



# **Understanding Law and the Nature of Society**

**Greg Paul**



# introduction

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

That said i also felt, like many people feel, that something was not quite right. What it was i did not know, but i felt it nonetheless. When the scale and depth of this glitch in the matrix became evident, there remained a simple choice to pretend as i had done before that it'll all be alright, or quit feeding the beast and become part of the solution.

The solution, as i hope you will see, is incredibly simple, but it is only simple for those with eyes to see. Had i been told two years prior to writing this e-book that all i need do is make one simple choice i would not have believed it; i needed to walk the yellow brick road with a strawman by my side and fight a wizard (all, as you will see, more literally than you may think) before i could see that if i simply clicked my heels three times i would return to the land of the free.

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

The principal purpose of this e-book is to show how we are quite literally slaves, slaves who have willingly volunteered to be slaves, slaves who are all equally responsible for this frankly unbelievable state of affairs currently masquerading as reality. But there is a light at the end of the tunnel; for anyone who is willing to follow their heart and live according to their conscience, it is possible to break the self-imposed bonds which hold us down and return to the garden in every sense of the word – which is what The Sovereign's Way is all about.

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

Although there is not time to define every word of note in this text, you may like to read the specific law references in this e-book with a law dictionary at hand, considering also the presumptions that each word implies. Every word that you speak, write or read is significant - it is through the use of spells and spelling that the powerful few obtain jurisdiction over the meek masses. It is unfortunate that we were not properly educated in critical thinking, the real English language or legalese at an early age, however this is no excuse, and we must now take responsibility for our own education if we wish to create a better life for ourselves and those around us.

*That said, the way to be free is not through mental understanding, so don't get too bogged down in trying to understand the matrix - prod it and probe it until you can see it for what it is and then move on to learning how to express your law and uphold your rights - this e-book is just to help you see it.*

# the construct

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

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

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

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

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

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

If we devote sufficient time to analysing our current perspectives, we will invariably discover that our entire world view, from our political, economic, religious and social opinions to our likes and dislikes is all a part of this construct. In fact if you are "Joe Bloggs, 10 Acacia Avenue, husband/wife, /father/mother, /brother/sister, /son/daughter, carpenter/secretary, Christian/muslim, conservative/liberal democrat, sports fan, lucky/unlucky, worthy/unworthy, happy/sad," the construct has you.

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

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

As you do find the answers, you will see that the limitations placed upon you by the construct no longer apply. You will see that you are no longer acceptable to the construct and it is not acceptable to you. Those who are still under the spell of the construct will ostracise and ridicule you, they have to or the construct would collapse. This is ok; the numbers of people seeking and finding their own truth are increasing exponentially and you need no longer stand alone. As you read on, consider the foregoing words and the nature of this construct; when you read something that conflicts with your current perspective, test your current perspective to see whether or not it truly stands up. Not that I am suggesting that you accept the words in these pages either, we must each search for and discover the truth for ourselves, I simply hope that you may receive from this e-book, inspiration in your search.

# the laws of nature

In most countries around the world it is taught that in the beginning god created man, and that he gave to man dominion over the earth and all things contained therein - i.e. property. Language differences aside, this is the foundation of almost every system of law which exists in the world today, be it that of a Christian nation or otherwise, and it is the foundation of International Law.

Whilst the manner in which it was taught to us was rarely clean and true, the essence from which it was wrought - with the intent to provide a framework for the laws of love to be upheld on earth - is written upon every man's heart (on the rare occasion s/he follows it) in the form of his conscience and sense of morality. It seems however that we have forgotten where we come from. We all know deep down that it is only in the heart that true wisdom and true happiness can be found, but we remain afraid to look within, subconsciously fearful of unearthing some defect in our character which would undermine our identity.

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

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

By this moral code can men live peacefully besides one another and in harmony with the rest of the natural world. This is the law of nature.<sup>[1]</sup>

The duty of man under natural law is well summarised by Emmerich De Vattel in his works on The Law of Nations<sup>[2]</sup>.

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

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

*The end of the natural society established among men in general is that they should mutually assist one another to advance their own perfection and that of their condition.<sup>[3]</sup>*

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



# the laws of man and his ego

The laws of man are often described as 'positive' laws<sup>[4]</sup> of society. They include anything and everything that does not fall under natural law – statutes, codes, regulations, even common law and trusts.

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

Although the world has been heavily guided and controlled for thousands of years by what can only be described as the greatest lie ever told, this situation cannot be entirely blamed on some conspiracy. To tackle this issue we must first address two key questions:

1. What triggered man to instigate the first 'positive laws of society?
2. What it is that drives man to increase his own wealth, protect his name, improve his status, and generally act in his own interests, all at the expense of his fellow man?

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

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

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

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

The people's ignorance of the law has led to a place where the rule of law is no longer followed, and where justice is nothing more than the balancing of an account. This is a very dangerous state of affairs; under such conditions the world can and has been guided to depths of despair limited only by the despotic imaginings of those responsible for the guiding.<sup>[5]</sup>

So why did man start making 'positive' laws? The Code of Hammurabi (c1790 BC, Babylon, first surviving positive code)<sup>[6]</sup> gives some clues. It contains such laws as:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The conflict in our lives is not external; it is not with the other men who tender for the same contracts at work, or with the other team at the match on Saturday. All conflict in our lives, regardless of how it manifests in your reality, takes place in the confines of our own minds.

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

Christ Letters

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

In the bosom of this, so-called 'positive' laws have been instituted at an alarming rate over the last couple of centuries, in an ever more despotic fashion. The western world already finds itself under the rule of a tyrannical leadership who have been busy creating an irreversible police state for many years now – a fact evident to anyone willing to honestly appraise the situation. Don't believe me? Consider how the world's entire seed stock has been patented by a single corporation so that you will no longer be 'legally' allowed to grow your own food, or consider how the government has claimed title to the water which falls from the sky so that you will no longer be able to 'legally' drink water without a license.<sup>[8]</sup>

i would again emphasise that this is not necessarily completely the result of a conspiracy. For millennia mankind has consistently shown that he is incapable of living harmoniously on the earth, and no doubt that those who seek to impose an irreversible police state probably believe that they are doing the world a favour.

Regardless of the motivating factors the fact remains that were it not for an ill educated, fearful, ego-driven public, the powers that be would not be able to guide the world as they do. The later chapters discussing the legal fiction and the name game will give a detailed overview of how such a seemingly impossible state of affairs has been made manifest.

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

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

A word of caution though to the growing number of people who are waking up to the truths of our situation and who, on the recommendation of the many law gurus (whom although well intentioned, have themselves obtained much of their information second-hand), are seeking to align themselves with a common law jurisdiction; Common Law is a very different thing to common law. Common Law is a term used to describe the body of law incorporating common law, equity and statute, whereas common law relates to the body of law which evolved from traditional forms of action.<sup>[9]</sup> This is a very clever tool used to obtain jurisdiction over the ill informed common law stalwart. Generally speaking any legal word beginning with a capital letter should be considered with caution<sup>[10]</sup>. If a word has a capital letter it is most likely a name denoting a specific thing over which the legal/financial system has jurisdiction. How easily we recognise the discrepancies in the way others spell words will determine the degree to which we are susceptible to the spell being cast. That aside, since common law is just another part of the construct anyway, why would we wish to subject ourselves to the ego-driven Common Law or common law system when we have natural law instead?

*There is not only a possible but also a necessary contradiction between positive and natural law, because the one is a coercive order while the other, ideally, is not only non-coercive, but actually has to forbid any coercion among men. A positive law, then, beside natural law is not only impossible from the viewpoint of formal logic, it is also superfluous from a material-teleological point of view, if the assumptions hold which alone permit one to maintain the validity of a "natural" order. For, why should a human-arbitrary order be needed for the regulation of human conduct, if a just regulation can already be found in an order "natural," evident to all and in harmony with what all men of good will would propose? To provide any coercive acts for the realization of such a natural order would not only be superfluous, but could be considered positively harmful and apt to produce precisely those evils whose prevention and elimination are the sole justification of coercion."* Hans Kelsen<sup>[11]</sup>

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

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

# the legal fiction

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

When you buy a car for example your name makes an exchange of money for a piece of paper evidencing title to a vehicle. Neither the man who used a name to allow the transaction to take place, nor the vehicle itself actually exists in the commercial world. This is a fundamental truth about the world we live in; it looks real and feels real but only a part of it actually is real. The parts that cause all the stress and strife; the names, the money and the pieces of paper are all a lie; they only exist in our heads, collectively in the heads of all of us who play the game; they are part of the construct. The problem, as we have already discussed and will examine yet again later, is that we have been told that they are real so many times that it is almost impossible to see the glaringly obvious truth; "there is no spoon."<sup>[12]</sup>

By definition a legal fiction is;

*An assumption that something is true even though it may be untrue, made esp. in judicial reasoning to alter how a legal rule operates; specifically, a device by which a legal rule or institution is diverted from its original purpose to accomplish indirectly some other object.*  
<sup>[13]</sup>

*"Legal fiction is the mask that progress must wear to pass the faithful but blear-eyed watchers of our ancient legal treasures [unalienable natural rights of the man]. But though legal fictions are useful in thus mitigating or absorbing the shock of **innovation**, they work havoc in the form of intellectual confusion." Morris R. Cohen, *Law and the Social Order* 126 (1933).<sup>[14]</sup>*

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

*The act of substituting an old obligation for a new one that either replaces an existing obligation with a new obligation or replaces an original party with a new party.*<sup>[15]</sup>

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

But what of the word 'person'? Statutory law never under any circumstances speaks of men; all such laws govern persons. In fact the hijacking and intermingling of the other positive law forms now means that the public court system no longer has the capacity to recognise men, they can only recognise persons. A person is defined as being;

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

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

*"A person is any being who is capable of rights and duties. Any being that is so capable is a person, whether a human being or not, and no being that is not so capable is a person, even though he be a man"*<sup>[16]</sup>

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

The use of the word person has evolved over many centuries and has its origins in the Holy Roman Empire; prior to the abolition of slavery in 1833,<sup>[18]</sup> the status of person was known to be a fictitious title, and one which most men gladly accepted because it was a step up from the status of slave, it was not the bottom rung of the ladder.



However when slavery was abolished the status of person became the lowest designation available in the fiction realm and, as you will see in the subsequent chapters, was effectively merged with the status of slave to form a voluntary position which not only allowed the continuance of, but grossly expanded, the slave trade.

And so one may first assume that "human being" is a more appropriate term to define ourselves by. This is not the case; a human is not a man, it is a hu-man; hu or hue means "colour of", so you might more accurately say that a human is the colour of man. Anyone familiar with the law will be aware that when something is defined as "colourable" it denotes something that is "intended to deceive; counterfeit"<sup>[19]</sup>. It is worthy of note that to the best of my knowledge no scriptural text ever uses the word human. When you consider that the majority of our law today derives to some degree from scripture, then whether you are religious or not, when engaging with the world of commerce we would do well to heed their words when defining ourselves. "For there is no respect of persons with God."<sup>[20]</sup>

<b>Reality</b>	<b>Fiction</b>
<b>Private</b>	<b>Public</b>
<b>Natural</b>	<b>Legal</b>
<b>Wo/man</b>	<b>Person/Human</b>
<b>True self</b>	<b>Ego</b>
<b>Actual things</b>	<b>Title of things</b>
<b>Money</b>	<b>Labour</b>

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

As we alluded to earlier, in this perceived 'outside world' there are, strictly speaking, two worlds. These two worlds we might call the private and the public, the world of men and the world of persons, the true self and the ego;

For example the house or flat that you live in is a real tangible thing, it exists in a private world where you, the wo/man, can impart your own bodily labour upon it and enjoy it in private. However that real tangible thing is referenced on pieces of paper in the public; mortgage deed, land registry title deed etc. These pieces of paper evidence title to a thing, they are fiction, and "there is no foundation in nature or in natural law, why a set of words upon parchment should convey the dominion of land." [21] The names of the "persons" contained on these pieces of paper are also fictions.

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

The reason why this situation starts to get complicated is that the wo/man who has everything he needs in his private world of real things, decides that she wants to be able to prove that the house belongs to her.

You may be starting to realise by now that it is not possible for a wo/man to own anything, only fictions have that capacity. Rights to property and ownership are not the same thing. Wo/man was born with nothing, he will die with nothing and whilst he is here he may freely use whatever he requires. The only way that a wo/man will be able to say "that is MY house" is if she not only has the real thing in the private but also the piece of paper evidencing title to the thing in the public.

Unfortunately, however, the only way she can have that piece of paper is by also saying "I am that Person," and diminishing himself to a status below wo/man in the process.

This is the forbidden fruit, we may exercise our free will in deciding whether or not to eat it and it will no doubt be incomparably juicy (for a while), but when we give in to the temptation of the ego, we are ejected from the metaphoric Garden of Eden. The next chapters cover how, practically and jurisdictionally speaking, this occurs. Hopefully when you see how easily you created these circumstances in your life you will see how unbelievably simple it is to reverse it. When you truly become able to see past the veil which is the name game, you will begin to find that the heavenly world you have always dreamed of exists right here, right now, on earth. [22]

# the banking system

Since approximately 1914 with the inception of the Bankruptcy Act,<sup>[23]</sup> the United Kingdom has been trading in a state of bankruptcy. Bankruptcy rules prevent the settlement of a debt with real tangible money. No real money is to change hands in bankruptcy; debts may be discharged into the future to allow trading to continue, and everything simply becomes an accounting exercise. Which is why 1914 was also the year when the gold specie standard was suspended, removing all value from the commercial world making it also impossible for a contract to be completed on the basis that no valuable consideration could be given.

The effect of this suspension was that the money in your purse was no longer redeemable for a tangible and valuable commodity; in fact it was redeemable for nothing. This suspension was instituted under the guise of the commencement of World War I, on the pretence that it was unfavourable to allow trade with gold to continue when such trade could see UK gold reserves disappear overseas. Despite an attempt to placate the naysayers of the fiat currency system<sup>[24]</sup> by introducing the Gold Standards Act 1925<sup>[25]</sup> which sought to establish the gold bullion standard, the gold standard was permanently suspended by Bill 227 in 1931. Overnight the nation, and the majority of the developed world, made the final switch to a fractional reserve banking system which operates solely on faith. Or does it?

The process of money creation is the backbone of any economic model; this new fractional reserve banking system<sup>[26]</sup> introduced the following process:

- *The central bank decides to increase the money supply by say £1m. It does so by purchasing government bonds/treasury bills from a dealer in government securities.*
- *In order to pay for these bonds the central bank creates a liability against itself - a simple accounting exercise.*
- *The dealer's bank account is credited with £1m as payment for the bonds.*
- *£1m of credit money that did not previously exist, now exists in the banking system.*
- *Because the government bonds are interest bearing, the government has effectively borrowed the credit money for its banking system, from what is effectively a private corporation, at interest...*

- *(there can never be enough money in circulation to pay back this loan because the interest payable on the government bonds has not yet been created – hence the perpetual and intentional cycle of boom and bust).*
- *"Income taxes pay the interest to the bondholders."<sup>[27]</sup>*
- *The central bank can control the supply of credit money by buying and selling its holding of government bonds at will. In this way does one single corporation control the entire economy.*

*"I am a most unhappy man. I have unwittingly ruined my country. A great industrial nation is controlled by its system of credit... The growth of the nation, therefore, and all our activities are in the hands of a few men. We have come to be one of the worst ruled, one of the most completely controlled and dominated governments in the civilized world... a government by the opinion and duress of a small group of dominant men."*

Woodrow Wilson [President 1913-1921] after he passed the Federal Reserve Act 1913 which instituted the Fractional Reserve System in the United States.

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

- *The high street bank(s) who received the £1m from the dealer's transaction is allowed to lend £900,000 of the original £1m, assuming a 10% fractional reserve requirement.*
- *However it does not lend any of the original £1m, if it did this no new money would be created. It keeps the whole £1m in its vault and creates, out of thin air, up to another £9m to satisfy the 10% requirement.*
- *It can do this because it "accepts promissory notes [loan application forms and offers] in exchange for credits to the borrowers' transaction account."<sup>[28]</sup>*
- *The bank lies to the public, telling them that they are making a loan (that must be paid back at interest).*
- *The bank then accepts the loan application form/offer as a promise to pay in accordance with the Bills of Exchange Act 1882<sup>[29]</sup> (much like the promise to pay bank notes in your wallet).*
- *Because they now have something of value from the 'borrower,' they are authorised by the banking system to create out of thin air the credit money that the 'borrower' wishes to 'borrow.'*

- *In essence the bank has simply converted the 'borrowers' promissory note into useable credit money. They have not lent a single penny of their own money or of anyone else's money. 100% of the monthly payments you make on a loan, mortgage or credit card are effectively profit to the banking system.*
- *It is the promise of future labour of the man acting as the legal fiction 'borrower' that increases the supply of fictional credit money in the fractional reserve system.*
- *Essentially it is us, the alleged borrowers, who make the loan to the bank, not the other way round.*

The excellent work of Thomas Schaff<sup>[30]</sup> covers this subject in much more detail.

Now what then is the only thing in the commercial world that actually has any value under this system?

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

So if the only thing that has any value is the labour of the people and the promise of future labour, what is it that gives value to the government bonds which are issued to the Bank of England in return for the currency it loans to the government?

For a government bond to have any value it must be backed by something. The only thing that has any value is mans labour and the promise of his future labour, so the only way that the system can function is if the government can somehow collateralise that labour; to have the people stand as surety for the bankruptcy.

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

*Americans, by unknowingly or unwittingly delivering the bills of lading to us, will be rendered bankrupt and insolvent, forever to remain economic slaves through taxation secured by their pledges. They will be stripped of their rights and given a commercial value designed to make us a profit and they will be none the wiser, for not one man in a million could ever figure our plans and, if by accident one or two would figure it out, we have in our arsenal plausible deniability. After all this is the only logical way to fund government by floating liens and debt to the registrants in the form of benefits and privileges.*

*This will inevitably reap to us huge profits beyond our wildest expectations and leave every American a contributor to this fraud which we will call “Social Insurance.” Without realizing it, every American will insure us for any loss we may incur and in this manner every American will unknowingly be our servant, however begrudgingly. The people will become helpless and without any hope for their redemption and we will employ the high office of the President of our dummy corporation to foment this plot against America.”*

Colonel Edward Mandell House in a private meeting with Woodrow Wilson [President 1913-1921]

How can we be debtors when we are the source of all credit? All credit money that has come into existence in the form of debt, be it mortgages, loans, credit cards etc has apparently made us debtors when we take out these alleged loans, but in debt to who if we are the source of all the credit, ourselves?

If we pay for this system with our labour, and we stand as surety for this system by the promise of our future labour, and we also volunteer to meet the obligations of the system, we surely are obligated to ask who is creaming the massive fictional profit out of the middle?

This book is not about pointing fingers, but usually if you wish to know which fictional entity owns a piece of property you look at the name on the deeds. Whose name is it that appears on the promissory notes you carry around in your wallet? And who really owns the Bank of England?

Despite my saying that we are the true creditors of the fiat financial system, i would like to make it clear that i do not under any circumstances advocate any of the commercial redemption claim your strawman creditor strategies that many people are now employing to deal with liabilities in the name. They are conflict based, self serving and, when compared to exercising dominion over the earth in the care of natural law, somewhat lacking in moral fortitude. The only reason why such paths are still followed is as a result of our continued failure to properly recognise the truth of who we are, and lack of willingness to take responsibility for ourselves; when this truth is properly realised and responsibility taken it is no longer possible to give any credence to that which is fiction and the notion of submitting to the jurisdiction of another becomes abhorrent.

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

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

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

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

# the name game

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

So how is this voluntary undertaking achieved? For that, we need to look more deeply at the birth registration process.

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

The legislation that governs the registration of births in the UK is The Births and Deaths Registration Act 1953<sup>[31]</sup>; it states that *"the birth of every child born in England and Wales shall be registered..."* Similar legislation to all that which is directly referenced in this e-book exists in most every other country on earth. So you yourself were never physically registered, only the event which was your birth – a historical fact. This is a very important fact, it affects all other facts which follow – we do not register our sons and daughters, we simply register the event of their birth. Furthermore the registered name was never intended to be your name as the same act clearly states - *" Where, before the expiration of twelve months from the date of the registration of the birth of any child, the name by which it was registered..."*



The key phrases here are "registration of the birth" and "the name by which it was registered" – hence it is not the child that is named but simply the event of the birth. You might therefore say that the most accurate response you could give when asked for a name (in a legal context) is "The name of the event of my birth is ..."

The key part in all this is surnames. The Act states that *"a name is given to the child."* Whilst this may be true, your given name(s) is not the full name you have become accustomed to using. That name includes a surname, which is absolutely not yours. Your given names are your names, but when coupled with a surname, it becomes the name of the event of your birth - a thing.

So this receipt, or Certificate of Birth (short form birth certificate), now undergoes a process called conversion. This conversion is the "innovation" or substitution referred to earlier. Conversion is "the change in nature of property from reality to personality or visa versa," or for the sake of understanding; the act of changing reality into fiction. It is at this moment that a legal fiction persona is born. The long form birth certificate (certified copy of an entry) is the representation of this new Person. The Person (name of estate) for which the myriad of statutory laws have been instituted to control. So in effect this birth certificate is a death certificate - the formation of an estate.

The questions we must ask then is who owns the estates? and who is liable for those estates? Consider for a moment the birth certificate which represents the estate; with the definition of a *"certificate"* as being *"a paper establishing an ownership claim."* Observing any birth certificate, or certified copy of an entry, produced in a Commonwealth jurisdiction you will notice that there are the words "CROWN COPYRIGHT".

As the Crown's own guidelines on Crown Copyright information state, the first owner of all Crown Copyright material is Her Majesty. And as the maxims of law tell us; "all liability rests with the owner." It is clear then that if we do not claim to own the estate or the property of the estate as our own property we cannot therefore have the liability imposed upon us; to do so would constitute involuntary servitude which as we know is forbidden.

*So by identifying yourself as the name on the birth certificate without qualifying that you are in fact a man or woman, you allow it to be assumed that you agree to be accessory property – you volunteer to be Crown property. Accessio cedit principali – an accessory attached to a principal becomes the property of the owner of the principal (the principal being the name, the owner of that principal being the Crown, with the accessory property being the flesh and blood man who made this voluntary attachment). This is how the allegiance of the people is obtained by the modern day Sovereign.*

As property of the Crown, which status is usually designated by the title 'citizen' or 'subject', all property in your possession, including but not limited to all real and personal property, your physical body, bodily labour, and rights therein, belong to the owner in totality. Hence any income which you derive from your bodily labour belongs also to the owner. Whatever you are allowed to keep for yourself is considered a benefit or privilege. Such benefits and privileges continue only for such time as you are complicit with the instructions of your master, so anyone who wishes to retain those benefits would do well to obey.

.To maintain the illusion of freedom these benefits and privileges are commonly called income, and the master receives the profit on their commodity - you - through taxation of this income. To ensure that you remain productive, the illusion of freedom must be maintained, hence you are told that the income is consideration for your labour and that the taxes will pay for services which benefit your fellow man. We know now of course that *"Income taxes pay the interest to the bondholders."*<sup>[36]</sup>

What happens when you are a child is unfortunately out of your hands – the law considers you to be property of your mother and father whether your birth was registered or not, if your mother and father had entered into a state of voluntary servitude, you the son or daughter as property of your mother and father were by accessio cedit principali also property of their master. This is the sole reason for the introduction of the social services; to maintain the property in good order so that it will later operate more productively for its master.

Without exception every single occurrence of a son or daughter being 'unlawfully' removed from their mother or father by the state has only been made possible because one of them has declared to a Social Services Agent either the 'child's name' or the 'parents name' or otherwise agreed to take the title of a child or parent in the first place, and thus have declared that the son or daughter is accessory property to a Crown owned estate. Once this statement has been made the mother or father has foregone all rights in determining the son or daughter's future.

But nonetheless, and despite the fact that the estate we have come to identify ourselves as has nothing to do with we as man or woman, we have come to accept as truth the notion that it does. Our minds have been conditioned; every occurrence in our lives to date has told us that we are that estate. Our mother and father told us and their mothers and fathers told them, we believe them because they believe themselves. The very first experience of the education system, when the register is taken, tells us the same thing. This process is then repeated twice daily for the entire period of our education/ indoctrination, until we leave school at 16 with absolutely no doubt in our minds as to our supposed identity. We have now been successfully trained to unwittingly volunteer for a life of slavery.

Despite the fact that use of the full legal name is much less of an issue for us when we are children, when we mature and are no longer property of our parents or their master, we are a free wo/man. But we are only a free wo/man up to that moment when we say "my name is..." without qualification. This is the moment you volunteered to be a slave. For just one brief moment, most probably on your eighteenth birthday, you were actually a free man.

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

Are you still willing to volunteer?

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

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

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

Your signature does not appear on your birth registration document or corresponding birth certificate, so it in and of itself cannot bind you to anything.

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

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

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

Remember that the court system, the police force or any other Crown agency only has jurisdiction over legal estates, titles and other crown agencies. The Crown, through its use of fictions and registry's, owns all titles to everything; the ownership of man requiring his willingness to take on a title. When the Crown or one of its many agents sends a piece of paper bearing the name to the property you are using, they are simply looking for an ego to volunteer to stand as surety for whatever fictional debt/charge is in question.

Everything the Crown can get us to volunteer to pay for, they don't have to pay for themselves. They are simply managing their own affairs, if we don't get in their way, they will settle the matter with honour. However as long as you continue to identify yourself as something belonging to another, without correcting the assumption of intent to indenture yourself in exchange for benefits and privileges, you will continue to live as an effective slave.

Lastly, for the benefit of anyone who upon waking to certain of these truths is under the illusion that the designation of Sovereign is something to aspire to; a Sovereign is still a part of the fictional realm, a Sovereign is still essentially a slave; they may be a higher ranking slave, but none the less they are still a slave. A sovereign is still bound to perform rights and duties; in fact a Sovereign is bound, in some respects, to an even greater degree. A Sovereign is still an estate and still requires a legal name in order to perform those rights and duties, and is thereby still technically the property of another. To be sovereign (free) is not the same as to experience the quality of sovereignty. The Sovereign's Way does not mean the way for man to be sovereign, it means God's Way

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

# the solution

This is the really great bit; it's incredibly simple... but not necessarily easy

To highlight your ability as a man or woman to freely exercise dominion over the earth and all things therein, and to highlight the legal systems acknowledgement of this ability, i'm going to share with you a selection of comments from Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries<sup>[38]</sup>;

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

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

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

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

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

The passages above describe the systems view of our most basic right as a man or woman - the right to property, and to set the law for ones own property. It is simply a case of doing that. The Crown may have claimed the illusion of ownership of all things through the use of titles, fictions and registry's, which they in turn own, but we as mankind have and will always retain the actual property itself, and the right to freely use whatever property we have "seized to our continued use", resulting from the right to exercise dominion over, and use the fruits of, the earth; provided of course that we don't surrender those rights by volunteering for a subordinate law form by identifying as a name/estate that belongs to another as our own.

The foundation of any system of positive law is invariably based upon the scripture of the nation's primary faith. As a Christian nation the bible is an invaluable tool for understanding how to conduct oneself in this nation's legal arena, and for that reason alone it is well worth a read. In particular i highlight the following passage:

*Matthew 6:24 No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.*

This passage was considered important enough to repeat again, word for word, at Luke 16:13. It highlights what is perhaps the most simple and clear cut choice we have as man and woman – to devote our lives to the service of others or some higher purpose, or to devote our lives to service to self through the endless striving to acquire money or accumulate wealth. When one expends energy to perform some task, there is always the same choice – do it out of love (god), or do it for the money (mammon). When one finds the courage to live in service of the right master, the rest is taken care of.

This is not some concept that requires 'public opinion' to be able to work, it is designed into the hardware of reality and includes within it the most foundational right that every wo/man has - to establish the law form that he himself chooses to live under, and to develop her soul in harmony with the laws of love. A positive law that interferes with natural law is an unenforceable law provided that we of mankind remain resolute in the application of this most sacred right, and the perspective to recognise the true relationship of ourselves to the world around is available to all.

In order to extricate oneself from the game with minimal fuss, we will all need to correct a few mistakes. Every action you have ever undertaken to this date in the public using a name that was presumed to represent a dead estate, was done without being in possession of the facts, hence it would be fair to say that we have all made a great many mistakes. If those of mankind who act for corporations from Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs to our local high street banks are mistaken in their presumption that we either are the full legal name we have consistently used or at least that we volunteer to stand as surety for that name, and if we have information now that will assist our brothers in settling matters that we were mistakenly involved with, then i am sure you will agree that an honourable wo/man would assist to the best of his ability. We must do the same. The Law of Mistake is very powerful; notwithstanding that we will always be responsible for the consequences of our actions.

In the eyes of the law, a man who sleeps on his rights has none. If we wish to have rights we must exercise them freely at all opportunities, and we must do so without first seeking the approval of others; any requirement we have for approval is an acknowledgement by us that we don't actually have those rights in the first place. Only through the continued use of our rights will we be able to establish and enforce those rights, no one else will do it for us.

It is always possible that we, the first to walk this path, may be tested to a greater degree than those that follow. It is possible that we may bear the brunt of the odd injustice as we proceed. However this has not been my experience; when you approach this process with love rather than fear, with your head held high, and with respect to others, I have found that that respect is invariably returned.

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

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

May your journey be blessed with joy and abundance.

Not that much has changed in the 11 years since i penned those words, and yet everything has changed... back then i was engaged in the business of reclaiming my soul, but was far from complete in the task, and had little idea how great the task would be - the way to be free of the rule of others AND still live in the world with others was yet to integrate in me, as it has now;

More of that particular story is shared at the link below, where i now offer an in-depth 10-week knowledge share alongside the man, Jon Little, during which we share knowledge of how you can reclaim full control over your life and affairs without the trials we had to go through to bring it to you;

For a full understanding of all layers of law for mankind, your rights as one of mankind, and how to establish and enforce your law and rights...

[LEARN](#) [MORE HERE](#)



## References

- 1 <http://ia301516.us.archive.org/0/items/treatiseoflaws00cumbuoft/treatiseoflaws00cumbuoft.pdf> ↑
- 2 <http://ia331421.us.archive.org/3/items/oflawofnatureat00pufe/oflawofnatureat00pufe.pdf>
- 3 <http://ia360630.us.archive.org/3/items/lawnationsorpri00ingrgoog/lawnationsorpri00ingrgoog.pdf> ↑
- 4 **\*The Law of Nations, Emmerich De Vattel,**  
<http://ia360630.us.archive.org/3/items/lawnationsorpri00ingrgoog/lawnationsorpri00ingrgoog.pdf> ↑
- 5 <http://ia311312.us.archive.org/2/items/naturepositivel00lighgoog/naturepositivel00lighgoog.pdf>
- 6 [http://ia700202.us.archive.org/20/items/TheNegativeSideOfPositiveLaw/3\\_positive\\_law\\_1.ps.pdf](http://ia700202.us.archive.org/20/items/TheNegativeSideOfPositiveLaw/3_positive_law_1.ps.pdf) ↑
- 7 <http://www.omega432.com/lie.html> ↑
- 8 <http://ia301537.us.archive.org/3/items/codeofhammurabi00hammrigh/codeofhammurabi00hammrigh.pdf> ↑
- 9 <http://ia311533.us.archive.org/3/items/theegoanditspla00shawuoft/theegoanditspla00shawuoft.pdf> ↑
- 10 [http://www.naturalnews.com/029286\\_rainwater\\_collection\\_water.html](http://www.naturalnews.com/029286_rainwater_collection_water.html) ↑
- 11 **Influences of Roman Law and Civil Law on the Common Law, Diana Nestorovska** ↑
- 12 [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitis\\_deminutio](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Capitis_deminutio) ↑
- 13 **\*General Theory of Law and State, by Hans Kelsen, translated by Anders Wedberg (20th Century Legal Philosophy Series: Volume I), Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1945.** ↑
- 14 **The Matrix, 1999, Wachowski Brothers** ↑
- 15 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 16 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 17 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 18 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 19 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 20 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 21 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 22 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 23 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 24 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 25 [http://www.pdavis.nl/Legis\\_07.htm](http://www.pdavis.nl/Legis_07.htm) ↑
- 26 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 27 **KJV Bible, Romans 2:11** ↑
- 28 **Commentaries on the Laws of England, Sir William Blackstone** ↑
- 29 [http://realneville.com/pdf/the\\_pruning\\_shears\\_of\\_revision.pdf](http://realneville.com/pdf/the_pruning_shears_of_revision.pdf) ↑
- 30 [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1914/59/pdfs/ukpga\\_19140059\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1914/59/pdfs/ukpga_19140059_en.pdf) ↑
- 31 <http://dailyreckoning.com/fiat-currency/> ↑
- 32 <http://www2.econ.iastate.edu/classes/econ355/choi/1925apr28a.html> ↑
- 33 **\*http://www.rayservers.com/images/ModernMoneyMechanics.pdf** ↑
- 34 **House of Commons Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, Canada** ↑
- 35 <http://www.rayservers.com/images/ModernMoneyMechanics.pdf> ↑
- 36 <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/45-46/61> ↑
- 37 **\*https://apollosolaris.files.wordpress.com/2014/05/tomschauf-topsecretbankersmanual2003\_ocr\_v-1.pdf** ↑
- 38 [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1914/59/pdfs/ukpga\\_19140059\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1914/59/pdfs/ukpga_19140059_en.pdf) ↑
- 39 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 40 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 41 **Black's Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 42 <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/1-2/12/contents> ↑
- 43 **House of Commons Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce, Canada** ↑
- 44 **Blacks Law Dictionary, Eighth Edition** ↑
- 45 **\*http://ia351409.us.archive.org/2/items/commentariesonla01blac/commentariesonla01blac.pdf**
- 46 **\*http://ia311302.us.archive.org/0/items/commentariesonla021768blac/commentariesonla021768blac.pdf**
- 47 **\*http://ia351405.us.archive.org/2/items/commentariesonla03blac/commentariesonla03blac.pdf**
- 48 **\*http://ia351430.us.archive.org/0/items/commentariesonla04blac/commentariesonla04blac.pdf** ↑
- 49 **Gate keepers are the judges and agents with responsibility for ensuring the continuance of the game. When a slave truly awakes he must be allowed to leave because positive law does not allow for involuntary servitude. The gate keepers always remain in honour and will test the slave to ensure that he is ready.** ↑

# the sovereign's way

Copyright © 2022 Greg Paul  
[www.thesovereignsaway.com](http://www.thesovereignsaway.com)