From: True Name, as apostle, hereinafter, “I”, “my”, “author”, “me”; and,

For the command of this author of this writing and the communication hereon is for an interpretation of all words with the rules of the interpretation of the author, in a positive-sense, in the present-tense, on a level-geometric-plane; and

Comes now True Name, in the office of apostle, speaking for his family and estate, a regenerate man in the faith of Yehoshua H’Mashiach and making a special visitation by absolute ministerial right to the district court, "restricted appearance" with the express intent to make known my repentance and to express my trust; and, I, give notice via this instant communication that I take full liability for my actions; and,

The following information is within my comprehension in regard to the relationship that establishes between men and women and the State which they inhabit; and, allow me to express my comprehension such that The Court and its judge can grasp what I mean by my repentance:

I begin my explanation by describing the relationships established between the Sovereign United States and the Union of States – [the] United States of America; and, it is my comprehension that [the] United States comprised of a body of men [the true Sovereigns] known as [the] “People of the United States” and that body of men, hereinafter “We the People” made a pledge to each other as written in “their” Declaration of Independence – “we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor - and “We the People” declared the torts against their king as they recognized Sovereign power in the king, in my opinion, in conformity with

agreements formerly made by the nation of Yisra'el [Israel] as codified in the 1611 King James Version at :

> 1Sa 8:19 Neuerthelesse, the people refused to obey the voyce of Samuel; and they said, Nay, but we will haue a King ouer vs:

and possibly in observance of commercial agreements internationally made with or by the Hudson Bay Company or the East India Trading Company and their king; and, said torts codified within the Declaration of Independence were issued with a decent Respect to the Opinions of Mankind, recognizing that men are with Choice; and given that men were absent the ability to "read minds" a descent Respect is to make known to others the reasons for their Separation; and,

Given that divine law mandates that the "debtor is slave to the lender"; and, given that the existing union of States were in fact not abiding by their international agreements thereby reducing said States to [dis]united States; and, realizing again that a slave has no right to contract, "We the People " forming a "moral person" established a more perfect Union of the States by creating a Constitution for [the] "United States of America"; whereby the former States, in agreement thru their silence or acquiescence, effectively were reduced to "districts of the United States"; and, evidence of my assertion can be found in the *Federal Judiciary Act of September 24, 1789, c. 20, 28 U.S.C. § 725 which provides:*

> *"The laws of the several States, **except where the Constitution, treaties, or statutes of the United States** otherwise require or provide, shall be regarded as rules of decision in trials at common law, in the courts of the United States, in cases where they apply[.]; and,*

Said States being parties to said Constitution made for the “United States of America” by “We the People” of [the] “United States” creates a compact between those parties only; and, no private man has any standing or claim upon said Constitution as no private man was a party to said Constitution; and, my assertions of the foregoing are upheld at Padelford Fay & Co. v. The Mayor and Alderman of the City of Savannah, hereinafter “Padelford”; and,

Furthermore, within Padelford the United States is clearly dictating to the States as the following quotes come from Padelford:

> “But the **States**, by the exercise of the taxing power, **can take** from their inhabitants every cent the inhabitants can spare, **and live.**
>
> *The principle comes to this: that the States, in making the Constitution, intended to give up the power of self-preservation.*
>
> *On the one hand, then, Congress may convert the General Government* ***into a dictator****; on the other,* ***the States have not retained the power of self-preservation.*** *This is McCulloch vs. Maryland. It is to this that the Supreme Court rule leads. Did the makers of the Constitution intend any such rule as this?*
>
> *But, indeed, no private person has a right to complain, by suit in Court, on the ground of a breach of the Constitution. The Constitution, it is true, is a compact, but he is not a party to it. The States are the parties to it. And they may complain. If they do, they are entitled to redress.* ***Or they may waive the right to complain. If they do, the right stands waived.;***

And, clearly the makers of the Constitution were “We the People”; and therefore said unincorporated association “We the People” are the Sovereignty; and, said Sovereignty is vested in [the] United States from those men who comprised “We the People”; and, furthermore, the Constitution made for [the] United States of America stipulates at Article III the following:

Article III – Section 2

"The judicial Power shall extend to all Cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority"

And, analyzing the foregoing Article and Section, in light of the Laws of Nations, the fundamental principle is the pot is never greater than the potter as codified in the 1611 King James Version at :

Jer 18:6 O house of Israel, cannot I doe with you as this potter, saith the Lord? Behold, as the clay is in the potters hand, so are ye in mine hand, O house of Israel.

And, as such, the Constitution being made for the "United States of America" stipulates that the States that comprise or make up [Publics] the United States of America are bound by the Constitution, the Laws of the [set apart] United States [as Sovereign] and any international Treaties that the United States, as Sovereign may enjoin itself and thereby bind [the] United States of America" by "*a priori"* agreement; and, said Treaties are to be made "under their Authority" whereby the "their" is the Signatories [ourselves] and the future co-beneficiaries and possibly co-trustees [our Posterity]; and,

My assertions are maintained at *Warren E. ENSMINGER v. THE FARM CREDIT BANK OF WICHITA; First National Bank of Okeene*, hereinafter "Ensminger"; and, reference the following decision coming from a three judge panel:

This action was instigated to determine who has the highest title to property located in [Major and Grady] county, Oklahoma Territory state, of which the ***United States of America by contract, gave up all right, title or interest in said property****, without any conditions set forth; and it is very clear by the defendant's pleadings that it is not that entity that is claiming the property, Mr. Butler for Federal Land Bank clearly stated that the claim* ***is the United States****,*

and that Federal Land Bank and First National Bank in Okeene are not of the United States of America[.] and,.

Clearly Ensminger recognizes the separation of [the] United States and [the] United States of America as being two separate and distinct entities; and, furthermore at *Chisholm v. Georgia* the opinions produced the following:

"To the Constitution of the United States, the term SOVEREIGN, is totally unknown. There is but one place where it could have been used with propriety. But even in that place, it would not, perhaps, have comported with the delicacy of those who ordained and established that Constitution. They might have announced themselves "SOVEREIGN" people of the United States. But serenely conscious of the fact, they avoided the ostentatious declaration."; and,

"No such ideas obtain here; at the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people, and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects (unless the African slaves among us may be so called), and have none to govern but themselves; ***the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens****, and as joint tenants in the sovereignty."; and,*

Clearly, at Chisholm v. Georgia, the Sovereigns are the Signatories or "We the People" and those Signatories chose not to employ that term Sovereign [to themselves] probably, in my opinion, as to not awaken the consciousness of Yisra'el in regard to their former agreement codified with the Ever Living at 1st Samuel 8 in the 1611 King James Version referenced hereinbefore; and, clearly Chisholm v. George notices that the Sovereigns, the Signatories of the new Trust, [the] United States are in fact Sovereigns without Subjects and *"have none to govern but themselves";* however, the ones who would come under the "Shade" of the new Trust [the] United States take the office of citizen and are equal in that office as fellow citizens as joint tenants; and, the citizens of America remain as subjects to the king of England as these never pledged anything, except maybe a pledge to a flag, and therefore never took the necessary steps to set themselves apart in this world; and, in my opinion, these will always be

Ruled and Governed as they will most likely never come to full liability for their actions; and, the principle remains as codified in the 1611 King James Version:

1Co 14:38 But if any man bee ignorant, let him be ignorant.

And, furthermore, the principal regarding who is fit to Rule is again laid bare upon the foundation that “Knowledge will always Rule over ignorance”; and, as such it is necessary for men and women to educate themselves should they desire to one day assume the Station of Equal Rights and Standing; and, this principal is again codified in the 1611 King James Bible at:

Zec 2:7 Deliuer thy selfe, O Zion, that dwellest with the daughter of Babylon.