FROM THE FORENSIC ACIVIST SERIES



Thanks for your recent visits. Nice to see you again, as always. Thanks for sharing your views with me.

My new vision and passion is, the *liberal arts.*

The following is material that must be known by what I call "the *true* [*forensic*] Activist",-- to be a really *effective* Activist. Any other form of activism is futile.

The only way an activist can initiate and be involved in true [*forensic*] Activism, to choose the correct (the only effective) goals and methods,-- is to know the following.

## The Liberal Arts

By the mid 20th century, a number of the great minds arrived at the conclusion that since the state, business, wars, and *enslavement* were becoming more mechanized, and, -- technology taking over the minds of statists, the state, academe, the common individual, and population. This meant that the academic and scientific communities were being taken over by a group known as *technocrats*[1].

Prof. Wm. H. Whyte Jr. (lately deceased) led those who were and still are warning that at academe's level, the *liberal arts* were thus suffering, and that it would get even worse,-- the liberal arts threatened with extinction.

In the middle ages and Renaissance the seven branches of learning were grammar, logic, rhetoric, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy (cf. the trivium, and quadrivium).

In modern times a proper education in the liberal arts include the same and in addition, philosophy, history, etc.

The term *liberal arts* is a translation of Latin *artes liberales*, so called **NOT** because they were "liberal" in any modern sense of the word, but because their pursuit was the *privilege*[2] of the freemen[3] who were called *liberi*.[4]

---

**1** Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith calls them the "technostructure", which, thirty (30) years ago he defined as the economy controlling, often and with each passing day even more so state and government controlling, population controlling, and individual controlling *core* of the big corporations that monopolize everything including how the masses *think* , act, and react; that, in order in effect,-- *force* people desire and buy the large corporations' goods and services, through advertising tricks,-- manufactured the desire (cf. psychological/physical) need for those products as if those products were as important as the *real* needs/esentials, food, water, clothing, shelter, warmth/ heating/fuel (THE NEW INDUSTRIAL STATE, Mentor, 1978 ed.; cf. his THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY, c.1969; o.c.o.).

What Galbraith laid down as the rules by which the state can be understood have, and are being proven to be correct, and what he *predicted* has come true (cf. Prof. Hans Reichenbach, Norbert Elias, works) . The ability to study, learn about, and understand things, and the thereupon based ability to *predict* and thus directly or indirectly be able to *control* the future,-- is the essence

Now the really shocking and scary thing that I can re-

of *true* science (Profs. H. Reichenbach, W.I.B. Beveridge, G. de Santillana, V. Brown; o.c.o.).

**2** It is NO coincidence that Prof. T.H. Greer defines a "liberty" as a grant of jurisdiction creating privilege or franchise (c.o.), noting that a freedman was always one who received some sort of grant of privilege, even supposed "freedom", from the emperor, king, or nobility, for which grant (cf. 5 USC 554) the freeman owed his benefactor considerable, even his life (cf. the trifle that was required for the *liberty* known as "Free And Common *Socage*") noting that those principles, laws (governing precedents), and practices have never changed ("Roman law is one of strict precedents", two of which strict precedents is that (A) everyone is a slave, and (B) "slaves [citizens*] are strictly rightless" (cf. Ency.Brit. 1968 ed.).

* Under Roman law, (a) the only slave that had rights was one who was conducting the state's (patricians' [patricians' estates']) business, and (b) everyone was considered to be so enfranchised, as (i) conducting the state's business, and/or (ii) in possession of and otherwise benefiting from the state's property* (cf. Prof. Vasily Klyuchevsky, RISE OF THE ROMANOVS).

* All legislation is enforced under **quasi contract***; two condition precedent elements that must be specially alleged and proven for conviction of liability on a charge of quasi contract are (a) the receipt of a property or property interest (whether that property was taken with or without the owners knowledge or permission, and (b) a thereto related or therefrom emergent "unjust enrichment" (a benefit, usually monetary in nature,-- NOT intended by the owner).

Note the expressed and implied *element* of **nexus** (substantial relationship) as is related to **quasi contract.** Quasi Contract was first developed by Lord Chancellor Mansfield, Chief Justice (Engl.), in 1760 in two cases, Luke v. Lyde and Moses v. Macferlan (2 Burr. Reports), and is said to have been declared to be a part of the common law by Mansfield and or England's Royalty, and nobility (the *admir*able ones, the *admir*als [*admir*alty]). I think I read somewhere, but nevertheless I maintain that quasi contract was developed in anticipation of and to cut off or to provide England with legal (cf. administrative/court) remedies for the *American* nobility's (admirals': "founding fathers") probable demand for independence from England (see the shocking revelations in PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, (1965), in light of US v. Mc Gill 1806).

OK, so what item or items of the state's (*estate's*)/governments' "property" or property interest or interests do defendant have, and out of which *property* arises a *benefit* that can be called a jurisdiction creating grant or receipt of a however owner/possessor (i.e. the state's) unintended privilege that's in the form of "unjust enrichment", or nexus ? (cf. the **nexus** cases, such as Bank of Augusta v. Earl 1839 in light of Ramsay v. Allegre 1827).

* Keener, QUASI CONTRACT, West's, p.16, with case law cites; o.c.o.).

**3** It must be remembered that during the middle (catholic, dark, medieval) ages, which it is said began to close when the Renaissance arrived,-- and throughout history* and throughout the world, until well into the twentieth century,-- everybody, everyone, every individual was considered to be a **slave**, and so even in the USA, whether they knew, or believed, or liked it,-- or not (cf. the fathers of the state, in this case, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, works),-- wherefore there were few real "freemen" who were so blessed as to be able to read, write, think more clearly (forensically), perceive at least more if not all of the otherwise available (forensic) reality, etc., and finally to question (test) authority, question everything. The state and statists (the ruling class elite) throughout history* considered everyone to be a **slave**, and still do. They just don't *openly* talk about it any more.

Outside of brute force, terror, kidnapping, torture, maiming, assassination, mass murder, and worse,-- statists have four different, but closely related major tools for **enslaving** people,-- secrecy, deceit, misinformation, and misdirection (Sun Tzu; Napoleon, works; o.c.o.). As Napoleon and other great statists said,-- only those ignorant of *forensic* truth, can be successfully targeted, attacked, defeated, **enslaved**, fleeced, and **destroyed** (o.c.o.). That is to say, ignorance is **slavery**,-- ignorance of forensic truth/reality invites, assures, and continues **enslavement** !

port to you now, that I discovered after I last saw you in

In order to **enslave** individuals, groups, and the masses, and make sure they remain enslaved,-- as a member of and speaking for the ruling class elite, Sigmund Freud said, "These dangerous masses must be held down most severely *economically*, and most carefully kept away from any chance of intellectual awakening [*Enlightenment*]" (Freud, Vienna, 1927; cf. Profs. John Strachey, C.S. Hall, works; o.c.o.). Knowledge and *application* of the forensic rules is *true* Enlightenment *itself*. Knowledge and *application* of the forensic rules is the *source* of all *true* Enlightenment. Absent the forensic rules, *true* Enlighetenment is impossible.

Those ancient Greek fathers of the state also said that statists must enslave everybody, but that to enslave them well, they must be carefully and craftily conditioned to believe they are free and talk and act like it,-- thereby continually conditioning themselves and all others to believe it (thus their organized and "revealed" religions (Freud, 1927/61), ***patriotism***, and constitutionalism, noting that [a] constitutions are legislation (c.o.), [b] **legislation is NOT law** (c.o.), [c] legislation does NOT apply to individuals (cf. Bank of Augusta v. Earle 1839 in light of Ramsay v. Allegre 1827; 15 Op.AG 262 (1877; 17 Op.AG 525 (1883) in light of 9 Op.AG 32 (1857), 37 FRD 564, 565-566 (1965), wherefore the state and its police do **NOT** protect any individual, family, group, or community (Warren v. City, 444 A2d 1 [1981]); the state is the **enemy** of the individual (Redfield v. Fisher, Ore. 1930, p.819); The state is out to **enslave** and **destroy** the natural born individual (Crandall v. Nev., 1869, p.**46**; Enoch v. Wms., 5CA fed. Fla. 1962, o.c.o., compare Reichenbach, THE RISE OF SCIENTIFIC PHILOSOPHY, U of Cal. Pr. 1951/55 ed.); the state is out to destroy not only the individual, but all established institutions (Sensei Ashida Kim), including the natural environments, knowledge, right, truth, reality, the Earth, and ***DESTROY* the whole of mankind**. Egads ! (cf. Prof. Robert Nadeau, MIND, MACHINES AND HUMAN CONSCIOUNESS, CB, 1991, p.39.8, 144.8, 121.8 respectivey).

Thus a number of greats have said,-- "Patriotism is the last refuge of scoundrels and **slaves**" (cf. Prof. H.L. Mendken; o.c.o.). Now that statement may initially confuse, but after reading the above, it will all become clear.

Deeper understanding of the above (insight) is gained, by comparing to the above,-- Prof. H. Marcuse's statement that,-- modern people (since yr. c. 1900)-- **incorrectly** think that freedom is a high and ever increasingly high standard of living; others consider that ignorant mistake,-- **slavery** itself.

*True* freedom is knowledge, and in all matters, interests, and endeavors, the *application* of the forensic rules,-- after which,-- material temporal physical freedom naturally follows (Prof. Paulo Freire, PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED, H&H, 1970; o.c.o.; cf. James Redfield, THE CELESTINE PROPHECY, Warner, 1993).

Nevertheless, that's what the state (*estate*; l'etat), the one-world *estate* of **slaves** is all about (ignorance) and upon which the state (estate) is based, and in which and out of which the state's power emerges *cato* (cf. Garcia v San Antonio 1965, in light of Frost v. CRC, 1927, p.596.7-597; Prof. J.H. Franklin, FROM SLAVERY TO FREEDOM, AAK, 1947/67; PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, [1965]),-- noting that the supreme courts in numerous cases have held that the individual's *labor* is the sole source of all property, wealth, money (cf. "the monetization labor" (me), and credit (c.o.) and thus the state's power (c.o.).

So,-- in order for the state (*estate*) to have full control of *all* of that *property* (N. Elias, POWER & CIVILITY, Oxf.Univ.Pr., 1938; Frost v. CRC 1927, p.986.7-987)-- it would of course be best for the state (*estate*) to own or control the people who provide that labor,-- thus **slavery**, **slaves** (cf. Garcia v. San Antonio 1985, the older, median, and later slave cases, Tumey v. Ohio 1927; US v. Mussry, 9CA fed. c.1983/84; o.c.o.).

We note here that the state (*estate*) and all regarding, claimed, and done by the state (*estate*) is **admiralty** (US v. Mc Gill 1806; PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, [1965]), wherefore.-- all of the state's courts are admiralty courts (Egads !), and in the first instance, all admiralty courts do **NOT** without more (without a special *admiralty* contract [cf. US v. Cash/Car, 37 FRD 564, 565-566 {1965}; cf. 9 Op.AG 32 {1857}]) act *in personam* (do NOT contemplate, seize, dispose of) natural born individuals,-- but act *only in rem* (contemplate, seize, and

c.1989 is that,-- **the state is Islam**. Egads !

dispose of *property* only; that *property* however can be *slaves* [citizens] {Egads !}) as in Admiralty 101/501; o.c.o.

* "History (cf. court-binding history*) begins with Hamurabbi", c.1792-1750BC (Prof. T.H. Greer, MSU, Prof. Eugen Weber, UCLA, works; o.c.o.).

* The term, *court-binding*, addresses only the "courts of justice"* which, *properly* understood then and now are Hamurabbi's one-world trust estate's highest administrators (*trustees*), along with all other *administrative* agencies, noting that all trial, and appellate (superior/supreme) courts (courts of justice) are totally NON-judicial *administrative* (fact-finding/rule-making) agencies (c.o.).

As legislated into existence, enabled, and staffed by legislation,-- *all* of the world's, history's, and even today's *trial* (inferior), and *appellate* (superior/supreme) courts -- are courts of justice (Hamurabbi's trustees): "[Today's and all of history's] Courts of justice are bound to consider the ancient {**original**} state of affairs as remaining unaltered" (Kennett v. Chambers 1852) and "In order to understand today's state and governments, -- you must *apply* the principles of the ancient [cf. **original**] and medieval [**slave**] states" (cf. Prof. T.A. Spragens Jr., UNDERSTANDING POLITICAL THEORY, St.Mar.Pr. 1976; BEUTEL'S BRANNON ON NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS, ch.1, LBC, 13th ed., c.1988, respectively). Thus the word **justice** does NOT mean what everyone has been by the ruling class elite carefully and craftily *conditioned* (Profs. H. Marcuse, D.T. Rodgers, Sensei Ashida Kim, works) to believe it is. Properly understood, the term **justice** means nothing more than the **administration** of the [Hamurabbi's] state (*estate*). Egads !

All *courts* that are *legislated* into existence, are nothing more than totally NON judicial *administrative* agencies (c.o.), whereas,-- truly judicial courts canNOT whatsoever under any circumstance or for any purpose or exigency be legislated into existence. That is to say,-- *true* common law courts (*truly* judicial courts) canNOT be legislated into exisence. *Truly* **judicial** courts come into existence only when a disappointed but *deserving* (cf. actually injured, or threatened) natural born individual properly executes, files, and prosecutes *certain* common law forms (cf. Morgan v. US 1954; o.c.o.). All courts, including courts of justice are bound only by facts (cf. also encyclopedic [historial] facts), truths, principles, precedents, realities, and traditions (cf. Bank v. Peavey, 64 F 912) that are forensically tested and proven to be true. In law, the past (history) is very important. Under the legal maxim, Law looks to the past (history is the law, history is law [cf. Prof. Marc Bloch, THE HISTORIAN'S CRAFT, WSP, 1943)-- judges are bound to apply encyclopedic (historical) facts as the law governing indeed dictating the content, operation, and end effect of all decisions, opinions, decrees, and orders (RES JUDICATA & STARE DECISIS, West's, c.1968, the author of which is a famous lawyer, whose name I forget).

A *truly* judicial court is known as a, Common law court of error three judge judicial review panel.

Properly understood,-- when mere administrative (NON-judicial) agencies (including trial, or appellate) courts hold that it or an inferior agency (i.e. inferior court) has NO jurisdiction,-- it *acts* judicially** (at least at that very moment)-- but nevertheless it is NOT a *truly* judicial court. The rule is that (a) the court is the judge, (b) the judge is the court (c.o.). That seems to exclude the court clerk, which early on was the chief officer of the court, the judges mere trappings, but that it seems was a common law principle governing common law courts (three judge trial courts, and three judge judicial review panels), which may be the case when one obtains a truly judicial trial or hearing (see me on this principle: HOT !: the activist may be able to obtain a three judge trial, NOT just an after the fact judicial "review".).

* cf. Kennett v. Chambers 1852, citing Rose v. Himely, Gelston v. Hoyt.

** Cf. No. Pipe v. Marathon Pipe 19821 citing Crowell v. Benson 1932

**4** See n.3 above on what a "liberty" really is, and "liberty" really is (the opposite of true freedom ["life, liberty, property [pursuit of happiness]), apply the forensic rules, *integration* & *synthesis* (Prof. V. Brown, THE AMATEUR NATURALIST'S HANDBOOK, S&SF, 1992 ed.; o.c.o.).

Islam

We know this because, (a) the state, all claimed and done by the state, and otherwise regards the state and its agency government[1], the state's, government's agents,-- is admiralty[2], and (b) all admiralty is Islam.[3] Egads !

It is NO coincidence that just about every title of nobility that England and Europe ever had, and even in the U.S.A., were and *remain* -- Islamic[4].

One title of nobility that is NOT Islamic (NOT Asiatic) is "earl", from the Old Viking (Anglo-Saxxon Dane) *jarl*[5], pronounced, "yarl".

---

**1** (i) The "government" is the agency of its parent creator state*, and (ii) each constitution is the government itself** (Thayer v. Hedges, Ind. 1864; rev.o.g. c.1865).

*Lehigh Valley Ry. v. USSR, NY fed. 1927

** Which means that the criminally **insane*** bums and parasites running around the country calling themselves the "government" are liars and frauds.

* All who believe in the existence, authority, and power of the state are **INSANE** ! (cf. Postman & Weingartner, LINGUISTICS, Delta, 1966; Prof. Arno Gruen, THE INSANITY OF NORMALITY, GW, 1992 in light of the "unwhole person" [Prof. Isaiah Berlin, THE AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT]; Prof. R. Olson, THE EMERGENCE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, Trayne 1993; o.c.o.).

**2** US v. Mc Gill, 4 Dall. 426 (1806); PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, (1965).

**3** 15 Ency.Brit. 1971/72 ed., p.985.7, "Roger II, King of Sicily" "the first admiral"*** (id.); Gilmore & Black, ADMIRALTY, ch.1, n.1*, Foundation Press 1963, p.1; o.c.o.

* Note the rule that what is *first* said by Caesar [cf. Hamurabbi]* first,-- governs, that all said thereafter is a restatement/clarification/application of what was first said by Caesar. Where some however incorrectly respond that what is later said by Caesar governs, it governs only as is congruent with and explains what was first said.

* All degreed and licensed individuals are the agents of (trustees for) Cae**sar***, rather, the first one-world emperor,-- Hamurabbi and his state (estate)-- estate of slaves. Egads !

* Cf. Caezar*

* (a) Initially,-- correct spelling is NOT of import,-- it's the referrent *phonemes* that count*, (b) inadvertent, or purposeful experimentation with misspelling of words, names, etc., can lead to the discovery of hidden truths*, and (c) there are a lot of different ways of correctly spelling such names as Hammurabi, Hamurappi, Hamu**rabbi**** etc., Nebuchadrez**zar**, Nabuchadnez**zar**, etc.

* Prof. Jaques Derrida, OF GRAMMATOLOGY, Fr., 1967, Prof. Gayatry Charavorty Spivak♥ (India/Suisse), Transl./Ed., J.H. Univ.Pr. 1976

** "['except for old Viking…'*] all of the world's languages, including ***Hebrew*** were spawned at the Tower of Babel"**; cf. Prof. George Seldes, THE GREAT THOUGHTS, Ballantine, 1985, p.39 a.5; cf. Rabbi Koestler, THE THIRTEENTH TRIBE; o.c.o.

* Prof. J. Montanaro, CONVERSATIONAL JAPANESE, (1980/81 ed.), preface; which also says that,-- where all other languages have absolutely NO inherent meaning whatsoever*,-- only Old Viking has inherent (and I say court-binding) meaning, in that that's where the common law forms came from, and the authorities say that only the common law forms (language) constitute the law itself (Puterbaugh, COMMON LAW PLEADING, Callaghan, 1844/84 ed.; Koffler & Reppy, COMMON LAW PLEADING, West's 1969; COMMON LAW PLEADING, West, 1940; o.c.o.

* cf. "The Greco[-Latin] language is totally **meaningless** (GREEK ELEMENTS, Concord Press, Saugus, Calif. 1980/81 ed., p.175; o.c.o.).

** Profs. Funk & Lewis, 60 DAYS TO A MORE POWERFUL VOCABULARY, WSP, 1943 (emphasis added)

**4** c.o.

The word *admiralty* means the **admir**able ones, the *nobility*,-- the ruling class elite[1], "the ruling class *corporative* elite" as Prof. Peter Woll puts it.[2]

The root **admir**, in **admir**alty, **admir**al, is from the Islamic (cf. Arabic) **amir**, **emir**, the **admir**able ones,-- the name for a certain level of high priests in Islam.

Noting that (a) just about every one of America's founding fathers were of the British and European nobility (held titles of nobility[3]) and that many of their families, such as that of George Washington were high nobility in England and Europe[4], and (b) America was NOT named after **Amer**icus Vespucci[5], it is obvious that,-- **Amer**ica was named after Islam's **emirs** (Amers, **Amer**ica). Egads ! (infra).

The word (name, *label*[6]) *California* was early on spelled **Caliph**ornia, **caliph** meaning another level of officers (high priests) of Islam. Egads ! (cf. "Roger II", first admiral").

As to naming California (Caliphornia), it must be remembered that the guys who early on took over the land that they named California were a gang of navy officers (**admir**als) who, by sea, invaded and claimed that land area.

Now the "**Phoenix**", the strange looking bird that "arises out of the ashes of defeat",-- is Islam's **caliphs'** bird (**orni**thology), the "**ia**" tacked on to end of the the word Caliph-**orn**... means state (*estate*) being nothing than a mere state of mind (later defined as **insanity**[7], infra), Hamurabbi's state of mind, as in the **insanity** known as schizophren**ia**). **Phoenix** (Az.) is the capital of that land.

Another symbol of the state is the *yoroboros*[8], the dragon with its tail in its mouth, symbolizing the fact that although the state attacks, feeds on, and destroys itself (cf. conflict as the life's blood of the state[9] [the life's blood of statists[10]]-- it survives, as does its cousin the **Phoenix**. All with the state is symbolism (lack of reality).

---

**5** Here of course, spelled with *Latin* alphabet letters.

**1** Yes, in every nation, state, county, city, town, corporation*, and business, in the world,-- there is a ruling class elite that governs, by setting the foundational, and the day to day, policies (Prof. J.K. Galbraith, q.v.; Profs. H. Marcuse, D.T. Rodgers, Vance Packard, works; o.c.o.).

**2** Prof. Peter Woll, AMERICAN BUREAUCRACY, (1963/77 ed.).

**3** There are still titles of nobility held by the major male members of America's founding fathers' families. The constitutional provision stating that there shall be NO new titles of nobility created in the USA, does NOT clearly repeal the prior and then extant and governing titles of nobility, it just masks (hides) those titles of nobility and their holders from the population, that throughout history the worlds' nobility feared worse than the plague, -- especially following the French and other prior revolutions.

**4** For example, (i) all of the corporate monopolies in England and Europe were founded, owned and run by, and for the most part profited from only by the *nobility**, and (ii) George Washington's father held one of England's highest offices of nobility (maybe a *prince*), and owned one of England's main steel

**ISLAM**

(Things Are Not As They Seem)

The first thing that the activist must understand, is that,-- little or nothing is as it seems; things are NOT as they seem[1].

---

monopolies, which family, under the direction of George Washington established in Ohio (George Washington's own private state [estate])-- steel corporations (monopolies), that up until recently were the world's most productive, important, exclusive, and profitable monopolies (*totalitarian* entities).

* Prof. Hutton Webster, ANCIENT HISTORY, ( ).

**5** Shapiro, THE BOOK OF LIES, (1988); o.c.o.

**6** (a) Substance governs over mere form, mere labels* (mere names), and (b) ********* (see me on this [I forget what I intended to put under b).

*PMA v. Kennedy, NY fed. 1979; Peo. v. Cull., NY 1961; Re. Smiley, 35 Wa.2d 863, 316 P2d 212 ( ); o.c.o.

**7** Cf. statist insanity discussed herein (Profs. Neil Postman & Charles Weingartner, LINGUISTICS, Delta, 1966, in view of I. Berlin, THE AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT etc. q.v.).

**8** Cf. BREWER'S DICTIONARY OF FACT AND FABLE.

**9** Prof. E.E. Schattschneider, THE SEMISOVEREIGN PEOPLE, (1960), in light of Profs. Dye & Zeigler, THE IRONY OF DEMOCRACY, (1969); o.c.o.

Prof. Schattschneider reminds us that, since statists' life's blood is **conflict**, and yet the natural state of affairs being peace and quiet,-- statists must continually manufacture fake **conflict** in order to survive, in order for their state (*estate;* slave state) to continue, and that those statists' personal profiting and other benefiting from enslaving and fleecing people under guise of law,-- shall also continue.

Prof. N. Elias q.v. reminds us that immediately upon installation in their offices, statists, for their own benefit,-- begin to personally use up, attack, give-away*, and sell off the constitutional state's (constitutional *estate's*) *property;* that is to say personally use up and otherwise destroy the constitutional state (constitutional *estate*) itself,-- wherefore, at certain doctorate levels, it is held that,-- statists are the state's own worst enemy (cf. what *treason* really is, as opposed to what people think it is).

* Cf. Jimmy Carter giving the Panama Canal back to Panama, Panama immediately signing the canal over to Red China (Communist Chinese) for management and administration (Egads !), and which Communists greatly profit from it not only monetarily but in political (*discretionary*), and world power.

**10** (a) Since corporations are fictions (myths, lies, frauds), that is to say, corporations don't really exist in the physical temporal material sense. Noting that the state is a corporation [Chisholm v. Ga. 1793], myth, fiction, lie, fraud), thus by themselves (without more, without the agency of man)-- can't whatsoever act, operate, or conduct business,-- they must act through human agency*, and (b) thus, when such cases as Redfield v. Fisher say that "the *state* is the **enemy** of the individual", and Crandall v. Nev. say that "the *state* is out to **destroy** the individual,-- you may find me using the term "statists" rather than "the *state*" as do the judges,-- in order that my students may know what's really going on**, what "the state **means**", that is to say,-- so that my students get see the *substance* of the matter (what it **means**)-- in spite of the misleading/NOT very revealing *form* (language) used by the authors of such statements,-- the judges.

* Corporate Law 101/501; o.c.o.

** People don't know what's really going on in the state, etc., "They can't !" (Prof. Avram Noam Chomsky, THE PROSPEROUS FEW AND THE RESTLESS MANY, 1993; cf. Profs H. Marcuse, D.T. Rodgers, D.T. Bell, works; o.c.o.).

**1** Carl Forster's wife Peggy Poor, an English Professor criticized the use of this phrase as being incorrect English, who supplied the correct alternative. I however prefer Linguistics Professor Willard Espy's approach in choosing the supposedly incorrect English phrase, "The Word's Gotten Out" for the title of his not only best selling, but highly important and informative 1988 work,

The only way to be able to perceive and understand

which criticized phrase also comports with Profs. Derrida and Spivak's idea that inadvertent, or purposeful *experimentation* with (a) misspelling, and (b) language, is most helpful and informative,-- as uncovering the purposefully hidden truths, but the stupid usage is the nutty professor Betty Friedan's insistence on the use of only a few elements of punctuation, or absolutely NO punctuation whatsoever (cf. Old Greek, and Old Latin, which languages all of history's Linguists define as "totally **meaningless**", as having NO *inherent* meaning,-- unlike the, Old Viking (old Anglo Saxxon Dane) language, which language indeed has inherent [pre-Hamurabbian] meaning [court-binding** **meaning**]; c.o.),-- along with America's enemy,-- Britain's Bill Bryson's ideas on doing away with, or the lack of need for, the rules of English that appear and are repeated over and over again in all of America's literary forensics and style books as essential, and which use of language (communication) is one of the reasons America is so far ahead of every other nation in science and technology, literature, etc., including England, and France.

Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith in THE NEW INDUSTRIAL STATE, and other of his works that are essential to *true* (forensic) freedom seekers, *true* Activists, calls what people perceive as the however non-forensic (unwhole) truth and reality as "conventional wisdom", "orthodoxy", cannon (implying false religion), dogma, and a fist full of other denigrating terms; Prof. D.T. Rodgers, "a false order of facts", Prof. H. Marcuse calling it all a, "false reality". The ruling class elite intellectuals who know and apply the forensic (empirical, the empire's, state's) rules,-- call those who don't know and apply those rules, thus who perceive a false (unwhole, NOT holistic) reality and who thus believe in, and order their lives around, such "**crap**"*,--"the uneducated, uneducable, dangerous, bovine *herd*" and worse (c.o.). As a member of and speaking for the ruling class elite, Sigmund Freud said, "These dangerous masses, must be held down most severely economically, and most carefully kept away from any chance of intellectual awakening [*true* Enlightenment]" (Freud, Vienna, 1927; o.c.o.; cf. Profs. John Strachey, WWN, 1961; Prof. C.S. Hall, works; o.c.o.).

* Postman & Weingartner, "...Crap Detecting" (Delacorte, 1969); the cranky ol' Prof. Al Fussells's, ...THE DUMBING OF AMERICA, ( ), Prof. Galbraith, THE NEW INDUSTRIAL STATE, Mentor, 1978 ed.; o.c.o.

** Court-binding ? Yes ! Cf. (a) L.C. John Fortescue, C.J. Year Book 1458, in light of (b) the substantive philosophy, theory, and Law underlying and governing *true* judicial review; (c) Puterbaugh, COMMON LAW PLEADING, West, 1969; (d) Puterbaugh, COMMON LAW PLEADING, Chicicago, Callaghan, 1884; Bank v. Peavey, 64 F. 912 (18 ), US v. Hopkins, NY fed. 1912, ( ), Morgan v. US 1954; o.c.o.

**2** Prof. Isaiah Berlin, THE AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT, ( ), the legal maxim, Law looks to the past (thus court-binding *precedent*), unto the **extreme** (Cr. v. Nev., 1869, p.***46***; Prof. H. Reichenbach q.v.; o.c.o.).

**3** Prof. I. Berlin (n.2 above) correctly holds that those who do NOT know and in all matters, interests, and endeavors properly (knowingly, *purposefully**, strictly, and scrupulously) *apply* the forensic rules,-- perceives much less than half of the otherwise available (forensic) reality, that those people are unwhole, thus NOT perceiving the whole reality (Berlin; Postman & Weingartner)-- their thoughts thus unwhole, incomplete (erroneous),-- their perception of reality unwhole, which Postman & Weingartner correctly hold as the definition of **insanity** (LINGUISTICS, Delta, 1966; cf. Prof. Arno Gruen, THE INSANITY OF NORMALITY, GW, 1992; Prof. R. Olson, THE EMERGENCE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, Trayne, 1993; o.c.o.).

* Knowingly, purposefully ? Yes. Prof. Wm.D. Brooks and others say that although most people don't know the forensic rules*, it appears that they do think in the *forensic* sense, however, only, "half consciously", or "unconsciously" [using a Freudian term {cf. sub-consciously}] (SPEECH COMMUNICATIONS, Dubuque, Wm. Brown Co., 1971/72 ed.

* Cf. Emerson, Dewey, works; o.c.o.

what's really going on with the state, etc., is to seek out[1], learn, and in all matters, interests, and endeavors, -- *apply* the *forensic* rules.[2]

---

**1** Prof. Hans Reichenbach says that there are only two ways (a) to learn the forensic rules, through someone who knows and cares, or (b) by seeking out those rules by yourself, which he says and I say,-- is almost impossible.

**2** As expressed and implied by all of the greats referenced in these works.

Note here that at least two well known religions, out of the infinite spectrum containing those rules, are however founded on certain narrow features of the forensic rules;-- one of which religions was established by Carl Jung, the other by (name omitted). Do you know what the other religion is ? The few narrow features of a few of the infinite number of rules of forensics upon which those two religions are based are nevertheless very productive. Just think therefore,-- how productive the involved individuals as leaders could be, and each member of the congregations could be,-- if they were taught and applied NOT just a narrow section of those rules, but,-- *all* of the forensic principles.

There are at least three or four levels of the forensic rules. The highest level, of those four levels of rules, containing three rules, are always kept a close and closed secret by those who know them. There's good reason for this. *First* of all, properly understood, most would consider those first three rules to be *subversive*, indeed running contrary to all we are by the ruling class elite carefully teach (*condition*) us to believe true, to think, to do, and NOT do. *Second*, if any one or all of those three first rules of forensics were revealed to anyone, whether highly educated and of high I.Q. (etc.), down to the least able and educated,-- most couldn't even understand them, and wouldn't believe any of it to be true, or correct, or even plausible. *Third*, the first of those three highest rules is so simple that most would (a) believe that the whole forensic system is ludicrous, absurd, preposterous, and thus implausible, unworkable, and unproductive, and (b) couldn't properly understand the first rule, absent knowing the two other of the first three rules,-- and what they **mean**, and couldn't understand what the second and third of the three rules means absent knowing the first and what it **means**. *Fourth*, absent learning the least of the forensic rules, first, the fourth, then the third, then the second level of those rules,-- any listener would probably report the speaker or writer to the police !, or maybe the nearest insane asylum. "Insanity seems normal to itself" (Postman & Weingartner, LINGUISTICS, Delta, 1966; cf. THE INSANITY OF NORMALITY, 1992, etc., supra^; o.c.o.).

I will give you a hint. The lowest (say fourth) level of the forensic, scientific, empirical, rules are those found in the scientific text books, mathematical texts, etc*. The second lowest or third level of forensic rules are found only in the works of certain philosophers. It's my opinion that contrary to Prof. Paulo Freire's admonitions, few if any common folk could understand and well and productively apply the highest order of the forensic rules absent basic knowledge of the sciences and mathematics. That's why I do NOT reveal the highest levels of the forensic rules to any one who has NOT attended my lectures on those two lower levels of the forensic rules.

* Profs. Postman & Weingartner in the 1966 works^, hold that (a) Linguistics is "knowledge critiquing knowledge", "science critiquing" science", and thus, "Thinking about thinking"* [cf. also, Thinking, writing, and speaking about thinking {me}].

* Cf. Prof. Alan W. Watts, THE WISDOM OF INSECURITY, Vintage, 1951; Thadeus Golas, THE POOR MAN'S GUIDE TO ENLIGHTENMENT, (c.1970/71). These are of the lowest priority, please. The highest priority books are the works of Freire, Reichenbach, Marcuse, Rodgers, Spragens, etc.

**3**
**4**
**5**
**6**
**7**
**8**

## Corporations

The crown, state, and their governments are corporations[1]. Now the state (*estate; l'etat*) jealously exercises its exclusive ownership or control of everything in, on, and above the Earth, and ownership and control of the Earth itself[2], and as well, the ownership and control[3] of all natural born individuals as its (Hamurabbi's estate's) **slaves**. Egads !

---

**1** Chisholm v. Georgia 1793 - 2 US 419

**2** Prof. Norbert Elias, POWER & CIVILITY, v.2, Oxf.Univ.Pr., 1938; in light of Garcia v. San Antonio 1985 that reminds us that all of the state's (*estate's*) power resides in and arises out of (emerges from) the state's ownership or control* of its *property*.

* The rule is however that in Law,-- there is NO such thing as ownership of property,-- only possession and thus "control" (cf. trust salesmens' sales pitch),-- although the judges of the courts of justice (infra)* officially (but NOT judicially) notice and if NOT *properly* challenged sub silentio (secretly; off the record) enforce the state's claim to ownership of all of the world's property, in all of its forms, whether real, chattel, tangible, intangible (cf. Frost v. CRC, 271 US 583, 596.7-597 [1927]).

US. Railroad Commission of State of California

* Throughout history, all the way back to Hamurabbi and through today, and without exception, all of the world's courts that were legislated into existence were/are nothing more than mere administrative (NON-judicial fact-finding/rule-making*) agencies**

* cf. 5 USC 554 (hearings) and 5 USC 553 (rule making), and the fundamental law underlying, and out of which, those code provisions* (see their parent legislation) were derived,-- that govern all other administrative agencies, which underlying law (cf. the law merchant and its Renaissance pie powder [pied poudre] court decisions and opinions***, etc.) in my opinion -- govern all courts of justice (trial and appellate: administrative) courts. What do courts of justice (administrative courts) administer ? Hamurabbi's original thus still extant and governing one-world state (*estate*).

* cf. West's US Code Annotated (USCA) Title 5 USC 101-559, 701-706 and the state, county, city, and D.C.'s analog code provisions; Prof. Bernard Schwartz, W. Gellhorn, K.C. Davis, works; o.c.o.

** PMA v. Kennedy, NY fed. 1979; Peo. v. Cull., NY 1961

*** Properly understood (and when legislatures are proceeding properly: in order to protect the involved constitutional state*),-- judges first declare the law on a case-by-case basis, which court decisions and opinions are later adopted by legislatures and restated/declared in (put into) their legislation, statutes, ordinances, code, and administrative rules and regulations books.

* The problem is that immediately upon being installed in their offices and agencies, etc.,-- those supposed governmental officers through abject ignorance or as conspirators and thieves, through stupid decisions and acts, and improper legislation,-- personally begin using up, depleting, and dismantling (**destroying**) that very same constitutional state (Elias, supra). Under the old, or through new legislation*, those statists begin to (i) dismantle the involve constitutional state (estate) and (ii) begin setting up their own constitutional state (estate)—whether they know or intend it or not. This the judges would be forced to declare as true (to be the law)-- if the question was ever *properly* brought before them.

* Note that (a) all constitutions are legislation, and (b) often states (estates) are established by legislatures through separate legislation.

**3** The ownership and control of all human beings, each and every natural born individual includes the power (cf. discretion) to enslave, fleece, and even *destroy* them*

* Crandall v. Nev., Enoch v. Wms. infra; compare the principles declared in that class of cases (supra/infra: q.v.) with those in Prof. Hans Reichenbach's THE RISE OF SCIENTIFIC PHILOSOPHY, U.Cal.Pr. 1951/55 ed.), remembering and applying (a) what Prof. Erich Fromm's statement that, when you find two or more

That is to say, the state (*estate*), rather the governing statists[1],-- consider all individuals to be slaves, as the property of their state (*estate*)

great authorities agreeing on the same posit, or independently arriving at the same conclusion,-- you can bet your booty that you've found the *natural law* of it, and (b) the rule of evidence and proofs known as Occam's (the *earl* of Occam's*) Razor, which has three (3) main elements, one of which (i) requires, and (ii) limits to two (2) all witnesses to and proofs of a single point.

It must be noted that properly proceeding, scientists are judges, and judges are scientists (cf. the empirical [the empire's state's] method of seeking, finding, testing, proving, refining, and applying forensic truths, as *precedents* -- in order to answer questions, solve problems,-- thereby discovering even more new truths, principles, laws, and so on repeated over and over again and again ad infinitum; the Cossack name for which is Pravda, the continual and unending search for truth, which Aristotle and Prof. R. Ardrey call "true knowledge", better said "more certain truth" [cf. the Cossack/Viking/**Law** story told by Prof. Henry Muscow, in, RUSSIA UNDER THE C**ZAR**S, HP, 1965; o.c.o.).

* The earl of Ockham was the chief judge of the trial, and appellate (superior/supreme) court of the area, parish, *dioces* (cf. *pope* [***Baba***] *Diocletian's* administrative district), county*, etc., known as Ockham (incorrectly spelled Occam).

* Remember that in England the Kings and Queens came and went, each switching things back and forth between Catholicism, and its languages, names/labels, and Protestantism (might as well be catholic [cf. Prof. Charles Beard, W. Durant, works; o.c.o.) and its languages and names/labels.

**1** The state (*estate*) being a corporation*, and all corporations being a fiction** (myth, lie, fraud),-- like all corporations,-- canNOT whatsoever act on its own, but must act through human agency [people] (Corporate Law 101/501).

I might as well discuss here what constitutions really are, (a) a written constitution such as the American kind are at the same moment a number of seemingly different things,-- not only mere legislation, but are trusts, corporate charters (corporations), administrative codes, assurance, ensurance, and insurance policies, etc., etc., ad infinitum. They are also by-laws, subsidiary to the and all related prior charters (cf. constitutions), such as the early British crown, royal, and parliamentary, Scandinavian, and continental charters, quite as are the by-laws adopted by a trust's trustees,-- those charters running all the way back to Hamurabbi's first, the world's **original** one-world constitution, one-world trust estate (one-world corporate charter), one-world administrative code, etc. Egads !, (b) another form of constitution is the "unwritten" constitution, such as England's, made up of already extant precedents,-- coupled with the common law (the court decisions), etc., and it also appears that other forms exist.

* Chisholm v. Ga. 1793

** Statists, in order to hide what they are really up to,-- invented the phrase -- "corporations are fictions of the **law**", which means fictions created by *legislation*, whereas to the contrary,-- we know that legislation is NOT law, so in the technical sense,-- corporations are NOT "fictions of the **law**" as they claim. The state itself is a fiction (a fiction created by prior charters, etc.),-- so, all such state/government chartered corporations, being fictions (Corp. Law 101/501) are in reality fictions built upon (built by) fictions,-- fictions created by fictions (cf. "assumptions built upon presumptions"*, etc.). Such **lies** are cooked up in order to fool (**enslave**) the masses*, and to fool the NOT so perceptive or astute professionals, professors, lawyers, and judges. The early state/government chartered corporations held charters issued by direct legislation; now they are usually chartered by administrative agencies that "fill in the interstices ['houskeeping details'] of the parent enabling legislation as in Wyman v. Southard 1825

* For this and other such reasons, I coined the following phrase, "When it comes to the state and statists and all done and claimed by the state and statists,-- the substance of the matter is their,-- total lack of substance".

Well, this is enough for now. No doubt there will be more as we go along.

Looking forward to seeing you again, and more often, or conversations, and,-- giving you some insights as to what's really going on in the world. I of course appreciate what you have been sharing with me in the way of your discoveries and conclusions.

I'm especially proud of a number of my discoveries, including the fact that under international law, today's states and governments are in reality,-- Hamurabbi's Babylon's **original** state/government/religion preserved, throughout history continued, and projected into and governing today's state/government, and the world's religions (re-legion).

I will have some things for you to read while we are together, but which due to security needs,-- I can't let out for any reason.

---

The *only true* substance (that which is substantive) is the natural law, that which is based upon natural law, that which arises out of the natural law, that which restates the natural law, such as the common law* (cf. Fortescue, Y.B. 1458 in light of Bank v. Peavey, 64 F 912 ( ), US v. Hopkins, NY fed. 1912, Morgan v. US 1954, Basso v. UPLC, 10CA 1974, etc., etc., ad infinitum.

* Properly understood,-- the common law is a restatement of the natural law of man, the individual's right to exist, be free, and to defend (*me* [we however need more substantive quotes and cites in support of my conclusion/statement; I think I read it in some form in Puterbaugh's or Koffler's and Reppy's common law pleading books, or elsewhere]).

1

**Supplement**

The state and its governments as corporations are not only the parent creators of all of the commercial and industrial corporations that they charter,-- but those states are the *owners* of all (each and every one) of those corporations, and thus and otherwise[1] *control* all of them,-- even corporate the press, media, cinema, theatre, etc., and those institutions and individuals that act as such.

That is to say, all commercial and industrial corporations are owned by and are thus the property of the chartering state[2],-- owned and controlled by the involved state and governments. It is therefore clear, that as far as the incorporated press,-- as a matter of Law[3],-- there is NO such thing as a free and uncontrolled media and press,-- NO such thing as a "free press". Egads !

Properly understood,-- all commercial and industrial corporations are collectives, communes, Communistic (totalitarian[3] monopoly) entities[4].

Being owned and controlled by the parent creator states, and otherwise,-- all commercial and industrial states in all matters, interests, and endeavors conduct only state/governmental business.[5] Egads !

That means that, and contrary to popular belief,-- all state/governmentally chartered corporations are NOT whatsoever engaged in free enterprise, the free market, or private enterprise. Egads !

---

**1** Frost v. CRC, 271 US 583, 596.7-597 (1927); Prof. Norbert Elias, POWER & CIVILITY, v.2, Oxf.Univ.Pr. 1938

**2** What "law" ? I thought that "legislation is NOT law" ! (cites omitted). So if legislation is NOT law, thus legislators/legislatures do NOT, indeed canNOT declare what the law is,-- just exactly who has the power to declare the law ? "Sir, the law is as I say it is…"* Only certain judges of certain courts have the power to declare what the law is, and it is my opinion that, properly understood,-- do so only when (a) acting judicially, and (b) *properly* hearing, deciding, declaring, and filing the written opinion that jurisdiction does NOT exist over the natural born individual;-- that's the only law there is when it comes to the natural born individual, outside of the common law forms, the language of which constitutes the unavoidably and inescapably and inabrogable and unrepealable court-binding **Law** itself (cf. Morgan v. US 1954; o.c.o, in light of all of the **nexus** cases, etc.).

* Lord Chancellor John Mansfield, Chief Justice (Engl.), Year Book 1458; o.c.o.

**3** As a matter of the court decisions and opinions, noting that (a) legislation is NOT law, (b) legislators/legislatures/legislation do NOT declare what the law is and (c) only certain judges of certain courts under certain circumstances have the power to declare what the law is (c.o.).

**4**

**5**

Even more shocking,-- many high academic authorities at the doctorate levels, and high legal authorities declare that due to the above facts,-- Communist Russia (Communism), Red China, Castro's Cuba, etc.,-- are more capitalistic than the U.S.A., and western analogs, that Communism is in fact more mature and advanced capitalism, whilst the USA and western corporate monopoly capitalism is rather,-- less mature, less advanced fascism, Communism, Nazism. Egads !!

Regarding the program you are establishing for yourself and suggest for me,-- there's a major problem with many facets, or to put it another way,-- there are many problems of many different sorts, that prevent me from participating in the program you have laid out for yourself.

I have my own plan, agenda, goals, and methods, and have little or NO time for anything else.

NO longer do I have the interests that I had before, and NO longer do I have the same priorities. Basically, my interests have expanded, relegating some to the NOT so important as before,-- a matter of *changed* priorities.

Although my long term goals are the same, my perspective, view, vantage point is different[1]. Further, I now employ a different, rather a more *holistic*[2] methodology, -- known as the empirical, forensic, scientific method which is a more *simple* method[3], yet a more *holistic* method.[4]

I also feel that the same problems exist today that existed when the Roman empire fell, as with all empires before and since, namely, the fall of the original, the Old Israelites, thus after 6,000 years, little has changed, wherefore I feel that there is NO rush, that I indeed do have time to get it all done, and done right.

**1** Prof. John Dewey, EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE, Oxf.Univ.Pr. 1927
**2** After I. Berlin, infra (cf. Postman & Weingartner, A. Gruen, R. Olson, infra).
**3** (a) the scientific, forensic, empirical methods are NOT different whatsoever, but are one and the exact same thing in *substance* (**origin**, operation, and end effect),-- differing only in mere *form*, mere labels, the names affixed to them by conspirators and the ignorant, and (b) The strictly "legal" method (forms) that I prior employed is however severely limited in its effectiveness.

I am instructed that the purely "legal" method past employed is NOT whole, NOT *holistic*, as reflecting the rather unwhole understanding (ignorance) that I had in the past,-- although I was doing the right thing with what I knew at the time, and in that,-- I was light years ahead of other activists playing the same *game* ("Everything that we are engaged in is nothing more than mere *gamesmanship*" [cf. Prof. Neil Postman & Charles Weingartner, LINGUISTICS, Delta, 1966]).

**4** Cf. Prof. Isaiah Berlin, THE AGE OF ELIGHTENMENT, ( ); o.c.o.

The method I am using has a number of major and lessor elements; the two major elements pertinent here being *integration* and *synthesis* (c.o.).

*Integration* is the system by and point at which all that one knows about that which is under study or of concern is put together, like a jigsaw puzzle.

*Synthesis* is arriving at a *correct* conclusion as to what it all **means**,-- the point at which the picture of it all becomes evident (c.o.).

The system that I am committed to is much more simple than that which was pursued by you, c.1989, in that it is based on a single statement in a single case, **Diblee** v. **Davison**[1], that, in order to properly challenge jurisdiction -- it must be done through a common law plea to the jurisdiction--that counters every fact on the record before the court judge, from which facts the judge can *reasonably* determine decide conclude that jurisdiction exists.

It appears however that since the rather recent advent of the "declaratory remedy" legislation, and its refinement by the courts,-- the above idea though NOT the common law form, can be, indeed must be used to lay the foundation for a proper challenge to jurisdiction, by petitioning for a determination by the judge whether or not a *nexus* (substantial relationship) exists between the petitioner and the state and or its agency government or governments.

A question arises at this point, that must be discussed and solved: How does the petitioner in a declaratory judgment case have the judge determine the **civil**, as well as the **criminal** aspects of proofs of the existence of the *nexus*,-- the first (**civil**, cf. *administrative*) requiring proofs only to a "preponderance of evidence", the second (**criminal**), requiring proofs "beyond reasonable doubt", a stumbling block more difficult for our enemies to overcome.

The apparent answer seems quite simple, that nexus is nexus, without which there can be NO claim to or proof of the existence of any jurisdiction whatsoever over the natural born individual[2].

---

**1** Diblee v. Davison[1], 25 Ill. 486 (1861). All such cases must be copied, read, analyzed, and **Shepardized.**

**2** For a definition of "individual" good for activists, see BALLENTINE'S LAW DICTIONARY, 3d. ed., 1969; while there see "special [*administrative*] proceeding", remembering that all courts are administrative agencies (c.o.).

I think the procedure by which we find out what's on the said record, and in the judges' mind is (a) *oyer*[1], and (b) demands for findings of facts, and conclusions of law.

The petitioner and ultimately all activists must discover the procedure that forces the judge to produce the proper findings of facts and conclusions of law.[2]

My new method requires NO consternation over, and NO on the record anticipation of, or written rebuttal (affidavit) against, what (the facts that) may be on the record that is before the judge and from which record/facts the judge can base a conclusion (decision) that a nexus exists.

Therefore,-- up front, from the petitioner,-- NO technical or lengthy or other affidavit is required.

The question of proofs of any supposed *jurisdiction* should **NOT** be brought up in the initial petition; it may be raised later by amended/supplemented petition (q.v.).

This new approach has many tactical/strategic advantages, which should be discussed and further investigated.

An affidavit may be required later, however,-- once petitioner *forces* the judge to revel what's being *officially* noticed[2] (if any there may be) that constitutes the *condition precedent* (required) *nexus*, which ultimately creates, or constitutes, or is analogous to, or upon which is based,-- the threatening/claimed/asserted, but challenged jurisdiction.

Without more[3,4], NO trial or appellate judge/judges act *judicially*; without more (supra), in all matters, they act only *administratively*[5,6]). Judges, along with any intervening

**2** The judges at all levels will resist this legal requirement. The activist must thus become familiar with the legal proceedings/remedies by which judges can be forced to provide such a record, and it should be written (NOT just provided orally) and under seal of the judge and court.

**3** Without the proper common law pleadings. I found one famous authority that says that the common law is an inseparable part of Roman Law (sic*) that every nation in the world has adopted (c.o.).

* "Legislation is NOT law" (c.o.).

**4** A lot of cases hold or imply that the involved administrative agency, and civil and trial and appellate courts are bound to sua sponte search the record for the proper condition precedent* proofs of the existence of the supposed jurisdiction,-- NOT waiting for a litigant to raise the issue. They NEVER do however. So, it's up to the victim litigant to raise it. POLICE MISCONDUCT, MB, c.1983 ed., says that such defenses should NOT be raised at the criminal trial levels, but should be raised by collateral attack. The declaratory relief remedy seems to me to be just that,-- in the nature of a collateral attack, maybe NOT,-- but even better !

* Cf. "prior hearing" (c.o.).

**5** c.o.

**6** *All* of the world's, USA's, US's (there's a big difference between those two, and D.C.'s), D.C.'s, trial, and appellate (superior/supreme*) courts act only *administratively* because they are totally without delegated or inherent *judicial* power, and without more (supra)-- cannot whatsoever receive truly