and otherwise interfering governmental agents,-- will do everything possible to discourage, frustrate, and derail

judicial (cf. discretionary**) power. Where it is said that a truly judicial court has "discretion", it means discretion (power) to step out of its (the judge's, otherwise unavoidably and inescapably mandated *ministerial*) power in order to act judicially, which means to JUDICIALLY notice facts that a ministerial (Hamurabbi's trust estate) court (cour of justice) canNOT,-- mainly that (a) Hamurabbi's idea of the state (upon which the "modern" sic state and government is based, and all that it claims and does)-- is a totally insubstantive myth, farce, lie, **fraud**, and (b) all that follows that realization, such as jurisdiction and discretion,-- does NOT in reality (in law) whatsoever exist.
* Properly understood, a "superior" court* is the local supreme court.
* Properly understood, (**a**) a county superior court is the county's supreme court, and should be treated and described as such. Few professors, lawyers, and judges, and even fewer activists know these however very important and governing distinctions and facts. County superior courts have inherent review/appellate power over the local trial (inferior) courts below. In New York, the New York Court of Appeals, is New York state's Supreme Court. Here we see the "substance governs over mere form, mere labels (c.o.) rule in action; it doesn't matter what the name of the court is, it's its **origin**, operation, and effect that counts,-- NOT the label ! The term *superior* and *supreme* thus mean the exact same thing. A twist is thrown into it all by states that have regional appellate courts; they are superior (supreme) in nature but only at the *interim* level. It must be remembered however that without more,-- *all** of the world's and the USA's, US's, D.C.'s, and other trial, and appellate (superior/supreme) courts are mere and totally NON-judicial administrative (fact finding and rule making: ministerial) agencies. They are also known as "courts of *justice*". This is important, because,-- that *ultimately* tells us something very important, requiring us to ask *ourselves* (Profs. J.-P. Liminet; Umberto Eco) and answer the following questions (id.): (a) since courts of justice are administrative agencies,-- what do they administer ? They administer Hamurabbi's **original** one-world state (estate; l'etat) (c.o.), (b) If courts of *justice* administer Hamurabbi's estate, what is "justice" ? Justice means absolutely NOTHING whatsoever more than the administration of Hamurabbi's state (estate), Hamurabbi's one world state (estate) of slaves (universal slavery *cato*). Egads!, and (**b**) an appellate court does NOT have jurisdiction if the trial court does not. Without more (supra), an appellate court's jurisdiction is derived from and based upon the trial court's jurisdiction (Knibb, FEDERAL COURT OF APPEALS MANUAL, West, 1981, §4.13)-- neither of which have jurisdiction without proof of **nexus**/jurisdiction appearing on the *condition precedent* records (cf. the "prior hearing" cases, c.1969).
* There may be exceptions to every rule that I repeat in these papers and lectures, but if such exceptions do exist,-- they will be very rare (when in New England be especially careful in applying such principles).
** This "discretion" thing can be confusing*. All administrative agencies, including all trial, and appellate (superior/supreme) courts, have little or NO discretion in most matters, thus they are called "*ministerial*" agencies, as "*administering*" the state (*estate*), which means Hamurabbi's **original***,-- the world's **first** and one and only one-world estate (one-world state), one-world government, one-world state (estate) of slaves ! Egads !! For example one case citing two others says, "Courts of justice [trial, and appellate {superior/supreme}] are bound to consider [*officially* notice] that the ancient [cf. Hamu*rabbi's*] state of affairs [the state of slavery] [and impose that fact {true or *false*} on all litigants --] as remaining unaltered" (c.o.; o.c.o.). Egads ! Thus another authority says, "Roman law is one of strict precedents", one of which strict precedents is that "slaves [citizens] are strictly rightless" (c.o.; emphasis added). All such agencies (including courts of justice) have discretion to fashion policy, but only *within* the governing precedents, the main precedent being that,-- they are all administering Hamurabbi's one-world slave state (estate of slaves) *cato*.
* First of all, in law,-- *politics* means *discretion*, *political* means *discretionary* (c.o.),-- the state's (estate's) discretion to do as it pleases

this kind of litigation, and its end effect,-- the exposing and destruction of the power of the ruling class elite, and the elevation of common man to his and her rightful place, -- true freedom, and will even attack the petitioner[6].

In his famous book, …THE WEALTH OF NATIONS, among the first of the scientific books on *economics* (which is just another name [label] for] *politics*[7]: corporate [collectivist,

---

with everything and everybody,-- including you (your Person, Life, Freedom, and Propety*),-- even unto their (your) total **destruction** (Crandall v. Nev. 1869; Enoch v. Wms. Fla. fed. 1962). So, one might think that administrative agencies thus have lots of discretion. NOT so. Originally the state's power (politics) was unlimited; but having a written constitution (a high and somewhat governing form of legislation/Roman law [sic])-- that otherwise totally unlimited discretion is as a result now quite limited.

* In law, your Person is defined as made up of three (3) elements, (i) your Life, (ii) "liberty"* sic (FREEDOM !), and (iii) Property** (c.o.).

* Watch out for that one ! Prof. T.H. Greer (MSU) reminds us that a "liberty" is a jurisdiction creating grant of privilege/franchise. Egads ! So we can't repeat that word where everyone else has been so carefully and craftily conditioned to ~~is~~ use it in, "Life, *Liberty*, and Property" etc. If an individual makes such a statement, it admits the jurisdiction of the state. Ignorance enslaves (cf. Napoleon, works); Forensic truths set you free.

** Cf. Lynch v. HFC, 1972, p.552; o.c.o.

*** Note that I herein stress the "**original**". Forensic Rules: (b) The substance (law, natural law) of a matter is found in its **origin**, operation, and end effect (related legal maxim: Law looks to the past [history is the law; history is law]), (a) *Substance* governs over mere *form*, mere *labels*, mere forensically (scientifically, empirically) untested /unproven biases, prejudices, opinions, practices, traditions*, "theories", *recitals* (mere recitals fall upon challenge [case law cites omitted]), etc.; (c) The substance of a matter is what it **means**, its truth, reality, law, *natural law*, end effect, the *isness* of it, (d) ...

* For an example of a forensically tested and proven to be *true tradition*, cf. Bank v. Peavey 64 F 911 ( ) in light of US v. Hopkins, NY fed. c.1912; Mc Kyring v. Bull (NY ?, maybe US Reports, 1857).

6 Adam Smith, …THE WEALTH OF NATIONS, Scotland, 1776; o.c.o.

7 It goes like this, (a) Economics is defined as "the dreary *science*"* (c.o.) "of who gets what" (c.o.); (b) having the power to determine who gets what**, presupposes *discretion*, (c) in law, *discretion* is defined as *politics* (c.o.), wherefore,-- economics is politics, politics is economics. This is a form of syllogism: If (a) and (b), then (c); study syllogisms, metaphors, aphorisms.

* True science presupposes the scientific method: employing scientific *precedents* that are tracked back all the way back through history to Pythagoras experimenting with vibrating gut strings, observing and recording the changes in pitch of sound and wavelengths resulting from changes in the tightness of those strings (c.550BC; the same period as Sun Tzu [THE ART OF WAR]); c.o.

** Who gets what is determined by the emperor, and sometimes his agents such as kings, queens, nobility, etc. (**cf.** the *etymology* of *arch*, mon*arch* [monok], *arcade*, empressario, impressment* (cf. 6 Anne 37, which in a few words, merely restates many other principles that throughout history were adopted in order to protect the *constitutional* state (Hamurabbi's estate**) and the empires (states [estates]) later established, which at best are mere and illegitimate fragments of Hamurabbi's original one-world *state* (one-world *estate*),-- which is doing its best to return to (coalesce) into its original one-world form (c.o.), through what is now the "European Union", noting that in 1993, secular humanists Prof. Avram *Noam* Chomsky & David Barsamian warned that the ruling class elite is about to install a one-world dictator (c.o.),-- backing up the "Christian" Prof. John Wesley White, in THE COMING WORLD DICTATOR, Bethany Fellowship, 1980). Note here that true secular humanists (enlightened liberals) abhor politics, politicians, political liberals, and political conservatives,

Communistic {*totalitarian*[8] monopoly] *commerce* (admiralty), -- Adam Smith warns that,-- when one attmpts to get to the heart (*substance*, truth, reality, natural law) of things, -- especially in what is labeled "*economics*" [which is in reality, politics[9]]-- that individual will be targeted by the ruling class elite and their agents, lackeys, and dupes, vilified, otherwise attacked, and even **assassinated** (cf. the assassination of Karen Silkwood[10] a few years back).

All attacks against *whistle-blowers* (activists) occur in spite of there being administrative, civil, and criminal rules, regulations, legislation, remedies, and penalties purporting to protect those *whistleblowers*; cf. also the corporate and governmental (what's the difference ? absolutely **NOTHING** !) attacks against the freedom seekers, including Gordon von Kahl, his son Yori, c.1986, and the more recent government (corporate, collectivist, Communistic: *totalitarian*) attacks, such as the mass murder at Waco, Texas, the Ruby Ridge murders and maiming. Nowhere on any condition precedent record, does any of the required proofs of *nexus* (cf. jurisdiction) exist as required by the various provisions of legislation, the codes, administrative agency and the judges'/court's decisions and opinions (c.o.).

-- wind up restating, however as the state's highest, even court-binding authorities,-- just about everything that conservatives, the right, and Christian fundamentalists rail about. Wherefore the right etc., should be reading those guys' and gals' books, and citing them as, in fact, court-persuading, court-binding authority in their works and court papers, etc.

Research

* Cf. 6 Anne 37 (Engl., c.1700-1715), prohibiting impressments, which legislation still governs the America, and world for that matter, as part of the pre-1787-1789 common law* (cf. Prof. K.D. Bowen's John Adams biography on how John Adams used this statute to defeat a criminal charge against one of those known as a founding father. When John Adams, at trial, opened the statute book to 6 Anne 37,-- "the judges were seen to flee from the room !").

* Any such legislation that early on became a part of the governing common law canNOT later or now or hereafter be repealed, diminished, abrogated, or ignored by the state's officials, but must be strictly enforced (c.o.). Statists "have buried the common law, but the common law rules us from its grave (c.o.).

** Although most such more recent authorities adopted or restated those principles in order to protect their own period's state (nation),-- in those authorities' ignorance of history and law,-- they failed to realize that they were actually protecting Hamurabbi's state (estate; l'etat), wholly or in part.

8 Mussolini personally coined the word "totalitarian" so that nobody ever again would forget or mistake what *all* state chartered, acquiesced in, and ratified (cf. quasi) corporations really are (collectives, communes, Communistic [exclusive monopoly: *totalitarian*] entities, and what they are really up to,-- the total enslavement, fleecing, and destruction of the natural born individual (c.o.).

9 See n.6 above

10 A couple of decades ago, Karen Silkwood was assassinated by an agent of the corporation that employed her,-- when she threatened to blow the whistle on the dangerous conditions at and the pollution turned loose on the land by that corporation. The problem here is that all such commercial and industrial corporations are not only controlled, but wholly and exclusively owned by the parent creator (chartering) state/government, and NOT by the shareholders*, wherefore

Once the judge decides that NO nexus exists, and properly files the written decision with the *required* supporting findings of facts and conclusions of law in the proper court record,-- it is my opinion that a certified copy of that record can be used to defeat any and all past, threatened, and future administrative, civil, and criminal claims or charges, for want of nexus, want of jurisdiction.

NOTE: The question of whether jurisdiction exists should ***NOT*** be raised on the face of the *initial* petition; only the matter of the existence of a **nexus** can be addressed.

NOTE: It is my opinion that all issues in the initial petition for declaratory remedy/relief must be presented as **questions** that require a **yes** or **no** answer.

It is my opinion that the above rule should be employed, where possible, in all forms and levels of litigation.

Regarding on the record facts upon which a judge can base a decision that a *nexus* exists,-- we however know that there can be NO such facts,-- because when it comes to the natural born individual,-- such facts not only do NOT exist,-- they can't exist[1], because as a matter of law (a matter of case law[2]), absent more,-- NO legislation[3] whatsoever can contemplate the natural born individual, but contemplates and applies only to the state (*estate*; l'etat), its *property* (note the *redundancy*), and the governmental offices/officers into whose hands they are placed for administration, maintenance, and safekeeping,[4] (and *disposal* [cf. Article VI of the 1789 Constitution][5]).

---

through its agency commercial/industrial monopoly (totalitarian) corporations, -- proceed against individuals and otherwise do things that are forbidden to the state/government not only by their own constitutions, legislation, and court decisions but international law as well,-- all of which violated principles, and other principles properly understood, were and are adopted solely and exclusively for the purpose of protecting not only Hamurabbi's state (the state [estate] parent to all others, even through today),-- but each such subsidiary state (estate) such as the United States, United States of America, the District of Columbia, etc., European Union, etc., etc., ad infinitum.
* Corporate shareholders have NOT ownership, but equitable (inchoate) interest in the profits of corporations and nothing more.

1 See Bank of Augusta v. Earle 1839 in light of Ramsay v. Allegre 1827 (the early *nexus* cases) in light of Basso v. UPLC, 10CA fed. 1974 (a later nexus case) and all other cases on the subject of jurisdiction including but NOT limited to those that you have cited in your works, but see 9 Op.AG 32 (1857) in light of US v. cash/car, 37 FRD 5 64, 565-566 (1965) in light of Swanson v. Fuline, NY fed. 1965, in light of the general principles of contract law.

Note: A **license** *may* constitute a **nexus**, but there are defenses against applying such things to the freedom seeking natural born individual* activist (cf. Long v. Rasmussen, Mont. fed. c.1921/22 class of cases, such as Cap. (EMI) v. Bennett, Economy Plumbing v. US (both F2d, 1982/71 respectively); cf. Stanton v. Ash (fed.); cf. also the said affidavit's content.

The problem is that, without more (without the *proper* **common law** pleadings) in all other (non-common law; non judicial) litigation,-- all trial and appellate court judges, are NOT required to act judicially, but act only administratively[1], have unbridled discretion to do as they willy-nilly please, including discretion to officially ("judicially" sic) notice whatever they want in order to make out jurisdiction, through (however incorrect, and ultimately illegal) presumptions, assumptions, etc., and presumption upon presumption and assumption upon assumption, etc., etc. ad infinitum.

---

* Cf. definition of individual in BALLENTINE'S LAW DICTIONARY, 3d.ed. 1969 !

2 (a) Legislation is NOT law (c.o.); (b) Legislatures do NOT, indeed canNOT declare what the law is, (c) "Sir, the law is as I say it is…" (c.o.); (d) only certain judges of certain courts under certain circumstances have the power to declare what the law is (e) it appears that such courts are (i) the truly judicial courts, and (ii) although having NO inherent judicial power whatsoever, and without more canNOT whatsoever receive any truly judicial power,-- a mere trial, or appellate (*administrative**) court can in certain circumstances act judicially, when declaring that jurisdiction does NOT exist. Do NOT confuse with "quasi-judicial" (fake judicial) power.

* Without exception,-- *all* of the world's and the USA's/US's/D.C.'s mere *trial* and *appellate* (superior/supreme) courts are nothing more than totally **NON**-judicial *administrative* (fact-finding/rule-making) agencies*, that hold only "special [*administrative*] proceedings"**,-- all such courts being private qui tam admiralty informers' courts (PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, [1965]). Egads !

* PMA v. Kennedy, NY fed. 1979; Peo. v. Cull., NY 1961, cf. n.3* below>).

** cf. BALLENTINE'S LAW DICTIONARY), their judges nothing more than mere "hearing examiners" (cf. Revil v. Petit, 6 Ky. 314).

3 Including all of legislation's *subsidiary* administrative agency* rules, regulations, hearings, decisions, and opinions (as expressed and implied in Wyman v. Southard 1925; cf. Profs. B. Schwartz, W. Gellhorn, K.C. Davis, works; West's US [*federal*?] Code Annotated [USCA], Title 5 USC 101-559, 701-706, and the local, city, county, and *national* analogs; eg. Wa.: RCW).

* See PMA v. Kennedy, NY fed. 1979; Peo. v. Cull., NY 1961; compare the principles in, Re. Smiley, 35 Wa.2d 863, 316 P2d 212 (19); o.c.o.

4 15 Op.AG 262 (1877); 17 Op.AG 525 (1883), cf. Warren v. City, 444 A2dd 1 (1981).

5 Cf. the moron if not conspirator Jimmy Carter's give away of the Panam Canal, which the leaders of Panama immediately turned over to the Red Chinese COMMUNISTS, for administration and profit-taking. Egads !

Op.AG means the U.S. Attorney General Opinions; case law holds that they are as effective as case law, but see Peo. v. Sims, Calif. Fall, 1982 on the limitations on applying case law, in light of Karlen, PROCEDURE BEFORE TRIAL, West, Nutshell Series, 1972 on *direct* application vs. by *analogy*.

* Apply, but be careful how (the context in which) you present, the *inverse* language to the same effect in Hale v. Henkel 1905, "The state owes nothing to the individual for it receives nothing therefrom", and "The individual owes nothing from the state for he receives nothing therefrom" respectively. Wow !

1 PMA v. Kennedy, NY fed. 1979, Peo. v. Cull., 1961

The first thing a judge "officially"[1] notices, is that, -- the individual who is appearing in the judge's own *private* court[2], which is a **qui tam** ("Me too"--"Let me fleece 'em too") admiralty (the admirable ones'; the ruling class elite's, *informer* court[3],-- in which everything and everybody is presumed to be NOTHING more than mere property[4] (property in the form of slaves, and in your case, the judges officially noticing that,-- you are nothing more than mere property,-- a ***slave***. Egads !

---

1 It doesn't matter what the judge calls (***labels****) it; if a single judge** at trial uses the phrase "judicial review" he/she is either lying, or is an ignoramus,-- who doesn't know the difference between official and true "judicial notice",-- which only a *truly* judicial (common law) court can effect.

* Substance governs over mere form, mere ***labels****, opinions, biases, prejudices, and all other things that are NOT critically tested and proven to comport with or emerge from or are based upon or declare the natural law, such as many common traditions (cf. Prof. H.L. Menken, and the Huxleys who railed against all such critically untested and un-proven practices and traditions).

For an example of a forensically (critically) tested and proven tradition, see Bank v. Peavey, 64 F 912 ( ) in light of US v. Hopkins, NY 1912, Basso v. UPLC, 10CA fed. 1974, Morgan v. US 1954; o.c.o.

* PMA v. Kennedy, NY fed. 1972, Peo. v. Cull., NY 1961, Crandall v. Nevada, 73 US 35, 46 (1869); compare re. Smiley, 35 Wa.2d 863, 316 P2d 212 ( ).

2 The state (estate) is a **private** trust, the settlors of which are the signators of the involved constitution (trust), thus the state's courts are private courts,-- the courts of those signators ("signatories")-- the private courts of those ruling elite persons (cf. PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, [1965] in light of US v. Mc Gill 1806; o.c.o.).

** Most trials are presided over by a single judge; all such trials are administrative*, NOT judicial.

* Those courts are "courts of justice" (cf. Kennett v. Chambers 1852); all of the world's and the USA's trial and appellate (superior/supreme) courts are administrative courts, NOT judicial courts. What do they administer ? Courts of justice administer,-- (a) primarily, Hamurabbi's original trust estate (*the* "state"). Therefore, the word "justice" does NOT mean what most people think it means; "justice" means *administration*, the administration of Hamurabbi's **original*** one-world state (*estate*), the one-world state of slaves, and (b) secondarily all of the (however, under international law, *illegitimate*) fragments of Hamurabbi's state (*estate***), those fragments now known now as the world's various "nation-states". Egads !

* The substance (meaning) of a matter (what it means, the truth, reality, natural law of it)-- is found in its **origin**, operation, and end effect q.v.

** Hamurabbi's trust estate, Hamurabbi's, the world's first and **original** written code and associated writings constituting the world's first and thus governing code, also being the world's first and **original** constitution by which all others are measured and come up short, and are restatements (declarations) thereof.

Lost text and notes, in apparent order

4 Originally, I concentrated on the law only, NOT knowing that the law that activists know and employ is just a part of the whole story, part of the whole picture, that,-- there is more to it all than that.

Further, the people I hung around with and believed in and depended upon told me to stay away from the works of those whom I now find most important, the *enlightened liberals** (*secular humanists***), such as Profs. Noam Chomsky, Erich, Fromm, John Kenneth Galbraith, and most others whom I now quote and cite in my works, whose works by the way are often court persuasive, even court-binding, quite as are legal precedents, expecially when the results are scientific principles, principles arrived at by the scientific method, which truths the state needs and depends upon for its survival, power, and growth (cf. Mao, works; cf. Frost v. CRC, 1927, p.583, at 596.7 - 597; o.c.o.).

* Do NOT confuse *enlightened* liberals with mere *political* liberals,-- the two being diametrically opposed and their goals and methods irreconcilable,-- political liberals being the **enslavers** as are political conservatives, the right, and religious fundamentalists the enslavers as well (cf. organized/revealed religions; as Hamurabbi put it, "re-legions" [cf. etymology*; epistemology, etiology, ontology, etc., as the sciences of "the possibility of knowledge" {cf. Prof. Steven Luper Foy, THE POSSIBILITY OF KNOWLEDGE, "Nozick's 'Brain in a Vat' theory", R&L, 1987; o.c.o;, cf. solopsists/solipsism, cf. Prof. Steven Hawking whining about solopsist criticism of his and other scientists' works}; o.c]).

* Etymology is the science of the **origin** and **original*** meaning of languages, words, phrases, phonemes, symbols, speech, writings, etc.

* Forensic rule: The *substance* of matters is found in their **origin**, operation, and end effect (cf. infra).

** The original of whom (I) now called "secular humanists" (cf. "enlightened liberals") (a) were the Catholic bishops and priests who first (a) read, translated, understood, and *applied* the ideas (cf. Roszak) found in the ancient Greek manuscripts, (b) challenged the authority of the catholic (universal: one-world) church (government), officers, religion, practices, and authority, (c) at the same time came up with the common law writs/remedies that even today govern the courts (Morgan v. US; o.c.o), (d) started the Renaissance, and the Reformation,-- and are still at it today,-- which is why throughout history and today, the chieftains of all of the world's religions cato -- so hate vilify them, (II) are responsible for establishing and maintaining *all* of today's freedoms, in spite of the world's ignorantizing and enslaving religions (*re-legions cato*), and (III) who in the same period developed the Magna Charta (c.1215-1226) upon which document many conservatives, the right, and religious fundamentalists (however improperly) quote and cite as establishing or restating their right to freedom, etc. Incorrectly ? Yes ! Legislation in all of its forms, including constitutions, *without more* (a *contract*; cf. 9 Op.AG 32 [1857]; US v. cash/car, 37 FRD 565-566 [1965] in light of Swanson v. Fuline, NY fed. 1965 on the purpose of the law merchant: to strictly enforce the provisions of contracts)-- does NOT apply to natural born individuals, but applies only to the involved constitutional state (*estate*) its *property*, and the few officers into whose hands that property is placed for administration, maintanance, and safekeeping (15 Op.AG 262 [1877]; 17 Op.AG 525 [1883]; Warren v. City, 444 A2d 1 [1981]; compare language in the latter cite with Hale v. Henkel 1905 for a big surprise, boost, encouragement, and boost !: "The state owes nothing to the individual for it receives nothing therefrom, and "The individual owes nothing to the state for he receives nothing therefrom" respectively).

Now the books that I mention at supra, among other things, say that,-- throughout history,-- mankind has been on the brink of total enslavement, avoiding slavery "only by the skin on their teeth"[1], but the fact that the ruling class elite enslavers must enlist the very people they intend to enslave, fleece, and destroy,-- to design, build, operate, and maintain the machines and systems of slavery[2] and destruction (including the state and government itself *cato*),-- those same people are thus able to anticipate, and figure out how to get around (avoid) that planned total enslavement, fleecing, and destruction.

Being free by a margin measured by the skin on one's teeth is however NOT enough. That is NOT true freedom.

Only by universal adoption of the forensic empirical scientific method[3] can you and I become and remain *truly* free.[4]

To divert for a moment, Ricardo, I recommend that you place the acquisition of the book entitled THE CELESTINE PROPHECY, and reading, annotating, and re-reading it,-- on your high priority list. Among other things it shows how revolution in all of its forms is useless, is part of the political process upon which statists, the ruling class elite depend for tightening the noose around our necks, etc. We bought the Spanish language version for some folks in Peru, but found that in that language,-- it loses its meaning, its substance. It's a semi-fictional novel about something that took place in Peru. As well as that of others in your life, in that book you will see you and I and our chance meeting and friendship.

---

1 (metaphorically speaking) Prof. Richard Olson, THE EMERGENCE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES, Trayne, 1993; other cites omitted: o.c.o. infra; cf. cites omitted:
2 Olson, n.1 above; cf. a similar statement, however meaning the same thing (Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, THE NEW INDUSTRIAL STATE*, Mentor, 1978, p.).
* In either this book, or his THE AFFLUENT SOCIETY, 1969 ed., and as with a number of other perceptive, astute, and high authorities,-- Galbraith says that he prefers to see and himself provide footnotes at the bottom of the very page of text that they address.

3 In THE CELESTINE PROPHECY, Warner, 1993, author James Redfield calls for the adoption of the scientific method in at least three places. Although fiction, the principles therein are true and correct.
4 Prof. Paulo Freire*, PEDAGOGY OF THE OPPRESSED, H&H, 1970
* Brazil, recently deceased.

Now, as opposed or in addition to what people and books say,-- what they **mean** is of the greatest import[1]. What things mean is their truth, reality, *substance*, essence, law, a restatement of the natural law of it,-- their end effect,-- the "isness" of things (cf. id.[<]).

Further, all *true* law, the natural law, common law (the common law [the language of the common law forms]-- is a restatement of the natural law of man[2],-- a part of the natural law general) is NO more than man's attempt to, in further irreducible statements, usually metaphors and aphorisms, restate, describe, or define what the natural law is, the "isness" of things.

---

1 Prof. Hans Reicenbach, THE RISE OF SCIENTIFIC PHILOSOPHY, Univ.Cal.Pr. 1951

2 The common law is a part of the natural law general, man's right to exist, be free, and to defend [my conclusion; NO known cite]).

THE *TRUE* ACTIVIST, AND FREEDOM SEEKING ACTIVISM
THE CORRECT APPROACH

TOP SECRET ! **TOP SECRET !**

Introduction

There are a million incorrect ways, but only one correct way to engage in *true* Freedom seeking activism (c.o.).

This is true in a single legal case, a long term project or whether involving one, a few, or many individual freedom seekers or organizations.

The only correct way to approach and design one's own *true* activism, choose its goals and methods, lies in these works.

It was and still is my intention to get this material out to all of the known activists throughout the U.S.A. (USA), give them a date, about a year away,-- on which date, hopefully,-- thousands if not millions would file their petitions for *declaratory* remedy and relief.

That tactic would preempt the oppositions' ability to anticipate and cut off any and all such filings, and prevent them from vilifying and attacking, thus neutralizing those activists.

If any one individual, however, files such a petition, without having the aid of thousands of others around the USA also filing and researching the forms, procedures, and related case law, etc.,-- it leaves that individual subject to the enslavers' focus and attacks.

I've been observing such activists for a number of years, and conclude that most of 'em being nevertheless sincere, are however *totally* ignorant of what is really going on in the world of the state, government, corporations, legal environs, etc.,-- wherefore I am putting this paper out now.

There's 30,000 pages of relevant material, but of course it's impossible to get any part it out to everyone, let alone the whole.

Here it is however, but only in barebones form, with a few nerves, arteries, veins, and fleshing it out with a little muscle, skin, and a few brain cells. It's up to you to further develop and refine the full body.

One thing you must remember is that, and as you will soon see re realize,-- you must forget *all* you *think* you know about constitutions, law, courts, patriotism, religion, what freedom is, and the like, and instead, -- concentrate first and only on pure unadulterated declaratory remedy and relief.

1. The true (forensic) Acitivist should consider researching and when properly familiar with the purpose, forms, procedure, and limitations,-- filing, in the local county court that has jurisdiction to hear and decide such petitions[1],-- a Petition for "Declaratory Remedy/Relief", -- for the sole and exclusive purpose[2] to determine whether a "nexus" (*substantial* relationship)[3,4] exists between his or her Person[5], and the state or any other state and or government[6] or corporation [collective, commune[7]] (cf. "in rem" infra).

---

1 See your state's annotated administrative*, judicial, and evidence codes, etc., and the pertinent case decisions and opinions, and the common law. Why the common law ? cf. Prof. Jacob Burckhardt, THE HISTORY OF RENAISSANCE ITALY, c.1889/1900, B&N?/S&S?, early 1990s ed., p.205.9-206 in light of Morgan v. US 1954 (o.c.o.) for a really nice and important surprise !

* I say to forget all that you think that you know... because in the first round -- it's all totally **irrelevant** ! You want a knock-out in the first round, but if you include any of that other crap,-- you won't be able to finish the first round, but will surely be knocked out.

2 Last time I checked (which was a few years ago) the face (language/context/gravamen/*content**) of a petition for *declaratory* relief should NEVER include any request for any kind of remedy/relief other than for *pure* declaratory relief, because combining any other with declaratory relief (a) is improper, (b) can lead to a dismissal, or (c) allows the judge to get around the *mandate* of *pure* declaratory relief, allowing him/her/it to play with your case and life.

After the first round, when the **question**** of whether the nexus exists is answered in the negative,-- additional remedy/relief can be requested by means of supplemental petition/complaint.

We always go the proper state (county) court first, then take that court's declaration that NO nexus exists, to another, mainly the *national* supreme Court (and only thereafter to a federal court if must needs be).

On the face of the complaint, always demand the assignment of a three judge *truly* judicial panel to *finally* if not initially hear and decide the case. It might be denied, but keep on demanding it at every stage/level (cf. the common law version). When a *truly* (NOT a mere legislated form of) judicial three judge panel is involved,-- only *one* judge, usually the chief judge, writes the decision and *opinion*, along with the involved (always demand a set of written, clear, concise, and complete) findings of fact, and the therefrom derived and otherwise *precedent* mandated conclusions of law.

* In literature, the *context* of a writing is its what it *says*; the *content* is however, NOT what it says, but what it **means**, and what it *means* is of the greatest import, because it is the *substance* of it all. This sort of rule is from one of the lower levels of what are known as the forensic (empirical) rules,-- the scientific method. Judges/courts are bound only by that which is forensic, that is to say, empirical,-- developed through strict and scrupulous rules (precedents) known as the scientific method.

3 Begin your search for, and study of, the "nexus" cases, with Bank of Augusta v. Earle 1839 in light of Ramsay v. Allegre 1827; 15 Op.AG 32 (1857), Warren v. City, 444 A2d 1 (1981) in light of the *inverse* language however to the same effect in Hale v. Henkel 1905; o.c.o.

A substantial relationship (*nexus*) between your Person and the state is required (must be proven to exist)-- as proof of the claimed/asserted jurisdiction[1] (cf. jurisdictional facts[2], v. mere constitutional facts[3], quasi jurisdictional facts[4], etc.), etc.

---

1 A contract with, or your use of the roads paid for by, the state/county, etc. -- does NOT constitute a *substantial* relationship (c.o.). Under certain circumstances it may constitute a lesser (insubstantial) relationship, but NOT a substantial relationship*. A license might also, but use your imagination on how to neutralize that claim (cf. Long v. Rasmussen, Mont. c.1921/22 in light the related entries in SHEPARD'S CITATIONS; o.c.o.

* cf. Bank of Augusta v. Earl 1839 in light of Ramsay v. Allegre 1827, Cohen v. Wright, Calif. 1863; Brady v. Richardson, Ind. 1863; St. v. Welsh, SD, 1933; Basso v. UPLC, 10CA fed. 1974; Morgan v. US 1954, Wis. v. JCPC 1940, Colonial Pipe v. Traigle 1975; US v. cash & car, 37 FRD 564, 565-566 (1965, in light of Swanson v. Fuline, NY? Fed. 1965 on contracts) in light of 9 Op.AG 32 (1857), 15 Op.AG 262 (1877), 17 Op.AG 525 (1883); o.c.o.

That having been said, in Wickard v. Filburn 1942, a contract existed between the "federal" sic* government

* The supposed "federal" government is NOT the government of a *true* federation. Calling and treating it a true federation is a lie, a fraud ! Note the difference between a true federation* and a *con*federation. A confederation is an organization of two or more institutions, such as two or more states (estges) in trust (cf. a written constitution), such as the confederation of the original 13 American states.

* A true federation is a single person dictatorship, such as Hamurabbi's position/status before he actually or impliedly delegated powers to another or others. Once any interest or power was by Hamurabbi delegated,-- that was the end of, and the end of all possibility of establishing any more and all true federations on this planet. At best and most (or *worst* and most) that could thereafter happen is that anyone who gained or in the future gains a one-world dictatorship,-- would be stepping into the office already created by Hamurabbi, quite as a certain few people in the USA/US step into the office of President, already created by the Constitution of 1789 (a trust), such officers the trustees for that trust, and the judges/courts would forced by the law (history) to so declare, assuming they are acting properly and deciding correctly (cf. MOORE'S DIGEST OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, USGPO, c.1906/26 ed.*, Jayson, THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATE OF AMERICA, ANNOTATED, USGPO 1971/72 ed.; o.c.o.).

* Book sets by the same title but with dates from the 1950s (some with fancy blue fabric covers) are unrelated and are purposefully full of irrelevant crap*,-- purposefully created to mislead and distract all researchers, and others who may stumble onto it.

* Cf. Profs. Neil Postman & Charles Weingartner*, "...Crap Detecting", Delacorte Press, 1969; and the word "crap" used by Prof. J.K. Galbraith, and the cranky ol' Al Fussell (...THE DUMBING OF AMERICA) to describe the same conspiratorial and ignorant (NON critical) gobbledegook that constitute the "accepted [but totally wrong] wisdom" and "orthodoxy" of history sic, politics, economics, and everything else that we have been by the ruling class elite and their agents, lackeys, and dupes,-- *conditioned** to believe is true, but is NOT whatsoever true, or doesn't mean what we have been carefully and craftily *conditioned** to believe it means (Reichenbach).

* Sensei Ashida Kim, SECRETS OF THE NINJA, Dojo Press*, c.1980/81; Profs. H. Marcuse ("Marcuzee"), D.D. Rodgers, works; o.c.o.

* DojoPress.com

5 In law, your *Person* is defined as made up of three elements, your *Life*, *Freedom*, and *Property* (cf. Lynch v. HFC, 1972, p.552; each state's early annotated code has even clearer cases on the subject. Beware of the word "liberty", which is in reality, a jurisdiction creating relationship, a grant of a state/government created franchise or privilege (Prof. T.H. Greer, MSU).

The ruling class elite have by patriotic and religious mantra *cato*, carefully and craftily conditioned us to use such words as liberty,-- unto our **enslavement**; ignorance is slavery (Napoleon, Sun Tzu, Mao, Lenin, Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini, Castro, wks).

6 For definitions and important insights (true *Enlightenment*),-- cf. PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, (1965) in light of US v. Mc Gill, 1806); o.c.o.

7 Properly understood*, and contrary to all that you have been by the ruling class corporate (collectivist) elite**,-- all state chartered, acquiesced in, ratified (cf. quasi) corporations are, collectives, communes, Communistic [totalitarian monopoly] entities.

* The phrase "properly understood" here means, as a judge, acting judicially and otherwise properly, would be forced by the governing law to declare it, as discussed in Christy v. Elliott, Ill., 1905

** "The ruling class *corporative* elite" (Prof. Peter Woll, AMERICAN BUREAUCRACY, (1963/77 ed.). *Corporative*, in that they act as if a corporati-on, with the same goals and tactics, to enslave everyone, if not through terror, brute force, torture, assassination (see G. & Y. Von Kahl; Ruby Ridge, etc., and a thousand other assassinated activists), and mass murder,-- through **secrecy** and **deceit**, misinformation and misdirection (Sensei Ashida Kim; Profs. H. Marcuse, D.T. Rodgers; cf. Shapiro, THE BOOK OF LIES, 1988; Freud, Vienna, 1927; o.c.o.).

1 Bank of Augusta v. Earle 1839 in light of Ramsay v. Allegre 1827; o.c.o.

2 Cf. Crowell v. Benson 1932; SHEPARD'S CITATIONS.

3 Ohio VWD v. Ben Avon Borough 1920 Properly understood, Constitutions are (a) *legislation*, as (b) exclusive *trusts*, corporate charters, administrative codes*)-- the authorities saying that legislation, without more (without a substantial relationship [*nexus*])-- does NOT apply to the natural born individual** (cf. Vol. 9 U.S. Attorney General Opinions, p. 32 [1857]; o.c.o.).

* Each constitution is at the same moment, a number of seemingly different, however really whatsoever NOT different things: a trust, corporate charter, administrative code as by-laws for the therewith and thereby created *trust* (constitutional) state (***estate***; l'etat), whose by-laws are the legislation (rules/regulations) promulgated thereunder, along with the involved administrative agencies' rules/regulations/decisions (cf. Wyman v. Southard 1825; o.c.o; on all cites, see SHEPARD'S CITATIONS).

Constitutions are NOT democratic instruments as we are by the ruling class corporative elite carefully and craftily *conditioned* (A. Kim, H. Marcuse, D.T. Rodgers, D.T. Bell) to believe (Irish & Prothro; o.c.o.). Constitutions are *closed* contracts dealing only with the *property* of the signators, "We the people" and "us and our posterity" meaning only them and NOT us ! Would you want third parties to be able to claim interests and rights in a trust that you have ? Quite as Hamurabbi in his Code and associated writings claimed the whole world as his own property,-- the founding fathers also did just that in their constitutions, and in particular the constitution of 1789 Egads !

Note,-- all of the world's and USA's and US's "courts of justice" (trial, and appellate [superior/supreme]) courts are totally NON-judicial administrative agencies*** (Oops,-- there goes Article III !), thus canNOT whatsoever act judicially nor "judicially" notice anything, they can only and merely "officially" notice certain things). There are a number of important facts that those courts of *justice* (courts of *administration* [justice means only the administration of the slave state]) must *officially* notice, and that control indeed dictate all of their decisions and opinions, namely the quasi jurisdictional fact that each individual appearing in and before it is nothing more than mere *property* in the form of a *slave*, who is thus "strictly rightless" [cf. "Roman Law", Ency.Brit. 1968 ed.)-- which facts however, *truly* judicial courts are NOT required to notice indeed can't notice, namely the state's original re-legion, the religion

It's my opinion that,-- the petition (cf. complaint) for *declaratory* relief (a) must be *captioned* as: Petitioner (cf. Plaintiff) by name (but NOT capitalized[1]) vs. *only* the "the world *in rem*" as the *respondents* (cf. defendants), with NO mention of the state, government, agencies or agents.

DO not ask for any kind of remedy/relief other than a declaration of the facts and law regarding the existence of the nexus as above referenced.

Any and all other forms of remedy and relief can be obtained by filing a separate complaint under the same docket number in the nature of a supplemental petition, or amended petition, etc. (study this one carefully; each jurisdiction/venue has different views on this problem and method).

of *universal* slavery *cato* (cf. Prof. Charles Beard). For the import of a truly judicial decision/opinion, see US v. Woodley, 9CA 1983; o.c.o.
**see definition of *individual* in BALLENEINE'S LAW DICTIONARY, 3d. ed., 1969, with case law cites; cf. 9 Op.AG 32 [1857 q.v.]). In legislation (which does NOT apply to natural born individuals, supra^)-- the word *individual* means a certain type of *corporation* (collective, *commune*, Communistic [*totalitarian* monopoly] entity) such as a quasi-corporation, as in BOUVIER'S various LAW DICTIONARIES; cf. ROSE ON FEDERAL JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE, 2d.ed., MBC, 1922; Robinson, ELEMENTARY LAW, LBC, 1910; o.c.o.).
*** PMA v. Kennedy, NY fed. 1979; Peo. v. Cull., NY 1961; compare the principles in, Re. Smiley, 35 Wa.2d 863, 316 P2d 212 (19); o.c.o. Just about every state and the D.C. have analogs to every case cited in these works; they are found in each state's and the D.C.'s earlier annotated code volumes, or those that are purposefully hidden must be searched out the hard way.

1 This in an attempt to avoid a problem that may arise, involving the rather new view that activists have, that includes the "straw-man". The "straw man" approach and all other "theories" (sic) and activists' notions and practices canNOT whatsoever be referenced in the *first* and **un**-amended petition.

If necessary, they can be brought up however in the amended/supplemental petition (supra), but,-- only if absolutely necessary. Never complicate any kind of litigation by interjecting things that do NOT constitute an immediate threat/danger or actual injury, especially petitions for declaratory relief.

Further,-- governmental agents, prosecutors, or even the involved judges may bring up the fact that the US Code's and the state's analogs' "anti injunction" statutes that say that declaratory relief canNOT be used to litigate tax issues*. prohibits any court and all courts from hearing let alone granting declaratory remedy and relief in "tax" cases, in anticipation of the activist bringing it up later, or pretending that that's what the declaratory remedy being sought is for. Such interpleading and interjection is improper, because in the original petition, the individual does NOT mention taxes or any other subjects, objects, or remedies, neither injunction, mandamus, etc.

It cannot be stressed enough that,-- NO other kind of remedy can be sought nor even mentioned in the initial petition for declaratory relief, whether injunction, mandamus, nor any other kind of remedy. The initial petition must be strictly and exclusively for declaratory relief **only**.
Noting that true taxes are in reality rents or in the nature of rents, and are different from assessments and are levied under two different interests and powers (cf. 117 ALR 330, 339, n.11)—the activist must study all such distinctions to be able how later to defeat them, and to stop failing to note such distinctions that are critical in litigation and determinative of outcomes.

The true Activist should place in (a) the proper *local* newspaper's legal notices section, and (b) a Washington D.C. newspaper's legal notice section, for the required number of day's or week's,-- giving notice to all that there has been filed, a petition for declaratory relief, "with an *in rem*[1] (against the world[2]) element", in which court, its docket number, etc.; and that any individual, person, corporation, local, city, county, national, federal, foreign, or international state (estate; l'etat) or government or anything or anybody else who is or may be affected,-- should inquire, study, and if necessary *properly* appear in the case, in order to assert and **prove** the existence and relevancy of their supposed interests, and any therefrom emergent (but merely *supposed*) rights, powers, etc.

---

1 Now the activist may be uneasy with the phrase "in rem" in that it suggests *admiralty*, knowing or correctly suspecting that **admiralty** is the **enemy** of and is out to destroy freedom*. Properly understood however, all of the world's and the USA's, US's, and D.C.'s trial, and appellate (*superior*/supreme) courts are admiralty (NON-judicial) courts**'***. Although in the first instance all courts are admiralty courts (cf. US v. MC Gill 1806; o.c.o. [mere administrative courts {PMA v. Kennedy, NY fed. 1979; Peo. v. Cull., NY 1961),-- through use of certain common law procedures (forms) you can turn those ad into common law (*truly* **judicial**) courts.

* Case law indicates that (a) the state/governments do NOT, indeed as a matter of law,-- canNOT indeed do NOT whatsoever protect anyone (c.o.), (b) the state/government/statists are the **enemy** of the individual, (c) the state/government/statists are out to **destroy** the individual, family, group, community, nation, and all other established institutions (Ashida Kim), including truth, reality, the natural environments*, Earth, and the whole of the human race (Prof. Robert Nadeau, MIND, MACHINES, AND HUMAN CONSCIOUSNESS, CB, 1991, p.39.8, 144.8, 121.8 respectively). Egads !

* How does the state destroy natural environments ? I thought the state regulated, prevented, and corrected environmental pollution ! Properly understood, (a) all state chartered commercial/industrial corporations are owned and controlled by the state/government, and all such corporations (b) are part of the state's administrative agency system, (c) in all matters, interests, and endeavors conduct only the state's/governments' business, thus, contrary to what we have been by the ruling class elite carefully and craftily conditioned to believe (Prof. J.K. Galbraith 1978) are NOT whatsoever engaged in free/private enterprise nor the free market. The state and its governments do through their agency corporations what the law does NOT allow them to do directly, namely deceive (**enslave**), fleece, and **destroy** individuals, who, through their labor, are the sole source and creator of all property, wealth, money value, credit, upon the backs of whom the non-producing ruling class elite paper-shufflers live, and whose life's blood labor and work-product the ruling class elite suck out as the worst of parasites.

Properly understood, Communism, Nazism, fascism, (a) are all one and the same thing in substance (their **origin**, operation, and **end effect**), and (b) are highly matured, highly developed corporate (collectivist, communistic) monopoly capitalism (R.C. Tucker, A. Cockburn, A.M. Rose, I. Brant; case law cites omitted), and in reality,-- western and American corporate monopoly capitalism is,-- less matured, less advanced fascism, Nazism, Communism. Egads !

Properly understood,-- all of the world's and America's state/government chartered commercial and industrial corporations are in reality, state owned, state controlled collectives, communes, Communistic [totalitarian monopoly] entities. Egads !

* Cf. imperialism, Renaissance mercantilism*, law merchant, **admir**alty, the

Now this is a lot of material to read and understand, much if not all of it running contrary to what I will call "today's activists' 'conventional wisdom",-- what supposed "activists" of today believe is true,-- but nevertheless, -- it's all stuff that must be learned and applied in order for one to become a "*true* [forensic: *successful*] Activist".

---

admirable ones, the **admir**als [the nobility], cf. *Islam* , Islam's **emirs** [c.o.]).
** Cf. US v. Mc Gill 1826; PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, (1965); o.c.o.
*** All trial and appellate courts that are NOT brought into existence by certain common law forms (procedures) are NON-judicial administrative courts, --"courts of NO discretion". NO discretion to do what ? NO discretion to rule against legislation, and its precursors,-- running all the way back through history to Hamurabbi and his **original** code, which code [legislation; the world's first one-world constitution]-- still governs today !*) and its subsidiary administrative agency promulgated ['interstices', 'houskeeping'] rules and regulations as defined and discussed in Wyman v. Southard 1825.
* "Roman [cf. Hamurabbi's original] law is one of strict precedents" (Ency. Brit., 1971/72 ed.).
2 (a) All of the world's and America's courts that are *legislated* into existence, staffed under legislation, and that enforce legislation, are **admir**alty (the nobility's; indeed, Hamurabbi's) courts,-- that contemplate only the nobility and their collectively owned/controlled *property* (including **slaves**: *us* ! Egads !), (b) in the first instance act only *in rem* (against the state's: nobility's: the patricians' collectively owned/controlled *property*),-- but do NOT act *in personam* (do NOT NOT proceed against the natural born individual, unless as a **slave** [as mere *property*, the property of the state, the property of Hamurabbi's one-world **estate**, estate of **slavery**). In order for **admir**alty* to proceed against a natural born individual the plaintiff, including the state/government/police/prosecutor, must first, at the administrative agency level (cf. "prior hearing")-- specially allege and prove the existence of a jurisdiction creating admiralty **contract** (c.o.) into which the subject fully knowingly, intentionally, an all otherwise voluntarily entered into for the purpose of being so liable and punished (cf. 9 Op.AG 32 [1857]; 37 FRD 546-547; o.c.o.; but see Prof. Vasily Klyuchevsky, RISE OF THE ROMANOVS, while noting that all legislation is enforced under **quasi contract** [c.o.]). In 1760 and in anticipation of the American nobility's probable move for independence (cf. Prof. J.H. Franklin, FROM SLAVERY TO FREEDOM, AAK, 1947/67 ed.), and in order to cut off that prospect, to prevent or remedy it or limit its effects (cf. PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION [1965] on handling such things in the courts, rather than violent revolution, but unto the same end effect) in two cases (Luke v. Lyde, Moses v. Macferlan, 2 Burr. Reports),-- Lord Chancellor Mansfield, Chief Justice (Engl.), created **quasi contract**. As a jurisdictional fact, as well as an *element* of the cause or crime itself as an adjudicatory fact (cf. subject matter)-- quasi (as if) contract requires that the defendant receive an unjust (unanticipated/unagreed to) benefit ("unjust enrichment") arising out of a piece of property owned/controlled by another,-- whether that property was by the legal owners voluntarily or temporarily surrendered temporarily or it was borrowed or stolen) without the agreement/permission of the owner (c.o.).

Please note that knowledge and application of most of the things I say in theses works is required in order to defend or sue. Most importantly much of it must be accomplished before the state/government et al. can *properly* sue, charge, arrest, try, find guilty, and punish a civil or criminal defendant, but which-- is NOT done by the state, government as the judges (case law) requires (cf. Basso v. UPLC, 10CA fed. 1974; o.c.o.; but see Peo. v. Sims, Calif. 1982), or its qui-tam ("me too"--"let me fleece 'em too") agents and courts and judges as discussed in PROLOGUE TO REVOLUTION, supra. That is to say, the state et al. skips many of the steps required to property proceed against the natural born individual (cf. the defi nitions and conditions expressed and implied in Lynch v. HFC, 1972, p.552).