

You Will never Win in Their Courts!

Here's Why.

We went from Common Law to the Uniform Commercial Code.

By: Freedom School - Texas

The Central government (State, Local, and Federal) is Organized Crime!

Today, we are dealing with George Orwell's "Newspeak." Accurate thinking requires words of PRECISE meaning. Confuse the vocabulary and the unsuspecting majority is at a serious disadvantage when defending themselves against a small but highly disciplined minority which knows what it wants and which deliberately promotes word-confusion as the first step in its efforts to divide and conquer.

Today, there are no "common law" **actions** in court's - there are no "common law" **courts**, there are no Article III judges acting under Christian common law-there are no common law citizens - there are no common law corporations - there are no common law governments - there is not in existence twenty "dollars" in which to invoke a common law court in accordance with Article VII Bill of Rights - there are no people paying their debts in "lawful" common law "money" so how could any of the above be in existence? - There are no common law churches - there are not Biblical Christians - there are no truthful commercial transactions.

Why, because there is no one dealing at the common law. Everyone, governments included, are statutory law merchants dealing in negotiable paper under limited liability for the payment of debts - there is nothing else!!!

"Law" like lawful money is based upon "substance" (property). Remove the substance from lawful money and the "Law" like the "Money" becomes a fiction. The American Politburo (Bar Association) have converted this "Government of the People, by the People, and for the People," to a "Government of the Bureaucrats, by Barristers, and for Bankers." We now have a "Colorable Law" (law applying only to fictional persons), Colorable Money (Bank Credit fiction) and Colorable Rights (fictional persons). Colorable Money (Bank Credit fiction) and Colorable Rights (fictional Remedies) and "reviewing agents" (judges) operating under a commercial tribunal to administer their corporate regulations concerning commercial financial transactions.

"Uniform Commercial Code. One of the Uniform Laws drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and the American Law Institute governing commercial transactions (including sales and leasing of goods, transfer of funds, commercial paper, bank deposits and collections, letters of credit, bulk transfers, warehouse receipts, bills of lading, investment securities, and secure transactions). The U.C.C. has been adopted in whole or substantially by all states." **Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Edition.**

From Sovereigns to Subjects

This article is an attempt to explain:

- 1) the importance of the **remedy** provided for us in the present commercial system of "law" (which replaced the Common Law upon which our nation was founded);
- 2) the legal thread which brought us from "sovereigns" **over** government, to "subjects" **under** Government, through Our Use of Negotiable Instruments (Federal Reserve Notes) to Discharge Our Debts with Limited Liability Instead of Paying Our Debts at Common Law with Gold or Silver Coin.

The change from "public law" to "private commercial law" was recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Erie v. Tompkins* (1938). After that case the procedures of **Law** were officially blended with the procedures of **Equity**.

Prior to 1938, All US Supreme Court Decisions were based upon what is termed: "public law" or that system of law that was controlled by the Constitutional limitation. After 1938, all US Supreme Court decisions are based on the "public policy concerning commercial transactions made under the "Negotiable Instrument Law."

The Negotiable Instruments Law is a branch of the "International Law Merchant," which is now known as the "Uniform Commercial Code" (UCC). The UCC was "made uniform" (*forced upon*) the 50 states through the cunning of the Congress by offering grants of negotiable paper (Federal Reserve Notes) to the 50 States of the Union for Education, Highways, Health, and other purposes. Thus the 50 states were bound in commercial agreement with the **Federal** "United States," (as distinguished from the **National** united states).

The states accepted the "benefits" (federal grants) offered by the Federal United States as the "consideration" of a **commercial** agreement between themselves and the Federal United States. Once they took the bait (benefits), the 50 corporate states were obligated to 1) **obey** the Congress of the Federal United States, and 2) **assume** their portion of the equitable Debt of the federal United States. These federal debts were largely owed to the **international banking houses**, for the **credit** loaned to the federal government. The State governments received "free money" (federal grants based on the federal governments credit and were therefore reluctant to expose the scam.

The system of Negotiable paper bound all corporate entities of government together in a vast system of Commercial Agreements. This nation-wide commercial "bond" altered our Courts from Article III Judicial courts operating under the Common Law to Article I, Legislative Tribunals operating under Commercial Law. People brought before these Legislative **Administrative** Tribunals are held to the letter of every statute of government on the Federal, State, County or Municipal level unless they

have exercise the **REMEDY** provided for them within the UCC whereby: "**when forced to use a so-called benefit**" offered, were available to them, **guarantee of the same, are not to be bound by a contract capitalize that, or Commercial Agreement, if they did not enter into it "knowingly", "voluntarily", and "intentionally"**.

How did the **free** preamble citizenry of the sovereign states lose their guaranteed and available rights and become **subject** to that federal government and **divorced** from their sovereign status in the Republic (which I call the "*National united states*")?

The answer? That divorce was caused by our ignorance concerning the **cunning** of the monopolistic legal profession. However, a knowledge of the **TRUTH** concerning the legal thread that trapped us will restore our formal status as sovereign preamble citizens of the Republic.

TWO UNITED STATES?

Few people realize that our national Congress works for *two* nations foreign to each other. Our collective ignorance is based on the fact that **both** nations are cunningly called the "UNITED STATES." The first "UNITED STATES" is the union of the 50 Sovereign States under the Constitution for the united States (which I call the "*National united states*"). The second "UNITED STATES" is the **Legislative Democracy** which originated under Article I § 8, clause 17 of the Constitution for the united States (which I call the "*Federal United States*").

Our Congress rules BOTH the *National united States* (pursuant to the Constitutional limits upon its authority), and the *Federal United States* (without any Constitutional limitations). Few people, seeing some so-called "law" passed by Congress asked themselves: "*Which nation* was Congress working for when it passed this or that 'law'?" Or, "does this particular law apply to the national citizens of the Republic or does this particular apply **only to residents** of the District of Columbia, and other enclaves and territories of the legislative democracy: called 'Federal United States'?" Also known as "citizens of the [*federal*] United States."

Since these questions are seldom asked by the public, is an open invitation for cunning political leaders to seek more power and authority over the entire Citizenry of the Republic through the medium of legalese (and fraud). Congress deliberately failed in its Constitutional duty to provide a lawful medium of exchange (gold, silver) for the Citizens of the Republic. Instead, through deception and adhesion contracts, it made new citizens who were artificial (persons) and it created an abundance of commercial **credit money** for the Legislative Democracy where it is not bound by Constitutional limitations.

The depression of the 1930s was caused DELIBERATELY by creating a shortage of lawful money. Once the emergency was created, Congress used (it's emergency

authority) to remove the remaining substance (gold; legal tender for the *National* united states Citizens to pay their debts) from the medium of exchange belonging to the Legislative Democracy (*Federal* United States).

At the same time Congress granted "the entire citizenry" of the two nations the "benefit" of limited liability Federal Reserve Notes in the *discharge* of all debts. Congress told the Citizenry that the gold and silver coins of the Republic were out of date and cumbersome; therefore they no longer needed to **pay** their debts in substance (gold), but were now **privileged to discharge** debt with this more convenient paper currency, issued by Federal United States. Everyone was forced to (gold modern) and surrender their gold as a patriotic gesture to the government. The entire news media went along with the scam and declared it to be a forward step for our "democracy" (no longer referring to America as a "**Republic**").

From that point on, it was a falling light for the Republic of 1776, and a rising light for Franklin Roosevelt's **New Deal Socialistic** Democracy (which overcame the depression with an abundance of **debt** paper money in the form of interest-bearing negotiable instrument paper called: Federal Reserve Notes). Notes, of course are evidence of a debt owed to the Federal Reserve Banking cartel.

Since 1933, all contracts have had the "**colorable**" consideration of Federal Reserve Notes instead of "genuine" consideration of silver or gold coin. Likewise since 1933, all contracts are "colorable contracts," and not "genuine contracts" because no genuine consideration (gold or silver) is paid by either party to the contract.

REMEDY by: Freedom School – Texas (not the opinion of the writer)

To enforce these "colorable" contracts, a new "colorable jurisdiction," called "**Statutory Jurisdiction**" was created. This statutory (colorable) Jurisdiction is legislative and administrative rather than judicial in nature and enforces Commercial Agreements based upon "implied consent" rather than Contracts under The common law.

Today, all our "courts" sit as "**Legislative Tribunals**" (*NOT* Article III **Judicial** courts) and the so-called "statutes" being enforced in these legislative tribunals are not "statutes" passed by the legislative branch of our three branch Republic. Our modern "statutes" are really "commercial obligations" to the Federal United States for anyone in the Federal United States or the National united states who 1) accepted the "benefit" or "privilege" of discharging his desk with limited liability Federal Reserve Notes and did not avail himself to the **REMEDY** within the UCC.

REMEDY by: Freedom School – Texas (not the opinion of the writer)

That **remedy** is found in the Uniform Commercial Code at Section 1 – 207 ("**with explicit reservation of all rights**"), or "**without prejudice, 1 – 207**"). In conjunction with the signature, the UCC 1-207 clause notifies the Magistrate of any

of our present administrative Legislative Tribunals (called courts) that the signer of the document has reserved his COMMON LAW RIGHT "**not to be bound to the statute,**" or commercial obligation, of any commercial agreement that he did not enter into "**knowingly, voluntarily, and internationally**", as would be the case in any common law contract.

Further, if you invoke UCC Section 1–103 (as §§45.05.006), any statute being enforced against you as a commercial obligation of a commercial agreement must be construed in harmony with the **old common law of America**. Under UCC–103, the tribunal/court must rule that the statute does not apply to the individual, wise enough, and informed enough, to exercise the **remedy** provided in this new system of law, whereby he may retain his former status in the Republic. Meanwhile, those about him "cause the darkness" of Commercial Law government, since they lack the truth needed to free themselves from a slave status under the "Federal United States."

Under the current legal system, the legislature creates "colorable" rights (actually, "**privileges**"), imposes duties, lays down rules of conduct, and the courts (their own Legislative tribunals) declare such rights. These are **privileges** that you must **ask for BEFORE** you come under their administrative jurisdiction.

However, the uniform commercial law is not colorable to government employees, agents, and agencies. Their claims against NATURAL persons must be supported by lawful consideration, they must acknowledge the remedies afforded by the UCC and any "ultra vires" acts are actionable with no immunity from the prosecution for any natural **person**. In other words, by reserving your rights with UCC code remedy (1-207) government agents can be sued or prosecuted for violating those rights. Of course, if you don't "reserve" your rights with UCC 1-207, you are **PRESUMED** to have surrendered those rights in return for accepting a government benefit or privilege. Without your rights, you have only privileges which the Legislative democracy/government can grant, terminate, ignore, or violate at will.

NOTE: "Free money" from the Federal Reserve (by way of the federal government) leeward the states into this mess. We can therefore expect the growing recognition That:

- 1) the federal government takes more from the State than it gives; and
- 2) is BANKRUPT;

will provide the catalyst for the federal government's collapse, and perhaps them restoration of Freedom, Constitutional law, and unalienable Rights to the People.

"**Common law**, as distinguished from statutory law created by the enactment of legislatures, the common law comprises the body of those principles and rules of action, relating to the government and security of persons and property, which derive their authority solely from usage and customs of immemorial antiquity, or from the judgments and decrees of the court's recognizing, affirming, and enforcing such usage and customs; and, in this sense, particularly the ancient unwritten law of England. In general, it is a body of law that develops and arrives through judicial decisions, as distinguished from legislative enactments. The common law is all the statutory and case law background of England and the American colonies before the American Revolution. *People v. Riemann* 253 C.A.2d 119 61 Cal. Rptr.65, 85. It

consists of those principles, usage and rules of action applicable to government and the security of persons and property which do not rest for their authority upon any express and positive declaration of the will of the legislature. 12 13 D.C.Tex. 334 F.Supp. 415,418... As a compound adjective 'common-law' is understood to be contrasted or opposed to 'statutory,' and sometimes also to 'equitable' or to 'criminal.'" **Black's Law dictionary, Sixth Edition.**

"**Common law action.** Action governed by common law, rather than statutory, equitable, or civil law." **Black's Law dictionary, Sixth Edition.**

[end]

=====

A good friend, a man of 86 years and a faithful servant of the people, as a New Hampshire State Representative, brings this common law claim against; the wrongdoers/lebbeles; the fraudsters; the negligent; the derelicts; in breach of their fiduciary duty.

Common Law is above the foreign, bankrupt, private de facto's STATUTORY COMMERCIAL CODE, written by those who are not lawfully allowed to hold offices of trust. The Crown Temple B.A.R. Attorneys are purveyors of fraud and piracy, and whatever they do is null and void on its face.

"US Supreme Court held that state officials acting by "color of law" may be held personally liable for the injuries or torts they cause and that official or sovereign immunity may not be asserted."; *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 US 232 (1974), 94 S. Ct. 1683, 1687 (1974), "When a state officer acts under a state law in a manner violative of the Federal Constitution, he comes into conflict with the superior authority of that Constitution, and he is in that case stripped of his official or representative character and is subjected in his person to the consequences of his individual conduct. The State has no power to impart to him any immunity from responsibility to the supreme authority of the United States."; *Warnock v Pecos County, Texas*, 116 F. 3d 776 – No.96-50869 Summary Calendar. July 3, 1997.

The de facto is foreclosed from parity with the tangible. Their STATUTES and CODES are colour of law, not law. They can control only that which they create. They are a CORPORATION, not a government. They, as TRUSTEES are all in breach of their fiduciary duty and many are guilty of HIGH TREASON.

These public servants have taken over so that we are their servants. This is what happens when the general population is hoodwinked into thinking they're supposed to be acting as U.S. citizens. It's the exact opposite of the truth! It's imperative to correct that tragic, mortal error mentally and in your political status. Many years ago, when Dick Marple was a young man, he and many others quit and resigned from the State Police because they learned they weren't law enforcement at all, in that they were CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS acting as RE-VENUE generators for the Bankruptcy by fleecing living people as if they were DEAD entities/PERSONS/JOHN H. DOE's under Color of Law. That is a serious crime and hangable/punishable by death.

Dick figured this out 60 years ago, yet still to this day, the general population doesn't know that they're supposed to be free and unencumbered by their servants.

Their STATUTES and CODES are to govern them, not us. Today, the Police are trained chimpanzees who go about kidnapping people for the foreign B.A.R. maggots in black robes who have no jurisdiction over us. Read *Jordan vs. New London*. That man couldn't get a job as a Policeman because he scored too highly on the test. The last thing the B.A.R. wants is a Cop with a brain capable of critical thinking, because if the Cops could think, they'd figure out that it's the B.A.R. Attorneys who need to be arrested, especially the scum at the Bank/Bench. Today, the Police don't know the difference between :john-henry: doe and JOHN H. DOE. When it's explained to them, they get that stupid "deer in the headlights" look on their faces, then they swear they're-hearing nonsense. [end]

=====

Dealing with Presentments: Why we lose in court by: Carl Lentz

Read the court sections of Dealing with Presentments. Here's a portion:

Why do we lose in court?

It is not because it is a military or maritime court (which it is), often evidenced by the gold fringe on the flag. It is not that we are under implied or adhesion contracts to some municipal corporation (if so we could raise the issues of contract law). It is not a plethora of other reasons advocated by innumerable "patriots," all of which "reasons" are rabbit trails. So, the short answer to why we lose in court is that we lose if:

1. We dishonor any of the people and processes that impinge on us, thereby enjoining the issues described in the presentment so that we become bound by the matter. We have no right to deny or speak to anyone else's utterances, and doing so lands us in the middle of their novel.
2. We traverse and therefore contractually amalgamate ourselves and our STRAWMAN into the court's jurisdiction so that we endure in the flesh the results of whatever trial or hearing might occur dealing with our STRAWMAN. It is the STRAWMAN that appears, is tried, and sentenced, not us. By traversing, however, the real us gets to go along for the ride and experience in reality the judgment against the STRAWMAN.
3. We fail to discharge the charges, thereby authorizing the system to enforce commensurate consequences on us.
4. We have no facts in evidence substantiating our position placed by a competent witness on the court record of the case. This crucial matter is discussed below in greater detail.
5. We have not bonded the case.

Let us briefly discuss these issues:

1. We avoid acting in dishonor by accepting and returning for value whatever presentment or charging instrument we are provided with and by not arguing, fighting, denying, or ignoring.
2. We do not join the dispute by traversing, by which we leave our own ground and tacitly give reality and credibility to the opponent's claims and allegations that are not facts but only presumptions and assumptions until we stipulate (expressly or by dishonor). Enjoining the issues in a presentment, such as denying allegations or charges, or saying that we don't owe an alleged debt, is a dishonor that enjoins us with the court's jurisdiction and our own STRAWMAN and creates a dispute that grants a court subject matter jurisdiction. It sucks us up into the made-up game of imaginary disputes between fictitious entities. The definition of "traverser" in Black's Law Dictionary confirms the point succinctly:

traverser. In pleading, one who traverses or denies. A prisoner or party indicted; so called from his traversing the indictment. Black's Law Dictionary, 5th Edition, page 1345.

3. Whenever we (i.e., our STRAWMAN) are "charged" with something, that charge is a bookkeeping entry of liability on the ledger and must be "discharged" by entering a balancing, offsetting asset. Filling in the asset side usually occurs by the loser parting with public funds of some kind, such as a check or FRNs, or doing "community service," or being bonded and incarcerated as the surety. When we discharge the charges by acceptance for value, which is a Banker's Acceptance, we end the controversy and become the owner of the contract. Each of us is a private banker. Under banking our acceptance and return for value establishes the facts and makes us owner of the transaction. We then own both sides of the deal, i.e., both the creditor and debtor side.

By accepting from the private side and providing the value from the private, i.e., substance, side we end the dispute and remove from the equation any controversy for a court to resolve.

4. It is imperative to understand that the admiralty/equity courts of the system do not deal with reality, substance, and facts in evidence. They deal in assumptions (such as unsupported claims and charges), and presumptions (unexpressed rules by which the system operates), and stipulations (agreements that create the "facts"). Because they are strawmen and cannot be competent witnesses through sworn testimony, neither attorneys nor officials can place actual facts in evidence on the record that a judge can judicially notice, such as claims supported by sworn testimony, either through an affidavit sworn true, correct, and complete, or testimony under oath on the witness stand in open court, or deposition.

Continue at Dealing with Presentments.

Anecdotes, such as gold and silver as payment.

[Editor's note: all anecdotes in this section are from People's Rights.]

One man said to the court, "The Constitution says "No State shall make any Thing but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts", but this court constantly

Does, so this court must not be "The State". If you are not "the State", Who the Hell are you people?" Court said, "Case Dismissed", "record sealed". (See Article 1, Section 10) [Editor's note: Could it be this simple?]

Another man, told them "I am not a "subject" of the British Crown, and the Court Rules and State Codes are "Copyrighted", and I do Not have permission to use them, therefore the Prosecution cannot use them against me." – "case dismissed", "record sealed".

Another man was ORDERED to get an Attorney before the next HEARING date or he would be put in jail. The date arrived, and the Judge said, "Well do you have an attorney?" The man said "Judge, I tried, but I couldn't find an attorney who was qualified and willing to take my case, who was not an "Esquire". "Case Dismissed" , "Record Sealed"

Steven Ames' (of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania) Father denied that he was a British "Subject". The Judge said "You prove you are Not one."

The reason that the Court "seals the records", seems to be that they (Judges/Lawyers) do NOT want the knowledge to get out:

1. that the Courts-are NOT Courts of Law, but Courts of " "Subject" Code Behavior Administration".
2. that the Courts are Not Courts of the State government (with separation of powers), but "private meetings" of "Lawyers" only.

More on People's Rights.

I do not consent. How to win in court.

(Editor's note: This tactic may only work if one first tells the judge in writing that one is a living man or woman. See Karl Lentz method explanation on this page. The court can't hear living men/women until the living man/woman enters paperwork stating, 'I am man' or 'I am woman'.)

Here's the text:

Do not sign anything.

Do not get a lawyer.

You tell the judge this word for word and nothing else.

This is for the record. "I am here in the body of flesh and blood." (Now read these four sentences)

1. "I do not consent to these proceedings."
2. "Your offer is not accepted."
3. "I do not consent to being surety for this case and these proceedings."
4. "I demand the bond be immediately brought forward so I can see who will indemnify me if [I'm] damaged."

Your case will be dismissed.

The judge has no choice other than to dismissal of your case he/she can not bring up the bond. Then give this to every defendant. The courts will close down because the courts are a Private Business and not a justice machine as originally thought.

Comments:

Thou might also want to get the case discharged and with prejudice. A dismissed case may be re-opened. A discharged case may not. Similarly, with prejudice means, though maybe in a different way, that the case can't be re-tried. At least get the case dismissed with prejudice. The "with prejudice" part should do the trick. Also, thou might say to the judge that it is your wish. "I wish that the case be discharged with prejudice." Thou may only wish for something. Never want of anything. Wants may be denied.

=====

THE NEW TECHNOLOGY REMEDY

The First Trust of The World

Unam Sanctam is one of the most frightening documents of history and the one most quoted as the primary document of the Popes claiming their global power. It is an express trust deed. The last line reads: "Furthermore, we declare, we proclaim, we define that it is absolutely necessary for salvation that every human creature be subject to the Roman Pontiff." It is not only the first trust deed in history but also the largest trust ever conceived, as it claims the whole planet and everything on it, conveyed in trust.

Triple Crown of Ba'al, aka the Papal Tiara and Triregnum In 1302 Pope Boniface issued his infamous Papal Bull Unam Sanctam—the first Express Trust. He claimed control over the whole planet which made him "King of the world". In celebration, he commissioned a gold-plated headdress in the shape of a pinecone, with an elaborate crown at its base. The pinecone is an ancient symbol of fertility and one traditionally associated with Ba'al as well as the Cult of Cybele. It also represents the pineal gland in the centre of our brains—crystalline in nature— which allows us access to Source, hence, the 13foot tall pinecone in Vatican Square. Think about why the Pontiffs would idolize a pinecone. See: Pharmacratic Inquisition: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xfkVnf4eEfM>

The 1st Crown of Crown Land Pope Boniface VIII was the first leader in history to create the concept of a Trust, but the first Testamentary Trust, through a deed and will creating a

Deceased Estate, was created by Pope Nicholas V in 1455, through the Papal Bull Romanus Pontifex. This is only one of three (3) papal bulls to include the line with

the incipit "For a perpetual remembrance." This Bull had the effect of conveying the right of use of the land as Real Property, from the Express Trust Unam Sanctam, to the control of the Pontiff and his successors in perpetuity. Hence, all land is claimed as "crown land".

This 1st Crown is represented by the 1st Cestui Que Vie Trust, created when a child is born. It deprives us of all beneficial entitlements and rights on the land.

The 2nd Crown of the Commonwealth The second Crown was created in 1481 with the papal bull Aeterni Regis, meaning "Eternal Crown", by Sixtus IV, being only the 2nd of three papal bulls as deeds of testamentary trusts. This Papal Bull created the "Crown of Aragon", later known as the Crown of Spain, and is the highest sovereign and highest steward of all Roman Slaves subject to the rule of the Roman Pontiff. Spain lost the crown in 1604 when it was granted to King James I of England by Pope Paul V after the successful passage of the "Union of Crowns", or Commonwealth, in 1605 after the false flag operation of the Gunpowder Plot. The Crown was finally lost by England in 1713, when it was returned to Spain and King Carlos I, where it remains to this day. This 2nd Crown is represented by the 2nd cestui Que Vie Trust, created when a child is born and, by the sale of the birth certificate as a Bond to the private central bank of the nation, depriving us of ownership of our flesh and condemning us to perpetual servitude, as a Roman person, or slave.

The 3rd Crown of the Ecclesiastical See The third Crown was created in 1537 by Paul III, through the papal bull Convocation, also meant to open the Council of Trent. It is the third and final testamentary deed and will of a testamentary trust, set up for the claiming of all "lost souls", lost to the See. The Venetians assisted in the creation of the 1st Cestui Que Vie Act of 1540, to use this papal bull as the basis of Ecclesiastical authority of Henry VIII. This Crown was secretly granted to England in the collection and "reaping" of lost souls. The Crown was lost in 1816, due to the deliberate bankruptcy of England, and granted to the Temple Bar which became known as the Crown Bar, or simply the Crown. The Bar Associations have since been responsible for administering the "reaping" of the souls of the lost and damned, including the registration and collection of Baptismal certificates representing the souls collected by the Vatican and stored in its vaults. This 3rd Crown is represented by the 3rd Cestui Que Vie Trust, created when a child is baptized. It is the parents' grant of the Baptismal certificate—title to the soul—to the church or Registrar. Thus, without legal title over one's own soul, we will be denied legal standing and will be treated as things—cargo without souls— upon which the BAR is now legally able to enforce Maritime law.

The Cestui Que Vie Trust A Cestui Que Vie Trust is a fictional concept. It is a Temporary Testamentary Trust, first created during the reign of Henry VIII of England through the Cestui Que Vie Act of 1540 and updated by Charles II, through the CESTUI QUE VIE Act of 1666, wherein an Estate may be effected for the Benefit of a Person presumed lost or abandoned at "sea" and therefore assumed "dead" after seven (7) years. Additional presumptions, by which such a Trust may be formed, were added in later statutes to include bankrupts, minors, incompetents,

mortgages, and private companies. The original purpose of a CESTUI QUE VIE Trust was to form a temporary Estate for the benefit of another because some event, state of affairs, or condition prevented them from claiming their status as living, competent, and present, before a competent authority. Therefore, any claims, history, statutes, or arguments that deviate in terms of the origin and function of a Cestui Que Vie Trust, as pronounced by these canons, is false and automatically null and void. A Beneficiary under Estate may be either a Beneficiary or a Cestui Que Vie Trust. When a Beneficiary loses direct benefit of any Property of the higher Estate placed in a Cestui Que Vie Trust on his behalf, he do not "own" the Cestui Que Vie Trust; he is only the beneficiary of what the Trustees of the

Cestui Que Vie Trust choose to provide. As all Cestui Que Vie Trusts are created on presumption, based upon original purpose and function, such a Trust cannot be created if these presumptions can be proven not to exist. Since 1933, when a child is borne in a State (Estate) under inferior Roman law, three (3) Cestui Que (Vie) Trusts are created upon certain presumptions specifically designed to deny, forever, the child any rights of Real Property, any Rights to be free, and any Rights to be known as man or woman, rather than a creature or animal, by claiming and possessing their Soul or Spirit. The Executors or Administrators of the higher Estate willingly and knowingly:

1. convey the beneficial entitlements of the child, as Beneficiary, into the 1st Cestui Que (Vie) Trust in the form of a Registry Number by registering the NAME, thereby also creating the Corporate Person and denying the child any rights as an owner of Real Property; and,
2. claim the baby as chattel to the Estate. The slave baby contract is then created by honoring the ancient tradition of either having the ink impression of the baby's feet onto the live birth record, or a drop of its blood, as well as tricking the parents to signing the baby away through the deceitful legal meanings on the live birth record which is a promissory note, converted into a slave bond, sold to the private reserve bank of the estate, and then conveyed into a 2nd and separate Cestui Que Vie Trust, per child, owned by the bank. When the promissory note reaches maturity and the bank is unable to "seize" the slave child, a maritime lien is lawfully issued to "salvage" the lost property and is monetized as currency issued in series against the Cestui Que Vie Trust.
3. claim the child's soul via the Baptismal Certificate. Since 1540 and the creation of the 1st Cestui Que Vie Act, deriving its power from the Papal Bull of Roman Cult leader Pope Paul III, 1540, when a child is baptized and a Baptismal Certificate is issued, the parents have gifted, granted, and conveyed the soul of the baby to a "3rd" Cestui Que Vie Trust owned by Roman Cult, which has held this valuable property in its vaults ever since. Since 1815, this 3rd Crown of the Roman Cult and 3rd Cestui Que Vie Trust representing Ecclesiastical Property has been managed by the BAR as the reconstituted "Galla" responsible, as Grim Reapers, for reaping the souls.

Each Cestui Que Vie Trust, created since 1933, represents one of the 3 Crowns representing the three claims of property of the Roman Cult: Real Property (on Earth), Personal Property (body), and Ecclesiastical Property (soul). Each

corresponds exactly to the three forms of law available to the Galla of the BAR Courts: corporate commercial law (judge is the 'landlord'), maritime and canon law (judge is the banker), and Talmudic law (judge is the priest).

What is the real power of a court 'judge'?

Given what has been revealed about the foundations of Roman Law, what is the real hidden power of a judge when we face court? Is it their superior knowledge of process and procedure or of magic? Or is it something simpler and far more obvious?

It is unfortunate that much of the excitement about Estates and Executors has deliberately not revealed that an Estate, by definition, has to belong to a Trust— to be specific, a Testamentary Trust or Cestui Que Vie Trust.

When we receive legal paper or have to appear in court, it is these same Cestui Que Vie Trusts which have our rights converted into the property contained within them.

Instead of being the Trustee, or the Executor, or Administrator, we are merely the Beneficiary of each Cestui Que Vie Trust, granted only beneficial and equitable use of certain property, never legal title.

So if the Roman Legal System assumes we are merely the beneficiary of these Cestui Que Vie Trusts, when we go to court, who represents the Trustee and Office of Executor?

Note: The judge is administering a Testamentary Trust or Cestui Que Vie Trust

We all know that all cases are based upon the judge's discretion which often defies procedures, statutes, and maxims of law. Well, they are doing what any Trustee or Executor, administering a trust in the presence of the beneficiary, can do under Roman Law. All the statutes, maxims, and procedures are really for show because under the principles of Trust Law, as first formed by the Roman Cult, a Trustee has a wide latitude, including the ability to correct any procedural mistakes, by obtaining the implied or tacit consent of the beneficiary, to obviate [*preclude, avert; use of intelligence or forethought to ward off trouble*] any mistakes.

Obviate derives from Late Latin *obviare* (meaning "to meet or withstand") and Latin *obviam*, which means "in the way" and is also an ancestor of our adjective "obvious." "Obviate" has a number of synonyms in English, including "prevent," "preclude," and "avert"; all of these words can mean to hinder or stop something. When you prevent or preclude something, you put up an insurmountable obstacle. In addition, "preclude" often implies that a degree of chance was involved in stopping an event. "Obviate" generally suggests the use of intelligence or forethought to ward off trouble. "Avert" always implies that a bad situation has been anticipated and prevented or deflected by the application of immediate and effective means.

The judge is the real and legal NAME. The judge is the trust, itself.

We are the mirror image to them—the ghost—the dead. It is high sorcery, trickery, and subterfuge that has remained “legal” for far too long. Spread the word.

=====