, regulate nor trespass**. In short, governments in America were **delegated power to adjudicate disputes, prosecute criminals, and defend against all enemies, foreign or domestic**. Nothing more **without consent** of the governed.

Skeptics may argue that the Declaration is not law, but it is no coincidence that EVERY state constitution repeats the "**self evident truths**" that all men have Creator endowed rights, whether they're called inherent rights, inalienable rights, human rights, sacred rights or use a different adjective.

Let me rephrase that : all men (which in English usage includes the feminine) have rights and liberties, as in natural rights, natural and personal liberties, absolute ownership of private property, inherent powers, privileges and immunities that **governments were instituted to secure.** 

So where does the government get the delegated power to impose mandatory civic duties that abrogate endowed rights? Any casual inquiry shows that Americans have to

get permission (license) and / or pay taxes to live, work, travel, travel in a car, own, buy, sell, trade, build a house, hunt, fish, fly, treat the sick, endow progeny, marry, and / or own a dog to name but a few.

I have found volumes of laws that appear to restrain, regulate and tax the poor U.S. citizen / resident residing at a residence, duly enrolled and enumerated, in FICA, with open, interest bearing bank accounts, with instrumentalities of the Federal Reserve, with whom they have a signed agreement to "abide by the rules of the bank." (Ex: signature card).

You were endowed by your Creator with absolute rights to life, liberty, absolute ownership, decision making, and action over you and yours. **No servant government is your master.** You do not need permission to live, travel, work, buy, sell, marry, endow, transmit, fly, enter occupations, build a house, or own a dog. Those who try to persuade you that an ephemeral Man cannot absolutely own land, nor exclude others from your land, nor exercise liberty, are trying to trick you into surrendering your birthright.

#### How do we know this is real?

Ask questions, investigate, and read the law.

Which Americans retain their endowed rights?

"All men" should have sacred rights – except those who consent to be governed.

What evidence is there that one has consented to be governed?

I grew up in the 1970s and 1980s, and one of the greatest fears was conscription, the draft, Selective Service. Ironically, few draft dodgers knew how and when they consented.

The Supreme Court has held, in Butler v. Perry, 240 U.S. 328 (1916), that the Thirteenth Amendment does not prohibit "enforcement of those duties which individuals owe to the state, such as services in the army, militia, on the jury, etc." In Selective Draft Law Cases, 245 U.S. 366 (1918), the Supreme Court ruled that the military draft was not "involuntary servitude".

In all the state and federal laws regarding militia duty, it appears to only apply to "citizens." Only citizens can be compelled to serve – all others may volunteer. Ditto, for jury duty.

WHOA... Aren't all Americans born within the jurisdiction of the "United States" a U.S. citizen and of the state in which they reside? That's the 14th amendment to the USCON.

Stop and think. Pursuant to the Declaration, **all men have endowed rights that governments were instituted to secure.** No government can impose citizenship upon an infant that abrogates all endowed rights by mandatory civic duties. And if you read the preceding 13th amendment, involuntary servitude cannot exist within the "United States", or any place subject to THEIR jurisdiction.

13th amendment, Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to *their* jurisdiction.

{United States, in the plural, means the States united aka "USA"}

14th amendment, Section 1. All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

{The term "thereof" means of the thing just mentioned. So one who is subject to the "United States" for the purposes of U.S. citizenship means the federal government. United States, in the singular, must refer to the Federal government, a foreign corporation with respect to a State.}

"We have in our political system a government of the United States and a government of each of the several States. Each one of these governments is distinct from the others, and each has citizens of it's own..."

United States v. Cruikshank, 92 U.S. 542 (1875)

"A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government ..."

Kitchens v. Steele, 112 F.Supp 383

FEDERAL CORPORATIONS – The United States government is a foreign corporation with respect to a state.

 – – Volume 19, Corpus Juris Secundum XVIII. Foreign Corporations, Sections 883,884

"The United States and the State of California are two separate sovereignties, each dominant in its own sphere."

Redding v. Los Angeles (1947), 81 C.A.2d 888, 185 P.2d 430.

It will be admitted on all hands that with the exception of the powers granted to the states and the federal government, through the Constitutions, the people of the several states are unconditionally sovereign within their respective states.

Ohio L. Ins. & T. Co. v. Debolt 16 How. 416, 14 L.Ed. 997

Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts.

[Yick Wo vs Hopkins, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886)]

One born within the boundaries of the USA of American parentage is an AMERICAN national.

If born within Federal jurisdiction, one is a U.S. citizen.

If born outside Federal jurisdiction, one is not a U.S. citizen.

The Supreme court ruled that mandatory civic duties were **NOT** involuntary servitude banned by the 13th amendment, which can only mean that

(a) citizenship is voluntary -or-

(b) U.S. citizens were not within "their jurisdiction" where involuntary servitude is banned.

They can't have it both ways – either imposition of U.S. citizenship upon infants is involuntary servitude banned by the 13th amendment – or its not really applicable to those born in the USA.

No American national, endowed with liberty from his Creator can be born a subject citizen, without violating the Declaration of Independence and the 13th amendment. Because no infant can give consent to be governed, and surrender their Creator's endowment. No one can consent for them, parent or guardian. **The whole "citizenship at birth" is a scam.** And it is no surprise that every government document requests you to **CLAIM TO BE THEIR CITIZEN.** Worse, they've fooled the private sector into asserting that they're U.S. citizens / U.S. residents residing at a residence, duly enumerated via FICA, and so on.

In all my years, I have never been informed by any public authority that I had the option to not give consent, and remain an American national, non-citizen, free inhabitant, non-resident, domiciled upon private property, with all rights, powers, liberties, and endowments intact. Nor was I informed that citizens surrendered or waived ALL ENDOWED RIGHTS. If you can be compelled to perform jury duty, militia duty, surrender a portion of your property via taxes (or suffer confiscation), you are <u>NOT</u> one of the people who have rights. That's been part of the law since day one.

If you've consented to be a citizen, you have NO ENDOWED RIGHTS.

Zip. Nada. Bumpkiss. Empty Set. Nought.

Any presumption to the contrary is an error not supported by law nor court ruling.

The government can order you to train, fight, and die, on command.

The government can take a portion of your property -or wages – or whatever – as it sees fit.

All authorized by your consent to be a CITIZEN (state or U.S.). Citizens, like the Founders, have pledged their lives, property and sacred honor in service to others and to the government.

### ONLY Non-citizen nationals (people) retain their endowed rights.

(The USCON complies with this, too. **People have rights and powers. Citizens have privileges and immunities. And they're mutually exclusive.**)

People have always had Creator endowed rights that the government could **Not** tax, regulate nor infringe. Some are enumerated in the Bill of Rights. **But they do not extend to the citizen who gave consent to be governed.** 

Remember, Creator endowed rights are <u>Not</u> constitutional "rights." In fact, anything a government grants is a **privilege**, <u>Not</u> a right. They may call them civil rights and political rights, but in the law, they're really civil liberties and political liberties.

#### WHY DID THEY DO THIS?

Simple reason – to legally (Not Lawfully) rob and rule you.

America is the only country on Earth with a republican form, where all men have sacred rights that make them **SOVEREIGNS** over their subject governments. In all other forms of government, the people whether citizens or not, are **SUBJECTS** of their sovereign governments. (Even the vaunted French Revolutionaries of 1787 wouldn't dare recognize that French people were sovereigns.)

SOVEREIGN – "...Having undisputed right to make decisions and act accordingly".

New Webster's Dictionary And Thesaurus, p. 950.

SOVEREIGN – A person, body or state in which independent and supreme authority is vested...

-- Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition, p. 1395.

At the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the People and they are truly the sovereigns of the country. But they are sovereigns without subjects with none to rule but themselves. -- Justice John Jay, Chisholm v. Georgia, 2 Dall. 440, 463 It will be admitted on all hands that with the exception of the powers granted to the states and the federal government, through the Constitutions, the People of the several states are unconditionally sovereign within their respective states. -- Ohio L. Ins. & T. Co. v. Debolt 16 How. 416, 14 L.Ed. 997 NATURAL LIBERTY – The power of acting as one thinks fit, without any restraint or control, unless by the law of nature. The right which nature gives to all mankind of disposing of their persons and property after the manner in which they judge most consistent with their happiness, on condition of their acting within the limits of the law of nature, and so as **Not to interfere in the equal exercise of the same rights by other** men. 1 Blackstone's Commentaries, 123, – Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth edition, p. 919. "PERSONAL LIBERTY, or the Right to enjoyment of life and liberty, is one of the fundamental or Natural Rights, which has been protected by its inclusion as a guarantee in the various constitutions, which is not derived from, or dependent on, the U.S. Constitution, which may not be submitted to a vote and may not depend on the outcome of an election. It is one of the most **SACRED** and valuable Rights, as sacred as the Right to private property...and is regarded as inalienable." -- - 16 Corpus Juris Secundum, Constitutional Law, Sect. 202, p. 987... **NATURAL RIGHTS** – ... are the rights of life, liberty, privacy, and good reputation. - - Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Ed., p. 1324

So what makes American People sovereign?

They have the undisputed right to make decisions and act accordingly over their persons, their property (private property), their offspring (biological property) their labor, the fruits of that labor, enter into compacts, etc, etc.

They do not need government permission (license) or pay a tax to live, travel, own, work, buy, sell, hunt, fish, drive a car, marry and / or own a dog. No state requires non-resident inhabitants domiciled upon private property to register property, get licenses, nor pay taxes on any endowed right or liberty.

### **LEGAL TERM PAIRS**

What most People are taught to use are the terms on the <b>RIGHT</b>
Few are taught what the terms on the <b>LEFT</b> refer to
□ national v. citizen
□ sovereign v. subject
□ individual v. person
☐ inhabitant v. resident
☐ domicile v. residence
□ natural liberty v. civil liberty
□ personal liberty v. political liberty
□ private property v. estate (real and personal property)
□ absolute ownership v. qualified ownership
Watch the evening news endlessly repeat the "correct" buzz words : resident, residence, driver, motor vehicle, real estate, licensed, taxpayer, etc, etc.

Enter a contest, and the rules will limit it to "U.S. citizens / U.S. residents". Why can't Americans / American nationals / free inhabitants enter? Is there some fraud involved that cannot stand up to scrutiny under the common law?

As long as you consent, no harm, no foul.

But if fraud was used to get your consent, it might be time to withdraw consent.

Why would you want to return to the republican form of government?

Because under the republican form, you are a majority of one. You have endowed rights that no majority elected or otherwise can deny. **No constitutional law can trespass those rights.** No servant government is your master, demanding that you need to get its permission or pay tribute to it. Your private property is your sovereign domain, where you make the law. Which is why it is perfectly lawful to post "PRIVATE PROPERTY – NO TRESPASSING – TRESPASSERS WILL BE SHOT!" Only sovereign Americans can impose capital punishment without benefit of trial... subject citizens holding qualified ownership of real estate should not expect the same rights and immunities.

We were born to be **Kings and Queens**, monarchs of our lives and destinies. Americans were once the social equals of every other monarch on Earth – which explains why Americans didn't bow to anyone. Any other "titled" nobleman was a step lower than the lowest American sovereign. And it explains why "royal" Americans could marry foreign nobility without violating local laws banning marriages to "commoners."

Our enemies have perverted generations, and polluted our language so that we may not recognize our tormentors. But I hope that someday, enough Americans awaken to their lost heritage. For when that day arrives, the heavens will rock with their exultation.

### WE ARE AMERICAN SOVEREIGNS!