Traps

The system has been set up over thousands of years, and hides behind the *legal fiction* called *government*, which does <u>not</u> exist.

These people, who hide behind this *fiction*, carryout scams and deceptions towards the people of this earth, which results in mass poverty, misery and war.

However these people hope you won't dig too deep and discover the truth, and place many traps in case you should even try.

<u>Note:</u> a few **government** scams are sophisticated and arduous to comprehend, but many are surprisingly easy to grasp, if you are willing to see.

Here is a list detailing many of these traps.

Assumption

The entire system requires your *consent* and *ignorance* to just *assume*.

The people controlling the system consider your *assumption* as *"consent"*, and therefore can then act upon you.

Note: Within the legal system there is a maxim of law: "For he who would be deceived, let him".

This comes from the Latin phrase "Mundus vult decipi, ergo decipiatur" meaning "The world wants to be deceived, so let it be deceived."

However when you question someone's claim or documentation, they often withdraw.

For if they told you directly, then your *assumption* has not been granted, and fraud has been committed against you.

Exemption

The word "exemption" means to be freed from an **obligation** or liability imposed by others with **authority**, usually through contract.

Therefore to use an **exemption** is to **accept** the **obligation**, and subsequent imposed authority, resulting in accepting the **policy** within a **contract** that **may** grant you exemption.

Religious exemption

The definition of *Religious exemption* is a *legal privilege* that exempts members of a certain religion from a *"law"*, regulation, or requirement by the state or *government*.

Note: you can never be *exempt* from *law*; otherwise the *victim* would be without justice.

A *legal privilege* is <u>not</u> a right, and it certainly is <u>not</u> your right; it is a clause within a contract that someone else controls.

If you do not control said contract, then the *privilege*, along with the *exemption* can be withdrawn at any time.

Religious Saviour

Although the choice to follow a religion is a personal one, there are *dangers* in doing so that are not quite so obvious to the average person of faith.

Throughout recorded history, many "religions" have either been started or taken over by people whose sole purpose is to gain wealth and power.

The usual trap is to instil *fear, depression* and *anxiety* that "all is lost", into the followers, and then give "salvation" to them if they just followed the cult leader, usually in the way of *penance*.

However the danger of instil **too much fear** into the people is some will often feel they are **without hope**, and a man **without hope** is a very dangerous thing.

So, a "saviour" is often created, given false hope that "salvation" is coming, all the followers have to do is wait and continue to give penance until such time as the "saviour returns".

This is a trap set up so you *believe* someone is going to save you, so you will <u>not</u> try and save yourself, with the modern day equivalent being QAnon, Anonymous and certain politicians.

<u>Note:</u> the word "religion" comes from the act of re-creating a legion of followers, after a collapse of society, older faith or war, with a Roman legion being made up of between 3,000 to 6,000 men.

Do not go looking for a *saviour*, as the *saviour* is found from within, it is *you*.

Authority

When someone is making a claim to their "authority", they are stating they have the power or right to give orders and make decisions over their subordinates.

The title "authorities" is often, yet incorrectly applied to a person or organization having political or administrative power and control, without contract.

Authority can only come from the individual, and to become a "subordinate", they must willingly, and without coercion give their authority to another.

This is usually done through *contract*, when a person decides to work for someone else, resulting in *limited authority* being given to the boss, who is *limited* by the policies written within said contract.

If anyone should try and impose their authority onto you, without agreement or contract, then this is a violation of your rights and should be challenged.

Resistance

Although the word *resistance* can refer to the ability to not be affected by something or someone, usually adversely, within the legal world it means something else.

Resistance also refers to the "refusal to accept", or comply with, something or someone, usually in the way of an order, rule or instruction.

However *resistance* is <u>not</u> required when there is no *contract* or *agreement* in place to the *implied* requirement to begin with, but the *act* of *resisting* now creates the *obligation* to comply.

Refusal

When someone offers you a service or product, do <u>not</u> say you *refuse*.

Saying you *refuse* indicates that you had a *prior obligation* to accept the service or product being offered, and you have now *defaulted* on your "*prior obligation*".

<u>For example:</u> do not *refuse* a test, just *decline* the test. If you refuse, the one making the offer will continue as if you have now *defaulted* on a prior *"obligated contract"*.

The correct response would be to "decline the offer", as this shows this is the first time the offer has been made, and therefore there <u>cannot</u> be any prior **obligation** within a contract to accept.

If they persist, then they are without honour and you can make a counter claim against them.

Non-compliance

Compliance and being **compelled** refers to the **obligated** action or fact of **complying** with a wish or command given by another.

However the act of *complying* means you had a prior agreement *to comply*.

Therefore an act of "non-compliance" means you agree that you should follow the order or command, but you have chosen not to, resulting in the loss of your honour, and now the party issuing said order can act upon you.

Disobedience

The word *disobedience* means the *failure*, *refusal* or *neglect* to obey rules imposed by someone in authority.

However you can only *disobey* a rule if you had already *accepted* the *obligation* of the contract from where the rule is stipulated, and therefore the authority from the person issuing said rule.

Many people make the mistake of "disobeying" a baseless order, which inadvertently places them under *obligation* to follow, when they should have just questioned the *obligation* all along.

Civilian

Although the official narrative of the title "civilian" means a person not in the armed services, or a "non-combatant", or "private citizen", the true nature of this title dates back over 2000 years.

Before people were referred to as "civilians", they were called "plebeians" within Ancient Roman society, who were a group of lower class commoners, under the rule and control of the upper class called Patricians.

These *Patricians* ruled over the *Plebeians* using a bureaucratic system of "*law*" which over time became *Civil Procedure Code*, or "*law*", which is controlled today by the *BAR association*.

Therefore anyone within the jurisdiction of this **society** was under the **authority** of **"civil law"**, and became a **"Civilian"**.

Civil Disobedience

There have been many calls for "Civil Disobedience" in retaliation against tyranny throughout history, however making the claim of "Civil" disobedience acknowledges "your title" and therefore position within a society.

This action is "acceptance" of operating within the jurisdiction of a society or "community" controlled by others, namely the state, and your agreement that you have no status, and therefore no rights, within it.

Meaning you have **no right** to **disobey** any command, and your actions have become threatening to the society you agreed to be a part of.

The result of which is you have now become an "Extremist", meaning "the state", which controls "the society" can now act upon you.

Why disobey when you had no obligation to start with?

Civil Rebellion

Similar to *Civil Disobedience*, "*Civil Rebellion*" is the action or process of resisting authority, control or convention; however it can also be seen as a "*call to action*".

A *Rebellion* is also applied to the act of armed resistance against an established government or leader.

Therefore to call for a "Civil" Rebellion, you are calling for "Civilians" with no right to rebel, to take up arms against the state; you have now become a "Domestic Terrorist".

Lawful Rebellion

Referring to a "Lawful" Rebellion would suggest the right to this action, where the word "rebellion" is being used to oppose an unfounded authority or an illegitimate claim of dominance upon you, resulting in a direct threat being made against you without a prior agreement.

Meaning if a group, corporation or government where to make unfounded claims of authority, then you would have the "lawful" right to rebel and defend yourself.

This could work if the individual chose to use their **own law**, but many make the mistake of referencing the **"law"** from others, resulting in the loss of their sovereignty.

The most common mistake would be quoting the *Magna Carta*, which was a contract signed by a king and a group of barons.

The person trying to use this ancient contract today is not only operating in the wrong jurisdiction, but quoting a document that does *not* bear their signature.

<u>Note:</u> You cannot and do not get your rights from another's contract, furthermore there is no document that can ever save you from tyranny.

Voting

The *Plebtorial system* which originated within *Ancient Roman Society*, developed and changed over time and became the *Electoral system*.

To give the *Plebeians* the *illusion* that they were in control, they were offered *elections* so it would appear they could choose who ran "their" government.

<u>Note:</u> of course the government was never the peoples, but those who owned the government, the *Patricians*, with all the candidates already preselected.

This deception begins with the ballot paper; when you *register* to vote, you handover power of attorney.

You are asked to use **black ink** and mark an "X" in a box, which is the signature of a "simpleton".

This action declares you are "incompetent" to make a decision, and are asking those in control to decide for you.

If you think you can vote your way out of tyranny, then signing an "X" was the correct thing to do.

Note: if you own your own land and are therefore **Sovereign**, you elect, you don't vote.

All you are doing when you go to the *polling station*, is recording your *opinion* within said *poll*, so the government can see what the general *consensus* of the people is, nothing more.

Constitution

In America on September the 17th 1787 twelve state delegates approved the *constitution*.

These states now became constitutors.

A *constitutor* in civil law is one who by simple agreement becomes responsible for the payment of another's *debt*.

A *constituent* is one who promises to pay the debt of another, meaning if you *register* to vote, within the *electoral system*, you have agreed to become the *debtor* to the *state*.

Note: A citizen does <u>not</u> have access to, nor is protected by, any constitution or "bill of rights".

Protests

The definition of the word "protest" means a statement or action expressing disapproval of or objection to something.

Within the *legal system*, this can be in the way of a written declaration, typically by a notary public, that a bill has been presented and payment or acceptance refused.

The word **Protest** is derived from the Latin word **"protestari"** meaning **"to declare publicly"** and the root word **"testari"** meaning **"to testify"** ergo **Pro-test** means to **"testify publicly"**.

However as "the public" has now become a controlled jurisdiction, to "protest" is no longer a right, but a "privilege" that can be revoked at any time by those who control the "general public", "society" or "community".

Furthermore, the very action of protesting indicates an *obligation to adhere* to the very issue you are protesting against.

This is why so many protests and petitions are organised and funded by the very corporate organisations you are protesting against, such as "big oil" and governments.

In simple terms you are accepting the "corporate authority", and by protesting it you are strengthening it.

Petitions

A *petition* is a formal written request, typically one signed by many people, appealing to *"authority"* in respect of a particular cause.

However in most cases, when you sign a *petition* you have inadvertently accepted the *obligation* of the very thing you are *petitioning* against, when in fact you many have had *no obligation* in the first place, as there was *no lawfully binding contract* to begin with.

Meaning the subject or cause you are petitioning against did <u>not</u> even apply to you, but through the very action of *petitioning*, now it does.

This is why most petitions against the "government" are actually set up by the very "government" you are "petitioning" against.

<u>Note:</u> a *petition* is an *"appeal"* which means in simple terms *"begging"*. You have lost you sovereign status and become subservient to a higher authority.

<u>For example:</u> If you petition against changes made to the "*Human Rights Act*" then you have accepted that "*contract*" or *corporate policy*, and are now bound by it, when it <u>never</u> even applied to you.

You have now agreed that your *rights* no longer belong to you, but are now controlled by the people who have written the "Human Rights Act", who now have the power to change them at will. You have become a *slave*.

A lawful *petition* can only exist where a standing agreed upon *contract* already applies.

<u>For example:</u> If a group of people all sign a *contract* to work for a *corporation*, and the management of said corporation then "*change the deal*", the group of people could "*petition*" against the changes to an *existing contract*.

However if you are *petitioning* against a change in policy regarding a contract you are obligated by, remember regardless of how many people signed said *petition*, the overall document is only considered as *one voice* and only carries the weight of "one person" in court.

Therefore it would be better to sue the management for **breach of contract** than **petition**, that way the workers retain their sovereign status.

<u>Note:</u> Most unions will not tell the workers this, and are usually working with the very corporation the union said they would protect the worker against.

Petitions are also set up and offered by **governments** to defuse a situation where the people are angry over a certain issue said **government** caused.

The way this works is those who sign have a *sense* they are acting *against* the issue and therefore are making a difference, when in fact they have not, and hence do not take the matter any further.

In short, only children or *slaves* beg, make *appeals* and *petition*.

Complaints Procedure

To *complain* seems a legitimate action when something is either unsatisfactory or unacceptable; after all if you accepted a good or service you have certain expectations or standards which are accepted to you.

However to *complain* is one thing, but to accept another's *procedure* to resolve such *complaint* is the trap.

Almost all corporations offer a "complaints procedure" department, however this is <u>not</u> done to assist you with your complaint, but to take control of the process and therefore determine the end result.

You have lost control of the situation, and as a result you will not be satisfied with the outcome.

Grievance Procedure

When working for someone else, and an issue arises, many people make a *complaint* to their immediate supervisor, which in turn usually leads to following the company's *"grievance procedure"*.

This is a formal way for an *employee* to raise a problem with their *employer* concerning the actions of another *employee*.

However this action establishes you as an *employee*, which is a *taxable human resource without rights*.

Furthermore, if you *initiate* this "grievance procedure" you have *lost* the ability to direct the process and are at the mercy of the "senior management", who have no obligation to conduct themselves fairly or justly.

<u>Note:</u> the primary goal of any senior staff is to protect the corporation from litigation, and not to help you.

Additionally you have now accepted the often convoluted *grievance procedure* rules and regulations, which are written in a way to entrap you further.

If someone has made a *complaint* against *you*, then you have the right to know who this person is within the private, but not as an *"employee"*.

If their name is not divulged, then the burden of proof and hereto the claim now becomes the responsibility of the supervisor you are dealing with, which you must deal within in the private.

Many people will opt for perceived simple solution of using a union, but just like petitions and protest, will only pull you into the *legal system* deeper, as most unions are usually working with the very corporation the union said they would protect you against.

Society

The general description of a "society" is a group of people living together in an ordered community or commune.

The official narrative regarding a **society** often includes the following:

- Shared Language.
- Customs and Traditions.
- Religion.
- Arts and Literature.
- Families.

But this is *culture*, <u>not</u> a "society".

However the definition of a **society** is more accurately applied to an **organisation** or club formed for a particular purpose or actively.

Within this organisation there is a *hierarchical management structure*, usually comprising of a board of directors or committee, *controlling* the members.

And when were break down a society further, we see the trap, as it includes the following:

• Forms of government.

- Economic systems.
- Businesses.
- Regulatory system.
- A class or cast system.

Note: A **society** operates as a business using **maritime law**, requiring a **membership** for the rules of said **society** to apply to you.

Within this *controlled class system*, the family is considered the *"basic unit"* of *society*, which in turn forms *communities*, with many *communities* making a *nation*, which in turn is under the jurisdiction of a *country* controlled by the *owners* of said *country*.

Being part of a **society** obligates you to the **social order** or **"new world order"**, with the loss of your freedom.

Social Contract

The term "social contract" is often causally spoken about and accepted without any proof that said contract even exists.

For there to be a *contract*, then informed consent must be *considered* and *accepted* with the signing of said *contract*.

With a **society** being **social control** of the **individual**, an **"imposed contract"** can be implied.

Never accept a contract without reading it first.

Class System

Class is a shortened word taken from *classification*, which is the operation of *separating* various entities or units, and *categorising* them within a set of definitions limited by margins or boundaries.

This set of definitions can be set up as a *hierarchy* which distinguishes between lower and higher importance.

A "social class" is the method of grouping people into a set of hierarchical social categories, with the most common being upper, middle and lower class.

This system of **separating** and **valuing** people is most evident within favoured and preferred **communities**.

Ask yourself this; who is putting you into a "class"?

Community

The word community comes from the Latin communis, meaning "common, public, and shared".

The first known or recorded use of the word *community* was in the 4th millennium BCE, and referred to a *Civilization of Mesopotamia*, which developed the first city-states.

Note: **BCE** stands for **Before the Common Era**, and refers to the Gregorian calendar.

Community also means "public", municipal, and obviously communal, which became the foundation for communism. It means the opposite to private.

<u>Note:</u> Man is tribal, not communal. The word *Tribunal* comes from the world *tribe*, which is "common law"

Countries

It is a common mistake to consider a *country* as a place where people live within an accepted culture; that would be called *"land"*.

<u>For example:</u> The name of **England** came from **"the land of the Angles"** or **"Engla-Land"**, which was the home of **Germanic Tribes** called **"Angles"**, who lived upon the **land**.

The name *country* came from the word *county*, which referred to a *jurisdiction* placed upon the land, usually by a king or monarch.

People who lived within this *jurisdiction* were considered "subjects" to the king, making them subject to his rule, where he would "count" the heads living upon the land, who would then became taxpayers.

<u>Note:</u> "Subject" is the *title* given to the person who has become *subjugated*; the act of *subjugation* refers to the action of bringing someone or something under *domination* or *control*.

A *country* is just a collection of *counties*, or "communities of taxpayers", under subjugation of a king. Today it means under the jurisdiction of a corporation, which exists on paper only.

<u>Note:</u> Moving from one *country* to another, with a change in *jurisdiction*, can be done by the stroke of a pen.

Flags

With an understanding of what a *country* is, which is nothing more than a *corporation*, *flags* are nothing more than *corporate logos*.

Using a *flag* from one of these *corporate countries* within your own *jurisdiction* or business, places your *private dominion* under the *jurisdiction*, and therefore *control* of said *corporate country*.

Therefore you have just placed yourself within the *authority* of that *flag*, including all the *rules*, *regulations*, *policies*, *taxes* and *legislation* that come with it.

A white flag does not mean surrender; it means you are **without flag** and therefore **not** operating within the **jurisdiction** of **corporate warfare**.

Note: the word **warfare** comes from combining **"war"** with **"fare"**, where **"fare"** means **"journey"**, or more accurately the **money** you **pay** for the **journey** you make, ergo **"the cost of war"**.

Rights

Your rights are often given away through the deceptive use of words, to understand how we need to know the following:

Adjective meaning: An *adjective* is a word that *describes* a *noun* or noun phrase. The semantic role of an *adjective* is to *change* the information given by the *noun*.

<u>Noun meaning:</u> A **noun** is a word that generally functions as the **"name"** of a specific object or set of objects, such as people, places or actions, such as **"Man"**, **"Home"** or **"Car"**.

This means placing an *adjective* before a word, usually a *noun*, *changes* said word or *noun*.

Therefore adding a word or "adjective" in front of the word "right" turns it into a title, and the "right" into a privilege controlled by someone else, usually the people behind government.

Meaning a word *before* the word *"right"* turns it into a *titled privilege* operating within *maritime law*, such as:

- Human rights.
- Civil rights.
- Cultural rights.
- Religious rights.
- Gay rights.
- Minority rights.
- Miranda rights.

Only a Sovereign individual can have rights, as it is their authority that enforces it.

Caution should also be exercised regarding rights, as making *open declarations* to your rights will make this appear as an *invitation* to *contract* by politicians, in the guise to "protect them".

It is far safer to consider that "no one" has "rights", or a right to something within your dominion, rather than you having a "right" to it, as the burden of proof is on the one making the claim to said right.

Rights protect you from the action of another, **not** to give you resources.

Human Rights Act

Many people fight *government* over changes to "human rights" and most notably the "Human rights Act".

However without the ability to read and see the truth, this is a futile fight and pointless.

When we breakdown the language, we can see the trap as follows:

Human: this is <u>not</u> referring to Man, but "colour of man", which is a "monster <u>without</u> rights".

- The combination of the word "human" and "right" now makes it a Title Privilege.
- The word "Act" means, "acting as law", so therefore not law.

Your rights do not come from some else, for if they did you would be a slave.

If your rights came from someone else, they can be taken away.

Sovereign Citizen

The official narrative regarding the title "Sovereign Citizen" is as follows:

"A member of a <u>political movement</u> of people who oppose taxation, question the legitimacy of government, and <u>believe</u> that they are not subject to the <u>law</u> and do not respect the <u>authority</u> of the police."

Although a *true sovereign* is capable of seeing through the official propaganda, the following issues with this statement are as follows:

- Being sovereign is <u>not</u> political, but a *status* of life, which is that of having *supreme authority* and *control* over one's life.
- Sovereignty is <u>not</u> a belief system, but truth in fact.
- The "law" that is referred to is nothing more than corporate policy without contract and therefore no obligation to comply.
- The police are a *private "For-Profit" Corporation* in the business of selling debt to the general public in the guise of fines, based upon bogus and unfounded rules and regulations.
- *Citizen* means "slave to the city" meaning that the title "Sovereign Citizen" is an oxymoron. You cannot be both sovereign and a slave.

The tactic is to create a *baseless hypothesis* and then apply a *title* to it, and then use said *title* to try and *strawman* the argument without attempting to even tackle it.

This is nothing new within the corrupt political game played by people who hide behind the legal fiction called *qovernment*.

Criminal Record

To "record" is the act of documenting data or to chronicle the history of a particular subject or person, resulting in the creation of a database for reference in due course.

Creating a "criminal record" is to produce a database of a person's previous criminal convictions; however what constitutes a "criminal conviction"?

Furthermore, who is doing the recording of said database, and under what authority?

Regardless of your life choices and any indiscretions you may have carried out, <u>who</u> did you give permission to that allows them to *record*, *store* and *share* the history of your life?

Moreover, a "criminal record" is actually "policy violation" from unfounded contracts, issued by corporations, which can be repeatedly brought up to further hinder your life, and is usually subjected to the poor only.

<u>Note:</u> It should also be noted that a "criminal record" is only applied to your corporate birth certificate, operating within the lower public realm or jurisdiction of a "democracy".

This is why the rich and powerful *never* get convicted or sent to prison.

Credit Rating

The definition of a credit rating is as follows; "A credit rating is an evaluation of the credit risk of a prospective debtor, predicting their ability to pay back the debt, with an inherent forecast of the likelihood of the debtor defaulting".

With the knowledge of the *corporate birth certificate*, enslaving newly born babies into lifelong debt slaves, the phrase "*credit rating*" takes on a whole new meaning.

It is the *corporation*, in the name of your *surname*, or "slave name" that is being "rated".

However, we should consider the obvious, when did <u>you</u> give **authority** for a **credit rating** to even be carried out, and by **whom**?

No Fly List

The official narrative regarding the "The No Fly List" describes it as a database controlled by the United States Federal Government and maintained by the "Terrorist Screening Center" using an algorithmic ruleset, issued by various government agencies and airlines to decide who to allow and deny to board airline flights, under the guise of "national security".

However this "official narrative" is quickly defeated when it becomes apparent that what is truly being said; the list is for people so dangerous they should never be allowed to fly on an airplane, yet so innocent that they cannot be arrested.

This conflict of narratives exposes the truth; taking away your right to travel if you do not do as you are told.

However, and this should be obvious:

- Who's list?
- Who's authority?

When did you give your authority to be added to this list, and who did you give permission to?

<u>Defund the Police</u>

Various groups and *movements* have called for the "defunding of the police", and are promoted heavily by many main stream media outlets and publications.

However this is an orchestrated propaganda *psyop* set up to manipulate the general public to move in the opposite direction.

A "psyop" is short for the phrase Psychological Operation or Warfare, which is the term given to the action of government's influencing the perceptions and attitudes of an individual or group, often foreign but become increasingly domestic.

Based on the ill-conceived and *incorrect* assumption that the *police* deal in *law*, and are there to "protect the people"; most individuals consider defunding the police a bad idea.

Usually based on the left-right divide, people who are unable to critically think and cannot see the deception are easily persuaded to go against the opposing side.

This results in the *refunding* of the police, which often includes them being granted more *"powers"* given to them by *government*.

Note: the amount of *political power* is dependent on the number of brainwashed slaves.

The truth is the *police* have *no authority*, nor does the *government*, but people with a slave mentality have just given away theirs.

<u>Note:</u> it should also be noted that from the earliest conception of the *police*, they have been working with organised crime. The "*criminals*" create the "*problem*"; the police are there to "*solve*" the "*problem*".

The police, courts, lawyers and "criminals" are all working together against you for money.

It is a scam and a racket, design to generate billions in revenue while simultaneously suppressing the poor and weak, referred to as the "citizen" or "slave to the system".

If you think you are safe by giving away your *sovereignty*, *rights* and *authority* to another, you never will be.

Court

Within the modern day "justice system" the "courts" operate within three basic jurisdictions:

- 1. Bank
- 2. Maritime
- 3. Religious

Each one is set up to extort money from you.

This is done by setting up a *constructed trust* in your name, where you a tricked in agreeing to be surety for a bond.

This bond is then used to support the trust, which is referred to as the *Res* or *trust body*.

With this trust in place the court is about to generate thousands, if not millions in credit.

<u>Note:</u> it should be noted that if you *accepted the bond for value*, the trust would collapse and so would the court, along with all the charges.

However if you "go to court" you are entering someone else's court, and have lost your sovereign status. This is the trap.

This scam could not exist if enough people knew the truth, which is only a **Sovereign** can hold court, which is you.

Coup D'état

Coup D'état is French for "stroke of state" and means a sudden, violent and "unlawful" seizure of power from government, more commonly known as a coup.

Many people believe they have to overthrow *government*, and have even attempted to do so, often resulting in death, a failed attempt and then imprisonment for life, or even execution.

However a "government" is just a corporation with no contract with the individual private natural person, so by carrying out a coup would be considered an "unlawful" act against the shareholders of said corporation.

Moreover if you've accepted the title *citizen* or even *subject*, then it is an act of war, which will be met with violence.

When you actually realise how the system works, you'll see there's no need for a *coup*, you just walk away from the game.

Prosecute Government

Although not quite as violent as a *Coup D'état* many people opt to *"sue government"* over *"regulations"*, but again this is a mistake.

Although hard to accept, the people behind "the system" <u>cannot</u> actually **force** you to do anything, and require your "consent".

Now, this is where the deception occurs, because although they <u>cannot</u> act without your "consent", they have no compunction in using *fraud*, deception, lies and even coercion to get it.

The way these people *defraud* you into "accepting" is by applying all these *rules*, *regulations* and *policies* to your *corporate birth certificate*, which in itself is a *fraud*.

The people behind government will never divulge this, as it would expose the scam, they just hope you *assume* that all those *"laws"* apply to you; basically you are self-imposing these regulations or *corporate policies*.

Therefore the very act of start litigation *against* the *"government"* shows you have already accepted the obligation to follow them; meaning you have already lost.

Acts and Statutes

When "acts and statues" are quoted in paperwork sent by various corporations, the person who sent it is hoping you just accept them.

However when "acts and statutes" are quoted you must question this and ask the sender if they are administrating the act or statute upon you.

No one will ever admit to this as this makes them *liable* for their actions of *administrating* something upon you, which you did <u>not</u> authorise.

Further to this, ask to see the **signed document** by **you allowing** that person to **administrate** the **"act or statute"** upon you; it doesn't exist.

Therefore do not fight *regulations*, inquire if you are *obligated* to obey them, and <u>who</u> is going to *administrate* them, and under what *authority*.

Miranda Act

Sometimes referred to "Miranda Rights", the Miranda act is a "police caution" that is spoken within many corporate country jurisdiction, when someone is detained or "arrested".

The typical spoken caution is as follows:

"You have the right to remain silent. Anything you say will and can be used against you in a court of law. You have the right to an attorney, and if you cannot afford one, they will be provided for you."

However this is **not** spoken to protect you, but to **entrap** you.

The clue is in the title *Miranda Act*; "act" means it is "acting" as *law*, so <u>not</u> *law*. It's nothing more than a *corporate policy*.

<u>Note:</u> If someone else is telling you what *your rights* are, you have none.

The most damning part of the *Miranda act* is; "You have the right to remain silent" the trap is if you stay silent the *police* will take this as *acceptance* as you *acquiesced*. This is a form of *pseudo-tacit* agreement.

<u>Note:</u> When someone says "you cannot take the law into your own hands" means you <u>never</u> had the right to the law in the first place.

Sham Documents

People are *scammed* and deceived into requesting and *paying* for *documentation* that they do not even need. This scam is perpetuated because you were just born into it, and it seems it has always been this way; it hasn't.

All these sham documents require a form of "registration", meaning you are literally handing over control of whatever the thing is that "requires" the document.

Furthermore you are also unknowingly entering into a *jurisdiction* controlled by someone else, and *accepting corporate polices* you do not even know.

Here are a few examples:

Passport.

- "Passport" means to pass from port to port, and the concept of a worldwide passport was created after the 1st World War.
- When you register for a passport, it identifies your corporation and not you.
 Furthermore you are now a "postman" carrying a "document" and operating within the postal union.
- The passport *restricts* you from travelling, *not assists* you.
- To travel is a *right*; therefore under what *authority* are you asking to have the *privilege* to travel?

• Driver license.

- The word *licence* means to ask permission.
- By registering for a licence you have given up the right to use your own car, and are now asking for permission from a higher authority and furthermore you are willing to pay for the privilege.

Log book.

- All corporate countries request registration of all forms of transportation.
- By doing so you have given up control, and in some cases ownership of the transportation.
- Furthermore you have now entered the *jurisdiction* of any *corporate policies* placed upon the roads, which are in fact common land owned by all and without policies.

• Identification.

Under what obligation do you have to identify yourself to anyone? The answer is none.

• National Insurance number.

• You are nothing more than "product", a human resource with a reference number.

Point of Contact

With so many *scams* and *deceptive schemes* within the "system", it is difficult to avoid them, however many people get suckered into them quite easily at the very beginning, with the *first point* of contact.

You are under <u>no obligation</u> to answer <u>any</u> offers put to you; **obligation** can only be ascertained once you have **entered** into **contract**.

- Open your front door: You are <u>not</u> obligated to open your front door to anyone who does <u>not</u> have an appointment, agreed by you.
- Answering the phone: You are <u>not</u> obligated to answer your phone, unless a call is expected, and you do <u>not</u> have to give any information over the phone.

- Texts received: "Texts" are <u>not</u> legal or lawful documents, and can be ignored, unless you
 have given permission and acceptance for texts to be used. If they are unsolicited, they can
 be blocked.
- E-mails: "E-mails" are considered secondary evidence in "court"; without contract or agreement you are under no obligation to accept them, reply to them or even read them. It is often prudent to not deal with any e-mails, for data protection reasons, and delete and then block any further unsolicited e-mails.

Many of these "first points of contact" will make a suggestion to a "customers account"; however you should question the following:

- When was the account offered?
- Do they have written evidence, signed by you, requesting an account?
- When was it accepted?
- In what name is the account set up?
- Who set up the account?

If you should open the door, the person who knocked will try and command the situation by ignoring to *verify* any *obligation* or *contract*, but instead deceptively focus on you, and your actions.

This trick will centre on questions such as: "why did you not reply to our correspondence".

They are trying to get you to "justify your actions".

Never do this; the **burden of proof** is on them; what right do they have to make you explain anything, especially when there is no agreement or contract? They have none.