The Silver Bulletin

An Open Paper By

BILL MEDINA
Post Office Box 70400
Sunnyvale, California, U.S.A.
Postal Zone: 94086-0400

REFERENCES

Black's Law Dictionary, Fifth Edition. (Hereinafter: Black's, Page _____.)

Bouvier's Law Dictionary and Concise Encyclopedia, Third revision (Eighth Edition) 1914, ISBN 0-8994-335-8, (Hereinafter: Bouvier's Volume _____, Page _____.)

Constitution FOR the United States of America (hereinafter: by Article or Amendment), in pari materia with the California Constitution pursuant to Article III, Section 1 thereof.

The Supreme Court on ABROGATION OF RIGHTS: Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S. 436, 491 (1966).

The Supreme Court on COMMON-LAW PLEA TO JURISDICTION: Roberts v. Lewis 144 U.S. 653:

The Supreme Court on the COURTS OF STAR CHAMBER: Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806

The Supreme Court on JURISDICTION: Maxfield's Lessee v. Levy 4 U.S. 308, 311, 312 (1797).

The Supreme Court on RIGHTS OF CONTRACT: Hale v. Henkel, 20 U.S. 43, 74-75 (1906)

PART 1

STATUS

"The status of an individual used as a legal term, means the legal position of the individual in or with regard to the rest of the community. L. R. 4 P.D. 11. The rights, duties, capacities and incapacitates which determine a person to a given class, constitutes his status; Campb. Austin 137. ... ... The action of assumpsit must be reckoned a technical instrument which gave no small help to the forces which were making for the transition from status to contract; 3 Holdsw. Hist. E. L. 349." Bouvier's Volume 3, page 3129.

MAJOR PREMISE

NATURE'S GOD Created Mankind, Mankind created Constitutions, Constitutions created governments created Rules, Codes, Regulations, and/or Statutes (hereinafter called Enactments), most of which are nefariously Executed and Applied as some government -sponsored Court - Crime -Revenue Raising-Activity.

The presumption that the THE PEOPLE are subject to government Jurisdiction by way of government Enactments, presumes that THE PEOPLE are subject to those Jurisdictions created by the Constitutions, which in-turn created Such governments in a self-perpetuating fashion.

The Colonists' intent not to create a SOVEREIGN but rather, to further bind the Branches of government is made clear in the Preamble To The Bill Of Rights-December 15, 1791.

"The conventions of a number of the States having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, IN ORDER TO PREVENT MISCONSTRUCTION OR ABUSE OF ITS POWERS, THAT FURTHER DECLARATORY AND RESTRICTIVE CLAUSES SHOULD BE ADDED: And as extending the Government, will best insure the beneficent ends of its institution."

The Unlawful presumption that the Colonists intended to establish a SOVEREIGN, by Their Constitutional Charter, thereafter conferring upon Such SOVEREIGN certain Jurisdiction over the Colonists Themselves, is properly debunked by: Article I., Section 9, Clause 8

"No Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: --" and Article I., Section 10, Clause 1

"No State shall ... grant any Title of Nobility."

Any Jurisdiction emanating from a presumption of a fiction is presumptive or fictitious, and Such is a Factitious Tool For Unlawful Control.

Government sovereignty over THE PEOPLE is a presumption and a fiction, and which when once repudiated, must thereafter be proved to exist.

If the Individual cannot be Proved to be subject to the Jurisdiction of any Constitution or Other Social Contract or Compact, He also cannot be proved to be subject to the Jurisdiction of any Branch of government Created Thereunder.

Likewise, if it cannot be Proved that The Individual is DIRECTLY Subject to the Jurisdiction of any Legislature, it also cannot be Proved that He is INDIRECTLY Subject to Such Jurisdiction by way of any Legislative Enactments.

In the absence of proof that The Individual is subject to the Jurisdiction of any Constitution or other Social Contract or Compact, Jurisdiction over Him DOES NOT EXIST.

ARGUMENT - SUMMARY

The general requirement that "... the burden is on the defendant to show the nonexistence of Jurisdictional facts; Russell v. Butler, (Tex.civ App.) 47 S.W.406; Gilchrist v. Oil Land Co., 21 W.Va.115, 45 Am.Rep.555.", (Bouvier's Volume 2, Page 1763), is resolved by Article VI which defines exactly Who is subject to the Jurisdiction of the Constitution, and exactly Who shall be Contractually Bound by Oath or Affirmation to support Such Constitution in Consideration for Offices Of Public Trust and those Benefits of Public Service and Public Employment. "... The Senators and Representative before mentioned, and the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executives and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution; ..." Article VI

Since the intent of Article VI is to define exactly to Whom the Constitutional Jurisdiction applies; since the fact exists that THE PEOPLE are excluded from the requirements of Article VI, prima facie; See: INCLUSIO UNIS EST EXCLUSIO ALTERIUS: Black's, Page 687;

since no presumption that THE PEOPLE are subject to the Jurisdiction of the Constitution is, or can be made; since all Constitutions are considered in pari materia with all other Constitutions;

since all Constitutions are subject to the provisions of Article VI; since no Constitution operates on THE PEOPLE at-large by virtue of the fact that THE PEOPLE are excluded from the requirements of Article VI, et sqq; then in pursuing His occupations of Common-Right, the Individual has made no Oath or Affirmation supporting any Constitution, and He is not subject to any Constitutional Jurisdictions.

CONCLUSION - SUMMARY

If The Individual is not subject to any Constitutional Jurisdictions, He is also not subject to any Enactment made by any Constitutionally Created Legislature;

if He is not subject to any Constitutional Jurisdictions, He is also not subject to any Jurisdiction presumed by any Constitutionally Created Executive Branch of Government; and

if He is not subject to any Constitutional Jurisdictions, He is also not subject to any Jurisdiction presumed by any Constitutionally Created Judiciary.

In the complete absence of any Lawful and verified Oath or Affirmation made by a Nonparticipant Individual, to support any Constitution; or in the complete absence of proving a Higher Title to that Property Known and Described as the Nonparticipant Individual Himself, In Personam Jurisdiction does not exist; and

in the complete absence of proving a Lawful and voluntary contract made by Such Nonparticipant, pledging Himself and/or His Property- Rights to certain specified performance, Subject Matter Jurisdiction does not exist; and

in the complete absence of any Lawful and verified complaint made against Such Nonparticipant, wherein a Real Injured Party Claims a Damage, no criminal Jurisdictions exist; thus

in the complete absence of proving the existence of either In Personam and or Subject Matter Jurisdiction, governmental Jurisdiction over the Nonparticipant Individual does not exist. QUOD ERAT DEMONSTRANDUM.

TORT REMEDY

Every Act perpetrated by any Constitutional Created Branch of government while absent Jurisdiction; every Such Act being required to be made unlawfully under Forces of Arms; and every Such act having been made without probable cause; then, every Such Act is required to have been made as a Trespass, and/or other Tort upon a Nonparticipant Individual, and shall constitute a Case to be pursued against the Perpetrator in an Action At Law for the recovery of Damages.

PART 2

To better understand the Jurisdictional Argument, We are first presenting a thumb-nail sketch of:

HISTORY

The Revolutionary War was principally financed by "Old-World" International Banking Interests (hereinafter called Federalists), Who had made Substantial Investments into the Colonies for the purposes of making Profits and Gains through Their Imports into, and their Exports from the Colonies, where All Such Trade was conducted in International Commerce under the Laws of Nations (in the Admiralty Jurisdiction).

Having been the Powers behind the Thrones and Churches throughout most of "Civilized" History, The Federalists Conspired to establish a Strong Central "Sovereign" Jurisdiction in the New Colonies to facilitate Their Control over the Colonists themselves as Feudal Lords of Their Private Lands.

Yielding to those Economic Pressures to establish an Area in which International Commerce could be conducted pursuant to the Laws of Nations (Admiralty), the Colonists established a Ten Mile Square (approximately., 3.2 miles x 3.2 miles) ADMIRALTY ZONE to be the Seat of the Admiralty Government of the United States.

SEDITION BY SYNTAX ("United States" DOES NOT mean "United States of America" or "the Several States")

The aforesaid Admiralty Zone, now called Washington, D.C., is analogous to the Thirteen Block Section known as "London Town" which was established approximately 1066 A.D., under William the Conqueror, which IS NOT part of Great Britain proper, and which operates principally in the Admiralty Jurisdiction.

Just as "London Town" IS NOT part of Great Britain proper, Washington, D.C., IS NOT part of the several United States of America, and Washington, D.C., was created by Cession of particular States, and by the acceptance of Congress, to become the Seat of the Government of the United States. See Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 of the Constitution and the "United States" as defined in Title 18 U.S.C. Section 5, "Title" 26 U.S.C. Section 3121(e)(2), and Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1603(c).

In 1790 the PUBLIC DEBT was 75 Millions of Dollars-by-Weight of Gold or Silver, and on or about 1790, the First National Bank was given a Twenty (20) Year Charter.

By 1792, "worthless as a continental" was commonly used to describe those bitter Private Loss-Experiences connected the "The Continental Dollar", issued by the United States in Its Federal Admiralty Jurisdiction under the General Auspices and Control of the Said Federalists.

This technique enable the Federalists to draw-off THE PEOPLES' Wealth replacing it with PAPER.

On April 2, 1792, the Congress (of the several States) passed The Coinage Act of 1792, Such Act exactly compelling the United States to Perform in accordance with Article I, Section 8, Clause 5

of the Constitution, by Prohibiting the United States from issuing PAPER Currency at any time in the future.

In or about 1810, the Congress refused to renew the Federalists' National Banking Charter.

In or about 1812, the Federalists declared War on the United States.

In or about 1815, the Second National Bank was given a twenty (20) year Charter.

In 1815, the court in the case of De Lovio v. Boit, 7 Fed. Cases Number 3, 776 stated that:

"A policy of Insurance is a maritime contract, and therefore of Admiralty Jurisdiction."

In 1835, the Public Debt was 38 thousands of Dollars-by-weight of Gold or Silver, THE LOWEST EVER.

In 1836, President Andrew Jackson forced the closing of the Second Bank of the U.S. by revoking Its Charter. He is said to have been met by the Money Changers Who approached Him in the Drawing Room of the White House, whereupon The President is said to have stated:

"Gentlemen, I have had men watching you for a long time and I am convinced that you have used the funds of the bank to speculate in the breadstuffs of the country. When you won, you divided the profits amongst you, and when you lost, you charged it to the bank. You tell me that if I take the deposits from the bank and annul its charter, I shall ruin ten thousand families. That may be true, gentlemen, but that is your sin! Should I let you go on, you will ruin fifty thousand families, and that would be my sin! You are a den of vipers and thieves. I have determined to rout you out, and by the Eternal God, I will rout you out!"

At the time of the Second Session of the 36th Congress in 1861, while absent a significant PUBLIC DEBT, the Federalists had failed to procure Jurisdiction over all of the Property contained within the several States by Rights of Debt through Contractural Banking Obligations.

Finding Themselves unable to Lawfully Manipulate Credit and Monetary Policy to Their own Gains, Advantages, and Benefits, the Federalists' United States joined in Collusion and Conspiracy with Certain of the several States, and with Certain Foreign Powers under the General Auspices and Control of the Said Federalists, to Commit Treason by Unlawfully Declaring War on Those Lawfully Constituted Governments of the United States of America, Such War being for the Singular Purpose of Overthrowing the Aforesaid Lawful Jurisdictions by Forces-Of-Arms, in a "CIVIL" Counterrevolution for the Purposes of Imposing Federal Admiralty Jurisdiction Upon Each of the United States of America, and upon Each of THE PEOPLE habitat therein.

In 1863, in order to finance Their "CIVIL" Counterrevolutionary Activities, the Federalists passed The National Currency Act of February 25, 1863, Such Act providing for the Issue of Commercial Paper Currency Secured by a Pledge of United States' Stocks, and the Act provided for "circulation and redemption thereof". See The Story of Money, Third Edition (1981), published by: Federal Reserve Bank of New York, 33 Liberty Street, New York, N.Y., U.S.A., Postal Zone: 10045.

"The Federal Government couldn't raise enough money to pay for the Civil War through bond sales and taxes. As rapidly as the treasury paid bills with gold and silver coin, the metal was hoarded. Reluctantly, Congress issued paper money -- U.S. notes -- that wasn't redeemable in gold or silver. Congress tried making the notes acceptable by declaring them "legal tender", which meant that they had to be accepted in payment of all private debts. The government also began chartering "national banks" which were given paper currency they could issue as their own. State banks were stopped from issuing notes. National banks received currency in proportion to the amount of Government bonds they purchased."

This technique allowed the Federalists to draw-off THE PEOPLES' Wealth replacing it with PAPER.

On December 18, 1865, the Congress enacted the Thirteenth Article Amendment abolishing Involuntary Servitude while leaving VOLUNTARY Servitude to Contract in its place.

By 1866, the Counterrevolution had been successful, the United States had won, the United States of America had fallen and were held hostage, Federal Jurisdiction and Martial Law had been Imposed, the Federal Monarchy had been installed, and the Public Debt, which was soon to become unquestionable, had attained a value of 2.7 Billions of Dollars-by-Weight of gold or silver.

In July of 1868, the Federalists made Their Declaration of United States Jurisdiction in the form and manner of the Fourteenth Article Amendment to The Constitution for the United States of America. Section 1. "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the Jurisdiction thereof, are Citizens of the United States ...", and Section 4. "The validity of the public debt of the United States ... shall not be questioned." (Emphasis added)

While the Thirteenth Amendment abolished PRIVATE ownership of PEOPLE, the Fourteenth Amendment made possible the PUBLIC ownership of PERSONS. In or about 1870, under the banner of the Census or Enumeration directed to be taken within every subsequent Term of ten Years, the formal practice of Birth Registration was begun, thereafter Recording Births in the Bureau Of The Census, Department of Commerce.

In 1884, in Julliard v. Greenman, 110 U.S. 421, the Supreme Court upheld the United States in reneging on Its Promise To Redeem Its Paper by allowing Its Money Trust to enter a silent interpleader, whereupon Judicial Notice was taken of a Third Party Contract resulting from Julliard using His Commercial Paper Currency as security in a Transaction for his 100 Bales of Cotton thus promoting the practice if Discharging Debt by Obligatory Notes instead of Tendering Payment for Debt in Lawful and Substantive Money in Dollars- by-Weight of gold or silver.

In 1897, the Supreme Court in the case of The Glide, 167 U.S. 623, stated that:

"The Admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction conferred by the Constitution and laws of the United States upon the District Courts of the United States is exclusive."

In 1904, the court in the case of Dailey v. New York, 128 F. 789, stated that:

Jurisdiction attaches in case of a maritime contract irrespective of the question whether it is to be performed on land or water."

In 1907, there was an economic depression.

On February 25, 1913, Secretary of State Knox Falsely and Fraudulently Certified that the Sixteenth Article Amendment to the Constitution had been Lawfully Ratified.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that The Sixteenth Article Amendment did not REPEAL those Restrictions Imposed on the United States by Article I, Section 2, Clause 3, or Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; pursuant to those Directives of Article V. Even if it were valid by having been properly ratified, The Sixteenth Article Amendment amended absolutely nothing pertaining to the several States or the Inhabitants thereof.

The Congress, being well aware of these Facts, never ENABLED The Sixteenth Amendment as Public Law by Appropriate Legislation, in that the Amendment did not REPEAL the aforesaid Restrictions, and the Internal Revenue Code ("Title" 26 U.S.C.) which is predicated upon the Sixteenth Amendment, is now, and has always been, "Private Law" based upon Public Commercial (Contractual) Law. See Amendment XXI, ratified December 5, 1933, for the Construction of a "REPEAL".

SEDITION BY SYNTAX ("Public DOES NOT mean "Private".)

More-often-than-not, Public Commercial Law has been called, "PUBLIC LAW" where It is in-fact, Public Commercial Law regulating Private Commercial Contracts and Interests in Equity and Contractual Performance made within the Admiralty Jurisdiction.

Presumably, on April 8, 1913, the several States "VOLUNTARILY" surrendered, and Consented to Deprive Themselves of, Their Rights of Suffrage by the Imposition of the Seventeenth Article Amendment to the Constitution, Such Amendment being an Abrogation of the Intent, Directive, Legal Construction, and Relevant Structural Conditions set forth in Article I, Section 3, and in Article V providing that no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of Its Equal Suffrage in the Senate.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that When THE PEOPLE of the several States Chartered the United States as an Admiralty Jurisdiction, it WAS NOT the Legislative intent of the September 1787 Congress to put into effect a self-destruct mechanism, Such as could possibly make a Proposed Constitutional Amendment to the several States, where, upon Its Ratification through any mechanism, the Constitutional Prohibitions regulating the United States would somehow cease to exist.

The Congress Itself, has never had the Power to modify The Very Constitution that Created the Congress Itself (Article I, Section 8), and any lawful modification done by way of Amendment, can only be made through the Legislature of three-fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress.

The Congress has been Delegated only those Seventeen (17) Powers enumerated in Article I, Section 8. All other Powers NOT vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof, are specifically reserved to THE PEOPLE for Their exercise of Primary Jurisdiction over Their Respective Governments. See the Tenth Article Amendment to the Constitution FOR the United States of America.

The Congress, once again being well aware of these Facts, never ENABLED The Seventeenth Amendment as Public Law by appropriate legislation, in that the Amendment did not REPEAL Article I, Section 3, nor did it REPEAL Article V of the Constitution.

During the Second Session of the 63rd Congress on December 23, 1913, two days before Christmas while most of the legitimate Congress vacationed, the Federal Reserve Act was passed by a Congressional Quorum establishing the Third National Bank, or the Functionally Secret Federal Reserve Bank, System, or Corporation (hereinafter called FED Corporation), on the basis of another Twenty (20) Year Charter.

The FED Corporation Act Fraudulently CONVERTED the Lawfully Delegated Congressional Power To Coin Money and regulate the Value thereof, while simultaneously Such Act franchised and enabled the newly created FED Corporation to counterfeit Certificates, Notes, Securities, and Other Obligations of the United States by providing for the Private Issue of Private PAPER Currency, where such Public issue of Public PAPER Currency was prohibited to the Congress by Law under Article I, Section 8, Clause 5; and the Coinage Act of April 1792.

The Congress effectively franchised the FED Corporation to carry out that which was Unlawful and Prohibited to the Congress Itself.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that no constitutional Amendment pursuant to Article V was ever made Such that the Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Article I, Section 10, Clause 1 Prohibitions by the Constitution were REPEALED. Consequently, the Federalists have continued to operate exclusively as Special-Charter Franchisees by Underwriting and Insuring the PUBLIC DEBT in the form and manner of Their FED Corporation, by way of Their own "Sub-Charter" Banks, all under Private Contract Law, and all within the United States' Admiralty Jurisdiction.

Amongst the rumors and presumed excuses for creating the FED Corporation was the alleged creation of a theoretically "ELASTIC CURRENCY" such as would supposedly s-t-r-e-t-c-h so as to avoid those economic depressions as occurred in 1907.

To accomplish this, the FED Corporation printed and circulated Notes, the value of which was 400% of all Lawful money in circulation. This was called "fractional reserve banking" at 25% of par value.

Thus the FED Corporation printed and circulated four (4) Paper Dollars for every one (1) Dollar-by-Weight of Gold or silver supposedly held in reserve in The United States Treasury; thereafter, each one (1) Dollar certificate had an Actual Redemption Value to twenty-five (25) cents. This technique, by the way of Their FED Corporation, enabled the Federalists to withdraw Gold from circulation replacing it with PAPER.

The average Man-On-The-Street was led to believe that the Paper Twenty Dollar Gold Certificate that he held in his Left Hand, had the same Redemption Value as the One Ounce Twenty Dollar Gold Coin that he held in His Right; where in-fact, Each Twenty (20) Dollar Certificate had an actual Redemption Value of Five (5) Dollars-by-Weight of Gold or Silver supposedly held in reserve.

While such "Paper" obligations were prohibited from being issued by The Congress Itself due to The Coinage Act of April 2, 1792, nothing prohibited the FED Corporation from issuing Its PRIVATE Silver Certificates and later, Its totally unredeemable FED Corporation Notes.

From 1914 to 1929, the United States Congress spent the value of four (4) Paper Dollars for every one (1) Dollar-by-Weight of gold or silver held in reverse in Its United States Treasury, thus the Congress participated in extortionate extensions of credit through the continuing re-discounting of commercial PAPER currency as performance obligations.

This technique once again enabled the Federalists to draw-off THE PEOPLES' Wealth replacing it with Paper.

By 1919, the Public Debt was 25 billions of Dollars-by-Weight of gold or silver.

On January 16, 1919, the Eighteenth Amendment was installed providing that after One Year from the Ratification of This Article, the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from THE UNITED STATES AND ALL TERRITORY SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION THEREOF FOR BEVERAGE PURPOSES WAS PROHIBITED.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that United States Federal Jurisdiction to enforce the Eighteenth Amendment within the Jurisdictions of the several States was notably absent, as succinctly set forth in the Enabling Clause, where THE CONGRESS AND THE SEVERAL STATES shall have CONCURRENT Power to enforce This Article Appropriate Legislation.

This Article operated exclusively upon the UNITED STATES AND ALL TERRITORY SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION THEREOF, but This Article was without general Force and Effect on the several States unless Each of Such several States individually volunteered to enforce the Article by Appropriate Legislation.

Prohibition, as it was foisted on THE PEOPLE, provided many opportunities to install a strong Federal Police Force by creating the Federal Bureau of Investigation, by enhancing the Secret Service, and by strengthening the preexisting Bureau of Internal Revenue, to name just Three.

By October 1929, the theoretically "ELASTIC CURRENCY" had s-t-r-e-t- ch-e-d to the point where the Public Debt was 17 Billions of Dollars- byWeight of gold or silver.

By June of 1933, at the termination of Its Twenty (20) Year Charter, after having ravaged the Nation with Four (4) years of Depression By Design, the FED Corporation Called Its outstanding United States' obligations. The United States' Treasury was bankrupt, and the credit discounted value of Its commercial PAPER currency had s-t-r-e-t- c-h-e-d to such proportions that the Congress was forced to declare an undeclared bankruptcy, without ever having explained the undefined "emergency" mentioned in House Joint Resolution 192, and without ever having notified THE PEOPLE At-Large of the Aspects, Conditions, Nature, or Causes of the Said emergency.

"HJR 192 JOINT RESOLUTION TO SUSPEND THE GOLD STANDARD AND ABROGATE THE GOLD CLAUSE, JUNE 5, 1933 (H.J. Res.192 73rd Cong., 1st Sess.)

Joint resolution to assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States.

Whereas the holding of or dealing in gold affect the public interest, and are therefore subject to proper regulation and restriction; and

Whereas the existing emergency has disclosed that provisions of obligation which purport to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency of the United States, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, obstruct the power of Congress to regulate the value of the money of the United States, and are inconsistent with the declared policy of the Congress to maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar, coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That [a] every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy; and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts.

Any such provision contained in any law authorizing obligations to be issued by or under authority of the United States, is hereby repealed, but the repeal of any such provision shall not invalidate any other provision or authority contained in such law.

(b) As used in this resolution, the term "obligation" means an obligation (including every obligation of and to the United States, excepting currency) payable in money of the United States; and the term "coin or currency" means coin or currency of the United States, including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations.

SEC. 2. The last sentence of paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 43 of the Act entitled "An Act to relieve the existing national economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emergency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes", approved May 12, 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"All coins and currencies of the United States (including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations) heretofore or hereafter coined or issued, shall be legal tender for all debts, public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues, except that gold coins, when below the standard wight and limit of tolerance provided by law for the single piece, shall be legal tender only at valuation in proportion to their actual weight." Approved, June 5, 1933, 4:40 P.M."

Thus On June 5th 1933, the United States Treasury was foreclosed upon by the FED Corporation because the United States' Treasury could no longer pay Its Credit obligations on Its commercial PAPER currency.

SEDITION BY SYNTAX ("Department of the Treasury" DOES NOT mean "United States Treasury Department".)

Upon making the foregoing UNDECLARED "declaration of bankruptcy", the Federalists' Congress began CONVERTING those ALLODIAL LAND TITLES that were Privately Owned by THE PEOPLE, At-Large.

In June of 1933, the Pennsylvania State Legislature pledged the privately owned Allodial Land Titles belonging to THE PEOPLE of the State of Pennsylvania, as security for Its portion of the PUBLIC DEBT (Penn. PL 111). Also see California Government Code Section 126 generally, and specifically Section 126(c). The result of pledging Such Titles as Security for a perpetual PUBLIC DEBT is: that upon Default by the United States, Ownership of the "Pledged" Land will revert to "Public" Federalist Control in satisfaction of Their "Public Debt".

After Fraudulently Pledging Such Titles in which the United States had NO LAWFUL INTEREST, The Congress soon thereafter, began another of Its "borrowing-spending" sprees designed to spend-out the Values of those Privately Owned Land Titles.

In August of 1933, an Executive Order Issued making it illegal for private Americans to own or trade in gold.

On December 5, 1933, The Eighteenth Article Amendment, having fulfilled Its designed purposes, was REPEALED by the Twenty-first Article Amendment, and like the Eleventh, Twelfth, Fourteenth, Sixteenth, Seventeenth, Eighteenth, Twentieth, Twenty-Second, and Twenty-Fifth Amendments, the Twenty-First Article Amendment was never ENABLED as Public Law by Appropriate Legislation.

In 1934, the Federalists passed The 1934 Gold Reserve Act which Proclaimed that gold could not be used as a medium of domestic exchange, and made it illegal for private Americans or firms to own Gold Bullion. This the Act effectively withdrew all remaining Gold from Monetary Circulation by requiring that it be tendered to the Federal Government. Additionally, the Act also restricted private ownership of gold to those who must use gold for industrial or export purposes (a restriction that was rescinded as of December 31, 1974).

Once again the average Man-on-the-street was lead to believe that the Paper One Dollar Silver Certificate that he held in his left hand, was of the same Redemption Value as the Silver Dollar that He held in his Right.

The Gold Reserve Act was enforced under the Police Powers of the United States by the Internal Revenue Service, and Those who failed to relinquish, or refused to tender Their Gold to the Federal Government in exchange for Its Paper, were faced with the confiscation of Their Property, Arrest, Trial, Fines, penalties, and/or Imprisonment.

In 1935 the Social Security (old-age retirement) "Insurance" Act (49 Stat 620) was created by the Congress providing:

1.for the establishment of the Social Security Board; 2.for the issue of a Social Security Account Number to those who VOLUNTEERED to "Join The March To Social Security"; 3.that Such Social Security Account Number was, on its face, "NOT FOR IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES"; and 4.that One would VOLUNTARILY have one-half of one percent (0.005) of

the value of one's Wages withheld and deposited into the Social Security TRUST FUND from which, upon living to age sixty-five (65), One could draw some small allotment, Such that One was not utterly destitute in One's twilight years.

The Social Security Act was later codified under Title 42 U.S.C., and is enacted under the "civil rights" provisions of the Fourteenth Article Amendment to the Constitution.

In 1939 The Congress passed the Public Salaries Tax Act which imposed an "income" tax on every "Public" Employee.

In 1942 the Congress passed the "Victory Tax Act" (a direct tax) wherein five percent (0.05) of the value of One's wages was levied, withheld, and converted toward the war effort as an "income" tax.

The "Victory Tax Act" was unlawful on its face in that it violated Article I, Section 2, Clause 3, and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution; however, the nation was at War, and no one really complained too loudly about the Violations and Illegalities of Such Act, although vocal oppositions to Such Violations and Illegalities are noted in the Congressional Records pertaining thereto.

In 1944 the "Victory Tax Act" was repealed by the Congress.

In 1945 the Congress passed the "McCarren Act" which provides that ALL "Insurance" be regulated in Interstate Commerce pursuant to Article I, Section *, Clause 3 of the Constitution. See "McCarren Act" -- Black's 5th, Page 883, "Internal Security" -- Black's 5th Page 732, "Internal Security Acts" -- Black's 5th, Page 732, Title 18 U.S.C. 2385 and 2386.

In 1961 the Congress decided to violate the Contractual Restriction that the Social Security Account Number was "NOT FOR IDENTIFICATION PURPOSES" BY USING SUCH NUMBER FOR IDENTIFICATION.

In 1968 Silver was withdrawn as the Substantive Security, Protection, and Indemnification supporting the value and buying-power of the Paper One Dollar Silver Certificate, and Such withdrawal of "backing" was accompanied by further extensions of fractional-reserve lending,

Meanwhile, the Social Security Trust Fund was technically and functionally abolished, and those funds that still remained, after extensive government "burrowing", were ultimately CONVERTED by adding them to the General (revolving) Fund, where such Funds promptly "revolved" right out of existence.

Once again the average Man-On-The_street was led to believe that the PAPER One Dollar Federal Reserve Note that he held in His left hand, was of the same redemption value as the PAPER One Dollar Silver Certificate that he held in His Right, and That was the Truth.

By 1976 the Social Security Account Number was used to "Identify" Each of THE PEOPLE, At-Large as a United States "person" and the Congress added Title 26 U.S.C. 6109 (d) to sanctify its own betrayal.

Thus culminating in HJR 192, the Federalists' Congress had abrogated Article I, Section 8, Clause 2 by digressing from borrowing money on the credit of the United States, through

borrowing credit on the money of the United States, through borrowing credit on the money of THE PEOPLE AtLarge, through borrowing credit on the credit of the United States, through borrowing credit on the privately held Allodial Land Titles of THE PEOPLE within several States, to borrowing credit on the perpetual servitude and continued mandatory performance of THE PEOPLE themselves.

Thus when all was said and done, direct Taxes were still required to be apportioned AMONG THE SEVERAL STATES; all Duties, Imposts, and Excises were still required to be uniform; No ... direct, Tax could be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration; and no tax or Duty could be laid on Articles-in-Commerce exported from any State.

PART 3

Part 1 of this SILVER BULLETIN series dealt with the fact that PEOPLE of Common-Right are not bound by conditions of any constitutions.

Part 2 of the series described:

the historical facts surrounding the formation of the foreign federal admiralty jurisdiction (D.C.); the violent counter- revolution overthrowing the constitutionally established governments of the several States of the American Union, the establishment of a new constitutional monarchy; the unmitigated theft of private property, and; MOST IMPORTANTLY, that ALL Insurance is a maritime contract, and therefore Admiralty Jurisdiction, wherein Jurisdiction attaches in case of a maritime contract irrespective of the question whether it is to be performed on land or water.

BACKGROUND

AS NATURE'S GOD CREATED MANKIND and established His Right therein, then that Mankind exists, compels the presumption juris et de jure, that Mans' Rights to Live and His Rights to defend His Life began as a genetic heritage which successfully existed and operated through Millenniums dating the inception of the Time Continuum itself; thus all of Mans' Right predate His Instruments, and Mankinds' Rights to Life, His Rights to defend His Life, and His Rights of TITLE-TO-SELF have existed long antecedent to the formation of all constitution, and of all other such Instruments. See "juris et de jure" Blacks 5th, page 767.

Accordingly, THE PEOPLE are the Lawful Heirs to Hereditaments, both Corporeal and Incorporeal, by Hereditary Succession, inclusive of the Highest Titles to those individual Properties known and described as THE PEOPLE Themselves, Sui Juris.

Likewise the fact that THE PEOPLE physically exist as Human Life Forms, clearly establishes Their Rights to Live, Their Self-Rights of TITLE-TO-SELF, and Their Rights to defend Their Lives which began, existed, and successfully operated through Their individual Genetic Linages and Heritages, wherein all such Rights have existed long antecedent to the formation of any constitution; consequently, THE PEOPLE are required to make NO CLAIMS for any so-called "rights" that might have been accidently enumerated or stipulated to in the Text(s) of any such Instrument.

As Instruments, Mankind created constitutions, or Social Contracts or Compacts, thereby created governments. See "Social Contracts or Compacts", Black's 5th, Page 1246.

PLEASE NOTICE that NO constitution ever provided THE PEOPLE with Rights that They did not already possess prior to creation of such Instrument.

Existence and formal recognition of preexistent Rights is demonstrated throughout The Magna Carta, June 15, 1215; the Declaration of Rights in Congress, at New York, October 19, 1765; the Declaration of Rights in Congress, at Philadelphia, October 14, 1774; the Declaration of Independence July 4, 1776; the Articles of Confederation, November 15, 1777; and the Bill of Rights inclusive of the Ninth and Tenth Article Amendments, December 15, 1791, etc.

PLEASE NOTICE that throughout all of the Aforementioned Instruments, it cannot be proved that THE PEOPLE are subservient to any conditions of any such Instruments, nor to any conditions set forth or decreed by any pseudo sovereign.

By the conspicuous absence of Declarations of Subservience, it must be presumed that the Colonists did not want to forfeit their Rights to any sovereign, thus those so-called "rights" that were enumerated or stipulated to in the Texts of Their Instruments, are in-fact, a series of stringent Power limitations that operate NOT upon THE PEOPLE, but upon Their governments so as to hopefully eliminate their traditionally Lawless, inherently Sleezoid, Criminal Activities. See the Declaration of Independence as the Colonists' Criminal Indictment against George III.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that no Legislature has ever made ANY Lawful Act that operates directly on THE PEOPLE at-large, simply because They do not have the Power to make Such an Act. See Article I., Section 8.

The Constitution itself is recognized amongst the Laws Of Nations, as a Common-Law Charter providing, in part, for the admittance of admiralty Jurisdiction onto the land pursuant to the Law Merchant (Black's 5th, page 798) within those geographic limits set forth in Article I., Section 8, Clause 17.

Contracts made pursuant to Such Constitution operate in pari materia with other Commercial or Mercantile statutes emanating from the Roman Civil Jurisdictions, which are exercised under admiralty Jurisdiction in LondonTown proper and in Washington, D.C., etc., where Such contracts are generally identified or recognized throughout the World under the Laws of Nations (Black's 5th, page 733), as having been conducted under Flag Law. See "Flag Law", Black's 5th, page 574. See "Law of Nations" and "Captures on Land", Article I., Section 8, Clauses 10 and 11, respectively. See "State Names, Flags, Seals, Songs, Birds, Flowers, and Other Symbols" by George Earl Shankle, Pf.D., New York, The H. W. Wilson Company, 1941(?). See Flag Circular, War Department, The Adjutant General's Office (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1925) page 1. See "Army Regulations Number 260-10, Flags, Colors, Standards, and Guidons, by Order of the Secretary of War (Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 1926) pages 4 and 5.

PLEASE NOTICE the military flag in every courtroom.

Article III., Section 1 provides that "The Judicial Power of the United States, shall be vested in one Supreme court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." Article I., Section 8, Clause 9 provides that "The Congress shall have Power To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme court;" and all such Article I courts operate solidly within the admiralty Jurisdiction since the Congress and the United States Itself so operates.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that "The judicial Power of the United States, ..." formed in the admiralty Jurisdiction , is what is being discussed in THIS portion of the Constitution.

Article III., Section 2. provides that The Judicial Power shall extend to all Cases , in Law and Equity, arising under the Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority; thus the judicial Power extends:

to all Cases, affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls ; to all Cases, of admiralty and maritime Jurisdiction ; to Controversies to which the United States shall be a Party ; to all Controversies between two or more States ; to Controversies between a State and Citizens of another State ; to Controversies between Citizens of different States ; to Controversies between Citizens of the same State claiming Lands under Grants of different States ; and to Cases between a State, or the Citizens thereof, and a foreign thereof, and foreign States, Citizens, or Subjects .

Only in Cases affecting Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, and those in which a State shall be a Party, does the supreme court have original Jurisdiction . In all other cases, the supreme Court has appellate Jurisdiction, both as to Law and Fact, with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that the Jurisdiction of the supreme Court is subservient to the legislative branch because Article III., Section 2 states that "... the supreme Court shall have appellate Jurisdiction ... under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.", (pursuant to Article I., Section 8, Clause 9); therefore, ALL APPEALS ARE APPEALS- IN-EQUITY, MADE WITHIN THE ADMIRALTY JURISDICTION.

Each constitution FOR each of the several States of the American Union, embraces the Constitution FOR the United States of America; thus, each State government is established in admiralty to regulate Commerce.

Clearly then, whether brought in a State, or in a United States' court, ANY "appeal" as to Law or Fact filed in ANY "appellate" court, is being brought in the admiralty Jurisdiction because an "appeal" in the technical sense, was unknown to the Common-Law, and it is the name of proceedings for the review of cases in equity, and in the ecclesiastical and admiralty courts. See HANDBOOK OF COMMON-LAW PLEADING (Hornbook Series) by: Benjamin J. Shipman, First Copyright 1894, Last Copyright 1923, Sections 337-338, page 537.

Then At-Law, the Analog of an "equity appeal" is the Trial de novo based on filing the Writ-Of-Error. See "trial" Black's 5th, page 1348. See "writs" Black's 5th, page 1441.

Philosophically, the differences between Law and Equity are precisely those between deductive and inductive thinking. Deductive logic looks backwards, examining the general facts leading to a specific set of conclusions; whereas, inductive reasoning looks in basing its general presumption on a selected set of few specific facts, upon which It derives Its General Conclusion, leading to equitable presumption and PRE-VENGE that is: a sort-of irrefutable revenge in-advance.

Article III., Sectional 2: "The trial of all Crimes, except in Cases of Impeachment, shall be Jury; and such Trial shall be held in the State where the said Crimes shall have been committed; ..."

Apparently there were no plans for United States "crime" trial.

If this were true, the United States' District Courts would not have territorial Jurisdiction since such courts do not legally lie within the "State where the said Crimes shall have been committed;..."

Correspondingly then, the land upon which such District Courts were located, would have been PURCHASED BY the CONSENT of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings, in which event, the United States should be able to produce Its Title to Such Property.

Article I., Section 8, Clause 17 provides that Congress exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such courts, presumedly categorized as "needful Buildings" since (some of the time) they do not actually qualify as Forts. Magazines, Arsenal, or dock- Yards.

Article III., Section 2: "... but when not committed within any State, the Trial shall be at such Place or Places as the Congress may by Law have directed."

What provides United States' Jurisdiction in admiralty? Is insurance an admiralty contract?

The fact that PROCEDURES of Law and Equity were merged in the latter 1930's, does not for a single moment imply that the statutory laws have superseded and/or replaced those bases of jurisprudence upon which are predicated, Law, Equity and all those other Courts of Executive Chancery, no more than Legislative Enactments or Supreme Court decisions can overturn, supersede, replace, or unweave the very fabric of the Constitutional Charters AT LAW, which first created Their very existence IN the ADMIRALTY Jurisdiction Itself.

As far as the 1938 Erie R.R. decision proclaiming that there is no longer a general federal Common-Law, We Present that: there never was "a general federal Common-Law", since the admiralty jurisdiction has never, cannot, and will never recognize the Common-Law! Common-Law and admiralty are equal and opposite Jurisdictions.

IT SHOULD BE NOTICED that nowhere in the Constitution is it stated that the Supreme Court has the Power to interpret the very Constitution that created such court, Itself. See "interpret" and "interpretation" Black's 5th, pages 733 and 734.

Otherwise, it is entirely conceivable for government to activate a self-destruct mechanism such that the Legislative and Executive Branches could amend the Constitution in such a manner as to abolish the Constitution itself. Thereafter, the Supreme Court, in its "interpretive" and "legislative" capacity, could uphold such Act by proclaiming It as having been Constitutional! Think about it. If one hires an employee under a contract-of-performance, can the employee unilaterally modify the Said contract by arbitrarily deciding not to abide by the terms thereof? We believe not.

PART 3.1

JURISDICTION or WHO OWNS WHOM?

Jurisdiction is purely and simply the Authority or Power to Act. When One is exercising Jurisdiction over One's Self or over One's Property or Liberties, "Jurisdiction" is called "Rights" which are inclusive of those Liberties permitted within the limits of the Common-Law. "LIBERTY. Freedom from restraint. The faculty of willing, and the power of doing what has been willed, without influence from without. Natural liberty is the right which nature gives to all mankind of disposing of their persons and property after the manner they judge most consistent with their happiness, on condition of their acting within the limits of the law of nature and so as not to interfere with an equal exercise of the same rights by other men. Burlam. c. 3, Section 15; 1 Bla, Com. 125. It is called by Lieber social liberty, and is defined as the protection or unrestrained action in as high a degree as the claim of protection of each individual admits of. Personal liberty consists in the power of locomotion, of changing situation, of removing one's person to whatever place one's inclination may direct, without imprisonment or restraint unless by due course of law. 1 Bla. Com. 134; Hare, Const. L. 777."; Bouvier's Volume 2, Page 1964 et seq.

When one is exercising Jurisdiction over Another's Being or over Another's Rights, Property, or Liberties, "Jurisdiction" is called "Powers" which INCLUDE ONLY those Powers permitted within the limits of a voluntary contractual agreement, or by the results of a Common- Law Suit. See"include" Black's 5th, page 687.

Otherwise, Jurisdiction can be Lawfully acquired ONLY by Permission of He who has It, and It can ONLY be enforced by Forces of Arms resulting in either the retention of, or the forfeiture of, Rights as Property.

Since all of Man has Rights, and since Rights ABSOLUTELY cannot conflict, Man has established courts to settle differences between Men who would claim the same Rights at the same time, Such courts theoretically avoiding some needless Bloodshed in Man's Trials-of Rights by Battle.

To function as Such, courts require Jurisdiction in the manner of Authority or Power to act, and Such Jurisdiction is properly divided into three distinct classifications:

1.In Personam 2.Subject-Matter 3.Territorial (venue), all of which are required to be proved by the Movant prior to proceeding in any Suit, inclusive of any Criminal Suit brought by and under any police state powers.

JURISDICTION

"The word is a term of large and comprehensive import, and embraces every kind of judicial action. ... It is the authority by which courts and judicial officers take cognizance of and decide case. ... The legal right by which judges exercise their authority. ... It exist when court has cognizance of class of cases involved, proper parties are present, and point to be decided is within powers of court. ... power and authority of a court to hear and determine a judicial proceeding. ... The right and power of a court to adjudicate concerning the subject matter of a given case." Black's 5th, page 766.

Notice the words: "authority", "legal right", "powers" of court, "power" and "authority" of a court, "right" and "power" of a court ... .

Rights and Powers are Property, and like water, "authority", "legal right", and "power", must flow from a Higher Source to a lower recipient. Put another way: "Authority", "legal right", and "power" and all other Property is required to be Lawfully transferred from an Owner (Donor) to a lower recipient (Donee). See Black's 5th, page 439.

Whom do you suppose provides the "authority", "legal right", and "power" to a court? The non-existent SOVEREIGN that is prohibited by Article I, Section 9, Clause 8 and Article I., Section 10, Clause 1, or the Party to a "suit of the King's peace" (Black's, page 1286) in the manner of form of a criminal Action? CRIMINAL ACTION. "Proceeding by which person charged with a crime is brought to trial and either found not guilt or guilty and sentenced. An action, suit, or cause instituted to punish an infraction of the criminal laws." Black's 5th, page 336.

The transfer of Jurisdiction ("authority", "legal right", "power") is based on the events surrounding One's appearance in ANY court action. APPEARANCE. "A coming into court by a party to a suit, either in person or by attorney, whether as plaintiff or defendant. The formal proceeding by which a defendant submits himself to the Jurisdiction of the court. The voluntary submission to a court's Jurisdiction." Black's page 89.

ATTORNEY AND CLIENT

"His first duty is to the courts and the public, not to the client. And where ever the duties of his client conflict with those, he owes as an officer of the court in the administration of Justice, the former must yield to the latter." Corpus Juris Secundum Vol. 7, Section 4.

IN THE GENERAL JURISDICTION

Thus if one makes a general appearance in an action, it is presumed that he has voluntarily appeared to confer general jurisdiction on to a court; that is: full and complete jurisdiction is presumed to have voluntarily conferred onto the judge to act in the capacity of a proper (statutory) judicial officer.

Under General Jurisdiction, if the Movant in a given Action happens to be some division of the Executive Branch of Government, DMV or IRS for instance, and if on Its Own Motion, A Court decides to proceed against a Nonparticipant Individual, by presumption of Jurisdiction while absent any actual presentation of proof of Jurisdiction by the Movant, then during the period of time that the court acts and answers for the Movant (Prosecutor), Who would be Acting for The Court, since the tribunal would be standing Legally Vacant?

Also if the court (Judicially) Acts for the Movant-Prosecutor (Executive), does it not create Conflicts-Of-Interest as established by the Seperation-Of-Powers doctrine, and is it not in Violation thereof? See "Violation", Black's page 1408.

If a judge were Contractually Disable to the Benefit of a Party to an Action, could the Same Judge Properly sit and Act in the Capacity of an Independent Judicial Officer? DISABILITY. "The want of legal capacity. 'Incapacity to do a legal act.' It would include the resignation of a judge before signing a bill of exceptions; McIntyre v. Modern Woodman of America, 200 Fed. 1, 2 C. C. A. 1." Bouvier's Volume i, Page 876.

If Such Judge were shown to hold ANY License or other Privilige- OfState (driver, etc.), it would follow that Such Judge would also be Personally Subject to the Jurisdiction of some

Executive Branch of government, DMV, for instance; and because Such Judge were personally subject to the Same Jurisdiction that the Movant would attempt to enforce upon the Nonparticipant Individual, Conflicts-Of-Interest would arise by way of the Seperation-Of-Powers doctrine, sufficient to cause recusation. See Black's 5th, page 1148.

Likewise, if the Said Judge files for, and/or pays a California State or a United States' federal income tax , pursuant to the Public Salaries Tax Act (1939) et sqq., not only do Conflicts-Of-Interest arise by way of the Seperation-Of-Powers doctrine, but there also exists a blatant violation and abrogation of Article III., Section l wherein:

"... The Judges, both of the supreme and inferior Courts, shall ... receive for their Services, a Compensation, which shall not be diminished during their Continuance in Office."

A Judge Who is subject to the jurisdiction of the executive branch, cannot be impartial in matters concerning such executive branch. This statement is fully and completely realized in: Lord et al. v. Kelly et al. Civ. A. 63-932 240 F.Supp 67 at Page 69 (1965).

"The original appearance in this Court by counsel for the Government was, if not insolent, at least none too respectful. The brief filed following the Court's adverse decision and asking for reconsideration thereof, showed more than hurt feelings and came close to being worthy of a rebuke.

More than once the judges of a court have been indirectly reminded that they personally are taxpayers. No sophisticated person is unaware that even in this very Commonwealth the Internal Revenue Service has been in possession of facts with respect to public officials which has presented or shelved in order to serve what can only be called political ends, be they high or low. And a judge who knows the score the score is aware that every time his decisions offend the Internal Revenue Service he is inviting a close inspection of his own returns."

If One were to argue that the Article III prohibition against diminishing the Judges' Compensation, operates upon United States' Judges of those inferior Courts (Article I., Section 8, Clause 9), which the Congress has from time to time ordained and established; and that Such prohibition DOES NOT attach to Judges on the States' Levels; then Such argument remains to defy the Seperation-Of-Powers Doctrine which is applicable on ALL Levels and which thereby demands an Independent Judiciary extending to all Cases, in Law and Equity, regardless.

Just as those Cases brought in the Common-Law Jurisdiction require the Independent Jury Of-One's-Peers, those Commercial (Equity-Contract) Cases brought in the admiralty Jurisdiction pursuant to Enactments and Contracts or Maritime Claims respectively, require the Independent Judiciary Such that It is free from Executive, Legislative, and all other external forces, influences, and imminent manipulations.

Assuming for the Argument, that a court of General Jurisdiction has been convened within the district wherein the "crime" shall have been committed, thus satisfying Territorial requirements; and assuming that the Nonparticipant Individual, is physically under the state's arrest, custody, and control (not necessarily Lawfully), thereby presumably satisfying In Personam Jurisdictional requirements by Forces of Arms; then there still remains Subject-Matter Jurisdiction to be proved by the Movant.

Exactly what Insurable Interest does the Movant (plaintiff) have in a Nonparticipant Individual's Property, such as could cause attachment of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction over Such Property? See Insurable Interest". Black's 5th, Page 720.

If One uses One's Own Time and Energy (Property in the form of One's Nonrenewable resource), to work (kds/dt) as a common-Right-matter in exchange for Payment (Property in Value of Exchange); and if One uses Such Property In Value Of Exchange to buy, say, an Automobile (Property), how does California, for instance, obtain a legal interest in the Said Automobile, sufficient that It can regulate, tax, control, and prohibit the Nonparticipant Individual's free use of His Own(ed) Private Property?

PROPERTY.

"That which is peculiar or proper to any person; that which belongs exclusively to one; in the strict legal sense, an aggregate of rights which are guaranteed and protected by the government.

The term is said to extend to every species of valuable right and interest. More specifically, ownership; the unrestricted and exclusive right to a thing; the right to dispose of a thing in every legal way, to possess it, to use it, and to exclude every one else from interfering with it. That dominion or indefinite right of use or disposition which one may lawfully exercise over particular things or subjects. The exclusive right of possessing, enjoying, and disposing of a thing. The highest right a man can have to anything; being used for that right which one has to lands or tenements, goods or chattels, which no way depends on another man's courtesy. The word is also commonly used to denote everything which is the subject of ownership, corporeal or incorporeal, tangible or intangible, visible or invisible, real or personal; everything that has an exchangeable value or which goes to makeup wealth or estate. It extends to every species of valuable right and interest, and includes real and personal property, easements, franchises, and incorporeal hereitaments.

"Black's Law Dictionary, Revised 4th Edition, page 1382.

From the above definition of "Property", it would appear that California has somehow managed to become the Legal Owner of the Nonparticipant Individual's Property .

How then, did California obtain Title to the Said Private Property?

If California Incorporated were to claim Title to the Public Rights Of Way. Such Rights-Of-Way would have become Private Privileges of way.

The Facts remain that these Properties have either originated as Private Toll Roads or as Highways in the Public Domain long antecedent to the formation of California itself.

How then did California obtain Titles to the Said Private and Public Properties?

Now if it were presumed that a "crime" were committed, Who and Where is the Victim, damaged Party, or Real and actual Party-of-Interest?

If it is presumed that California, in Its Corporate Capacity, were somehow damaged by way of some Nonparticipant Individual's nonadherence to selected Legislative Enactments, how then was California Incorporated actually damaged and to what extent?

If it were presumed that an Action be brought in the Name of the "injured" People of California, Such Action would inevitably require that:

1.the attorney General produce the actual and verifiable, written, Powers-of-Attorney authorizing Him to represent EACH of ALL of the People of the State of California in His Mass-Action Criminal Law Suit; 2.The Nonparticipant Individual has injured EACH of ALL of the People of the State of California, otherwise there could be no Cause Of Action; 3.the Attorney General can produce Actual and Verified Complaints made by EACH of ALL of the People of the State of California; and 4.the attorney general disclose the proposed source of Jurors if the matter were to go to trail before an "impartial" jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed; in light of the fact that EACH of ALL of the State of California would have by then become Parties-Of-Interest to the outcome of Such Legal Mass-Action therefore EACH of ALL of the People of the State of California could no longer qualify as "impartial".

From where then, would an Impartial Jury be drawn?

!!! THIS IS WHY One is REQUIRED to volunteer into a GENERAL Jurisdiction. !!!

The foregoing can occur only under private contract-law exclusively within the admiralty Jurisdiction as defined in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 otherwise the separation of powers doctrines forbid general application of these anomalies.

From the foregoing it is plainly evident that governments have no Jurisdiction over THE PEOPLE since THE PEOPLE cannot be proved to be subject to the Jurisdiction created by Their own Constitution Charters, and those presumptions that EVERY HUMAN BEING in this Nation is subject to Enactments of the Legislature is rebuttable. See Black's Page 1067.

Armed with Discovery and other Implements Of Due Process Of Law, a belligerent "old time" Nonparticipant Individual might establish that the whole of California's Subject-Matter Jurisdiction is limited to repairing the holes in Public Rights-Of-Way.

The Patriot's Soapbox wishes to thank Bill Medina for publishing this as an open paper.