

# To be a Man

## Foreword

---

Not so long ago I, like most people in this world, believed that I had a name and that this name was my identity. I believed that money had intrinsic value and I believed that if I had enough of it I could positively affect the world. I believed that everyone ought to pay their taxes for the greater good. I believed that statute was law, and that those laws were there for the benefit of all. I believed that the health service would fix my ills, that the education system would impart knowledge, and that the police force would help me in my hour of need. I believed that war could be just, that climate change was real, and that there really was a free market economy. But most of all I believed that I was a free man.

That said I also felt, like I think many people feel, that something was not quite right. What it was I did not know, but I felt it nonetheless.

When the scale and depth of this 'glitch in the matrix' became evident, there remained a simple choice; to pretend as I had done before that it'll all be alright, or to quit feeding the beast and become part of the solution.

The solution, as I hope you will see, is incredibly simple, but it is only simple for those with eyes to see. Had I been told two years ago that all I need do is make one simple choice I would not have believed it; I needed to walk the yellow brick road with a strawman by my side and fight a wizard before I could see that if I simply clicked my heels three times I would return to a land of freedom.

Mankind's history is littered with examples which stand as testament to the fact that divorcing oneself from nature will ultimately lead to destruction. This e-book is intended to show those people who are beginning to realise this fact what the alternative is and how that alternative is easily achievable.

Despite the title, this e-book is directed at men and women the world over, the term man when written throughout refers to the species and denotes both men and women. Its sole purpose is to show how we are quite literally slaves, slaves who have willingly volunteered to be slaves, slaves who are all equally responsible for this frankly unbelievable state of affairs currently masquerading as reality.<sup>1</sup> But there is a light at the end of the tunnel; for anyone who is willing to follow their heart and live according to their conscience, it is

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hLZ7GqWpEqM>

possible to break the bonds which hold us down and create an environment where the world truly is our oyster.

Please follow the hyperlinks inserted in the footnotes, particularly those marked with\*; some have been so linked because their author has more competently dealt with the particular subject than I would be able to. Also much of the important peripheral information surrounding the subjects we discuss is provided this way to help keep this e-book more modestly sized.

Although we do not have the time to define every word of note in this text, I would urge you to read the legal references in this e-book, and any other documents of legal import, with a law dictionary at hand, considering also the presumptions that each word implies. The significance of each word that you speak, write or read cannot be emphasised enough. It is through the use of spells and spelling that the powerful few obtain jurisdiction over the meek masses. It is unfortunate that we were not properly educated in critical thinking, the real English language or legalese at an early age, however this is no excuse, and we must now take responsibility for our own education if we wish to create a better life for ourselves and those around us.

Thanks are in order to the giants on whose shoulders I am now able to stand, their work helping to make a life of freedom possible. Without the selfless work of Vic Beck, Christian Walters and Batman to name but a few, none of us would have the wonderful opportunities to escape the bonds of slavery that we have today. I love you guys.

# The Construct

---

Before you read this e-book, please take a moment to consider the foundation of your current knowledge, not just regarding the topics we shall be discussing, but in respect of all things. Where did all that knowledge come from? What do you actually know, for sure, about anything? What do you have first hand knowledge of?

Does the earth revolve around the sun? Is the moon responsible for the tides? What is a black hole? What is the atmosphere composed of?

The answers you possess to every one of those questions, along with almost all of the rest of the information in your head, was most likely gained from either the television, from a text book, from a teacher, from the internet or from some other third party. We may attempt to validate the knowledge by assessing the validity of the source (although any assessment will itself be based on second hand information), but when it comes down to it, we really have no idea whether the information being presented to us is correct or not. Yet we will happily answer these and many other questions when asked, with the conviction of a man who has experienced all these things for himself.

So how about the big question - Who am I?

The sad fact of life is that most people will never discover the answers to this question, nor will they ever make a meaningful attempt at even trying to discover the answers. The answers to the question of who you are, for most people, made up entirely of the second hand knowledge and opinions of others. Consider even the most fundamental parts of our alleged identity – How do you know your name is Joe Bloggs, or that you even have a name? Who told you that? How do you know your date of birth? Did you make a note at the time? Is there any actual evidence of either of these supposed facts?

The very nature of life is such that we are products of our parents and childhood surroundings; each parent will usually try to do the best by their children, but their best is based upon a construct of values and opinions that they themselves have gained from second hand sources. Whether you like it or not, by the time you leave your parental home you will have been moulded and shaped into a storehouse of values and opinions which have little to do with your personal experiences and true knowledge, and absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with who you really are.

This is a fundamental truth of modern life, it is a part of growing up in the construct and we would do well to remember it.

If we devote sufficient time to analysing our current perspectives, we will invariably discover that our entire world view, from our political, economic, religious and social opinions to our likes and dislikes is all a part of this construct. Everything that represents this perceived 'identity' is a lie; you are not your thoughts, but your thoughts will keep you from ever finding out who you really are. The clever part of the construct is that it engages each of us in such a way that our own minds are responsible for our own enslavement to the construct.

This question of who you are is by far the most important question anyone can ask, and certainly it is the only question worthy of you devoting your time to answering. The problem is that before you can begin to objectively and honestly answer it, the entire manufactured construct that currently exists must be recognised for what it is.

The construct is many things but none of those things are the truth; it is an incredibly elaborate, marvellously fiendish, self perpetuating fiction, manufactured by a fearful collective for a fearful collective. Its sole purpose being to keep you from asking the one question that will actually lead to the truth – Who am I? If you have manned up enough to devote yourself to the search for the answers to this question then welcome, I wish you well.

As you do find the answers, you will see that the limitations placed upon you by the construct no longer apply. You will see that you are no longer acceptable to the construct and it is not acceptable to you. Those who are still under the spell of the construct will ostracise and ridicule you, they have to or the construct would collapse. This is ok; the numbers of people seeking and finding their own truth are increasing exponentially and you need no longer stand alone.

As you read on, consider the foregoing words and the nature of this construct; when you read something that conflicts with your current perspective, test your current perspective to see whether or not it truly stands up. Not that I am suggesting that you accept the words in these pages either, we must each search for and discover the truth for ourselves, I simply hope that you may receive from this e-book, inspiration in your search.

# The Laws of Nature

---

We are told that in the beginning god created man, and that he gave to man dominion over the earth and all things contained therein. This is the foundation of almost every system of law which exists in the world today, be it that of a Christian nation or otherwise. It is the foundation of The Law of Nations and it is written upon every man's heart (on the rare occasion he follows it) in the form of his conscience and sense of morality.

It seems however that we have forgotten where we come from. We have spent the last five hundred years subservient to a scientific ideology where the answers to all of life's mysteries are sought only by the observation of external phenomena. If it cannot be proven on paper it is considered not to exist. Detached from nature we no longer listen to the heart, choosing instead to rationalise every action with the mind. We all know deep down that it is only in the heart that true wisdom and true happiness can be found, but we remain afraid to look within, subconsciously fearful of unearthing some defect in our character which would undermine our identity.

Not that we should discard the scientific rationale of the mind which has for so long ruled our world, rather it should be brought into balance with the wisdom of the heart, that we may better employ the tools given us and express ourselves in a more evolved manner.

Curiously, for reasons we will later explore, we seem on occasion to find it disagreeable to use the tools that even science has given us. Since the universal law of cause and effect has long been established by the scientific community, it seems bizarre that we choose not to accept that it is in fact universal. If it is universal why do we not apply it in our daily lives? Through this most basic of laws we have all that is necessary to provide abundantly for all mankind. When a man's deeds are expedited freely in the service of others, it stands to reason that he too shall receive. When he uses his words to uplift others as opposed to putting them down, it stands to reason that he too shall be uplifted. And when he thinks only positive and loving thoughts of others, he must surely be blessed with an abundance of love and positivity himself. What insanity to think this law of cause and effect can apply to one thing and not to another just because it is more convenient that way.

By this moral code can men live peacefully besides one another and in harmony with the rest of the natural world. This is the Law of Nature.<sup>2</sup>

The duty of man under natural law is best summarised by Emmerich De Vattel in his works on The Law of Nations<sup>3</sup>:

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://ia301516.us.archive.org/0/items/treatiseoflawsof00cumbuoft/treatiseoflawsof00cumbuoft.pdf>  
<http://ia331421.us.archive.org/3/items/oflawofnaturenat00pufe/oflawofnaturenat00pufe.pdf>

*The general law of this [natural] society is that each member should assist the others in all their needs, as far as he can do so without neglecting his duties to himself—a law which all men must obey if they are to live conformably to their nature and to the designs of their common Creator; a law which our own welfare, our happiness, and our best interests should render sacred to each one of us. Such is the general obligation we are under of performing our duties; let us fulfil them with care if we would work wisely for our greatest good.*

*It is easy to see how happy the world would be if all men were willing to follow the rule we have just laid down. On the other hand, if each man thinks of himself first and foremost, if he does nothing for others, all will be alike miserable. Let us labour for the good of all men; they in turn will labour for ours, and we shall build our happiness upon the firmest foundations.*

*The end of the natural society established among men in general is that they should mutually assist one another to advance their own perfection and that of their condition.<sup>4</sup>*

All of which begs the questions – Why did we develop the myriad of other laws to which most of us voluntarily adhere? And do we still need those laws?

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://ia360630.us.archive.org/3/items/lawnationsorpri00ingrgoog/lawnationsorpri00ingrgoog.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> \*The Law of Nations, Emmerich De Vattel,  
<http://ia360630.us.archive.org/3/items/lawnationsorpri00ingrgoog/lawnationsorpri00ingrgoog.pdf>

# The Laws of Man and His Ego

---

The laws of man are often described as ‘positive’ laws<sup>5</sup> of society. They include anything and everything that does not fall under natural law – statutes, codes, regulations, even common law and trusts.

Since the world's first known positive law, The Urukagina Code, dating to almost 4500 years ago we have developed and embellished so-called law to the point where in the UK alone there are now over six million statutes and codes which seek to control every aspect of the human experience. How did we get to this place where freedom no longer exists? Where people can be denied the basic human need of shelter by a corporation because they have a particular piece of paper? Or where people are forced to use similar pieces of paper if they wish to put food on the table of their families, clothes on their children's backs, even water in their cups?

Although the world has been heavily guided and controlled for thousands of years by what can only be described as the greatest lie ever told,<sup>6</sup> this situation cannot be entirely blamed on some conspiracy. To tackle this issue we must first address two key questions – 1. What triggered man to instigate the first ‘positive laws of society’? and 2. What it is that drives man to increase his own wealth, protect his name, improve his status, and generally act in his own interests, all at the expense of his fellow man?

Sir William Blackstone, author of probably the most well respected law book in English, if not world, history – Commentaries on the Laws of England, stated his opinion that;

*“It is well if the mass of mankind will obey the laws when made, without scrutinizing too nicely into the reasons of making them.”*

This mentality is the sole reason why our species finds itself in the difficulties it does; the people do not take responsibility for ensuring the decency of the laws which they blindly follow. I know of no one who read the various licensing Acts before applying for a driving license, or who read the Income Tax Act before getting a job.

*“In religion and politics people's beliefs and convictions are in almost every case gotten at second-hand, and without examination, from authorities who have not themselves examined the questions at issue but have taken them at second-hand from other non-examiners, whose opinions about them were not worth a brass farthing.”* Mark Twain

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://ia311312.us.archive.org/2/items/naturepositive00lighgoog/naturepositive00lighgoog.pdf>  
[http://ia700202.us.archive.org/20/items/TheNegativeSideOfPositiveLaw/3\\_positive\\_law\\_1.ps.pdf](http://ia700202.us.archive.org/20/items/TheNegativeSideOfPositiveLaw/3_positive_law_1.ps.pdf)

<sup>6</sup> \*<http://www.omega432.com/lie.html>

The people's ignorance of the law has led to a place where the rule of law is no longer followed, and where justice is nothing more than the balancing of an account. This is a very dangerous state of affairs; under such conditions the world can and has been guided to depths of despair limited only by the despotic imaginings of those responsible for the guiding.<sup>7</sup>

Returning to our initial question – why did man start making 'positive' laws? The Code of Hammurabi (c1790 BC, Babylon, first surviving positive code)<sup>8</sup> gives some clues. It contains such laws as:

*If anyone commits a robbery and is caught, he shall be put to death.*

*If a man knocks the teeth out of another man, his own teeth will be knocked out.*

*If a man strikes a pregnant woman, thereby causing her to miscarry and die, the assailant's daughter shall be put to death.*

*If a judge tries a case, reaches a decision, and presents his judgment in writing; and later it is discovered that his decision was in error, and it was his own fault, he shall pay twelve times the fine set by him in the case and be removed from the judge's bench.*

It is evident then that people were not, as a general rule, living in accordance with the highest principles of natural law. If they were, they would not be committing a robbery, or knocking out a man's teeth and most importantly they would not be accusing their brothers. The sentiment of the time then, which is exactly the same as that of today, is that an eye for an eye is good justice.

The same general theme is to be found in all 'positive' laws; retribution rather than forgiveness being the overriding factor.

It seems then that man's 'positive' laws evolved out of a perceived necessity. The people's inability or unwillingness to live in accordance with natural law meant that those people who were not living in accordance with natural law needed some form of law to keep each other in check.

So why would anyone choose not to follow the law of nature? The answer to this question is both incredibly complex and unbelievably simple – it is responsible for all conflict in the world, it is responsible for all the negative thoughts you have ever had, it is your greatest (in fact your only) opponent and the most amazing thing of all is that the majority of people today actually think it is them. I refer, of course, to the ego.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.omega432.com/lie.html>

<sup>8</sup> <http://ia301537.us.archive.org/3/items/codeofhammurabi00hammrch/codeofhammurabi00hammrch.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> [http://ia700109.us.archive.org/16/items/GroupPsychologyAndTheAnalysisOfTheEgo/IPL\\_VI\\_Freud\\_Group\\_Psychology.pdf](http://ia700109.us.archive.org/16/items/GroupPsychologyAndTheAnalysisOfTheEgo/IPL_VI_Freud_Group_Psychology.pdf)



*"Each of us is something of a schizophrenic personality, tragically divided against ourselves."* Martin Luther King Jr

My own personal experience of dealing with this hidden part of the psyche is that when you hear the chatter in you mind, when you are analysing the past or planning for the future, or when you try to win an argument in your head, this is the ego and it most definitely is not you. It says this is MY house and MY car, and I must go to work to put food in MY belly. It speaks the language of the self, it isn't evil, its there to make sure you survive. The sheep and the horse in the field live entirely in their egos; they have no concept of anything other than instinctually eating grass and surviving. The problem comes when this natural survival instinct is combined with intellect – man's intellect allows the ego to be applied in ever more complex ways, to improve his status, persona, image and wealth. The ONLY way that one man can have his ego embellished in these ways is at the expense of another – it can only happen where there is conflict.

*"You will always find a good opponent in the last place you would think to look. There is something about yourself that you don't know; something that you will deny even exists until it's too late to do anything about it. It's the only reason you get up in the morning, the only reason you suffer the shitty boss, the blood, the sweat, and the tears. This is because you want people to know how good, attractive, generous, funny, wild and clever you really are. Fear or revere me, but please, think I'm special. We share an addiction, were approval junkies, we're all in it for the slap on the back, and the gold watch, the hip-hip-hoo-fuckin' rah, look at the clever boy with the badge, polishing his trophy – shine on you crazy diamond, because we're just monkeys wrapped in suits, begging for the approval of others. If we knew this we wouldn't do this, someone is hiding it from us, and if you had a second chance you would ask; Why?"*

*You've heard that voice for so long you believe it to be you, your best friend. Where is the best place an opponent should hide? In the very last place you would look. You're in a game, you're in THE game. Everyone's in this game and nobody knows it. And all of this, this is his world, he owns it, he controls it, he tells you what to do, and when to do it. Do you know what's so elegant about this little game? Nobody knows where the enemy is, they don't even know he exists. He's in every one of their heads, and they trust him, because they think they are him. If you try to destroy him, to save them, they'll destroy you to save him. You have to admire the opponents' elegance."*  
Revolver<sup>10</sup>

The conflict in our lives is not external; it is not with the other men who tender for the same contracts at work, or with the other team at the match on Saturday. All conflict in our lives,

---

<http://ia311533.us.archive.org/3/items/theegoanditspla00shawuoft/theegoanditspla00shawuoft.pdf>

<sup>10</sup> [http://thepiratebay.org/torrent/4043342/Revolver%5B2005%5DEng.DvDrip.\\_\\_\\_\\_NeRoZ](http://thepiratebay.org/torrent/4043342/Revolver%5B2005%5DEng.DvDrip.____NeRoZ)

regardless of how it manifests in your reality, takes place between you and the only true opponent you have ever had – your ego.

*“Were there no other people or living things in the world the magnetic impulse [ego] could have full sway in a personality and no harm done. It is only when ‘other people’ or living creatures or other people’s persons and possessions have to be taken into account, that the uncontrolled ‘magnetic impulse to attract, draw, bond, hold, possess’ becomes a sickness of the personality, if it is not equally balanced with the needs of all other living things.”* The Christ Letters<sup>11</sup>

It would be fair to say then that the only impediment to peace on earth and the rule of natural law is the ego. Positive law is the very definition of ego; positive law concerns itself with interactions between ‘individuals,’ making sure that no ‘individual’ is unnecessarily harmed by another, protecting the culture of I, me and mine.

Worryingly so-called ‘positive’ laws have been instituted at an alarming rate and have, over the last couple of centuries, evolved in an ever more despotic fashion. The western world already finds itself under the rule of a tyrannical leadership<sup>12</sup> whose sole purpose is to instigate a police state where mans ability to exercise dominion over the earth has been permanently revoked. Don’t believe me? Consider how the worlds entire seed stock has been patented by a single corporation so that you will no longer be ‘legally’ allowed to grow your own food,<sup>13 14</sup> or consider how the government has claimed title to the water which falls from the sky so that you will no longer be able to ‘legally’ drink water without a license.<sup>15</sup> I would again emphasise that this is not necessarily completely the result of a conspiracy. For millennia mankind has consistently shown that he is incapable of living harmoniously on the earth, and I have no doubt that those who seek to impose an irreversible police state probably believe that they are doing the world a favour. Regardless of the motivating factors the fact remains that were it not for an ill educated, fearful, ego-driven public, the powers that be would not be able to guide the world as they do. The later chapters discussing the legal fiction and the name game will give a detailed overview of how such a seemingly impossible state of affairs has been made manifest.

For those who think the ‘positive’ laws of society are in fact a constructive creation, I wish you only happiness and success as you navigate the fictional waters of commerce. But for those who think the ‘positive’ laws of society, the imposition of rules which act as an impediment to free will and natural law, are not so beneficial for you in your life, you have a choice – to continue to voluntarily abide by rules which you know in your heart to be wrong, paying guilty by fear, or to lay aside your ego, stop allowing other men to impose their will

<sup>11</sup> \*<http://www.christsway.co.za/dletters.php> (not religious or dogmatic)

<sup>12</sup> <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-515319560256183936#>

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.healthfreedomusa.org/?page\\_id=155](http://www.healthfreedomusa.org/?page_id=155)

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EtLGuOQemnQ&feature=related>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdanZhORQJg&feature=related>

<sup>15</sup> [http://www.naturalnews.com/029286\\_rainwater\\_collection\\_water.html](http://www.naturalnews.com/029286_rainwater_collection_water.html)

upon you, and make a choice to live each moment in the service of others. However if you make this choice remember that the system of society with all their 'positive' laws is, temporarily at least, not necessarily a bad thing. Given humanities current level of consciousness the majority of people in the world would not survive without it. Don't fight those who run it, embrace them, for they are your brothers, and when you address them appropriately, with honour, they will protect you from the near 7 billion lunatics who still think that little voice in their head is actually them, and who will act on the instructions of that little voice and most likely cause injury to you in the process.

A final word of caution to the growing number of people who are waking up to the truths of our situation and who, on the recommendation of the many law gurus (whom although well intentioned, have themselves have obtained much of their information second-hand), are seeking to align themselves with a common law jurisdiction; Common Law is a very different thing to common law. Common Law is a term used to describe the body of law incorporating common law, equity and statute, whereas common law relates to the body of law which evolved from traditional forms of action.<sup>16</sup> This is a very clever tool used to obtain jurisdiction over the ill informed common law stalwart. Generally speaking any legal word beginning with a capital letter should be considered with caution<sup>17</sup>. If a word has a capital letter it is most likely a name denoting a specific thing over which the legal/financial system has jurisdiction. How easily we recognise the discrepancies in the way others spell words will determine the degree to which we are susceptible to the spell being cast. That aside, since Common law is just another part of the construct anyway, why would we wish to subject ourselves to the ego-driven Common Law or common law system when we have natural law instead? If you are having difficulty dispelling the common law myth, please see<sup>18</sup>.

*There is not only a possible but also a necessary contradiction between positive and natural law, because the one is a coercive order while the other, ideally, is not only non-coercive, but actually has to forbid any coercion among men. A positive law, then, beside natural law is not only impossible from the viewpoint of formal logic, it is also superfluous from a material-teleological point of view, if the assumptions hold which alone permit one to maintain the validity of a "natural" order. For, why should a human-arbitrary order be needed for the regulation of human conduct, if a just regulation can already be found in an order "natural," evident to all and in harmony with what all men of good will would propose? To provide any coercive acts for the realization of such a natural order would not only be superfluous, but could be*

---

<sup>16</sup> Influences of Roman Law and Civil Law on the Common Law, *Diana Nestorovska*

<sup>17</sup> [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitis\\_deminutio](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitis_deminutio)

<sup>18</sup> \*<http://www.omega432.com/freeman.html>

*considered positively harmful and apt to produce precisely those evils whose prevention and elimination are the sole justification of coercion.” Hans Kelsen<sup>19</sup>*

This then is the real truth; by instituting positive laws when we live in a natural world we denigrate the natural, we dishonour it, and we manifest the very evils that we were trying to prevent in the first place. Upon the implementation of the first positive law we jam a stick in the spokes of the natural wheel of justice. This “coercive order” of positive law ultimately means that more positive laws will need to be implemented to deal with the chasm that the previous ones made when the perfection of natural law was undermined. The passage of time sees mankind gradually lose control over the positive law, such that it becomes necessary to implement over 3000 pieces of legislation each year just to prevent the manmade ship from sinking. The main focus of our existence now becomes keeping the ship afloat; no longer is anyone concerned with the navigation, the destination or the even enjoyment of the journey itself. When the whole world has forgotten the purpose of life, the net result must surely be a world of chaos.

For those of us who are able to shoulder the greater responsibilities that accompany self governance, our duty, individually and collectively, must be to discontinue our voluntary acceptance of so-called positive law and return to self governance by the principles of natural law, united as one in the spirit of mutual acceptance.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>\* [http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=4dAr24IK4BEC&pg=PA411&lpg=PA411&dq=positive+law+cannot+interfere+with+natural+law&source=bl&ots=tnPOS\\_dsX3&sig=mYvvsYWeXkIPuY58kiTAZLKvdcl&hl=en&ei=11TITL6RN4a6jAeu-rBA&sa=X&oi=book\\_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=OCBUQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false](http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=4dAr24IK4BEC&pg=PA411&lpg=PA411&dq=positive+law+cannot+interfere+with+natural+law&source=bl&ots=tnPOS_dsX3&sig=mYvvsYWeXkIPuY58kiTAZLKvdcl&hl=en&ei=11TITL6RN4a6jAeu-rBA&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=OCBUQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q&f=false)

<sup>20</sup>\* [www.awakeningasone.com](http://www.awakeningasone.com)

# The Legal Fiction

---

Legal fictions, often called strawmen, are the real players in the game of commerce. A man cannot be recognised in the legal world of statutes and codes, he must have an interface, a person, to allow him to engage with the system. Nothing in the world of commerce actually exists; there are no men, no money and nothing of any substance. Form not substance is the language of the game.

When you buy a car for example your name makes an exchange of money for a piece of paper evidencing title to a vehicle. Neither the man who used a name to allow the transaction to take place, nor the vehicle itself actually exists in the commercial world. This is a fundamental truth about the world we live in; it looks real and feels real but only a part of it actually is real. The parts that cause all the stress and strife; the names, the money and the pieces of paper are all a lie; they only exist in our heads, collectively in the heads of all of us who play the game; they are part of the construct. The problem, as we have already discussed and will examine yet again later, is that we have been told that they are real so many times that it is almost impossible to see the glaringly obvious truth; “there is no spoon.”<sup>21</sup>

By definition a legal fiction is;

*An assumption that something is true even though it may be untrue, made esp. In judicial reasoning to alter how a legal rule operates; specifically, a device by which a legal rule or institution is diverted from its original purpose to accomplish indirectly some other object.*<sup>22</sup>

*“Legal fiction is the mask that progress must wear to pass the faithful but blear-eyed watchers of our ancient legal treasures [unalienable natural rights of the man]. But though legal fictions are useful in thus mitigating or absorbing the shock of **innovation**, they work havoc in the form of intellectual confusion.” Morris R. Cohen, *Law and the Social Order* 126 (1933).*<sup>23</sup>

The interesting point here really becomes apparent when a definition of innovation is considered. A dictionary of law will direct your search to the definition of novation, which definition is;

---

<sup>21</sup> The Matrix, 1999, Wachowski Brothers

<sup>22</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

<sup>23</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

*The act of substituting an old obligation for a new one that either replaces an existing obligation with a new obligation or replaces an original party with a new party.*<sup>24</sup>

The substitution we are concerned with is that of the man for the legal fiction. This ‘innovation’ takes place through the process of conversion. A process we will examine in a later chapter.

It is fitting at this point to also consider the use of the word ‘person’. Statutory law never under any circumstances speaks of men; all such laws govern persons. In fact the hijacking and intermingling of the other positive law forms now means that the public court system no longer has the capacity to recognise men, they can only recognise persons. A person is defined as being;

*1. A human being – also termed natural person*

*2. An entity (such as a corporation) that is recognised by law as having the rights and duties of a human being.*

*“A person is any being who is capable of rights and duties. Any being that is so capable is a person, whether a human being or not, and no being that is not so capable is a person, even though he be a man”*<sup>25</sup>

Thus you may be a man, but you are only a person if you are capable of rights and duties. Are you capable of rights and duties? I for one most certainly lack the capacity to properly fulfil duties that are governed by more than 6 million statutes and codes, all written in the language of legalese that only the legal profession is licensed to decipher. The law should surely regard me as insane to conclude otherwise. Especially when you consider that a duty is *“a legal obligation that is owed or due to another that needs to be satisfied.”* How can any man have legal obligations when the legal world can only recognise persons and not men?

Also person derives from the Latin persona, literally meaning “mask”, which sheds a little more light on the statement that *“legal fiction is the mask that progress must wear to pass the faithful but blar-eyed watchers of our ancient legal treasures.”*<sup>26</sup>

The use of the word person has evolved over many centuries and has its origins in the Holy Roman Empire; prior to the abolition of slavery in 1833,<sup>27</sup> the status of person was known to be a fictitious title, and one which most men gladly accepted because it was a step up from the status of slave, it was not the bottom rung of the ladder. However when slavery was abolished the status of person became the lowest designation available in the fiction realm and, as you will see in the subsequent chapters, was effectively merged with the status of

---

<sup>24</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

<sup>25</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

<sup>26</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

<sup>27</sup> [http://www.pdavis.nl/Legis\\_07.htm](http://www.pdavis.nl/Legis_07.htm)

slave to form a voluntary position which not only allowed the continuance of, but grossly expanded, the slave trade.

One would assume then that “human being” would be a more appropriate term to define ourselves by, this is not the case; although you would probably get away with identifying yourself as a human being without granting jurisdiction to another, because the word has become so accepted by the modern legal world to actually mean mankind – nonetheless it does not. A human is not a man, it is a hu-man; hu or hue means “colour of”, so you might more accurately say that a human is the colour of man. Anyone familiar with the law will be aware that when something is defined as “colourable” it denotes something that is “intended to deceive; counterfeit”<sup>28</sup>. It is worthy of note that to the best of my knowledge no scriptural text ever uses the word human. When you consider that the majority of our law today derives to some degree from scripture, then whether you are religious or not, when engaging with the world of commerce we would do well to heed their words when defining ourselves. “For there is no respect of persons with God.”<sup>29</sup>

Human rights then are a trap. Human rights appear to be an attempt to ensure by legislation that the natural unalienable rights of man are observed by the United Nations member states. This could not be farther from the truth. A man has unalienable natural rights; a natural person has human rights. Human rights are enforced in a court; quite often the European Court of Human Rights. To bring a suit in such a court, a name (designating an account) must be used (the significance of this will become apparent in a later chapter). By such an act the man seeking enforcement of his rights has unwittingly foregone every unalienable natural right he once had. He has effectively declared that he is a person to whom rights and duties have been ascribed; any remedy the court now provides will be conditional upon him continuing to bind himself to perform his person citizen duties.

As we alluded to earlier, in this perceived ‘outside world’ there are, strictly speaking, two worlds; as is always the case in this dualistic reality. These two worlds we might call the private and the public, the world of men and the world of persons, the true self and the ego;

<u>Fiction</u>	<u>Reality</u>
Public	Private
Legal	Natural
Person	Man
Ego	True self
Titles to things	Tangible things
Money	Labour

---

<sup>28</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

<sup>29</sup> KJV Bible, Romans 2:11

For example the house or flat that you live in is a real tangible thing, it exists in a private world where you, the man, can impart your own bodily labour upon it and enjoy it in private. However that real tangible thing is referenced on pieces of paper in the public; mortgage deed, land registry title deed etc. These pieces of paper evidence title to a thing, they are fiction, and *“there is no foundation in nature or in natural law, why a set of words upon parchment should convey the dominion of land.”*<sup>30</sup> The names of the “persons” contained on these pieces of paper are also fictions.

By this very simple model man is free to exercise dominion over the earth and remain true to himself, whilst the Crown (the fictional owner of all property) may keep its pieces of paper along with the burdens they entail.

The reason why this situation starts to get complicated is that the man who has everything he needs in his private world of real things, decides that he wants to be able to prove that the house belongs to him; for whatever ego-driven reason, he wishes to own it. Let’s not forget that years of indoctrination and second hand opinions have taught him that this is how it is done.

You may be starting to realise by now that it is not possible for a man to own anything, only fictions have that capacity. Man was born with nothing, he will die with nothing and whilst he is here he may freely use whatever he requires. The only way that a man will be able to say “that is MY house” is if he not only has the real thing in the private but also the piece of paper evidencing title to the thing in the public. Unfortunately, however, the only way he can have that piece of paper is by also saying “that is MY name, I am that Person.”

This is the forbidden fruit, we may exercise our free will in deciding whether or not to eat it and it will no doubt be incomparably juicy (for a while), but when we give in to the temptation of the ego, we are ejected from the metaphoric Garden of Eden. The next chapters cover how, practically and jurisdictionally speaking, this occurs. Hopefully when you see how easily you created these circumstances in your life you will see how unbelievably simple it is to reverse it. When you truly become able to see past the veil which is the name game, you will find that the heavenly world you have always dreamed of exists right here, right now, on earth.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Commentaries on the Laws of England, Sir William Blackstone

<sup>31</sup> [http://realneville.com/pdf/the\\_pruning\\_shears\\_of\\_revision.pdf](http://realneville.com/pdf/the_pruning_shears_of_revision.pdf)



# The Banking System

---

Since approximately 1914 with the inception of the Bankruptcy Act,<sup>32</sup> the United Kingdom has been trading in a state of bankruptcy. Bankruptcy rules prevent the settlement of a debt with real tangible money. No real money is to change hands in bankruptcy; debts may be discharged into the future to allow trading to continue, and everything simply becomes an accounting exercise. Predictably then 1914 was also the date when the gold specie standard was suspended, removing all value from the commercial world making it also impossible for a contract to be completed on the basis that no valuable consideration could be given.

The effect of this suspension was that the money in your purse was no longer redeemable for a tangible and valuable commodity; in fact it was redeemable for nothing. This suspension was instituted under the guise of the commencement of World War I, on the pretence that it was unfavourable to allow trade with gold to continue when such trade could see UK gold reserves disappear overseas. Despite an attempt to placate the naysayers of the fiat currency system<sup>33</sup> by introducing the Gold Standards Act 1925<sup>34</sup> which sought to establish the gold bullion standard, the gold standard was permanently suspended by Bill 227 in 1931. Overnight the nation, and the majority of the developed world, made the final switch to a fractional reserve banking system which operates solely on faith. Or does it?

The process of money creation is the backbone of any economic model; this new fractional reserve banking system<sup>35</sup> introduced the following process:

- *The central bank decides to increase the money supply by say £1m. It does so by purchasing government bonds/treasury bills from a dealer in government securities.*
- *In order to pay for these bonds the central bank creates a liability against itself – a simple accounting exercise.*
- *The dealer's bank account is credited with £1m as payment for the bonds.*
- *£1m of credit money that did not previously exist, now exists in the banking system.*
- *Because the government bonds are interest bearing, the government has effectively borrowed the credit money for its banking system from what is effectively a private corporation at interest (there can never be enough money in circulation to pay back this loan because the interest payable on the government bonds has not yet been created – hence the perpetual and intentional cycle of boom and bust).*
- *"Income taxes pay the interest to the bondholders."<sup>36</sup>*

---

<sup>32</sup> [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1914/59/pdfs/ukpga\\_19140059\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1914/59/pdfs/ukpga_19140059_en.pdf)

<sup>33</sup> <http://dailyreckoning.com/flat-currency/>

<sup>34</sup> <http://www2.econ.iastate.edu/classes/econ355/choi/1925apr28a.html>

<sup>35</sup> \*<http://www.rayservers.com/images/ModernMoneyMechanics.pdf>

<sup>36</sup> House of Commons Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, Canada

- *The central bank can control the supply of credit money by buying and selling its holding of government bonds at will. In this way does one single corporation control the entire economy.*<sup>37</sup>

*"I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit... The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated governments in the civilized world... a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men."* Woodrow Wilson [President 1913-1921] after he passed the Federal Reserve Act 1913<sup>38</sup> which instituted the Fractional Reserve System in the United States.

The £1m created by the central bank can then be expanded to a theoretical £10m through the following process:

- *The high street bank(s) who received the £1m from the dealer's transaction is allowed to lend £900,000 of the original £1m, assuming a 10% fractional reserve requirement.*
- *However it does not lend any of the original £1m, if it did this no new money would be created. It keeps the whole £1m in its vault and creates, out of thin air, up to another £9m to satisfy the 10% requirement.*
- *It can do this because it "accepts promissory notes [loan application forms and offers] in exchange for credits to the borrowers' transaction account."*<sup>39</sup>
- *The bank lies to the public, telling them that they are making a loan (that must be paid back at interest).*
- *The bank then accepts the loan application form/offer as a promise to pay in accordance with the Bills of Exchange Act 1882<sup>40</sup> (much like the promise to pay bank notes in your wallet).*
- *Because they now have something of value from the 'borrower,' they are authorised by the banking system to create out of thin air the credit money that the 'borrower' wishes to 'borrow.'*
- *In essence the bank has simply converted the 'borrowers' promissory note into useable credit money. They have not lent a single penny of their own money or of anyone else's money. 100% of the monthly payments you make on a loan, mortgage or credit card are effectively profit to the banking system.*
- *It is the promise of future labour of the man acting as the legal fiction 'borrower' that increases the supply of fictional credit money in the fractional reserve system.*
- *Essentially it is us, the alleged lenders, who make the loan to the bank, not the other way round.*

<sup>37</sup> <http://video.google.ca/videoplay?docid=-2550156453790090544&ei=LZpfStyRGYe6qQKKpJycDQ&q=money+as+debt&hl=en#>

<sup>38</sup> <http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-515319560256183936#>

<sup>39</sup> <http://www.rayservers.com/images/ModernMoneyMechanics.pdf>

<sup>40</sup> <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/45-46/61>

This credit expansion process is in itself a massive fraud upon the people, but for the purpose of this text I shall simply direct you to the excellent work of Thomas Schaff<sup>41</sup> and move on.

Now we must consider what the only thing in the commercial world is that actually has any value under this system? For every product or service created the only real cost is our labour. Take, for example, a car – the raw materials for its construction were free, as with all the things that nature provides, but men must be paid to extract those materials, transport them, build the vehicles which transport them, manipulate those materials into car parts, assemble those parts, build the factories in which they are manipulated and assembled – the list goes on. If man didn't charge for the labour to undertake these many tasks, what would things cost? Nothing in this world costs a single penny unless and until a man puts a price tag on it to cover the cost of his labour. And so when one man does it, we all do it, in our typical herd mentality. Since you started playing this game of commerce have you ever stopped to consider why we charge for our labour and why we use money to buy life's necessities, when you like I have been told innumerable times that mankind has been given dominion over the earth? Please take a moment to consider this before you read on.

So in light of what we have learnt about the function of the fiat banking system, if the only thing that has any value is the labour of the people and the promise of future labour, what is it that gives value to the government bonds which are issued to the Bank of England in return for the currency it loans to the government? For a government bond to have any value it must be backed by something, when you consider that the only thing that has any value is mans labour and the promise of his future labour, the only way that the system can function is if the government can somehow collateralize that labour; to have the people stand as surety for the bankruptcy.

*“[Very] soon every American will be required to register their biological property in a national system designed to keep track of the people and that will operate under the ancient system of pledging. By such methodology we can compel people to submit to our agenda which will affect our security as a charge back for our fiat paper currency. Every American will be forced to register or suffer not being able to work and earn a living. They will be our chattel and we will hold the security interest over them forever by operation of the law merchant under the scheme of secured transactions.*

*Americans, by unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of lading to us, will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent, forever to remain economic slaves through taxation secured by their pledges. They will be stripped of their rights and given a commercial value designed to make us a profit and they will be non the wiser, for not one man in a million could ever figure our plans and, if by accident one or two would figure it out, we have in our arsenal plausible deniability. After all this is the only logical way to fund government by floating liens and debt to the registrants in the form of benefits and privileges. This will inevitably reap to us huge profits beyond our wildest expectations*

---

<sup>41</sup> \*<http://www.scribd.com/doc/18528530/Secret-Bankers-Manual>

*and leave every American a contributor to this fraud which we will call "Social Insurance." Without realizing it, every American will insure us for any loss we may incur and in this manner every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly. The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and we will employ the high office of the President of our dummy corporation to foment this plot against America."* Colonel Edward Mandell House in a private meeting with Woodrow Wilson [President 1913-1921]

How can we be debtors when we are the source of all credit? All credit money that has come into existence in the form of debt, be it mortgages, loans, credit cards etc has apparently made us debtors when we take out these alleged loans, but how can we be both the source of all credit, the true creditors if you like, whilst also being the parties liable for that credit?

The answer is we are not creditors and debtors, we are just creators, and we are the source of all fictional credit money. The debtor is not you it is the name. This is the name that you have been conditioned to accept as your own when in fact, as you will see in the next chapter, it is most definitely not. Cleverly then by hiding the fact that our only role is that of creator/creditor, we have been duped into playing both roles unnecessarily.

If we pay for this system with our labour, and we stand as surety for this system by the promise of our future labour, and we also volunteer to meet the obligations of the system, we surely are obligated to ask who is creaming the massive fictional profit out of the middle? This book is not about pointing fingers, but usually if you wish to know which fictional entity owns a piece of property you look at the name on the deeds. Whose name is it that appears on the promissory notes you carry around in your wallet? And who really owns the Bank of England?<sup>42</sup>

Despite my reference to the fact that we are the true creditors of the fiat financial system, I would like to make it clear that I do not under any circumstances advocate any of the commercial redemption creditor strategies that people are employing to deal with debts in the name. They are conflict based, dishonourable and, when you compare them to exercising dominion over the earth in the care of natural law, wholly degenerate. Why should you need to play paper games, fill in someone else's forms, represent a fiction in someone else's court and generally acting like a well trained, indoctrinated conflict junkie, when you could peacefully choose to exercise the dominion over the earth with which you were born?

We end this discussion on the banking system with a selection of comments from the Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, Canada:

---

<sup>42</sup> \*<http://video.google.com/videoplay?docid=-515319560256183936#>

*"Will you tell me why the government with power to create money should give that power away to a private monopoly and then borrow that which parliament can create itself back at interest...Why should a government borrow that money at interest?"  
"Now, if parliament wants to change the form of operating the banking system, then certainly that is within the power of parliament."*

*"It is absurd to say that our country can issue \$30,000,000 in bonds and not \$30,000,000 in currency. Both are promises to pay; but one promise fattens the usurer and the other helps the people."*

*"It is the people who constitute the basis of government credit. Why then cannot the people have the benefit of their own gilt-edged credit by receiving non-interest bearing currency, instead of the bankers receiving the benefit of the people's credit in interest bearing bonds?"*

# The Name Game

---

To force people to serve the system in the manner described above, to make them stand as surety for the entire construct, would be slavery. Let us not forget that slavery was abolished in 1833, so a government cannot subject the people to a life of servitude unless they volunteer. The problem is that if everyone knew how the game of commerce was really played – the real rules of the game if you like – no one would play, no one would volunteer themselves to a life of unnecessary servitude.

So how is this voluntary undertaking achieved? If we look more deeply at the birth registration process mentioned earlier the answers become apparent.

First of all what do we, if we have children, and our parents actually have first hand knowledge of? Well sometime most likely before your 42<sup>nd</sup> day on this earth, your mother or father attended an office where a man purporting to be a registrar was located, whereupon they offered to the registrar certain information about the event of your birth which was duly accepted. They gave him a name, date of birth, place of birth, address etc. A document containing this information was signed by your mother or father and left in the custody of the registrar. If they requested such, a receipt or Certificate of Birth (commonly called the short form birth certificate<sup>43</sup> and not the same as a certified copy of an entry<sup>44</sup>) will have been provided. Unless you have studied this subject it is likely that that is all the first hand knowledge you have. An examination of the facts is therefore in order;

The legislation that governs the registration of births in the UK is The Births and Deaths Registration Act 1953<sup>45</sup>; it states that *“the birth of every child born in England and Wales shall be registered...”* So you yourself were never physically registered, only the event which was your birth – a historical fact. This is a very important fact, it affects all other facts which follow – we do not register our children, we simply register the event of their birth. Furthermore the registered name was never intended to be your name as the same act clearly states - *“Where, before the expiration of twelve months from the date of the registration of the birth of any child, the name by which it was registered...”* The key phrases here are *“registration of the birth”* and *“the name by which it was registered”* – hence it is not the child that is named but simply the event of the birth. You might therefore say that the most accurate response you could give when asked for a name is *“The name of the event of my birth is ...”*

---

<sup>43</sup> <http://fakeutility.com/id3.html>

<sup>44</sup> [http://www.santoriniweddings.com/UK\\_BIRTH\\_CERTIFICATE.htm](http://www.santoriniweddings.com/UK_BIRTH_CERTIFICATE.htm)

<sup>45</sup> [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1914/59/pdfs/ukpga\\_19140059\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1914/59/pdfs/ukpga_19140059_en.pdf)

Quite cleverly a red herring has been thrown into the mix also. The Act states that *“a name is given to the child.”* First of all let’s consider the circumstances – the child has just been born, it does not understand that it has been given a name in fact it understands nothing of this world. When something has been given without consideration it is a gift. A gift requires an offeror and an acceptor. Legally speaking a gift is a transaction; thus a person can be liable for gift tax, so until a gift has been accepted the transaction is incomplete. An acceptor of anything be it gift, contract or otherwise needs to meet certain criteria for the transaction to be valid, as an absolute minimum he must be of legal age and sound mind. I shall leave it to you to decide whether or not you consider yourself to have legally accepted the gift of the legal name, that you will be bound to use for all legal transactions for the rest of you life, when the offer was made. Furthermore that name was also given to the registrar during the registration process; how can the same thing be given to two different entities? It can’t, only one of those gifts was actually accepted in accordance with the law.

As we continue, keep in mind the following definition of property as defined by various statutes, dictionaries and the High Courts of most nations – property is *“anything”*. Blacks Law Dictionary elaborates; property is *“any external thing over which the rights of possession, use, and enjoyment are exercised.”*

Consider also that legally speaking a *“thing”* is *“the subject matter of a right.”*<sup>46</sup> And remembering that *“a person is any being who is capable of rights and duties,”*<sup>47</sup> it is clear that a ‘person’ is technically a ‘thing’.

A name is *“a word or phrase identifying or designating a person or thing and distinguishing that person or thing from others,”*<sup>48</sup> and we have just learnt that a person is also a thing. Thus in the legal world, a name is only used to *“identify or designate”* some *“thing over which the rights of possession, use, and enjoyment are exercised.”* Are you a name? Do you have a name? Does someone else have a right to possess or use you? Names are not and were not ever meant for men, names are for things, and names are for slaves; although every man does have the right to determine what he wishes to be called, this does not necessarily mean he has a name.

Returning now to our first hand knowledge in respect of the actual process of registration and the receipt issued upon registration. This receipt, or Certificate of Birth (short form birth certificate), now undergoes a process called conversion. This conversion is the *“innovation”* or substitution spoken of earlier. Conversion is *“the change in nature of property from realty to personalty or visa versa,”* or for the sake of understanding; the act of changing reality into personality. It is at this moment that a legal fiction persona is born. The long form birth certificate (certified copy of an entry) is the representation of this new Person; the Person for whom the myriad of statutory laws have been instituted to control.

---

<sup>46</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

<sup>47</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

<sup>48</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

So information regarding the event of your birth, known as an entry in a register, was given to the registrar. In accordance with the same Act “*when a register of live-births or a register of deaths is filled, the registrar shall deliver it to the superintendent registrar to be kept by him with the records of his office.*” Furthermore the Population Statistics Act 1938<sup>49</sup> tells us that “*It shall be the duty of the Registrar-General to make such arrangements and to do all such things as are necessary for the collection and collation of all particulars furnished to registration officers...*” So the registrar, who is an employee of the Crown, gives the information regarding the event of your birth to a superintendent registrar, who is an employee of the Crown, with whom that information will remain until the Registrar General, another employee of the Crown, takes custody of it and collates it with all the other registers. At all times a Crown employee, acting on behalf of the Crown, has in their possession, property which they have been given by an ‘informant’ (a person who gives information to another), which property includes the name which you believe to be yours.

The questions we must ask then are who owns the name? and who is liable for the name? Consider for a moment the birth certificate whereupon the name is found; with the definition of a “*certificate*” as being “*a paper establishing an ownership claim.*” Observing any birth certificate, or certified copy of an entry, produced in a Commonwealth jurisdiction you will notice that there are the words “CROWN COPYRIGHT”. As the Crown’s own guidelines on Crown Copyright<sup>50</sup> information state, the first owner of all Crown Copyright material is Her Majesty. And as the maxims of law tell us; “all liability rests with the owner.” It is clear then that if we do not claim to own the name we cannot therefore have the liability imposed upon us; to do so would constitute involuntary servitude which as we know is forbidden.

Furthermore as the purpose of the copyright process is to limit reproduction of the copyrighted material it is necessary to get the copyright holders permission before re-using copyright information. Did you, the man, get permission from Her Majesty before using one of Her names for your own personal gain in commerce? Given what we now know about the public/private, legal fiction/real man scenario, is it even possible for permission to be granted to you the man even if you could find a way to ask?

So by using this name, which we have believed is ours, we have breached Crown Copyright. But that’s not all, when you say “my name is...” you’re not just using a name, you are claiming it as your own, and in so doing you have made a claim over property which belongs to the Crown. But what’s worse is that by saying you are the name you make yourself accessory property, such that by your own actions, which in the absence of evidence to the contrary the law will assume you are of sound mind when acting, you volunteer to be Crown property. *Accessio cedit principali* – an accessory attached to a principal becomes the

---

<sup>49</sup><http://www.statutelaw.gov.uk/content.aspx?LegType=All+Legislation&searchEnacted=0&extentMatchOnly=0&confersPower=0&blanketAmendment=0&sortAlpha=0&PageNumber=0&NavFrom=0&parentActiveTextDocId=1084994&ActiveTextDocId=1084994&filesize=22213>

<sup>50</sup><http://www.opsi.gov.uk/advice/crown-copyright/copyright-guidance/index>



property of the owner of the principal (the principal being the name, the owner of that principal being the Crown, with the accessory property being the flesh and blood man who made this voluntary attachment). From here on in you are a slave. This is how the allegiance of the people is obtained by the modern day Sovereign. It is however important to note that although the first owner of Crown Copyright material is Her Majesty, Her Majesty and the Crown are two very different entities. Her Majesty is one of the Queens several Legal Fictions, whereas the Crown relates to the City of London Corporation and independent state, the worlds true power and legacy of the Holy Roman Empire.<sup>51</sup>

As a slave, which status is usually designated by the title 'citizen' or 'subject', all property in your possession, including but not limited to all real and personal property, your physical body, bodily labour, and god given rights, belong to the slave owner in totality. Hence any income which you derive from your bodily labour belongs also to the slave owner. Whatever the slave is allowed to keep for himself is considered a benefit or privilege. Such benefits and privileges continue only for such time as the slave is complicit with the instructions of his master, so anyone who wishes to remain a slave would do well to obey. To maintain the illusion of freedom these benefits and privileges are commonly called income, and the slave owner receives the profit on their slave commodity through taxation of this income. To ensure that the slave remains productive, the illusion of freedom must be maintained, hence the slave is told that the income is consideration for his labour and that the taxes will pay for services which benefit his fellow man. We know now of course that *"Income taxes pay the interest to the bondholders."*<sup>52</sup>

What happens when you are a child is unfortunately out of your hands – the law considers you to be property of your parents whether you were registered or not, if your parents had entered into a state of voluntary servitude, you the child as property of your parents were by *accessio cedit principali* also property of their master. This is the sole reason for the introduction of the social services; to maintain the slave owner's property in good order so that it will later operate more productively for its master. Whether or not the child uses the name would appear to be immaterial as the child is not of legal age and sound mind, so is not capable of sailing a vessel on the sea of commerce, and thus he is not strictly a part of the game anyway. To a large degree this is the case, but one must remember that without exception every single occurrence of a child being 'unlawfully' removed from their parents by the state has only been made possible because either the child, parent or most probably both child and parent have declared to a Social Services Agent either the child's name or the parents name, and thus have declared that the child is accessory property to a Crown Copyright name. Once this statement has been made the parent has foregone all rights in determining the child's future.

---

<sup>51</sup> <http://www.omega432.com/lie.html>

<sup>52</sup> House of Commons Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, Canada

But nonetheless, and despite the fact that the names we believe are ours are clearly not ours, we have come to accept as truth the notion that they are our names. Our minds have been conditioned; every occurrence in our lives to date has told us that they are our names. Our parents told us and their parents told them, we believe them because they believe themselves. The very first experience of the education system,<sup>53</sup> when the register is taken, tells us the same thing. This process is then repeated twice, often several times, daily for the entire period of our education/indoctrination, until we leave school at 16 with absolutely no doubt in our minds as to our supposed identity. We have now been successfully trained to unwittingly volunteer for a life of slavery.

Despite the fact that use of the name is much less of an issue for us when we are children, when we mature and are no longer property of our parents or their master, we are a free man. But we are only a free man up to that moment when we say “my name is...” This is the moment you volunteered to be a slave. For just one brief moment, most probably on your eighteenth birthday, you were actually a free man.

The fortunate thing is that if an act is voluntary it need only continue for as long as the volunteer continues to willingly comply.

Are you still willing to volunteer?

Not that much more needs to be said on the matter, the circumstances speak for themselves, but to ensure that you are in possession of all the facts, consider also the following;

No authority exists that states that a birth certificate is *personal identification* or that states that a birth certificate is evidence of the identity of the man presenting it.

No authority exists, absent the consent of the man presenting a birth certificate, which authorizes anyone to recognize or identify that man as being the name contained therein.

Your signature does not appear on your birth registration document or corresponding birth certificate, so you were never intended to be a party to the undertaking.

In fact nothing that appears on your birth registration document or corresponding birth certificate relates in any way whatsoever to you (it is all referencing the event of your birth only), then how can you possibly have been intended to be a party to the undertaking?

The Births and Deaths Registration Act states that “*Any person shall be entitled to search the said indexes at any time when the General Register Office is open... and to have a certified copy of any entry in the said certified copies.*” So if anyone can obtain a copy of the certificate of your birth it can no more identify you than it can anyone else.

---

<sup>53</sup> <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9M4tdMsg3ts>

Certified copies of the birth certificate carry the words “A CERTIFICATE IS NOT EVIDENCE OF IDENTITY.” In fact the decision of ECHR case of *SHEFFIELD AND HORSHAM v. THE UNITED KINGDOM*, stated that *“the use of a birth certificate for identification purposes is discouraged by the Registrar General, and for a number of years birth certificates have contained a warning that they are not evidence of the identity of the person presenting it. However, it is a matter for individuals whether to follow this recommendation.”* Pointing out yet again the voluntary nature of this entire situation.<sup>54</sup>

We are not supposed to be using their names to identify ourselves. In fact the legislators, judges and Crown agents regularly go out of their way to tell us this. If we look out on the state of the world today, if we have misgivings about our own circumstances, there is always a tendency to look outwards to some other person or group of persons responsible for causing our misery. This is a lie, we are each entirely culpable for every experience, positive and negative, that occur in our lives and most of those negative experiences were initiated by a single act – claiming as our own, a name which is the property of another.

Remember that the court system, the police force or any other Crown agency only has jurisdiction over names and other crown agencies. The Crown, through its use of fictions and registry's, owns everything; the ownership of man requiring his consent. When the Crown or one of its many agents sends a piece of paper bearing the name to the property you are using, they are simply looking for an ego to volunteer to stand as surety for whatever fictional debt/charge is in question. Everything the Crown can get us to volunteer to pay for, they don't have to pay for themselves. They are simply managing their own affairs, if we don't get in their way, they will settle the matter with honour. However as long as we continue to meddle in other peoples business we will continue to be punished as slaves.

A final word of caution for all those people who, in the interest of escaping the jurisdiction of the system, identify themselves as Joe of the Family Bloggs or Joe: Bloggs; no matter how you write the name it is still their name. Identifying yourself in this manner is just another example of voluntary attachment to the name and by extension to the statutes and codes and the game itself. The doctrine of *idem sonans* “prevents a variant spelling of a name in a document from voiding the document.”<sup>55</sup> Legally speaking, if it sounds the same it is the same.

Furthermore for the benefit of anyone in the freedom movement who is under the illusion that the designation of Sovereign is something to aspire to; a Sovereign is still a part of the fictional realm, a Sovereign is still essentially a slave; they may be a higher ranking slave, but none the less they are still a slave. A sovereign is still bound to perform rights and duties; in

---

<sup>54</sup> <http://www.pfc.org.uk/node/343>

<sup>55</sup> Blacks Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

fact a Sovereign is bound, in some respects, to an even greater degree. A Sovereign still requires a legal name in order to perform those rights and duties, and by having such a name is still technically the property of another.

We cannot use words, titles and processes which derive from the system in order to escape the system. There are no clever claims of right, fancy titles or trust expressions required, these are just our ego looking for a new way to express itself. All we need do is retrace our steps and, as a man, un-volunteer for that which we have previously volunteered – we simply rebut the presumption and stand under natural law. There is no other way to completely escape its clutches.

# The Laws of War on Land

---

The laws of war on land derive from international law. International law is basically the law of nature applied to nations but with unnatural 'positive law' appendices. These appendices are the treaties and conventions. The United Kingdom (which is basically a subsidiary of the City of London Crown Corporation<sup>56</sup>) is a signatory to both The Hague Convention Regulations concerning the Laws and Customs of War on Land<sup>57</sup>, and The Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War<sup>58</sup>, these are the two main international treaties relating to the laws of war on land. As a signatory the rules set forth therein must be observed at all times.

The conventions do not only deal with circumstances when a direct declaration of war has been made, they deal with ALL belligerent activity – a declaration is not necessary, or at least it is not normal practice.<sup>59</sup>

Articles 2 and 3 of the Geneva Convention deal with its scope of application; article 3 stating that it applies not only to international conflict but also to that which occurs within the territory of a signatory nation. Whilst article 2 states that:

*“The Convention shall also apply to all cases of partial or total occupation of the territory of a High Contracting Party [signatory nation], even if the said occupation meets with no armed resistance.”*

It is easy to see then how the laws of war on land have been expanded to cover all conflict, not just that which you may normally consider as being 'war'. In fact when read with eyes to see, it is evident that both conventions apply to all those who are involved in a situation where one party is acting combatively towards another.

Considering then that the conventions apply to “all cases of partial or total occupation of the territory of a High Contracting Party” a definition of occupation is in order.

Occupation means both “the seizure and control of a territory by military force; the condition of territory that has been placed under the authority of a hostile army; the period during which territory seized by military force is held” and “the possession, control or use of real property.”<sup>60</sup>

One would more accurately say that those two definitions are the same. The latter deriving from the former such that a man, when ignorant of such laws, will define himself as a hostile force without realising it, simply by stating that he is an occupant. The truth of this fact

---

<sup>56</sup> <http://www.omega432.com/lie.html>

<sup>57</sup> <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/385ec082b509e76c41256739003e636d/1d1726425f6955aec125641e0038bfd6>

<sup>58</sup> <http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/385ec082b509e76c41256739003e636d/6756482d86146898c125641e004aa3c5>

<sup>59</sup> War rights on land J.M. Spaight P20 <http://www.archive.org/details/warrightsonland00spaiuoft>

<sup>60</sup> Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

becomes apparent when you consider what is actually going on here – the term occupant from the latter definition is generally used to describe someone who is an owner or tenant or other form of self professed occupant. In order to be an owner or tenant, it is necessary to be identifiable and therefore have a name – which as we know is not our name anyway, and by claiming that name as our own we are in any event acting combatively and are thus in occupancy in accordance with the former definition. The question is if defining ourselves as occupants or tenants has such effect, what should we be defining ourselves as?

*“Broadly speaking, the peaceful inhabitants of the enemy are immune from warlike attack so long as such inhabitants take no part in the fighting, Thus, the law of war separates the population of the enemy into two classes: the combatants and the peaceful inhabitants.”<sup>61</sup>*

Every man fits into one of these two categories; either he is a combatant, “a person who participates directly in hostilities”<sup>62</sup> or he is not. A peaceful inhabitant is at war with no one, and a belligerent force must always recognise this.

Some people are combatant in their daily affairs and they know it, on the other hand some people act peacefully and they also know it, however most people are combatants yet believe they are peaceful inhabitants. This is because of the construct; if we act upon information which is false, e.g. “My name is...” then it is more than likely that we will mistakenly act combatively. When we innocently and ignorantly claim the name as our own we are in occupation of territory belonging to another, this is not the act of a peaceful inhabitant. Ignorance of the law is, as always, no defence.

We have all been brought up with the phrase “actions speak louder than words,” well the law likewise has a maxim which says the same thing; “by your deeds shall you be known.” So whether you fall into the category of combatant or peaceful inhabitant will depend entirely upon how you act.

Ultimately which category a man falls into will again be determined by his success, or otherwise, in taming his ego; the man who is at peace with himself will find it much easier to live in peace with others.

*“Inhabitants who rise in an occupied territory have no rights under international agreement. Conventional war law deals with them, as it deals with spies, on the broad principle (a principle not unknown to humanity in other spheres of action) that he who tries and fails is entitled to no consideration.”<sup>63</sup>*

Essentially an inhabitant who rises against an occupying force has no rights whatsoever, not even the right to life, echoing the conclusion of the name game chapter that when we claim as our own a name that belongs to another we forego all the unalienable natural rights we once had.

---

<sup>61</sup> Law of land warfare, J.A.G.S text 7

<sup>62</sup> Black’s Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition

<sup>63</sup> War rights on land J.M. Spaight P53 <http://www.archive.org/details/warrightsonland00spaiuft>

A reading of the two conventions along with War Rights on Land<sup>64</sup> is highly recommended to fully discover the high levels of protection afforded to peaceful inhabitants.

*“The separation of armies and peaceful inhabitants into two distinct classes is perhaps the greatest triumph of International Law. Its effect in mitigating the evils of war has been incalculable...It may be said broadly that there is no room in modern war for the resistance of unorganised inhabitants.”<sup>65</sup>*

It is we who have allowed the Crown to peacefully accumulate ownership of all things through the use of fictions and registry's. The Crown, and all its agents, banks etc, is simply defending its property from the attack of a belligerent. It is not they who start the war against us, it is us who exercised our free will and chose not to be peaceful inhabitants; choosing instead to become inhabitants who have, by claiming the name, for all intents and purposes 'taken up arms.' We are from here on in entitled to no consideration.

The laws of war on land are yet another positive law form for the legal world. As such they are an invaluable tool in highlighting the importance of being at peace both in, and out of, the legal arena. If you are not acting peacefully, if you are being combative in any way (including claiming the name), you will be deemed as having no rights whatsoever. If we do not meddle with the game of commerce, it will have no choice but to leave us in peace. We would do well to remember this.

Any Police Officer will tell you that the first thing they look for when dealing with any inhabitant is how pleasant, or otherwise, their attitude is. If you fail the attitude test you will likely find yourself in a cell having been afforded “no consideration.” Furthermore it is only when a name has been 'given' that there is anything upon which the officer can act; though he will no doubt try anyway we must remain resolute when faced with ignorance. The same principle is applied to all your interactions with any Crown agent.

Surely then there is no better way we could identify ourselves than as peaceful inhabitants. Peaceful inhabitants are afforded the highest level of protection and at all times are effectively untouchable by any belligerent force – foreign or domestic. But then of course we must also remember to act accordingly!

---

<sup>64</sup> War rights on land J.M. Spaight <http://www.archive.org/details/warrightsonland00spaiuft>

<sup>65</sup> War rights on land J.M. Spaight P37 <http://www.archive.org/details/warrightsonland00spaiuft>

# The Solution

---

This is the really great bit; it's incredibly easy, we just need to remember two simple things;

1. Natural Law is still king, it always has been and it always will be. So simply start exercising dominion over the earth; this is what you were born to do.
2. The name is not yours and the mail which you receive is not, and never was, intended for you. It's just a test. Sit with this until you truly realise it in your heart. Once you have achieved this you will fear nothing. There is nothing else to be done.

In the interest of highlighting our ability as men to freely exercise dominion over the earth and all things therein, and to highlight the legal systems acknowledgement of this ability, it is appropriate to share with you a selection of comments from Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries<sup>66</sup>;

*There is no foundation in nature or in natural law, why a set of words upon parchment should convey the dominion of land.*

*The earth, and all things therein, are the general property of all mankind, exclusive of other beings [including fictional corporations], from the immediate gift of the creator.*

*Bodily labour, bestowed upon any subject which before lay in common to all men, is universally allowed to give the fairest and most reasonable title to an exclusive property therein.*

*Taking amounts to a declaration that he intends to appropriate the thing to his own use, it remains in him, by the principles of universal law, till such time as he does some other act which shows an intention to abandon it.*

There it is, straight from the pages of a book that takes pride of place in most every Judges chambers in the land.

The passages above describe what the public/fiction/positive law system calls usufruct. Usufruct simply means "use of the fruits" but more specifically "the right to use and enjoy the fruits of another's property."<sup>67</sup> Because the Crown has claimed ownership of everything through the use of fictions and registry's, which they in turn own, we as men have what would be termed a usufructuary interest in whatever property we have seized to our continued use, resulting from the unalienable right to exercise dominion over, and use the

---

<sup>66</sup> \*<http://ia351409.us.archive.org/2/items/commentariesonla01blac/commentariesonla01blac.pdf>

\*<http://ia311302.us.archive.org/0/items/commentariesonla021768blac/commentariesonla021768blac.pdf>

\*<http://ia351405.us.archive.org/2/items/commentariesonla03blac/commentariesonla03blac.pdf>

\*<http://ia351430.us.archive.org/0/items/commentariesonla04blac/commentariesonla04blac.pdf>

<sup>67</sup> Blacks Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition



fruits of, the earth; provided of course that we don't surrender those rights by volunteering for a subordinate law form by claiming the name as our own.

Money cannot provide an abundance of life's necessities without also fostering a lack of abundance for another. The very nature of money is that whilst it may provide for some, it does so at the expense of others. We live in a culture driven by profit, profit can only be maximised when supply is controlled in such a way that the prevailing demand coupled with the controlled supply creates the greatest income after deduction of costs. It is these limitations resulting from the profit motive that impose restrictions on the supply of a commodity, ensuring that whilst the people of the world volunteer to play an unnecessary game, there will never be enough to go round.

Man is a creature of nature and only nature can fulfil his every need. Only recently has the western world began to see the superiority of natural and homeopathic remedies in the world of healthcare, and we are beginning also to recognise the superiority of natural organic food eaten raw the way nature provides it. Surely then it is time that we considered applying the superiority of nature in respect of the law, in the way we conduct ourselves, in the way we serve our fellow man, in the way that we honour the opposite sex, and in the way we provide life's necessities; or more accurately in the way we allow life's necessities to be provided for us; for all of us, by nature.

This is not some concept that requires 'public opinion' to be able to work, this is a basic right that every man has; to establish the law form that he himself chooses to live under. A positive law that interferes with natural law is an unenforceable law provided that we remain resolute in the application of our unalienable natural rights.

In order to extricate oneself from the game with minimal fuss, we will all need to correct a few mistakes. Every action you have ever undertaken to this date in the public using the name, was done without being in possession of the facts, hence it would be fair to say that we have all made a great many mistakes. Furthermore corporations from Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs to our local high street banks have most likely mistakenly presumed that we either are the name or at least that we volunteer to stand as surety for the name; if they are mistaken and if we have information that will assist our brothers in settling matters that we were mistakenly involved with, then I am sure you will agree that an honourable man would assist to the best of his ability. We must do the same. The Law of Mistake is very powerful; once alerted to a mistake the senior members of the system will facilitate its rectification.

We must deal with this scenario with the same care and attention that need be applied to dealing with the angry police officer; no more letters telling the other party what rights you have and what you're going to do should they breach those rights. They like everyone else on this planet are our brothers and sisters, help them with their problem and try to see from their perspective. They don't know that you're not a person; they're just doing their job. See

the Addendum for specific direction on how to peacefully assist the legal system and establish yourself as a free man. In this way it is possible to live along side the system without being subject to its jurisdiction.

It is important at this point that we each understand that this solution is a way of life. It cannot be applied to one circumstance yet laid aside for another simply for convenience. If you decide to follow this approach, but you still want to own 'your' house, and to fight against injustices, don't be surprised when you find yourself being sectioned in the interest of public safety. Not that I wish to scare anyone, there is nothing to fear, but it is important that this path be followed for the correct reasons, if your motive is monetary gain or based upon the desires of the ego, the gate keepers<sup>68</sup> will not let you pass. They will know you by your fruits.

We must remember that the very basis of a natural law system is that each member gives freely in the service of others. It would therefore be unjust to freely use the fruits of the earth whilst also continuing to accept money in exchange for our labour. We must remember also that the money we have been using is Caesars' money; it says right on the front "Bank of England," when we say "MY money" we become bound to perform 'duties' (like filing tax returns etc) by the same process of *Accessio Cedit Principali*.

Ultimately then, there is only one thing for it; to render unto Caesar that which is Caesars'. After all, all roads lead (quite literally!<sup>69</sup>) to Rome. See the Addendum for suggestions.

Do not be disheartened by the scale of the changes required to make this transition, the processes are simple and like everything else it is not necessary to do everything overnight. Nor are you on your own, an increasing number of people are recognising the superiority of the natural approach to life and law, and because of our collective philosophy on service to others, there will always be someone able to offer assistance and support.

Remember also that in the eyes of the law, a man who sleeps on his rights has none. If we wish to have unalienable rights we must exercise them freely at all opportunities, and we must do so without first seeking the approval of others; any requirement we have for approval is an acknowledgement by us that we don't actually have those rights in the first place. Only through the continued exercise of our rights will we be able to establish and enforce those rights, no one else will do it for us, especially a court system that is incapable of recognising us when we're not wearing a legal slave persona.

It is always possible that we, the first to walk this path, may be tested to a greater degree than those that follow. It is possible that we may bear the brunt of the odd injustice as we proceed. However this has not been my experience; when you approach this process with

---

<sup>68</sup> Gate keepers are the judges and agents with responsibility for ensuring the continuance of the game. When a slave truly awakes he must be allowed to leave because positive law does not allow for involuntary servitude. The gate keepers always remain in honour and will test the slave to ensure that he is ready.

<sup>69</sup> <http://www.omega432.com/lie.html>

love rather than fear, with your head held high, and with respect to others, I have found that that respect is invariably returned.

*"A man cannot ride your back unless it's bent."* Martin Luther King Jr

# Conclusion

---

It's easy to blame other people for what has happened to the world; corrupt politicians, banking cartels, oil tycoons etc, but those people were just a little more successful at the game of commerce than the rest of us. You might even say they were just greater victims of the construct than the rest of us. We must remember that with few exceptions every politician followed the political path because they wanted to instigate some positive change in the world, to improve the quality of life of the people they serve. But somewhere down the line they realised, as we all do, that's not how it works in the game. They realised that if they wished to keep their position of authority they would have to 'tow the party line.' The ego needs to keep this position of authority so it makes up little stories like 'well if I do what is expected of me this time then at least there will be further opportunities to do the right thing when it really matters'. The problem is that now he has ignored his conscience once, it will be easier to do the same thing next time; the justification process gets easier and easier until the time comes when he has forgotten his original ideals, not paid attention to the gradual decline in his consciousness as he continually ignores his heart in the interest of the 'greater good', until one day he finds himself making deals with private corporations, covering up child abuse scandals, and fiddling his expenses.

The exact same rationale is responsible for the police officers who walk over the rights of the people, for the doctors who knowingly avoid prescribing one of the many cancer cures available for fear of losing their job, for lawyers who dispossess men of their homes on behalf of corporations, and for the 'little man' who only screws his neighbour so his family can eat. To some degree each and every one of us is guilty of this, each and every one of us is or has been part of the problem and each and every one of us is now either part of the problem or part of the solution; there are no innocent bystanders.

None of these symptoms will disappear if we meet anger and fear with anger and fear, love and forgiveness must be the currency of the future. We have collectively allowed the current condition to flourish; we are each responsible for the circumstances we find ourselves in.

Nature does not recognise good and evil, or right and wrong; nature only recognises balance and imbalance. There are those of us who cause the imbalance and those of us who restore it. For too long the number of us causing the imbalance has far outweighed the number of us restoring it, and it is our duty and purpose as stewards of the earth to re-establish that balance that we ourselves are culpable for perverting the course of.

The funny thing is that the joke really is on us. We've collectively compromised our principles for a few pieces of paper that don't exist, in pursuit of a life that can never be. I

hope for your own sake that you are able to laugh at how tremendously funny that is. If you can I hope that one day our paths may cross and we can laugh together as friends.

*"We thought of life by analogy with a journey, with a pilgrimage which has a serious purpose at the end, and the thing was to get to that end, success or whatever it is, or maybe heaven after you're dead. But we missed the point the whole way along; it was a musical thing and we were supposed to sing or to dance whilst the music was being played."* Alan Watts

May your journey be blessed with joy and abundance.

I love you

If you would like to join us in this holistic approach to life; exercising your dominion over the earth and freely using its fruits, please visit [www.peacefulinhabitants.socialgo.com](http://www.peacefulinhabitants.socialgo.com)