



**A Simple Guide
To Autonomous Living**

By: Paranoid

As King

A Simple Guide to Autonomous Living

Written By: Paranoid

Edited By: Sydney J. Woodside

Copy-Edited By: Jen K. Sethi

2011

Index

Foreword

Chapter 1: What is Government and Where Does it Come From?

Chapter 2: What Are States and Citizens?

Chapter 3: How Do I Become Autonomous?

Chapter 4: As King, the Quest I (am) On

Thanks and Recommendations

Foreword

Many will pick up this book and, upon first glance, think that it is an argument for why the author believes that government should be abolished. That, however, is not the point of this literary work. In writing this, it was the hope of the author that you would see the truth for what it is. It is not meant to sway your opinion to the belief that government should not exist, but rather to shed light on the fact that government does not exist. What we think of as government is really nothing more than a small percentage of the populace using the *idea* of government in order to force their will on the rest of the population at large. It is the goal of the writer to open your eyes to your own potential and show you how to live in a way that eliminates the necessity for government. Ultimately, what is being strived for is to point out the possibility of a truly free society. A society where public servants act as servants and whatever form of government that is allowed to continue to exist will actually perform as advertised. Nothing you read here is meant to be legal advice. These writings reflect merely the opinions and experiences of the author.

Chapter 1: What is Government and where does it come from?

"A government is the most dangerous threat to man's rights:
it holds a legal monopoly on the use of physical force against legally disarmed victims."

-Ayn Rand

"Government is a disease masquerading as its own cure."

-Robert Lefevre

What is government and where does it come from? This is a question that I have asked myself many times throughout my life. How can another man claim the right to make a decision over how I will live my life and conduct my affairs? Can there be government and freedom at the same time? Countless times I have been told, “we have the best form of government on the planet” and “you live in the freest country in the world” but, for some reason, these responses were never enough to kill the deep-seated feeling that what I was being sold was a nice, shiny ball and chain with the word “freedom” painted on the side. And so, I would ask myself again, what is this thing we call government and where exactly does it come from?

A man known as George Washington was once quoted to say that "Government is not reason, it is not eloquence, it is force; like fire, a troublesome servant and a fearful master." This leads me to believe that government is something that should not be taken lightly, but it still brings me no closer to an answer for my initial question. To truly understand what government is, I feel it is best to break the word down to the very roots of its verbal meaning. This is the only way to discover the truth of what government is.

The word “govern”, in and of itself, means to control, restrict or regulate. Think of how a company’s charter governs how it does business or how a speed governor on a stock car keeps it from reaching its potential top speed. To govern is, quite simply, to control.

The suffix “ment” denotes an action or a resulting state. Words like “refreshment” or “achievement” illustrate this clearly.

So, what is government? Government, by its very definition, is a system in which a few men and women may carry out the act of keeping all the other men and women in a state of control. It makes me wonder if a “republican” form of “government” is even possible. Is there any form of government whatsoever that can honestly say it is there to protect the freedom of the people it governs? I would have to find that the unsettling answer to this question is an overwhelming no. The two ideals, freedom and governance, are inconsistent and cannot cohabit the same space and time. No man can logically seize control over another in order to protect the other man’s freedoms. One can call this action whatever they will and can label it with whatever “ism” that they want to; it does not change the fact that government, any and every form of government, is, at its very core, only one thing: slavery.

Now that I had reached the ugly truth of what government really is, it made the second part of the question that much harder to answer. We are all children of a creative force that none of us can truly even begin to understand. But we are all life. We are the energy that pulses throughout the universe. We are sentient beings and, deep down, we know that we are supposed to be the masters of our own lives, bowing only to the Supreme Authority that authored our very existence. So why, then, do we cast aside this need for freedom, this part of our very being, in order that we may live under this thing called government? And just where does this thing called government

even come from? To answer this, we must go back to the beginning, back to the dawn of man, back to when groups first became tribes and the idea of a leader first entered the mind.

I can only suppose on this, as I am merely a man of just over thirty years and I was not around when it all began, but common sense would dictate that the need for a leader sprang from the need for protection. Back when we were huddled around small fires in caves, and the main goal of the day was to live until the next, it was in this time that the need to feel protected probably came second only to the need to fill your belly. Out of these small groups, one or two might rise above the rest in certain regards, and primitive people, with all their insecurities intact, would act pretty much the same as modern people do to this day: by electing someone else to be put in charge so the masses might feel safe and protected.

For example, while most might not ever give a second thought to the stars in the sky, the fascination of one individual might lead him or her to realize certain patterns in the stars' movement that would give them seemingly godlike knowledge over the seasons. This exalted one would know when it is time to plant the seeds, when it is time to gather the fire wood and when it is time for the great hunts. It is only logical that wisdom of this kind would make one more valuable to the survival of the group as a whole and might make him or her a good choice to lead the others. This line of thought rings true in the concepts of shaman and medicine men as well as many other societal structures. There is much truth in the old saying "knowledge is power."

Another example would be the alpha male scenario. In this case, brute force is power. The many will stand behind the one out of the fear. Fear of what he protects them from, and often times, fear of the protector himself. Communities governing under this form of rule were just as common, and just as successful as the first example. History is ripe with many great kingdoms that were built and maintained under the alpha male ideology. "After all," one might say, "my current serfdom is surely not as bad as the guaranteed slavery I would endure if a rival king from a foreign kingdom were to invade and conquer." With that in mind, they might logically continue, "why would I not pay taxes and bow down before the current king?"

Today, most governments of the world have become a twisted, perverse amalgamation of the two concepts discussed above. Government, in modern times, is the act of controlling and domineering. But it is sold as a bundle package which is advertised to also include the act of protection. Government, as we now know it, is little more than a mafia protection racket that prances around calling itself lawful and legitimate. Look solely at the actions of government, disregarding their titles of nobility, and you will most likely see what I mean.

One man stops another on the road because he feels the other man was driving at an unacceptable speed. Keep in mind that the man who was stopped has harmed no one and has caused no damage to anybody's property. The man who initiated the stop then demands paperwork and money from the other and when denied, he takes the denier off to put him in a little

cage. This is called highway robbery, kidnapping and false imprisonment if you or I do it, but if we had the title of government, it would be called traffic enforcement.

This same logic applies to the monetary system as well. What if you or I decided to start printing up our own money? We have nothing to support the value of the money, but we can print it into oblivion. Then, let's say we take our money and try to circulate it in the community as a legitimate medium of exchange. Would we not be immediately called out as counterfeiters? Would this action of printing money out of thin air not be misleading and criminal in nature? Could our intent be anything other than to defraud those foolish enough to accept our funny money? How then, is the very same act not criminal when it is perpetrated by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve? It seems that by simply calling yourself government, counterfeit currency is magically transformed into legal tender.

How about taxes? Let's say I enter into an agreement with my employer, and I agree to give my time, energy and labor in exchange for some pieces of paper that I might be able to trade for other goods. How, then, does the act of a third party coming in and demanding a share of that money, when they had no part in helping me earn it, not constitute theft? It is theft. But, if the said third party wears the title of government, somehow, it is not theft?

How far will we allow our protectors to go? How many freedoms must we sacrifice in order to have our freedom protected? Take, for example, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA). When you board an airplane and an agent from the TSA sticks their fingers down your children's pants to ensure you and your family are not terrorists and when those same agents have taken pictures of all of your naked bodies, is it then that you will realize the truth of what just happened to you? Is it then that you will come to grips with simple facts? When you strip away the silly title of "government", this act of "protection" was really nothing more than an act of pure molestation.

Why do we allow this fraud to continue? Why do we refuse to throw off the shackles that so obviously bind us? Why do we go to the extremes of creating excuses for the continued existence of this malfeasance? The answer is very simple; it is because of fear and insecurity. Most people truly believe that, for some reason, ninety-seven percent of us cannot succeed in doing what the ruling three percent are able to accomplish. Thus, our own insecurities help create the very seats of power in which our rulers sit.

Most tyranny only exists because the peonage believes it is necessary to have slave masters so that the plantation might not erupt into utter chaos. The concept of a free society, where no man can pretend to be god over another, is often regarded as political blasphemy. Sadly, though I wholeheartedly disagree with this widely held conclusion, I cannot say it is totally without merit.

It is very easy to see that one of the things that people want to be protected from the most is responsibility. This is the nature of most human beings and it takes a strong and noble character to break free of this common personality flaw. This is also why most would rather vote in secret as opposed to carrying out the desired act themselves in plain view of all who might care to see. Any mark on a ballot is the act of imposing one's will on his or her neighbors. Only, it is done in the shadows and through a vicarious third party so the blood is not as easily visible on the hands of the voter, therefore eliminating any sense of responsibility.

For those who consider themselves to be the elite, it is not hard to see how they can justify such a self-aggrandizing point of view. Many of the people whom they assume to rule over are quite content to live their entire lives acting like grown up children. The life of herded cattle seems often times preferred over the rigorous path of self-realization. This is most likely due to the fact that reaching one's true potential means accepting the full responsibility that comes with true freedom. This is a task far too daunting for most, and so the old adage proves itself once again, that those who refuse to control themselves are but begging to be controlled by another.

What is government? Government is the idea that you and I ought to be controlled by another. I know in my heart and soul that this is a lie. Some might argue that government is a necessary evil. I say it is just evil. Government is evil based on a fundamental lie. Government is the fallacy that you should live your life as a well-fed slave. If this book has found its way into your hands, it is because the time has come for that lie to be washed clean from your mind. It is time for the matrix to be revealed as nothing more than an illusion of deceit and manipulation. It is time for you to take back your power and start living your life as the king or queen that you truly are.

Chapter 2: What Are States and Citizens?

“The state represents violence in a concentrated and organized form.

The individual has a soul, but as the state is a soulless machine,
it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence.”

-Mahatma Mohandas K. Gandhi

“Everything the State says is a lie, and everything it has it has stolen.”

-Friedrich Nietzsche

“Every actual state is corrupt. Good men must not obey laws too well.”

-Ralph Waldo Emerson

“The great non sequitur committed by defenders of the State,
including classical Aristotelian and Thomist philosophers,
is to leap from the necessity of society to the necessity of the State.”

-Murray N. Rothbard

“Why nationalize industry when you can nationalize the people?”

-Adolf Hitler

What is a state? This is a very powerful question, and one that most government officials will evade at all costs. Especially when asked for the facts as to what a state really is. To unravel the confusion that swirls around this question, let us start with the propaganda we have been fed about the subject. There are many different types of states: city-states, nation-states, and so on, but for the sake of streamlining this discussion, I will refer to all forms of government simply as states. So, what is a state?

First and foremost, when one thinks of what a state is, they are likely to think of the territorial lines on a map and the ground to which that map refers. In other words, most people think that the state is the land upon which they are standing. They believe that the land is the state and since their house was built within the borders portrayed on a map, they are then citizens of whatever state that map might indicate. This idea, however popular it may be, is not the whole truth of the matter though, as will be pointed out below.

The state cannot be the ground. This is very easily proven with just the slightest bit of thought. For, the land was there long before the state ever existed, and the land will continue to be there long after the state has passed. The state is not the streets and buildings, for if the state were to un-incorporate, the streets and buildings would not just vanish into thin air. Thus, it is fairly safe to say, the streets and buildings are not the state. From this surface examination, it is very clear that the ground and the state are not one and the same. So if the state is not the ground that most believe it to be, then what exactly is it?

A smaller percentage of the population might be closer to the truth in their definition of what a state is. They would suggest that a state is a body politic, the end result of a social contract that encompasses the whole of a people who live within a particular geographical location. This belief is warmer but it still does not cut to the heart of the matter. Any contract, including a social contract, requires the presence of certain elements in order to be valid and enforceable. One such element is a meeting of the minds. Both parties must agree to the terms and conditions of said contract in order that it may be binding upon the parties involved. Yet, how many things can you think of, that the state does in your name, and you do not agree with? If the people claiming to be our representatives cannot be held accountable for their actions by the very people they claim to represent, is there actually a valid social contract? Without a valid social contract, can there be a legitimate body politic? Even if the argument is made that the state is not the social contract, but instead the people who are bound by it, it still begs the question. If all the people move, does the state then move too? Again, this explanation falls short of providing a whole and accurate description of what the true nature of a state really is. So, what is it?

When someone says they work for the state, what do they mean? Is there some omnipresent being that they are servants of? Is there some magical force behind a closed door that we, mere common folk, may never see? If we were to storm the streets and march on Capitol Hill, and if we were to then open those sacred doors and reveal to the world what the state is and

where these people get their power to rule, what would we find? What physical thing can one point to and say, in no uncertain terms: "There it is, that is the state."?

I am afraid, that with a little bit of reason, you will find that the state is quite simply this: a figment of the imagination. It was an idea imagined by people whom you have most likely never even met; an illusion that was then forced into your imagination through a lifetime of constant brainwashing. It is an idea that has no physical, tangible referent. There is nothing that you can hold in your hand and say "this is the state." Does the state tax man claim the soil as the source of his authority while he takes your home from you? The state is, at most, a corporate municipality and the closest that you could find to physical proof of its existence would be the stack of paperwork filed by lawyers when the state was incorporated. In this sense, the state is no more real than any other legal fiction and has no more inherent authority. The only difference between the state and almost all other businesses is the amount of guns used to get you to pay for their services. The state is the theocratic equivalent of a McDonalds. Only, instead of using catchy jingles to sell their Big Macs, they use a standard issue 9mm Beretta.

Let's say, that while buying cheap Chinese merchandise, your phone begins to ring. It is a friend and they are wondering where you are. Without thinking, you answer "I'm in Wal-Mart." Is this an honest answer? Or did you just say what you have been trained to say? Did the brainwashing answer the question for you? If Wal-Mart were to go out of business, the buildings that they own would most likely not be swallowed up by a hole in the ground. They would still be there, either vacant or inhabited by a new retailer. Therefore, when you are in that building shopping, you are not in Wal-Mart, for you are not in a stack of paperwork in a filing cabinet somewhere in some unknown law firm's office. No; to speak in facts only, you are in a building, one that you have been misled to believe is Wal-Mart, but is factually just a building.

This is the same as when it comes to the state. In fact, the United States Code, also known as the USC, when defining what the United States is, spells it out quite clearly when it says "the United States is (1) a federal corporation."¹ When you believe that you are in a state, the truth is, you are not. For, the state - much like any other corporation - is only a figment of the imagination, and it is not possible for you to physically be in a figment of the imagination. When you are standing within "city limits," what you are really doing is standing on land that you have been misled into believing is the city. This same logic holds true for counties, states and nations as well. All are nothing more than figments of the collective imagination with no real power, or evidence of existence, whatsoever.

So, how then do we find ourselves in a time where these figments of our imagination have more control over our own lives than we do? How does a corporate fiction have more claim to the resources of the planet than we, the living men and women, do? Why do most people go on living, day after day, subservient to a force that cannot even be proven to exist? Why do we let these

¹ U.S. Code TITLE 28, PAR VI, CHAPTER 176, SUBCHAPTER A § 3002 (15)

CEOs, senators and monarchies continue to act as though they were the priests of old, handing down dictates from God himself? Is this really how *civilized* we have become?

Why is this madness allowed to persist? Perhaps it is because of a lie that we have all been told our entire lives. Perhaps, because the mind control has worked its way so deep, most people have actually taken the idea of the state and made it into part of their personality. That special fondness of your hometown football team, that pride you feel when you see the stars and stripes, why do you associate who you are with things that are not of you? Why do so many of us take symbols of the state and use them to personify parts of our own identities? Perhaps because, just like the lie of the state, we have been sold another lie: the lie of the citizen.

I'm sure you have heard it before, "I have rights; I am a U.S. citizen." The same proud tone can be heard when someone says they are a native to their respective area. For example, "I'm a Texan, born and raised." But, if the state does not really exist, how then can a citizen of a state really exist? More importantly, how does where you chose to make your home have any power in deciding who and what you are? How does changing your outside location change anything about who you are on the inside? What makes you or me a citizen, and for that matter, just what is a citizen?

What is a citizen? Dictionary.com describes a citizen as follows, "1. a native or naturalized member of a state or nation who owes allegiance to its government and is entitled to its protection."² Black's Law 9th Edition supports this definition by expounding further, "Citizen 1. A person who, by either birth or naturalization, is a member of a political community, owing allegiance to the community and being entitled to enjoy all of its civil rights and protections; a member of the civil state entitled to all of its privileges."³ And the Supreme Court of the United States spelled it out pretty clearly in *Luria v. United States* when they declared, "Citizenship is membership in a political society, and implies the reciprocal obligations as compensation for each other of a duty of allegiance on the part of the member and a duty of protection on the part of the society."⁴

People submit to the rules of this great and powerful state because they believe that they are citizens of it. They believe that if they give the state their allegiance, their undying, blind support and obedience, that the state will then give them in return some form of protection. And thus, the true nature of where government comes from is once again unveiled in the idea of a citizen. The state is there to fulfill the basic human need for protection, and if I want that protection, I will act as if I am a citizen. This seems to be the common consensus as to why most people give their unquestioning allegiance to the mental construct known as "the state." But, does

² <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/citizen>, Dictionary.com, LLC., 1-1-11

³ Black's Law Dictionary, 9th Edition, Page 278

⁴ U.S. Supreme Court *Luria v. United States*, 231 U.S. 9 (1913)

the state then hold up its end of the bargain? Let's take a closer look at the relationship between the so-called state and the so-called citizen, shall we?

For the sake of argument, we will say that someone is trying to break into your car. It is two o'clock in the morning and you are in your home alone when you hear the window shatter. The men breaking into your car have a very foreboding look about them and you have no gun or any other means of protection, so you do the only logical thing. You call the police for help. On their way to your house, another call comes over the radio which is hailed as having higher priority. By the time they arrive in response to your initial call, your car is long gone. Can you then hold these policemen accountable for their failure to protect your property? I think we both know the answer to that question is no. Even if the reason for the delayed response was one so heinous and unlikely as the city's finest deciding to make a quick stop at the donut shop, the end result for you would still be the same. You would have no car and no one to hold liable for the failure to provide protection.

Now, let's look at a more real world scenario: September 11th, 2001. On one day, in the span of less than a few hours, four planes were hijacked and used as weapons to kill close to three thousand people. Despite what you may think about who was really behind this atrocious crime, one thing is for certain: it was a total and utter failure on the part of the federal corporation to protect the people. It was almost as if they did not even try. And who was held responsible for this blatant case of "asleep at the wheel?" Not one soul. In fact, most of those involved with letting this plot of terror come to fruition, the heads of all of the so-called security agencies who failed miserably to see any of it coming, were all given raises and more power as punishment for their incompetence. Increased military spending and power grabs like the Patriot Act hardly seem proper redress for the lost lives of three thousand people. If I dutifully pay my taxes and follow every one of the ever increasing laws that are legislated for me, why then does it seem that the state has no real obligation to offer me any true form of protection?

Perhaps this question can be answered from the mouths of the very people who claim to be representing the state. Let's take a look at what the "honorable" judges of the Supreme Court have said on the topic of the state's duty to protect its citizens.

In *Bowers v. Devito*, it was stated that "there is no constitutional right to be protected by the state against being murdered by criminals or madmen. It is monstrous if the state fails to protect its residents against such predators, but it does not violate the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, or, we suppose, any other provision of the Constitution. The Constitution is a charter of negative liberties; it tells the state to let the people alone; it does not require the federal government or the state to provide services, even so elementary a service as maintaining law and order."⁵

⁵ *Bowers v. Devito*, 686 F.2d 616 (7th Cir. 1982)

The notion that the state has no duty to protect the people is further shown in *Hartzler v. City of San Jose* when it was found that “the administrator of the estate of Ruth Bunnell, who had been killed by her estranged husband, brought a wrongful death action against the city whose police department refused to respond to her call for protection some 45 minutes before her death. Mrs. Bunnell had called the police to report that Mack Bunnell had called saying he was on his way to her home to kill her. She was told to call back when Mack Bunnell arrived. The police had responded 20 times to her calls in the past year, and on one occasion, arrested her estranged husband for assaulting her. The Court of Appeal held that the police department and its employees enjoyed absolute immunity for failure to provide sufficient police protection. The allegations that the police had responded 20 times to her calls did not indicate that the police department had assumed any special relationship or duty toward her such as would remove its immunity.”⁶

Where is the protection that we are paying for? Where is the reciprocal obligation on the part of the state? I believe that the Supreme Court sums it up pretty well in *South v. Maryland* when they ruled, “Local law-enforcement had no duty to protect individuals, but only a general duty to enforce the laws.”⁷

How much more evident must it become before you realize the truth of the situation? The state is not there to protect you. It admittedly has no intention on providing you with protection. It is nothing more than a fantasy that offers a false sense of security in exchange for your subservience and tax dollars. The fact of the matter is that there is no duty of protection, thus, logic would follow, there should be no obligation of allegiance. Pondering on this, I can only rationally conclude that neither state nor citizen actually exists. This may be a hard pill for the average person to swallow, but the evidence is indisputable. There are no states and there are no citizens. There are only men and women pretending to be citizens and other men and women pretending to be officials. Can you now see, as I do, what states and citizens really are? They are mere mental conceptions, imaginary cognitions and nothing more.

⁶ *Hartzler v. City of San Jose*, 46 Cal.App.3d 6, 120 Cal.Rptr. 5 (1975)

⁷ *South v. Maryland*, 59 U.S. (How.) 396, 15 L.Ed.433 (1856)

Chapter 3: How Do I Become Autonomous?

“It is only when the people become ignorant and corrupt,
when they degenerate into a populace,
that they are incapable of exercising their sovereignty.”

-James Monroe

“The sovereignty of one's self over one's self is called Liberty.”

-Albert Pike

“‘Autonomy’ means to make one’s own laws and to administer them,
to be self-legislating.

An autonomous being is one which ordains for itself the principles by which it shall live,
and is therefore self-governing.”

-Brian Fay

“The highest manifestation of life consists in this:

that a being governs its own actions.

A thing which is subject to the direction of another is somewhat of a dead thing.”

-Thomas Aquinas

How do I become autonomous? It may not always be in those exact words, but this is the question I hear most from people as they slowly snap out of the statist fairy tale. Once they start to realize the fraud that has been perpetrated upon them, they almost immediately want to be free of it. Often, because they have not completely let go of the idea of government legitimacy, the first impulse is to file some paperwork with the state. There are many methods prescribed out there for doing this very thing, from filling out a UCC-1 form to filing a “Claim of Rights” or an “Affidavit of Truth” with the county recorder. And, though I have filed my own Claim of Rights with the local recorder’s office clerk in my area, I have never had to use it in a case. It is merely my notice of intent and understanding. I do not rely on it for the same reason that I have never filed a UCC-1; because the very idea of asking them to recognize these types of paperwork seems a bit double-minded to me. It is as if I am asking them to use their authority to make valid my claim that they have no authority. How can I ask them to do what I do not believe they have the power to do? This circular logic leads me to believe that the path of the “paper terrorist” is a trail to nowhere. So, if paperwork cannot make me autonomous, then what can?

Perhaps it is better if we first visualize the destination before we start plotting out the trip. Before I can be autonomous, I must first understand what autonomy is. Webster’s defines autonomy as “the power or right of self-government, whether in a community which elects its own magistrates and makes its own laws, or in an individual who lives according to his own will.”⁸ Another source cites it as such, “Independence or freedom, as of the will or one’s actions: *the autonomy of the individual.*”⁹ Evidently, autonomy has little or nothing to do with one’s paperwork, and almost everything to do with one’s actions.

Making a determination based off of these two definitions, it would lead me to believe that we are all autonomous in one form or another and to varying degrees. When my head has an itch and I think to myself, “scratch,” I do not have to ask and wait for permission before my arm reaches up to perform the commanded action. This is because I am in control of my arm. When I decide I have had enough rest and it is time to get up, if I then make my body roll out of bed, at least in that moment, I am being autonomous. If I choose who I will date, when I will vacuum the floor and what clothes I will wear, for the most part, I am already autonomous. But these things alone do not encompass the whole of what autonomy means.

Where autonomy seems to be most desired, and most lacking for that matter, is in the arena of politics. This is also commonly known as sovereignty. Sovereign, as a word, finds its roots in Latin. The prefix, coming from the word *super* or *supra*, means to be above or over. Combined with the word reign, you get the meaning “to reign above” or “to be above the reign of another.” This is the basic idea of political sovereignty but it is often muddled with many

⁸ Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged, (1965) Page 123

⁹ <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/autonomy>, Dictionary.com, LLC. (1/15/2011)

misconceptions. The most common error in belief is that one can be made into a sovereign citizen. This often bought-into notion is flawed on more than one level.

First, and most importantly, one cannot be a sovereign *and* a citizen. The two are antithetical. A citizen is a slave, owing allegiance and bowing before its master. A sovereign is free and has no master to bow to. The inclination that one could be a sovereign and a citizen is about as preposterous as the idea of “jumbo shrimp.” To say that one is a free slave is really not saying anything at all. Though the term “sovereign citizen” is muttered about almost as frequently as the words “jumbo shrimp” are, they really have no business being in the same sentence and, when used together, have no real meaning whatsoever.

Secondly, when someone asks me, “Can you make me into a sovereign?” I know that they do not fully grasp the concept of sovereignty itself. I am not capable of making anyone else into a sovereign. Only the pope in Rome claims to have such powers and even in his case, it is a lie. The only being with the power to make you autonomous and sovereign is the Creator of all life and the universe itself. And, the truth is, it has already been done. All that is necessary now is for you to exercise that sovereignty and for others to respect it.

What evidence do I have that the powers that be actually do respect the autonomy of the individual living man? Other than my own personal experiences, I have very little to back up this belief, but, there are many statements made in Supreme Court cases that seem to lend credence to this conclusion. That is not to say that I believe these statements reflect the way these so-called judges actually felt, but it is part of the propaganda they spew forth in order to maintain the veil of legitimacy, so it is the statements themselves that hold the value.

In *Yick Wo v. Hopkins* we read, “Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts.”¹⁰ This is further declared in *People v. Herkimer*, which states, “The people, or sovereign are not bound by general words in statutes, restrictive of prerogative right, title or interest, unless expressly named. Acts of limitation do not bind the King or the people. The people have been ceded all the rights of the King, the former sovereign... It is a maxim of the common law, that when an act is made for the common good and to prevent injury, the King shall be bound, though not named, but when a statute is general and prerogative right would be divested or taken from the King [or the people] he shall not be bound.”¹¹ And finally, sovereignty is alluded to in *Lansing v. Smith*, when it is said the “People of a state are entitled to all rights which formerly belong to the King, by his prerogative.”¹²

¹⁰ *Yick Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356 (1886)

¹¹ *The People v. Herkimer*, 4 Cowen (NY) 345, 348 (1825)

¹² US Supreme Court in *Lansing v. Smith* (1829) 4 Wend. 9,20

It would seem pretty clear to me that what is written and what is being practiced are two very differing ideals. Does the king allow his servants to pull his carriage over to the side of the road and demand to see his papers? Do the court jesters have the power to tell the king what herbs he may or may not put into his own body? Does the king surrender any of his rights to his guard so that they might treat him like a petty subject or peon? Why, then, do we the people subject ourselves to this unacceptable lowering of status?

I believe the answer lies in our misunderstanding of where our rights come from. I cannot count how many times I have heard the phrase “I’m an American, I have rights.” As if an imaginary nation can somehow create liberties for the people doing the imagining. Yet another horrifyingly common misconception that was often espoused in my high school civics class is the idea that “our rights come from the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.” Try and grasp the absurdity of this belief. How can four pieces of paper give you or me anything, other than a paper cut? One cannot give what one does not have. How, then, can a document give us freedom? Did the document first have possession of said freedom, and then decide to transfer it over to we the people? The very notion is preposterous. How can the rights of a living man come from the skin of a dead animal? (Parchment being treated animal skin, typically from sheep). The root of this flawed paradigm is the widely held assumption that rights come from the government and the belief that the government, which claims jurisdiction over the plot of land where you dwell, has the right to dictate to you how you will live your life.

This assertion, no matter how popular, is not the truth of the matter. Government is not the source of our rights. In fact, more often than not, the people who call themselves government seem to be the first ones attempting to strip us of our rights. In all honesty, rights can only be granted from one source, the same source that granted you life in the very beginning. Some call this source God. Others refer to the same entity by many different names. YHWH, Gaia, Allah and the Grand Architect are just a few that come to mind. I find the simple title of “the Creator” to be the most fitting as it does not restrain this giver of life’s true glory to only that which I can conceive. To confine a thing with a name is to apply limitations to what it may be. Such limitations are not acceptable when discussing the very life force of all existence. Thus, I will refer to it as the Creator and leave the interpretation up to you, the reader. My rights, as well as your rights, come from the very same creative force that manifested everything around us. The fact that I am alive is testament to the fact that I have rights, and only that which gave me life can be credited with also giving me my rights. Perhaps Thomas Jefferson said it best when he wrote “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.”¹³

So, what exactly are my rights? Well, basically, my rights are whatever I say they are, so long as my actions do not cause injury or loss to another living man, woman or child. My rights are

¹³ The Declaration of Independence (1776)

not dictated by statutes or regulations; rather, they are dictated by common sense and morality. If I want to consume mind-altering substances, even to the point of harming my own body, that is my right. Much like it is the right of the clinically obese to keep consuming their biggie-sized fries and other overly processed foods. As long as they are not stealing my Blu-ray player to pay for their Twinkies, they are within their rights, as am I when I possess and ingest marijuana. So long as I am not violating any of your rights, I am within my rights.

I have the right to be captain of my own vessel, as do all sentient beings. Any codified rule that goes contrary to this very simple principle is fraudulent on its face as it is not in alignment with the laws of nature. When a group of men and women get together and record their will to a piece of paper, this does not, in fact, alter the reality of what any other men and women can do. If I were to make a rule that dishes had to be cleaned every night before the sun set, could I then go to my neighbors at dusk and start handing out citations if they had not complied? What if I had taken that rule and written it down on a piece of paper, would that make it more binding? What gives me the right to impose my will upon the other people living in my cul-de-sac? What gives any of us that right? What is a statute if not exactly what I have just described? If anything, one's will should only be applicable to oneself and the will of the group should only bind the agreeing members of the group. But what do we see when we look at our modern day legislators? Though they are all too willing to lock up the common folk for a few dirty dishes, more often than not, their own sinks are overflowing with filth. Apparently, the only people to whom these rules should apply, the very people who come up with and swear to enforce these rules, are somehow exempt from any obligation to follow them. One need only look at the CIA's involvement in drug trafficking during the Iran Contra Affair to see the hypocrisy. And a quick glance through the politics section of your morning paper will show you that little has changed since then. The headlines are ripe with stories of senators caught with call girls and mayors smoking cocaine.

If they do not take their own rules seriously, then why should I? So long as I am in accordance with the laws of nature and nature's Creator, what care I of the laws of mere men? This idea is the hardest pill for most people to swallow. Anarchy has been demonized by those who are financially and ideologically dependent on the belief in a state. They fear that the idea of personal autonomy will usher in an era of lawlessness. They incorrectly perceive anarchy as meaning no rules, when in fact, it simply means no rulers. If people are animals that need to be controlled, picking the best groomed felines and putting them in charge of herding all the other cats is not the best option. This form of outward governance, no matter how limited it seems at its conception, will always lead to tyranny. It is not in harmony with reality and will always result in an unjust imbalance of power. The only lasting solution will be personal sovereignty in a voluntarily based society.

The biggest roadblock that we face in creating a truly free civilization is the responsibility that will come with that freedom. To be sovereign, one must take full responsibility over his or her life and actions as the kings of old would have taken over their kingdoms. This means that we

must stop looking for scapegoats to place blame on, and instead, do what we can to rectify the situation when things go wrong. Being the king means being the boss, and it is hard to be the boss. The boss carries all the weight and is ultimately the one held accountable when things fall apart. That responsibility is something that most of us fear. Even if not for ourselves, we fear that the rest of the people around us would not handle this double edged sword well if given the opportunity.

The truth is, however, that most human interactions already exist without the use or need of forceful governing. In most areas of our lives, we have already accepted the liability of self control. If we would just take that next step and start truly living as sovereigns, and respecting all others as sovereigns, we would eliminate the very need for government. I would rather trust my neighbors, the people who live in my area, to do what is best for our community. Especially when the only other option is to trust a representative who lives miles away in a fancy house on a big hill and has no real connection or accountability to me or my fellow denizens. The choice seems almost glaringly obvious to me.

Mankind, as a whole, is reaching a fork in the road. Will we continue down the same road of slavery and oppression that has plagued us for most of our existence? Or, will we finally come to our senses and take the road less traveled? I, personally, have high hope for humanity. I honestly believe that we can reach a voluntary society, a peaceful anarchy. Only time will tell, but the fraudulent nature of the current system seems to be nearing the end of its run. What comes next will be determined by what we put our energy into. Will we continue feeding an out-of-date machine that is only holding us back from reaching our true potential? Or will we finally claim the sovereignty that we all inherently have, and truly become autonomous? The choice, dear reader, is entirely yours.

Chapter 4: As King, The Quest I (am) On

“People who ask confidently get more than those who are hesitant and uncertain.

When you've figured out what you want to ask for,
do it with certainty, boldness and confidence.”

-Jack Canfield

“All I ask is for powerful people to respond honestly to the questions,
and if they can't, explain why.”

-Bill O'Reilly

“He who asks is a fool for five minutes, but he who does not ask remains a fool forever.”

-Ancient Chinese Proverb

As a king, the quest I am on is quite simple: I seek only to live free. I do not wish to vote for or beg for my liberty. It is not my intent to elect a leader so I might follow him or her into freedom. I know that as a true sovereign, only I can be responsible for ensuring my own independence. The only way that I can be free, is to just live free. This is how I choose to live my life and, for the most part, it works out very well for me. But, what am I to do when I get caught in the crosshairs of a so-called “authority” figure who refuses to treat me as an equal? How do I handle being forced to appear against my will and answer to crimes that have no victim and no injury? This concern is not without merit. After all, what is the point of living autonomously if it only buys me a one way ticket to a cage? Now that I am aware of the fraudulent nature of the state, can I utilize this enlightenment to avoid being sentenced to one of the aforementioned cages? How do I use this newfound knowledge of self when confronted by men and women willing to kill or imprison all those who fail to see the glory of the emperor’s new clothes? The answer is very simple. I ask questions.

There are many schools of thought behind this powerfully effective principal. In the realm of commercial redemption it is often said that “creditors ask questions and debtors make statements.” Although there are many aspects of the commercial remedy movement that I find to be suspiciously lacking in logic and basis, this particular stance I find very agreeable. The concept was explained to me as follows: I am the boss, therefore, I ask the questions. The only question a servant should ever ask their master is “How high?” Now, as I do not see myself as anyone’s master, I would never be so bold as to command anybody to jump. This explanation did, however, drive home the point that these people who claim to represent the state chose to take on the role of “public *servants*.” I have also heard it summarized that “to act as king, you must be asking.” Hence the name of this last chapter. While all of these are good philosophies, none get to the heart of the matter as to why asking questions should be preferred to making statements. So, in the interest of clarity and expediency, I will cut straight to the chase.

Asking the questions prevents my opponent from having anything to attack. If I am argumentative and start taking positions, my points can be retaliated against and ultimately denied. Any statements I make can be thrown back in my face as merely my opinion. Then, the onus is on me to prove my claim, which can be rather difficult when the other side is financially and emotionally invested in my being incorrect. I know that I am sovereign and above their law. I am cognizant of the fact that they are only using threats of violence and an illusion known as the state in order to maintain control over my life. But how do I get them to admit it? The truth is, I probably will not be able to get them to make such admissions, as doing so would expose their protection racket for what it is. But, by simply asking questions and sticking to the facts, I can make it much more difficult for them to make their crimes look legitimate, therefore, giving them good reason to dismiss their baseless accusations against me and move on to the next sheep for the fleecing.

So, what kind of questions could I ask? Well, if I want to be effective to any degree, I am going to ask them questions that, if answered honestly and responsively, will destroy any pretense of legitimacy they might have had. I want to box them into a corner, question by question, to the point where they can no longer answer without contradicting their previous statements. In any court proceeding, the burden of proof always lies on the accuser. My questions should be to the point, few in number, and delivered in a way that puts the plaintiff in the uncomfortable position of having to back up their claims with facts, ones that are not capable of proving their accusations and ones that will only make their position look as frivolous and erroneous as it really is.

The whole thing is a game; at least, that is how I look at it. There are rules and procedures to make it look real and lawful, but as I alluded to earlier, the entire system is operating in a de facto capacity. They claim to get their authority from a legal fiction and pieces of paper that have no factual connection to me. It is based off of deception and manipulation from top to bottom. It is a game and the deck is most definitely stacked in the house's favor. The judge, the prosecutor and cop all play for the same team, the state. How can I get a fair trial from an impartial decision maker when said assessor is paid for and represents the very party who is coming against me? It seems like it would be impossible. If I decide I do not want to play the game because I'm not a gambling man and I do not like the odds, a default judgment is issued against me and I now get to live like a hunted animal. It seems like my only choices are play or lose. And if you look at the statistics of how many people actually beat victimless criminal charges, it is almost as if the game is Russian roulette and there is only one slot in the revolver without a bullet. Even if I somehow pull the trigger and no bullet comes flying out, in other words the case is dismissed, I still cannot call it a win. The closest thing to a victory would be for them to just leave me alone. Even so, I have still lost precious time and energy, neither of which will be compensated, and I will most likely not even get so much as an apology for their trespass against me. At most, I could call this a draw, but to call it a win would be a wild stretch.

It is a game and it is even played on a "court". The prosecution has home team advantage, the ref only gets paid if I lose, and a draw is the best I can hope for. This is not a game I want to play, but because I live in the *freest country on earth*, I am never really given a choice in the matter. How can asking questions help secure me a draw? If they refuse to give me responsive answers, if their witnesses are not subject to my cross examination, if there are no facts to back their accusations, I walk away with a stalemate. That is the best I can hope for. That is my goal and this is how I can do it.

First of all, let's discuss appearance and attitude. Whenever I enter the courtroom, I am in my Sunday best. Slacks, dress shoes, shirt and tie. Behind the all powerful black robe worn by the judge, you are still dealing with a human being. Human beings have a terrible habit of prejudging other human beings. Judges, with all their god-like perfection, are not above falling victim to this all too common personality flaw. In fact, considering the path they chose in life, one could argue that they might even be predisposed to it. This is a psychological game, a battle of the wits where

my life, liberty and property might be on the line. With that in mind, I want to enter the field in full uniform. I do not want to give the judge any reason to look down at me before I even start talking. It is also my intent to have them lower their guard. People are comfortable with that which is familiar, dressing in a manner to which they are accustomed helps keep them from putting up their defenses. Lastly, I always try to treat them with the same respect that I wish to receive. I smile at them and tell them “thank you” when they do as I ask or require. They see themselves as society’s babysitters and I only reinforce that belief if I go in acting like a rebellious, whining teenager. Part of my overall goal is to effectively demonstrate that I am a competent man capable of self-governance. I have found this approach beneficial also in the fact that it is as hard to punch a man who smiles at you as it is easy to kick a man who disrespects you. If you have to play the game, at least play it smart.

Now, on to the questions. The first few are just to back them into a corner, and to make sure they cannot evade the later, more difficult questions. These questions are not from any one particular case; rather, they are just my standard first play of the game. To set up my pieces, I usually start with the judge.

“Sir (or ma’am), am I entitled to a fair and meaningful hearing?”

They will most likely answer “yes.”

I follow with, “Am I entitled to be informed of the nature and cause of the charges and proceedings against me?”

This will also yield a “yes” reply.

Next I will ask, “Am I entitled to responsive answers to any questions I might have about these charges and proceedings?”

Again, the answer should be “yes.”

At this point, I have set up a situation where they will either answer the rest of my questions or they will show that their hand is only backed by lies and violence. Moving forward, I ask, “Do you have the discretion to accept testimony from a witness that you have declared incompetent to testify?”

This is a very important question for later and I need them to answer responsively. That means I need a “yes” or a “no.” If they try to give me anything else, I explain, “Sir (ma’am), I’m not a lawyer and I don’t understand most of this. Can you please just limit your answer to yes or no?”

If they still try to avoid answering, I might reword the question to get the same result. “If a witness is found to be incompetent to testify, do you still have discretion over whether or not to accept their testimony?”

I want the judge to admit that he or she cannot accept testimony such as that given by an incompetent witness. As with most of these questions, I don't ask them unless I already know the answer and I know the answer will tilt the scales in my favor.

That is the end of my set-up questions. At this point, the judge might still be feeling rather confident in his or her position. This false sense of security, however, will not be a lasting one. Now that I have successfully sealed off all routes of escape, the gloves come off. I still keep the same demeanor as described before, killing them with kindness, but the love taps are over and I am looking for a knockout punch.

First, I attack the fairness of the trial. I do not accuse them of any wrongdoing by bringing up the fact that the judge cannot hold their position and remain neutral at the same time. I find it is much more effective to have the judge make those statements for me. That way, I make my point without presenting an argument. In a recent case of my own, I did this as follows. And I paraphrase.

"Is it a conflict of interest if a judge either represents or receives money from a party to a proceeding?"

To which the female judge responded, "Certainly."

I then asked her, "Could I receive a fair trial if such a conflict of interest existed?"

Again, her answer was straight to the point. "Certainly not," she proclaimed.

Next, I asked her the question that, in some cases, has proven to be the nail in the coffin. I asked her, "Who do you represent here today?"

Now she was stuck. If a judge answers truthfully, they will have to admit that they work for the plaintiff. Then I would simply ask for them to recuse themselves based off of a conflict of interest. If they lie and say that it is not a conflict of interest, I simply ask for the legal authority they rely on to back their assumption that they can represent a party without it constituting a conflict; or, how they can be an impartial decider when they have a financial reliance on the opposing party. If they dodge these questions, I am not being informed. Either way, the fraud is exposed.

Here is where the ego kicks in. Because the judge does not want to look bad, even though he or she has been beaten, they will most likely not be willing to throw in the towel just yet. Such was the case in the aforementioned scenario. What I had done, with the very first question I asked, is the equivalent of handing the judge a plate. Each question that followed was like adding a scoop of manure. By the time she realized what was going on, she had found herself sitting in front of a steaming pile of feces. If this judge let the case go now, she might have seen this as her having to eat the whole plate of poop, which by now was the size of a Thanksgiving turkey. And it

would have meant admitting she was wrong. That is not the typical action of one who sees themselves as a god amongst men.

More often than not, this is when I am turned over to the prosecutor: a lawyer of lesser stature, made evident by the fact that he or she is not wearing the magical black robe adorned by only the most exalted. I try to handle this lawyer in much the same way as I did the first. I try to ask questions that they will not answer, but this time, I also ask for facts that cannot be provided. I already know that the client they claim to represent, the state, does not exist. But if I start making statements to that end, I will quickly be labeled a lunatic and ordered to appear at a faretta hearing to test my mental competency. That is not my goal. So, instead, I attempt to have them make my case for me.

“Sir,” talking to the attorney, “do you have the burden of proof in these proceedings?” This question is rather non-threatening and will most likely render an affirmative response. From there I might follow up with, “Is there any evidence of a complaining party?”

On more than one occasion, I have had the prosecutor make mention of the cop in an attempt to get me off point. I redirect by asking, “So, is the officer the plaintiff in these proceedings?” This will usually get me back on track.

If they answer “the people,” or, “the state” is the complaining party, I raise the proper objection. “I object. That’s non-responsive. I did not ask who the complaining party is believed to be. I asked if there was any *evidence* of a complaining party.”

This will be impossible to answer as their client is imaginary and has no factual evidence to prove its existence. And after all, do they not have the burden of proof on every part of their case? And isn’t that burden supposed to be met with facts and evidence? Is it not rational to ask for evidence that the opposing attorney is actually there representing someone other than him or herself? But, for some reason, they will not produce any facts to prove that they even have a client. What a sham. If an attorney were trying to represent any other party in a court proceeding, they could not get away with this blatant disregard for due process, but since their client is the state, it is standard operating procedures.

I need not proceed any further to show that the prosecutor is not acting in good faith. If the case was not dismissed before, it surely should be by now. If there was even the slightest bit of interest in justice, the state attorney would do the only respectable thing and withdraw the charges. Unfortunately, the ego, again, comes into play. The prosecutor does not want to be made the fool. And he or she certainly has no desire to eat the fecal entree that was passed down to him/her by the judge. This is where the buck gets passed to the cop, the low man on the totem pole.

Keeping in mind what the judge said earlier about not having the discretion to accept testimony from an incompetent witness, I attack the competency of their witness. I am going to hit

the cop with a series of questions that will result in answers that prove they have no case against me. If he is allowed to answer, and if he answers honestly and responsively, he will end up exposing the scam for what it is, and the case must be thrown out.

This however, is not what is more likely to happen. More often, in an attempt to keep the cat in the bag about the scam that is being perpetrated against me, the judge will stop my line of questioning short. If this is done by declaring the officer not competent to testify, I move for their entire testimony to be stricken, including the original charging instrument that started this whole dog and pony show. If they then declare the officer competent again but still refuse me the answer to my question, I have been denied my right to effective cross examination, a judicial error of the highest magnitude and easily reversible upon appeal.

Recently, I was helping my friend Jeremiah with his speeding ticket. I felt obligated, as I was in his car, encouraging him to hurry, when we got pulled over. We were already late to class and this unplanned roadside rendezvous only added to our tardiness. When our day in court finally came, Jer was able to get the cop impeached with only a few questions.

“Officer,” he started out, “did you witness me commit a crime?”

To which the answer was a confident “Yes.”

Then he asked, “Would there have been a crime if I was not within the state on the day in question?”

If, at this point, the prosecutor objected, arguing the hypothetical nature of the question, Jer could have asked instead, “Does the statute require my presence in the state to be applicable?” But, in this case it was not necessary as both the judge and opposing attorney allowed the question to be answered.

After the cop admitted his presence within the state was required, he continued with, “Was I within the state on the day in question?”

“Well, yeah” the cop most proudly exclaimed.

This is where Jeremiah brought it back to the facts. “Sir,” he asked, “is that an arbitrary opinion or is it based off of facts currently in your knowledge?”

When the cop stated it was based on facts currently within his knowledge, Jer came back with, “Factually, what is the state?”

The cop and the D.A. just sat there like deer caught in the headlights. This question was so powerful because a state, factually, is nothing more than a figment of the imagination. There was no way to prove his presence in a figment of the officer’s imagination. The cop had no idea how to answer.

If the claim was made that the state is the geographic location, we know that this is not entirely true, as I explained in earlier chapters. This response could have quickly been knocked down by asking, “Are you telling me that the prosecutor is here representing the ground?” If the cop was foolish enough to respond with a yes, he could then ask, “So, do you believe that the ground did not exist before the state was incorporated?” I don’t think so.

The cop can only answer this question one way, by contradicting his earlier testimony. I, of course, would object if this happens. “Objection, inconsistent testimony, witness now testifies that the ground and the state are not one and the same. I move to strike their earlier statements pertaining to my presence within the state.”

I would then re-ask the initial question, but in much more loaded fashion this time. Something like, “Officer, knowing that my presence on the ground is not the same as my presence within the state, is it still your testimony, under penalty of perjury, that I was present within the state on the date in question?” Followed up by the questions about arbitrary opinions and facts, I have effectively left no wiggle room whatsoever for the witness to escape.

Fortunately for Jeremiah, this level of persistence was not required and the judge dismissed his case without any further effort on our behalf.

Another recent victory involved a friend of mine by the name of Chris. This hearing was at the Denver County Court in the “state” of Colorado. By simply asking a few of the set up questions that were detailed at the beginning of this chapter, and filing two motions with the court, Chris was able to get his judge to recuse himself. When he showed up to his trial date, there was a new black robed lawyer sitting on the bench. This new judge had not yet ruled on the motions we sent in and said that she had no idea as to the whereabouts of said motions.

Not letting this suspicious turn of events discourage him, Chris instead decided to focus strictly on cross-examination. When the time came, He got right into it. “Officer,” he said, “what type of paperwork did you file to initiate these legal proceedings?”

The response given was a very snide. “I filed a speeding ticket with the court.”

Chris continued. “And did you file that ticket because it was your opinion that I was involved in some sort of illegal activity?”

“Yeah, you were speeding.”

“Ok,” Chris replies, “And was the ticket that you filed a valid ticket?”

Of course the judge allowed the witness to answer this question. It only helped the state’s case. The cop answers, “Yes.”

Chris then asks the million dollar question. “Officer, how many elements are in a valid ticket?”

This is a trick question. A ticket is considered to be a “cause of action.” In order for a cause of action to be valid, it must meet three required elements: injury, damages, and redress-ability. So the ticket, as is the case with most tickets, was not valid. But, if the cop is going to testify that the ticket was valid, he should at least know how many elements a valid ticket consists of. This, however, was not the case. In fact, it was at this point that the judge declared her only witness incompetent to testify. She told Chris that the officer was not required to answer the question as it called for a legal conclusion and such determinations were outside the scope of the cop’s expertise.

The real reason she stopped this line of questioning short, I believe, is the next logical question. If, by some sort of miracle, the cop actually answered the last question responsively, Chris could have easily followed up with, “And what are those elements?”

Now the witness would be in a very tough position. He wouldn’t be able to answer without admitting that some of the essential elements were not present. There was no injury and therefore, no corpus delicti. Ultimately, what this means is that there is no crime: no case, no valid cause of action, no injury, and no crime. This is made clear in *Colorado v. Smith* when it is stated, “The corpus delicti of a crime minimally requires two elements: (1) An injury which is penally proscribed...and (2) The unlawfulness of some person's conduct in causing that injury.”^{14,15}

Once she had ruled that the cop was not capable of rendering legal determinations, Chris moved to have all of the officer’s testimony stricken from the record. When the judge complied, Chris then added, “Including the original charging instrument.”

Game, set and match. She had no choice. Although it was with some hesitance, she threw out Chris’ ticket. He then returned to his seat with his money safe in his pocket. This was wonderful for Chris, but what happened next was truly amazing. In fact, it was almost unbelievable.

When the next case was called, a new defendant stepped up to be sheared. Neither I nor Chris had ever met this individual and it is doubtful that he had any understanding of what just transpired in Chris’ case. Most likely clueless as to what he had just witnessed, a stroke of inspiration must have struck him. In a brilliant case of monkey see, monkey do, this new defendant stood up and asked, “Officer, did you file a valid ticket against me?”

¹⁴ People of the State of Colorado v. Smith, 510 P.2d 893, 182 Colo. 31.(Colorado)

¹⁵ State v. Libero, 83 P.3d 753, 763 (2003), [quoting State v. Dudoit, 55 Haw. 1, 2, 514 P.2d 373, 374 (1973)] (Hawaii).

That was enough. The judge turns to the cop and asks, "Do you have your notes from this arrest?"

"No, your honor, I don't," a look of shame now running across his face.

In frustration, she mutters out, "Case dismissed."

She then proceeds to dismiss every other case on the docket pertaining to tickets written by this particular officer. When she was done, all that remained was a poor schmuck who had been picked up on a warrant. He did not get off so easy as the rest of the would-be victims in the room, but for all others involved, it was their lucky day. They were all able to keep their hard earned money because one guy had the tenacity to stand up for his rights, and because of Chris' actions, they had their rights protected as well.

Although I have not had every ticket thrown out using these methods, the number of dismissed cases is far greater than the number of convictions. As with any journey, one must learn to adapt. For me, any guilty verdict is merely a setback, and as such, has tremendous potential to teach me what I need to know for the next step on my path. All that I have written here are my travels and ideals being shared with you. I am not advising any action on your behalf. But, if you decide to take this road, I believe that you will have similar results to those of my own and my friends. This could undoubtedly leave you feeling more empowered and aware of the freedom you rightfully deserve, therefore, bringing you that much closer to a true sense of autonomy.

But that is not where it ends. No, that is just the beginning. Imagine what would happen if your courage caused a chain reaction that then inspires a few others to follow suit, much like what Chris experienced firsthand. What would happen if this reaction then snowballed to the point where the majority of the people refused to blindly cooperate with this treacherous system?

Imagine, if you can, a world where not only are you free, but all people are free and treated as equals. This world is possible, but to achieve it, we must first change ourselves. To live in a world that is free, we have to start by living free ourselves. We cannot force freedom on others, as force is the antithesis of freedom. We can only live free and autonomous and hope to be an inspiration to others. It is my hope that this book will be that inspiration to you, and that you, in turn, will be that inspiration to others.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I must thank the Creator for granting me life and the ability to reason. To my mother, father, grandmother and grandfather, all of whom taught me to be caring and considerate, but also confident and courageous. To Love Cooper who first planted the seeds of sovereignty in my mind. A very special thanks to Marc Stevens for all of the knowledge that he has shared with me on my path to self realization. Many of the questions I use in court and other legal proceedings come directly from him. You can find an extensive script for fending off criminal and civil attacks at his website,

marcstevens.net.

I would also like to thank Tactikalguy1 for his contributions to this movement as well. He can be found on YouTube and on his own website,

tactikalguy1.webs.com.

I have learned a lot in the matter of how to handle court procedures from these two gentlemen and must give credit where credit is due. Thank you to my friends Sydney and Jen for making sure this didn't come out sounding like the ranting of an illiterate madman. I must also thank my friends, Jeremiah and Chris, for letting me use their stories to illustrate the power of standing up and asking questions. And lastly, I must thank you, the reader. Without you, this information is useless. Knowledge only becomes wisdom once it has been shared. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to share with you what I know in my heart to be true.

For a more in-depth look at the legal system and its many flaws, I highly recommend "Adventures in Legal Land" by Marc Stevens.

To better understand the mental prison that we all live in and how it is constructed, so that you might deconstruct it, I recommend

"The Four Agreements" by Don Miguel Ruiz.

And, to find the power to really take back control of your reality, a must read is "As a Man Thinketh" by James Allen

And if you want to continue your studies into the fictional world of "law", I highly recommend getting a copy of your "state's" rules of evidence and rules of criminal and civil procedure.

About the Author



Nathaniel Anton Fraser, more commonly known as Paranoid, is a long time political activist and musician. He is also established in the world of talk radio, having hosted a number of shows that have aired both online and on AM and FM stations. With this work, he now adds the title of author to his list of accomplishments.

Born in the late 1970s, he was raised in a lower income household, the oldest of four children. As a young boy, his views on government were very heavily influenced by his Hispanic stepfather and the native-American grandfather on his mother's side. As a teenager, he had more than his fair share of run-ins with "law enforcement" and very quickly grew to understand the dissent towards government expressed by the male figures from his childhood. Events like those in Waco, Texas and Ruby Ridge solidified his distaste for the despotism he saw growing all around him.

On September 11, 2001, what little respect he had left for the operations of government flew out the window like the plumes of debris that exploded out from the twin towers. From that point forward, he decided to make it a personal goal to do everything he could to fight for a future where freedom is the only rule. On his path, he quickly realized that the subjugation that effects most people is the bondage of mental slavery. It was at this point that he came to the conclusion that spending his time and energy fighting against the tyrants on Capitol Hill might not be the most fruitful endeavor before him. After all, what good does it do to trim the branches of an unsightly tree when they will always grow back?

Because of this, Nathaniel decided to dedicate his efforts to striking the very root of the tree we call tyranny. Instead of wasting time attacking the many dictators that are out there, he now spends his time attacking the idea that any man has the right to dictate over another man, for that is the only real, long term solution. After years of battle against a system that he believed was taking his freedom, he realized that only he could ensure or destroy his ability to live free. This book is intended to be an example that will show the reader how one man was able to find true freedom in the middle of a society that seems hell-bent on functioning like a prison. Nathaniel now strives to live his life in a way that will act as a shining beacon of truth to show all that we are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.