



PATRIOT MISBELIEFS © Authored by PAC info@pacinlaw.org *Research and Applications of Law*

INTRODUCTION

If you are looking for *Freedom* or *Sovereign* based information, you have probably run into several different terms or phrases being used. This section is of the purpose to explain what some of these things mean; and in some cases clarify them, and even debunk some of them.

Simply, you might say we are attempting to get across to you: *Ideas vs. Reality*.

To explain: Due to a lack of understanding, people tend to look for ways to free themselves using methods that the government (and *courts*) will not see or understand. It is ventured that some of these ideas have been released by the “other side” to confuse people. Once released, people seem toglom onto such methods. Unfortunately, it goes downhill from there.

The main rule that you need to understand is word definitions in law are different than regular language. People are mixing whimsical ideas into law. This creates some of the confusion. But, in most cases, most people fail to understand the principles of “private law”. That issue is the main issue that people fail to understand. This is what creates, to what we refer to as, “workarounds.” A workaround is a way to get around a private law statute using sham methods. Such methods are either not grounded in law, or are a misapplication of proper law. Again, the courts look at these workarounds as *nonsense* or “frivolous”. A good number of these “workarounds” are attempting to get around the thing in private law entitled the “natural person”. Such term relates to the *entity* that distinguishes a ‘man’ (*or woman*) from a ‘corporation’ in private law.

These noted issues become even more complicated due to the political status that is held under the 14th Amendment system. This establishes the legal nexus of a man to the statutory scheme created by a legislature. This is the primary agreement where one has agreed to be controlled by statutes. The status that people maintain under this amendment extends the maze of *private law* that applies to an American. Accordingly, due to the dualistic system of law created by the 14th Amendment, people tend to get even more confused about legal issues.

For your understanding as a principle throughout these explanations, just putting whimsical descriptive language in a legal document *will not* defeat the nexus created by private law. Using these type tactics in legal documents is nonsense as it has no legal basis. Some descriptions mix plain English with law language. This is where a lot of things go haywire: You cannot mix the two. It is unfortunate that people cannot distinguish whimsical descriptions from the real law. Understanding the nature of statute construction of a jurisdiction (*city, state, or federal*), hence the proper application of law, will save one from looking incompetent (or like a nut).

Also, there are other terms and issues that we will discuss in this area. Keep in mind that we are attempting to clarify the issues so that you may speak intelligently in your legal endeavors. In regard to this, keep in mind that PAC is on a different path than most people. We may seem to be hypercritical due to the fact that we center on status (*i.e.*, lawful nationality).

Finally, please understand that it is not that we agree with the system. However, we emphasize to you that it is necessary to keep within the guidelines in order to defeat it. And, there could have been case law and maxims noted to backup these explanations, but we have foregone them to keep things simple. You are invited to ask any competent authority to review our notations.

Thank you for paying attention, *LB Bork*

FORWARD: DISQUALIFYING INFORMATION

Below is a brief listing of the Patriot Movement misBeliefs. Some venture into different terms which are misplaced legal terms, others are just misapplications of law. Others are just plain harebrained ideas that someone has come-up with. Most of the listed *bad* ideas spread like the plague mostly DUE TO THE PROFITEERS preying on people. We also go over some issues where someone may say something which can prove to be not in his or her best interest.

It should be noted that people fall for these methods due to their gullibility. Face it, they fell for the political system under the 14th Amendment, they just go onto the next farce.

1) I HAVE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Firstly, the 14th Amendment creates a dual system of law. So what rights is one claiming here? Rights under the old system; or the ones under the 14th Amendment? Most people are claiming to be under the protection of the Federal Government when they say “*I have constitutional rights.*”

Unwittingly, they are claiming protection under the Roman Law system that has been created by the 14th Amendment. This sets them up for the big fall. They are basically claiming that all statutory law applies to them. They will then be given “due process” under the system of *private law* established by the statute law of the United States and the current insurgent states.

- For more information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/US_Citizen_Examined.php

2) I'M A CAPITAL 'C' CITIZEN

You do not have jurisdiction because I am a capital ‘C’ Citizen.

This workaround is one of the best. The story is, though, it will get you nowhere.

People are getting this from the body of the original Constitution. Firstly, this was just a writing style; it has no legal basis. What people are trying to accomplish here is that they are not 14th Amendment citizens. The problem is they probably are due to the fact they have done nothing to terminate the citizenship. The court will consider that you are such a citizen under a legal rule called a “legal fiction”. To explain, a *legal fiction* is a presumption made by a court due to the lack of evidence to the contrary of which the court formulates its belief. There are plenty of legal fictions based on facts and legal doctrines that will show that you are a 14th Amendment citizen.

To end this misplaced theory, there are no capital ‘C’ Citizens. The 14th Amendment usurped the status. One has to be in political rebellion against the original Constitutional system to be a citizen. In other words, as the term “citizen” means political rights, the status is dead. That is why the Coalition is centering on state nationality: the citizen status is not able to be used.

Face it: The government of your state (*country*) has been taken-over by a bunch of insurgents. Your neighbor, who is voting for them, put them in office and has stolen your political rights.

- For more information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Citizen_Legal_Fiction.php
- And also see: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/14th_Section_2.php
- Also see: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Some_Questions.php

3) I'M A STATE CITIZEN

You do not have jurisdiction over me because I am a “state citizen”.

This workaround is practically the same as the capital ‘C’ citizen. It will also get you nowhere.

People are getting this from the principles of the original Constitution. Like the capital ‘C’ citizen ruse, what people are trying to accomplish here is to claim that they are not 14th Amendment citizens. The problem is they probably are due to the fact they have done nothing to terminate the citizenship. The court will consider that you are such a citizen under a legal rule called a “legal fiction”. A *legal fiction* is a presumption made by a court due to the lack of evidence to the contrary of which the court formulates its belief. There are plenty of legal fictions based on facts and legal doctrines that will show that you are a 14th Amendment citizen.

To end this misplaced theory, there are no *state citizens*. The 14th Amendment usurped the status. One has to be in *political rebellion* against the original Constitutional system to be a citizen. In other words, as the term “citizen” means political rights, the right/status is dead. That is why the Coalition is centering on state nationality: the *de jure* “citizen” status is not able to be used.

Face it: The government of your state (*country*) has been taken-over by a bunch of insurgents. Your neighbor, who is voting for them, put them in office and has stolen *your* political rights.

- For more information: http://www.pacinelaw.org/pdf/Citizen_Legal_Fiction.php
- And also see: http://www.pacinelaw.org/pdf/14th_Section_2.php
- Also see: http://www.pacinelaw.org/pdf/Some_Questions.php

4) I'M A SOVEREIGN

I am a sovereign man. This claim has many avenues of which may be explored.

An anarchist is someone that believes in no government. What rules does ‘this’ sovereign man follow? Does he set his own moral code? Would one really want this *sovereign man* living around him? Maybe he likes to do things that you believe to be immoral. Another case, is a man that follows *his religion* a sovereign man? This man notes that God is the sovereign. This sovereign man cannot do whatever he wants if he is beholden to the law of Scripture. How is he sovereign?

The point is, most do not know what is encompassed when they claim to be a *sovereign man*.

To clarify some points here, some people believe in God, some do not. Either type of belief will nonetheless bring one under a system of law entitled “natural rights” (or one might say: born free with unalienable rights). Accordingly, one could speculate that one is in full control of his life and not beholden to anyone. In a perfect world, this would be great; however, people in America are born within the dominion of a multi-tiered governmental system. That brings us to:

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

In international and constitutional law, the state is considered the sovereign. Once someone submits to any benefit of a government whatsoever, in most respects he has pruned his natural rights. As a general rule, using any court or filling-out any government forms will render you a citizen/subject. Moreover, most do not understand that rules of law place a man to be under the dominion of a government at his birth; accordingly, he is a citizen/subject of the governmental system. Such issues aside, the maxim of law that “*a man is king of his castle*” illustrates that he has dominion within the limits of his property; however, “the games” begin when he leaves that

property. Although he is *born free* with *natural rights*, being a citizen of a government clips his sovereignty. This is similar to the states having a clipped sovereignty under *international law* for being a member of the Union under the United States Constitution.

❖ Simply put: Members must follow *The Rules*.

The long and the short of the *sovereign man* standing is, the private law system created under the 14th Amendment and its legal fictions will render the state the ruler over the man. And, one should take into consideration of what William Penn stated: “*Those people not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants.*” In other words, if the state knows that you do not have a superior law form that governs your life, it will be controlling you if you are living within its dominion.

So, sovereign man? Not if you are a “citizen member” under the dominion of government. If you are not a *citizen* of that government, you may be treated as stateless; and depending on the people in dominion you may not be able to own property, or have many other rights afforded to that body politic. Sorry, but in view of the systems of *public* and *private* law and in the realm of the international arena, if you are claiming to be a sovereign man, you better have your own island.

In summary, it is ventured that someone who parrots the phrase “I’m a sovereign” is thinking he is not under the *so-called* corporate United States government. Just saying such a thing will not put a force-field around them. As the maxim of law goes, *the contract makes the law*.

- For more information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Sovereigns_without_Subjects.php

5) I'M A MAN ON THE LAND

This patriot adage is special. The question is: Is not every man on the land?

Most people have no idea what they are talking about when they use this phraseology. There are some that profess that *admiralty law* (law of the sea) has come onto the land and everyone is out to sea. Sorry, wrong. Also in this vein, it is ventured that this phraseology is also used by some mentors that are attempting to describe the federal overlay that is created by the 14th Amendment law system. Some call it a hover-zone. Sorry, close, but wrong again.

The *Man on the Land* is describing that one who believes he *is not* subject to private law. The fact of the matter is most people are tied into some “private law” statute. This is due to their actions. In other words, they have entered into some agreement to be under any given statute.

In America, the *political status* of the 14th Amendment creates the private law nexus. Without correcting one’s nationality will affix this nexus to you. Status correction brings you down from the “*hover-zone*” or “*off the sea onto the land,*” if you have bought into useless explanations.

One could venture that this is just a *worthless* statement that attempts to get people out of their contracts of private law that fall under the de facto governmental system. This is just more antics which amounts to nothing that has absolutely no basis in law... It must just sound darn good.

I would like to thank Dr. Sam Kennedy for adding to this nonsense by claiming he is a “dry” man on the land (*see the admiralty law section for the story on this*). The thing is, aside being a totally worthless position, a judge will have no idea what this is all about. My question to the “Doctor” is, if the United States is under *admiralty law* explain the juries? *Does the insanity ever end?*

For more information see the section on *Admiralty Law*.

6) YOU ARE A VESSEL

Some people believe they are a vessel (*e.g.*, boat). Oh, really? You say you are a boat?

The Coalition would like to personally thank the people who have set-back teaching people of America about 20 years for this one. These “nutty professors” have got people thinking that they

are under admiralty law on the land. People are so into this *false belief system* that they fail to use good judgment when reading. Here is where the main mistake came from:

US Code, Title 18, Part 1, chapter 1 (general provisions)

Section 9. Vessel of the United States defined. The term "vessel of the United States", as used in this title, means a vessel belonging in whole or in part to the United States, or any citizen thereof, or any corporation created by or under the laws of the United States, or of any State, Territory, District, or possession thereof.

In the reference above, the sentence structure clearly states that vessels—in example, boats—that are owned by “citizens of the United States” fall within the term “vessel of the United States”. It DOES NOT state that *citizens of the United States* are vessels. Come on people!

Again, this misplaced premise has been put in place of the *Law of Persons* law form. It is private law you are under, not admiralty law. Admiralty law takes place on the water, not the land.

Accordingly, sorry to say you *are not* a “boat” on the “sea of commerce”.

For more information see the section on *Admiralty Law*.

- See this for more information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Straw_Man.php
- Also see this from Larry Becraft: <http://home.hiwaay.net/~becraft/AdmiraltyJuris.html>

7) ADMIRALTY LAW

There are many people in the movement that believe that courts of the United States are operating in admiralty. For the most part, this is incorrect. There are admiralty jurisdictions, but unless you are *on water* you are not under this law form. To clarify, the governmental system under the 14th Amendment has installed a system of *private law* which has its basis in agreement. The private law system incorporates rights—or more correctly: privileges—and duties. This system of law installs and utilizes penalties—*penal law*—over common law offenses (true *criminal law*). At times the private law system may appear to look like admiralty, but it is not such law form.

The problem is that people fail to realize that the *metamorphosis* has taken place. The common law system does still exist, but most jurisdictions have altered a lot of the procedures (*e.g.*, many writs). Additionally, common law offenses have been converted into penal law (*statutized*).

The next *four sections* were taken from Wikipedia. We have verified the information and have found it to be correct and on point. Please take heed of the information. There is follow-up with some short comments in the end notes section.

INTRODUCTION. Admiralty law—also referred to as *maritime law*—is a distinct body of law which governs maritime questions and offenses. It is in the body of *private international law* governing the relationships between private entities which operate vessels on the oceans. It is distinguished from the Law of the Sea, which is a body of public international law dealing with navigational rights, mineral rights, jurisdiction over coastal waters and international law governing relationships between nations.

JURISDICTION. Article III, Section 2 of the United States Constitution grants original jurisdiction to U.S. federal courts over admiralty and maritime matters. While admiralty cases remain the exclusive jurisdiction of the federal courts, many lawsuits involving incidents in maritime practice may be brought in either federal or state court.

The federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over most admiralty and maritime claims pursuant to the terms of 28 U.S.C. § 1333. Under this statute, federal district courts are granted original jurisdiction over admiralty actions “saving to suitors” a right to sue for most of these actions in state courts. Despite the savings to suitors clause, certain actions are only permitted to be filed in

admiralty in federal court. Those include all in rem maritime actions. This includes suits seeking to arrest ships to enforce maritime mortgages and liens, petitions to limit liability of a shipowner to the value of a ship after a major accident, and actions seeking to partition ownership of a ship. However, the vast majority of maritime actions, such as suits for damage to cargo, injuries to seamen, collisions between vessels, wake damage, and maritime pollution cases may be brought in either state court or federal court by virtue of the savings to suitors clause.

In federal courts in the United States, there is generally no right to trial by jury in admiralty cases. However, Congress has created some limited rights of jury trial in seamen's personal injury actions brought under the Jones Act. In state courts, the right to trial by jury is determined by the law of the state where the case is brought. Consequently, admiralty cases brought in state courts can be tried before a jury.

APPLICABLE LAW. A state court hearing an admiralty or maritime case is required to apply the admiralty and maritime law, even if it conflicts with the law of the state, under a doctrine known as the "reverse-Erie doctrine." The "Erie doctrine" says that federal courts hearing state actions must apply state law. The "reverse-Erie doctrine" says that state courts hearing admiralty cases must apply federal admiralty law. This can make a big difference; for example, United States maritime law recognizes the concept of joint and several liability among tortfeasors, while many states do not. Under joint and several liability, where two or more people create a single injury or loss, all are equally liable, even if they only contributed a small amount. A state court hearing an admiralty case would be required to apply the doctrine of joint and several liability even if its state had outlawed the concept.

HISTORY. Admiralty law became part of the law of the United States as it was gradually introduced through admiralty cases arising after the adoption of the United States Constitution in 1789. Many American lawyers who were prominent in the American Revolution were admiralty and maritime lawyers in their private lives. Those included are Alexander Hamilton in New York and John Adams in Massachusetts.

In 1787 Thomas Jefferson, who was then ambassador to France, wrote to James Madison proposing that the United States Constitution, then under consideration by the States, be amended to include "trial by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land—as opposed the law of admiralty—and not by the Law of Nations, *i.e.* not by the law of admiralty. The result was the Seventh Amendment to the United States Constitution.

END NOTES. Please note the history that was discussed in regard to the Seventh Amendment. One must note that the Seventh Amendment is grounded in *admiralty law*. Most people think it has to do with general court matters, *i.e.*, their right to "common law" proceeding in a state court. To assist you in understanding this premise better, before that 14th Amendment was put in place the *so-called* Bill of Rights generally had nothing to do with the people in the several states. People fail to understand that each state in the Union (United States) is a nation; wherefore the United States Constitution is an agreement that is grounded in *international law*. Hence, the common law was unique to each state. The principles of this law form *were not* seen by the *Law of Nations*. That is to say, that is why the *Savings to Suitors* clause was installed into American law. In actuality, the Seventh Amendment has to do with taking *the common law out to sea*.

Below is the reference from the Judiciary Act where the connection is referenced:

- **Title 28 USC § 1333.** Admiralty, maritime and prize cases. The district courts shall have original jurisdiction, exclusive of the courts of the States, of:
 - (1) Any civil case of admiralty or maritime jurisdiction, saving to suitors in all cases all other remedies to which they are otherwise entitled.
 - (2) Any prize brought into the United States and all proceedings for the condemnation of property taken as prize.

8) WE THE PEOPLE

For some strange reason, Americans believe that “We the People,” as is seen in the Preamble of the Constitution, means you and me. Sorry, not true. It was the ones that signed it.

To explain, a man named Sir William Blackstone—who was of England—can be quoted as stating the following about the phrase “the people” in his many commentaries:

❖ *The popular leaders, who in all ages have called themselves “the people.”*

Hold on, it does not stop there. If you read the Federalist Papers, you will find that *the people* who organized the *Constitution for the United States* referred to themselves as “Rulers”. Now, is someone who is referring to himself as a “ruler” actually your servant?

It is true that the phraseology “the people” has been used to refer to the body politic, which is you and me; however, it is asked: When a *criminal case* is brought by “the people” (or the state), is it truly you and I that have formulated the law in that case (*i.e.*, by custom and usages)? Or, is it the whimsical *private law* that has been set down by “the people” (or *the Rulers*)?

The long and the short of this one is: Smoke and Mirrors. That is all law is: a con-game to get your *tacit* or *overt* consent to be ruled by these group of elitists. The “signers” of the Constitution created an agreement (contract) between themselves. Of course they want your approval to go along with it, *i.e.*, “*Governments are instituted by the consent of the governed.*”

So the question is: Are you really “The People” or just a dupe?

They love when you use this language, as they know that you are confused.

- For more information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Sovereigns_without_Subjects.php
- Also read this information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Con_Game.php
- Information on the Rulers: <http://www.pacinlaw.org/sup/rulers.html>

9) ALL CAP NAME

The “all cap” spelling (*e.g.*, JOHN DOE) of your name represents you in a *private law* capacity.

The question is: What contract did you enter into which the name appears that the documentation represents? There is some statutory reference where this nexus is created. Simply put, this is just a symptom of the problem. Fix the problem. DO NOT go around saying things like:

“That is not me.” Or, *“That is my straw man.”* Or, anything else remotely like those.

Don’t be a dummy. See the *Straw Man* section for more information.

10) THE STRAW MAN

The straw man: this one has run its course. People take the position that “the government” has created this *straw man character* to act as them. These types believe that the “all cap” spelling (*e.g.*, JOHN DOE) is the straw man. Some even believe they can separate themselves from it. But that is not the end of this nonsense, some even think that they can benefit from this created entity and not have any liabilities attached to it. Sorry, but that is against the law:

❖ *Cujus est commodum ejus debet esse incommodum.*

He who receives the benefit should also bear the disadvantage.

Having that said, you will never see a straw man in jail. You, *the man*, will be the one in jail.

In legal reality, a “straw man” is an actual *third party* that may be seen handling a transaction or placing something in *his name* for someone else. This is the legal term usage.

This is a case of a misapplication of law that uses whimsical ideas. Like many other harebrained workarounds, this is just another one that is attempting to get around the system of private law. The “all cap” name is a symptom of the problem. Fix the problem, and do not create whimsical workarounds to deal with the problem. Correction of nationality will remedy the problem.

The “straw man” principle is one of the most ridiculous notions and is total nonsense.

- See this for more information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Straw_Man.php

11) COPYRIGHTED NAME

Some people think that by copyrighting their name in the “all cap” spelling (*e.g.*, JOHN DOE) will actually create some kind of force-field benefit for them. They threaten to sue anyone that uses the name in such form. What fun this may be every time this problem arises.

Firstly, under the common law copyrights are only local to a country (*i.e.*, a state). In the case of the United States of America, that would encompass each “one” of the states. To have copyright protection outside that jurisdiction requires *international law*. In the case of these United States, you would have to enter into the private law of the “United States” under its statutory conditions.

This is another amusing workaround to get around the *private law* scheme. The “all cap” name is a symptom of the private law scheme. Fix the problem, and do not use symptom fixers.

Simply put: This is a ridiculous notion and total nonsense.

12) UNITED STATES IS A CORPORATION

Some people like to call the United States *Corp US*, and other cute names. But, for what purpose? What is this fixation on the United States being a corporation? It always was.

“The United States of America are a corporation endowed with the capacity to sue and be sued, to convey and receive property.” —From Marshall’s commentaries, circa 1820

So, what is the point? The United States was always a corporation. What now?

It is ventured what such people are attempting to say is: The governmental system is *de facto*. People have been pulled into the legislative jurisdiction of the United States under the ruse of the 14th Amendment. This in effect creates the full *private law* system of which controls them.

Now, observe the following law definition from *Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 1856*:

❖ **BODY POLITIC**, government, corporations.

1) When applied to the government this phrase signifies the state.

2) As to the persons who compose the *body politic*, they take collectively the name, of people, or nation; and individually they are *citizens*, when considered in relation to their political rights, and *subjects* as being submitted to the laws of the state.

3) When it refers to corporations, the term *body politic* means that the members of such corporations shall be considered as an artificial person.

Here is the best explanation that we can formulate on this ruse, both *in law* and *workarounds*:

As the United States of America *is not* a nation, the *citizenship* that is created by the 14th Amendment can only be in the nature of a corporate *body politic*, and *not* a *body politic* government. As people have accepted this perverted citizenship under the *very bad* amendment, they are treated as “natural persons” full-time. This sets-up the *legal fiction* that they are controlled by all *private law* the *state* and *federal* governments establish.

In support of this, corporations in the states are noted as “citizens” in Title 28. Hence, it is noted that the 14th Amendment actually *perverted* law terms and creates new ones. It is amusing to watch the courts dance around this issue in their decisions with *double-talk* and other *deceptive methods*. But what would one expect from the group of *usurping insurgents* of the Republic?

There is one other myth to quash within this area. There are some people that believe that due to the fact Washington DC set-up itself as a *municipal corporation* the date of February 21st, 1871, a new government was established. They believe that this is where the *incorporated* government was established. This *is not* correct. The 14th Amendment created a *new* body politic. In effect, this made the states political subdivisions of the *United States*. Now things operate somewhat in reverse. The states can no longer claim *political* sovereignty. The “United States” controls their bodies politic; the *ultimate power* of a state. The 14th Amendment killed *the Republic*.

That is it in a nutshell. Simple, but it seems that no one has figured it out. Instead people come-up with a bunch of *cute sayings* and *senseless workarounds* to get around the problem.

You may find details of the 14th Amendment *scam* covered in *The Red Amendment* book.

In a side note, there are three (3) definitions of “United States” that can be noted in the body of the original Constitution. This is due to sentence structure. The definition noted above by Justice Marshall—and other variations—can be found in Title 28 USC § 3002(15) Definitions. *United States* means: (A) a Federal corporation; (B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or (C) an instrumentality of the United States.

As an exercise, which one of the definitions noted in 3002 is Marshall describing? A, B, or, C? If your answer was (A), sorry, but you are wrong. Look at Marshall’s language. *Think about it. You have to implement the rule of: Which came first, the chicken or the egg?*

13) HYPHENS/COLONS IN NAME

Some people think that by putting hyphens and colons between their names will actually create some kind of force-field around them. This one is one of the amusing workarounds to surface. It is believed they do this to separate themselves from the “all cap” spelling (e.g., JOHN DOE). It is also said by many that this is separating the Christian name from the family name.

One must ask this question: Where in history has a society or nation done this?

There is the principle of the Christian name and the family name. However, there has never been a practice where the punctuation was ever put in place. There is no legal basis for it. As a matter of fact, in the history of some countries the last name was used to extend the distinction of people. Due to multiple names in the same area, this was so they could be taxed more accurately.

With that said: Maybe this is a disinformation program. The purpose of the program being of design to have people “tattoo” themselves; hence being *readily identified* as a group that *listens to anything*. This way an adversarial court or government agent knows he can walk all over them.

Simply put: This is total nonsense. Just installing arbitrary “punctuation” in your name in legal documents—or in other places—will not defeat the nexus between you and *private law*. It will not negate any of the legal fictions that a court or agency maintains if they believe you are subject to a particular statute. This harebrained method does not *correct your status* as to alleviate the nexus that you are under due to some action you have taken. As the maxim of law goes, *the contract makes the law*. They believe they have control over you due to a contractual nexus.

That is the long and short of it.

14) GOVERNMENT IS A FICTION

People tend to call government (*or* the US Government) a fiction. This is wrong, to a point. True, government is a corporation which is a creation under the law of man. However, it does exist. To go around saying that government is a “fiction” will not make it go away.

Another misapplication in regard to this is that people call government a “legal fiction”. A legal fiction is a presumption made by a court due to the lack of evidence to the contrary of which the court formulates its belief. People are mixing up things that are natural (of God) with things that are created by man. Please remember, do not mix regular language with terms of law.

See *Legal Fiction* and *United States is a Corporation* for more information.

15) STATELESS MAN

The stateless man situation will render one with no inherent rights. Many people are going to a foreign country of a consulate office of the United States to terminate all ties with the United States, *i.e.*, expatriates. This forfeits all rights of *posterity* that one has with his country. Actually, this makes one an alien. A *state* or *body politic* can remove such a man from the dominion that it controls as he has no right to be there, if the *state* so decides. Depending on the circumstances, such a person cannot own property and have other benefits of *posterity* like the other people who maintain *rightful nationality* of one of the several states (*countries*) in the Union.

Moreover, because it is the main purpose for those who wish to *destroy families* and the *unity of communities*, terminating American nationality plays right into the hands of these people.

Ergo, *stateless status* is not recommended; and a *totally undesirable* workaround.

16) VOID FOR NONDISCLOSURE

People think that a particular law cannot apply to them due to not being given full disclosure. The fact is everything is published so you can get to it. Accordingly, this position will not work.

There is a maxim of law that states: “*Ignorance of the law is no excuse.*”

Granted, that rule only applies to the common law, and not statutes; but when one engages into a *contract*, he must know the rules. The contract here is: United States citizenship. You have agreed to be an entity under the *law of persons*; hence the “playing field” has expanded.

See *United States is a Corporation* for more information.

17) LEGAL FICTION

In example, there are a lot of people that like to call things like the government a “legal fiction”. It is not. It may be a creation of man, and not a creation of God, but it is still there.

The government is a *legal entity*, not a *legal fiction*.

In proper reference of the term, a *legal fiction* is a presumption made by a court due to the lack of evidence to the contrary of which the court formulates its belief. In example: You are a United States citizen, even though you say you are not. This is what the court will think due to the fact you have no evidence to the contrary. This is one example where this rule will be used.

Study *Rules of Evidence* and *Rebuttable Presumptions* to understand this one more.

18) APOSTILLE: ACT OF STATE

The Apostille/Act of State ruse is similar to that of people being conned into using International Driving Permits (IDP) in past years. Like the IDP, it incorporates a misuse of treaty law.

Here is the general explanation of what an Apostille encompasses:

- Apostille is also a French word which means a certification. It is commonly used in English to refer to the legalization of a document for international use under the terms of the 1961 Hague Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalization for Foreign Public Documents. Documents which have been notarized by a notary public, and certain other documents, and then certified with a conformant Apostille are accepted for legal use in all the nations that have signed the Hague Convention. —*Wikipedia*

Here is what the Michigan Secretary of State says about them:

- Apostilles SHALL NOT at any time be issued for use in the United States.

Moreover, if one would research websites of the states, at times there is notice that the secretary of state is *not responsible* for the information being *true and correct* that is under Apostille. So someone could be claiming to be the President of planet Zercon. So what does this gain?

In line with the above, most of the documentation executed under the “Apostille” ruse has been patriot blathering, *i.e.* nothing of proper legal substance that a court would recognize. Along with that, it cannot be used within the continental United States. Again, what does this gain?

Ask whoever has been conned into this ruse to produce any wins. Further, someone that uses it will not know how to defend it when they go to use it. Again, most of these documents lack any valid legal substance. An unsuspecting person using this method will get slammed by a court.

So, what does an Apostille (Act of State) accomplish? Giving the state some money and putting some money in someone’s pocket that sold some unsuspecting chump a package. That is about it. Like other programs, all this is doing is wasting time in us winning the “proverbial” war.

Simply, the Apostille is just another shyster (money making) and/or disinformation program.

19) DIPLOMATIC STATUS

So, you claim to be a diplomat of the United States of America

Right. Who appointed you?

- 18 USC 912 - Sec. 912. Officer or employee of the United States. Whoever falsely assumes or pretends to be an officer or employee acting under the authority of the United States or any department, agency or officer thereof, and acts as such, or in such pretended character demands or obtains any money, paper, document, or thing of value, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.

Does the insanity ever end?

20) NONRESIDENT ALIEN STANCE

The non-resident alien thing that a lot of “Patriots” use in regard to taxation and other Acts that Congress uses such language in is a faulty stance. It is not what people say/think it is. People who are US citizens are not considered nonresident aliens as defined by any act of Congress.

Here is a sample of the US Code that exemplifies of what is stated:

- Title 8 USC § 1101. Definitions
 - (a) As used in this chapter - [chapter 12 of Title 8]
 - (20) The term “lawfully admitted for permanent residence” means the status of having been lawfully accorded the privilege of residing permanently in the United States as an immigrant in accordance with the immigration laws, such status not having changed.

- Title 26 USC § 7701. Definitions (Internal Revenue Code)
 - (b) Definition of resident alien and nonresident alien.
 - (1) In general. For purposes of this title (other than subtitle B) -
 - (A) Resident alien. An alien individual shall be treated as a resident of the United States with respect to any calendar year if (and only if) such individual meets the requirements of clause (i), (ii), or (iii) [*details of ii & iii omitted for irrelevance*]:
 - (i) Lawfully admitted for permanent residence. Such individual is a lawful permanent resident of the United States at any time during such calendar year.
 - (B) Nonresident alien. An individual is a nonresident alien if such individual is neither a citizen of the United States nor a resident of the United States (within the meaning of subparagraph (A)).

The verbiage “within the meaning of subparagraph (A)” means he (a nonresident alien) has to be a complete foreigner to the “USA”. Please look closely at what a RESIDENT ALIEN is in regard to what a “lawful permanent resident of the United States” is considered. This is the language found in Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(20), *i.e.* “within the meaning of subparagraph (A)”. When you see the term *nonresident alien* you should be able to trace it back to a treaty that the United States has entered into with other countries. This is *private international law* that deals with “persons”.

The claim/position of being a nonresident alien fails if one is a citizen of the United States. State Nationals are *Aliens* (Title 8 USC § 1101(a)(3)) and are not *Residents* (*see* Law of Nations), but are not *nonresident aliens* within the US Code. However, one has to have the evidence to claim the State National status to not be deemed a *citizen of the United States* (US citizen).

21) SMALL ‘U’ UNITED STATES

There are many that like to write United States using a lower case ‘u’ in United. The question to these types is: What does this do? Is this creating some kind of force-field here?

This practice comes from the Declaration of Independence. Simply, the many colony-states that broke off from England were not yet incorporated. The use of the lower case ‘u’ is nothing more than illustrating that the word “united” is an adjective, rather than a noun (as used in *later* times).

When the *states* broke off from England they *united* under the *Articles of Confederation*. They then formed an *entity* which then had the *style* of “The United States of America”. This name was also used in the *Constitution for the United States of America*. However, under this *new entity* they also threw in the term “United States”. That created a real need for better understanding.

Sorry, but the small ‘u’ United States has been gone since the several states agreed to incorporate under the Article of Confederation in 1781. Once again, *the contract makes the law*. For more information on this subject, check out *United States is a Corporation*.

22) UCC REMEDIES

There are many people around that have gotten bitten by the UCC remedy kick. This harebrained workaround has caused the movement a lot of damage. It is really hard to believe that people fall for this. The ones that started this nonsense should be hung-up by their fingernails.

In seriousness, the UCC (Uniform Commercial Code) is fundamentally a special code that deals transactions that are purely commercial in nature. The general purpose of the code is to handle commercial transactions that involve personal property. Also, the code was designed to limit the actions that were filed into the court system as to lessen burden on the courts.

Although the *private law* system is grounded in contract, the UCC has no place for protecting the rights one has under any constitution. The general idea that the “nutty professors” sell people on

in regard to this scheme is to convince them they are securing their property that was bought with Federal Reserve Notes. Some of these “nutty professors” actually had people put their children on Form UCC-1 and register them with the state. This use of the form is similar to a mechanics lien. The connection of that form to such insanity is unconceivable. It has been said that people are establishing first rights of lien so government cannot lien the property for any debt. On its face, this is fraud. These people are establishing liens on things they have no debt interest in.

Further, there were people calling themselves “transmitting utilities”. In example, that term is from the UCC and it defines a regulated entity that maintains lines to transmit power.

Yes, people actually bought into these things, and still are. One cannot even venture where these ideas have come from. There were numerous profiteers that raked many *thousands* of dollars from gullible people for doing seminars and charging for filing bogus documents. Also, books like “Cracking the Code” were also sold pushing these ridiculously bogus law principles.

Due to the fact a lot of people are in legal trouble allows these profiteers to prey on their victims. Many go for the bogus methods out of desperation. It is highly recommended that you stay far away from anyone that even talks about this nonsense. And also be aware that a lot of the UCC scam artists/profiteers refer to these techniques as “Redemption” as well.

You should just go and read the code yourself to understand its appropriate usage. The code is even somewhat clear for someone that has not even opened a law book before.

Also see *Redemption* for more information on this scheme.

To be continued... Many more details on this ludicrous philosophy...

- See Kahn indictment as example: http://www.pacinelaw.org/pdf/sup/Kahn_Indictment.php

23) INTERNATIONAL DRIVING PERMIT

In past years a lot of people in the “movement” have been using the International Driving Permits (IDP). People selling this idea have people pay them for it. It is in violation of law.

People fail to understand that the IDP was not valid unless they had a driver’s license from the same country of which the IDP represented. That was what the treaty stated. This sham worked for awhile until law enforcement in the United States got wise to it and started making the holder of the IDP provide the driver’s license from a country to back the IDP up.

This is just another case of people getting taken by sham artists who claim to know the law.

24) REDEMPTION

One can witness that most of the people in this “movement” do not want to pay income tax. It should be noted that not paying income tax is one of the biggest drives behind “the movement.” Other people just do not want to pay obligations they have entered into, such as mortgages and credits cards. The general argument is that there is *no money*. This principle is grounded in the current money being represented by the private Federal Reserve Bank not being constitutional.

There is *no doubt* that the Federal Reserve is a problem. Congress should be dealt with severely for letting this *bad contract* continue, let alone for even letting it happen.

In this vein, redemption people make-up in their minds that this is a reason not to pay their debts. So-called “redemption” takes on many faces. There are none that are any good. Most information from this movement came out of the UCC, or Uniform Commercial Code.

To be continued... much more on this ludicrous philosophy...

- See Kahn indictment as example: http://www.pacinelaw.org/pdf/sup/Kahn_Indictment.php

OTHER WORK IN PROGRESS...

CORPORATION SOLE

Generally, the corporation soles are used as a *workaround* for dodging income tax. One should note that they put-up big red flags for the Internal Revenue Service. This is a current favorite for those who are selling (*i.e.*, profiteers) high-dollar packages to people in the movement.

Here is an example of copy taken from an *indictment* of someone *peddling* corporation soles:

ARL* also sold so-called “corporation sole” to customers for \$1300 each. “Corporation sole” were *fake* religious entities set up by ARL and registered as corporations in the State of Nevada that were to be used by customers to hide assets and income from the IRS and other creditors. *(*American Rights Litigators, Guiding Light of God Ministries, a.k.a. Eddie Kahn*)

- See the full indictment here: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/sup/Kahn_Indictment.php

TRUSTS

Trusts, like corporation soles, are generally used as a *workaround* for dodging income tax. Like the corporation sole, these also put-up big red flags for the Internal Revenue Service.

However, please note that a trust can be a valid endeavor for asset protection, etc. And, there are some trusts that are not seen by the Internal Revenue Service. We must caution you on how your matters are handled in this regard. Take heed of who you are dealing if you walk this path.

The trust profiteering racket has been a long time favorite for those who are selling high-dollar packages to people in the movement. They are still a favorite used to make money for many in the movement today. So again, take heed of who you are dealing with in this arena.

Again, people use trusts because they fail to understand *political status* and *private law*.

TAXES: SHOW ME THE LAW

Oh yes, there is a law(s). For now though, understand that the Internal Revenue Code is an endless trap. No argument will create a bulletproof win every time. More to come on this...

- See this for more information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Show_Me_The_Law.php
- See this for more information: http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Income_Tax.php

LAND PATENTS

There is some substance with land patents, but not a magical cure-all. Once again, the answer is *political status* and *private law*.

To be continued...

~~~~~  
Authored by the People’s Awareness Coalition

POB 313 – Kieler, Wisconsin [www.pacinlaw.org](http://www.pacinlaw.org)

PAC may be reached via email at: [info@pacinlaw.org](mailto:info@pacinlaw.org)

**NOTE:** This is a work in progress. Get updated versions\* at:

- [http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Patriot\\_Misbeliefs.php](http://www.pacinlaw.org/pdf/Patriot_Misbeliefs.php)

\*The version number is noted as a date in the footer of the document.