

Purging America of the Matrix.

By Thomas Clark Nelson.

A discourse, revealing the congressional stratagem of 1864, subterfuge of 1871, treason of 1913, and fraud of 1935, heretofore generally unknown or unrecognized, used to dupe, ensnare, and impress into subjection to income tax and personal jurisdiction the American People—and providing a practical remedy for individual Americans to liberate themselves personally and their society as a whole of this and other related mischief, the effects of which constitute the insidious, quasi-dystopian paradigm referred to colloquially as *the Matrix*.

October 22, 2012.

Disclaimer.

The contents hereof are not intended as legal advice, should not be inferred to be such, and are offered strictly in the spirit of education, scholarship, research, and helping one's fellow Man through the sharing of his experiences.

Re the claims, accounts, and sample documents provided herein: There is no recommendation that the reader apply any of said material to his life and no guarantee of results in the event that he does; but by the same token, there is no known falsehood within these pages.

Further, the writer hereof has never suggested that someone do what he has not done himself or would not do.

The reader should undertake a particular course of action not because it is written here, but only because of his own due diligence, verification and evaluation of pertinent facts, and realization of personal certainty in the matter under consideration.

The authors whose work is quoted herein are thanked for their diligence and scholarship. This discourse is offered free of charge and is intended for the reader's erudition as set forth above, to be adopted or rejected as the reader sees fit.

Contents.

Preface	iv
Part One: The Fable of Federal Jurisdiction	1
Part Two: Liberation from Bondage	26
Sample Correspondence	36
• Commissioner of Social Security (8 pages) Affidavit of Mailing (1 page)	
• Local Postmaster (1 page) Affidavit of Mailing (1 page)	

Preface.

As documented herein, the sole legal justification used by Federal and State authorities to compel performance (e.g., Obamacare) and restrict the liberty (e.g., USA PATRIOT ACT, National Defense Authorization Act) of ordinary Americans and exercise legislative power over their daily lives is *presumption of residence in the District of Columbia*.

Whereas, only a tiny percentage of Americans physically reside within the geographical limits of the District of Columbia, nearly all others are *construed* to reside there based on their relationship with the Government of the United States via the Social Security contract.

Strictly contractually speaking, anyone entitled to receive Social Security retirement or survivor benefits (a privilege and political right conferred by Government known as a *franchise*) is, for legal purposes, a resident of the District of Columbia and, among other things, a United States Government employee, member of the class defined as *Federal personnel*, citizen of the federal government, and so-called taxpayer, personally subject to the absolute exclusive legislative power of Congress.

For those Americans who are content with this relation and status, the within discourse will be of no interest.

For any other, however, who would prefer to overcome the prima facie evidence of legal residence in the District of Columbia, dissolve the bonds of voluntary servitude, and, *as authorized by law*, recover (1) his original standing as one of the creators¹ of the United States of America, as defined in that certain seminal instrument of creation, *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776, commonly known as the *Declaration of Independence*, (2) all unalienable Rights with which he is endowed by his Creator, among which are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness, and (3) his Right to alter or to abolish any form of Government that becomes destructive of the aforesaid ends, said discourse will be found to be of great value.

Thomas Clark Nelson.

October 22, 2012.

¹A species of American that begins disappearing from the scene February 3, 1913 (*infra*, p. 15).

Purging America of the Matrix.

By Thomas Clark Nelson.

Part One: The Fable of Federal Jurisdiction.

Let me tell you why you're here. You know something. What you know you can't explain, but you feel it. You felt it your entire life: Something is wrong with the world. You don't know what it is, but it's there. Like a splinter in your mind, driving you mad. It is this feeling that has brought you to me. Do you know what I'm talking about? (Neo: The Matrix?) Do you want to know what it is? (Neo nods.) The Matrix is everywhere. It is all around us. Even now, in this very room. You can see it when you look out your window or when you turn on your television. You can feel it when you go to work, when you go to church, when you pay your taxes. It is the world that has been pulled over your eyes to blind you from the truth. (Neo: What truth?) That you are a slave. Like everyone else, you were born into bondage, born into a prison that you cannot smell or taste or touch. A prison for your mind. Unfortunately, no one can be told what the Matrix is. You have to see it for yourself. This is your last chance. After this, there is no turning back. You take the blue pill, the story ends, you wake up in your bed and believe whatever you want to believe. You take the red pill, you stay in Wonderland, and I show you how deep the rabbit hole goes. (Interrupting as Neo starts to reach for the red pill) Remember, all I'm offering is the truth. Nothing more. . . .¹

Morpheus (circa 2000 A.D.).

What Americans know and feel is a growing sense of powerlessness over their own destiny; what they cannot explain is the seeming dictatorial legislative power of the United States Congress over their personal lives, liberty, and property, exercised with apparent disregard for, and in contravention of, *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*, *Articles of Confederation*, *Constitution for the United States of America*, and *Bill of Rights*—and executive- and judicial-branch actors in the United States Government poised and only too eager to enforce the provisions of such legislation against them.

According to the four aforementioned foundational instruments creating and advancing the United States of America, the United States Congress has **no territorial legislative power** within the territorial limits of any state of the Union and **no personal legislative power** over Americans who make their home there. Notwithstanding the indisputable veracity of this statement, executive-branch agents of the United States Government and personnel of the Internal Revenue Service (hereinafter “IRS”) can be seen running around the several states of the Union asserting and enforcing jurisdiction over the lives, liberty, and property of said Americans.

Either said executive-branch agents and IRS personnel are state-sanctioned serial lawbreakers engaged in organized crime or there is some other factor, unobserved essentially by all, that provides legal justification for such conduct.

¹*The Matrix*, directed by The Wachowski Brothers, distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, 1999.

To flush out the truth in any situation one must examine things from the beginning; *to wit*:

***Cujusque rei potissima pars principium est. The principal part of everything is the beginning.*²**

Quod prius est verius est; et quod prius est tempore potius est jure. What is first is truest; and what comes first in time, is best in law.

The principal and truest part of the United States of America is *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776; commonly known as the *Declaration of Independence*, which provides, in pertinent part:

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. That, to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the consent of the governed. That, whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. . . .

. . . We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress assembled . . . do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right, ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connexion between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that, as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes, and our sacred Honor.

Non differunt quæ concordant re, tametsi non in verbis iisdem. Those things which agree in substance, though not in the same words, do not differ.

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America—composed by some of the most brilliant legal minds in history—creates a *trust relation* between certain parties and, though not in the same words, agrees in substance with, has all the elements of, and does not differ from, what is defined as a *declaration of trust*, *trust agreement*, or *trust indenture* and, more specifically, is a species of trust known as a *voluntary trust*; *to wit*:

²*Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Maxim.” Hereinafter, italicized text in Latin followed by its underlined translation in English signifies a maxim of law, each of which, unless noted otherwise, is found in *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Maxim,” pp. 2122–2168, defined and described as follows:

MAXIM. An established principle [*see maxims immediately below*] or proposition. A principle of law universally admitted, as being a correct statement of the law, or as agreeable to natural reason. [Sir Edward] Coke defines a maxim to be “conclusion of reason,” and says . . . in another place: “A maxime is a proposition to be of all men confessed and granted without prooffe, argument, or discourse.” . . . *Black's Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

Maxime ita dicta quia maxima est ejus dignitas et certissima auctoritas, atque quod maxime omnibus probetur. A maxim is so called because its dignity is chiefest, and its authority the most certain, and because universally approved by all.

Contra negantem principia non est disputandum. There is no disputing against or denying principles. *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

trust, *n.* . . . The right . . . to the beneficial enjoyment of property to which another person holds the legal title; a property interest held by one person (the trustee) at the request of another (the settlor) for the benefit of a third party (the beneficiary). For a trust to be valid, it must involve specific property, reflect the settlor’s intent, and be created for a lawful purpose. . . .

“[A] trust involves three elements, namely, (1) a trustee, who holds the trust property and is subject to equitable duties to deal with it for the benefit of another; (2) a beneficiary, to whom the trustee owes equitable duties to deal with the trust property for his benefit; (3) trust property, which is held by the trustee for the beneficiary.” Restatement (Second) of Trusts § 2 cmt. h (1959). . . . [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Trust”]

declaration of trust. 1. The act by which the person who holds legal title to property or an estate acknowledges that the property is being held in trust for another person or for certain specified purposes. 2. The instrument that creates a trust. — Also termed (in sense 2) trust instrument; trust deed; trust agreement. [Ibid, s.v. “Declaration”]

voluntary trust. . . . 1. A trust that is not founded on consideration. • One having legal title to property may create a voluntary trust by (1) declaring that the property is to be held in trust for another, and (2) transferring the legal title to a third person who acts as trustee. 2. An obligation arising out of a personal confidence reposed in, and voluntarily accepted by, one for the benefit of another. [Ibid, s.v. “Trust”]

The elements of the voluntary trust established by *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* (hereinafter the “Declaration of Trust”) are as follows:

Name of Trust: *the United States of America*
Trustor: *the good People of these Colonies*
Protectors: *the People*
Trustees: *the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress assembled*
Property: *confederation of these United Colonies . . . Free and Independent States*
Beneficiaries: *the People*

The Trustor.

The Trustor, *the good People of these Colonies*, acting in collective sovereign capacity as a *real and natural corporation*—not in capacity of individual men and women—successor sovereign to King George III of England, is the trustor/donor/creator/grantor/settlor of the Trust; *to wit*:

[John] Locke, for example, in two critical passages used analogies of incorporation to explain the origin of government:

When any number of men have so consented to make one community . . . *they are thereby presently incorporated, and make one body politic*, wherein the majority have a right to act and conclude [*sic*] the rest. For when any number of men have, by the consent of every individual, made a community, they have thereby made that community one body with a power to act as one body, which is only by the will and determination of the majority.³

. . . That which makes the community, and brings men out of the loose state of nature, into one politic society, is the agreement which every one has with the rest *to incorporate and act as one body, and so be one distinct commonwealth.*⁴

³John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* 52 (ch. vii §§ 95, 96), ed. C.B. Macpherson (Hackett Publishing Co., 1980), quoted in Eric Enlow, *The Corporate Conception of the State and the Origins of Limited Constitutional Government*, Washington University Journal of Law & Policy (2001), 23 [Emphasis in Enlow.].

⁴Ibid at 107 (ch. xix §211) [Emphasis in Enlow.].

This “agreement . . . to incorporate” created a corporate body with rights of self-determination. The corporation of the people, in turn, acted to create government; that is, no government was required to create this corporation, but rather, the people exercised their inherent right to incorporate themselves. These corporate ideas, borrowed from canon law, are the foundation of the American theory of popular sovereignty to which this Article now turns.

The view that the people are separate, superior, and antecedent to government requires that they be self-incorporating. This idea was present in America before the American Revolution. The Pilgrims on board the Mayflower announced that even without a state to incorporate them they could, in the presence of God and one another, covenant and combine to form a “civil body politic.”⁵ Comparing church and state, the Pilgrims reasoned that just as they had the right to form a congregation, they also had the right to form a state: “A visible Church under the Gospel [is] as spiritual body politike . . . [formed] by a free mutuall consent of Believers joyning and covenanting to live as members of a society . . . by such consent . . . all Civill perfect Corporations [i.e., states] did first beginne.”⁶ [sic]

Following the Pilgrims’ example, in 1647 the colonists of Rhode Island erected themselves into a corporation by their own act: “Wee do jointly agree to incorporate ourselves and soe to remain a Body politicke . . . and do declare to own ourselves and one another to be Members of the same body, and to have right to the Freedom and priviligés thereof.”⁷ [sic] Thus, the precedent was established that the corporation of the people is created not by act of the state but by the self-acting power of properly assembled individuals giving themselves a corporate capacity. Likewise, after the American Revolution, the leaders of New Hampshire urged all towns “forthwith [to] incorporate themselves” so that in the absence of Crown authority “the people” might not slip into anarchy but “*ma[k]e a stand at the first legal stage, viz. their town incorporations.*”⁸

A decisive moment in American constitutionalism came when the former colonists decided that the people, acting through their own initiative by convention, outside of an established legislature, could form “a body corporate and politic in name and fact.”⁹ The contract principles based on an agreement between ruler and those ruled served the English Constitution in Magna Charta but could not provide a foundation for the creation of the “American People.”¹⁰ No government yet existed. As Thomas Paine stated: “To suppose that any government can be a party in a compact with the whole people, is to suppose it to have existence before it can have a right to exist.”¹¹ Instead, the people had to incorporate before they could take steps towards forming the new government.

Accordingly, early American minds fastened on the corporatist ideas of John Locke, who advocated replacing a contract between ruler and those ruled with the idea of the people as a self-incorporating entity.¹² This self-formation of the people as a corporation “seemed to make sense of their rapidly developing idea of a constitution as a fundamental law designed by the people to be separate from and controlling of all the institutions of government.”¹³ Moving the fundamental source of authority from the government to the people allowed the development of a law that would be superior to government and thus capable of limiting government. . . .

The particular powers of the United States Congress were not derived from its identity with the people, like Parliament’s powers, but delegated according to its charter from the people. Thus, America transformed the doctrine of popular sovereignty from one that delivered omnipotence to the government to one that restrained the government.

⁵H. Hoepfl & M. Thompson, *The History of Compact as a Motif in Political Thought*, 84 *Am. Hist. Rev.* 919, 938 (1979), quoted in Enlow, *Ibid.*

⁶*Ibid.*

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸Gordon S. Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic 1776-1787*, 330 (1969), quoted in Enlow, 24 [Emphasis in Enlow.].

⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁰*Ibid.*

¹¹Thomas Paine, *Rights of Man* 210, ed. Henry Collins, 1969, quoted in Enlow, 24.

¹²Wood, *supra* n. 10, at 283, cited in Enlow, 25.

¹³*Ibid.*

. . . Common law conceives of the government as a legal corporation and places it thereby firmly under the law. The canon law, by contrast, conceives of the people as a self-incorporating body and, thereby, treats the people as an entity antecedent and superior to government. These two corporate conceptions combine in the United States Constitution to create a government twice limited, once by its own merely legal nature and once by the people's prior existence.

. . . On the other hand, the fact that the Framers treated the people as a natural corporation and the government as an artificial legal corporation is surely significant, even if not a logical necessity. In fact, precisely because the differentiation is not a requirement of logic, it emphasizes the deliberate nature of the Framers' choice. To maintain the Framers' vision, the government's artificial legal existence must always be distinguished from the people's real and natural existence.

. . . Similarly, the conception of the people as a corporation renders a great service if only in reminding us that the government is not ultimate, natural, or instituted for any purpose beyond the needs of the people.¹⁴

Wherefore, following bequest to the Trust (*the United States of America*) and care of the Trustees, *the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress assembled (hereinafter the "Congress")*, of legal title to the Trust Property, i.e., the confederation of *these United Colonies . . . Free and Independent States (hereinafter the "Confederation")*—not the geographical territory of said States—the Trustor (real and natural sovereign corporation known as *the good People of these Colonies*) retains no rights in the Trust Property and has no duty to manage the Trust Property or operate the Trust (*the United States of America*) in behalf of the Beneficiaries (*the People*).

The Protectors.¹⁵

Whereas, the Declaration of Trust appoints *the People* as Protectors and charges them with ultimate security of the Trust (*the United States of America*)—*to wit*: “whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it”—the Declaration of Trust also identifies the selfsame parties, *the People*, as the Beneficiaries of the Trust by disclosing that any new Government that the Trust Protectors may institute is solely for their benefit—*to wit*: “and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.” Further, whereas the Trustor, *the good People of these Colonies*, acts in collective capacity as a real and natural sovereign corporation, the Trust Protectors (and Trust Beneficiaries), *the People*, rather act in individual capacity as men and women, as determined strictly by use of the plural pronouns *them* and *their, supra*. *The People*, as Trust Protectors, have the Right to alter or to abolish, summarily and without litigation or recourse, any *form of Government* (Trusteeship) that *the People*, in their sole discretion, determine is destructive of the stated ends of the Trust, including removal of delinquent Trustees (members of *Congress*) for violation of the Declaration of Trust, and institute new Government as they see fit.

The Trustees.

The Trustees, *Congress*, are responsible to operate the Trust (*the United States of America*) and have the duty to manage/administer the Trust Property, i.e., the *Confederation*, in good faith, in accordance with and fidelity to the letter and spirit of the Declaration of Trust, *The unanimous*

¹⁴Enlow, 23–27 [Emphasis in Enlow].

¹⁵[A] person appointed by the Grantor to oversee the Trust functions, and who has the right to fire Trustees for violation of said Indenture. . . . The Beneficiaries' first recourse is with the Protector. . . . [who] stands between the Trust and a court of law, since he or she has the power to resolve issues without litigation. Charles Arthur, *The Art of Passing the Buck: Vol. One: The Secrets of Wills and Trusts*, (Woodland Hills, Calif.: Charles Arthur Enterprises, 2007), 146.

Declaration of the thirteen united States of America; namely to secure for the Beneficiaries, *the People* (of the *Free and Independent States* of the *Confederation*) all of the unalienable Rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator—among which are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—and to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, and establish Commerce against or with any emperor, king, prince, foreign power, or other third party, and to do any and all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do, in the name of the Trust (*the United States of America*), in behalf of the Beneficiaries (*the People*), in order to secure these ends.

Invoking the protection of divine Providence, the Trustees (*Congress*) mutually pledge to each other, unanimously in individual capacity as co-Trustees, their Lives, Fortunes, and sacred Honor for the support of the Declaration of Trust (*The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*).

The Property.

Ex diuturnitate temporis, amnia praesumuntur solemniter esse acta. From length of time, all things are presumed to have been done in due form.

Notwithstanding that the Declaration of Trust neither recites nor provides evidence of legal title to the Trust Property—i.e., the *Confederation*, not the geographical property, of *these United Colonies . . . Free and Independent States*—in the name of the Trustor (*the good People of these Colonies*), the Trustees nevertheless make oath and solemnly publish and declare “in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies” that title to said (intangible) Property is rightly transferred to, and held by, the Trustees free and clear of any third-party claim or encumbrance of owed Allegiance or political connexion, which publication and declaration, in the fullness of time, is borne out by the fact of cessation of all third-party demands and counterclaims re legal title to the Trust Property, quieted, ultimately, by treaty, and so, appears to have been done in due form.

The Beneficiaries.

[A]t the Revolution, the sovereignty devolved on the people, and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects . . . and have none to govern but themselves . . .¹⁶

The Declaration of Trust, *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*, drawing substantially from the writings of John Locke, breaks from earlier paradigms of “Government as master” and sets forth the prototype of “Government as servant” and expressly charges the Trustees, *Congress*, with the purpose and duty of securing for the Beneficiaries (*the People*), i.e., those Americans who make their home in one of the Free and Independent States of the *Confederation*, all unalienable Rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator, among which are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness. As of culmination of the Revolution, the Beneficiaries (*the People*) of the Trust (*the United States of America*) enjoy lives free of interference from the Trustees (*Congress*), whose sole duty is to secure the aforesaid unalienable Rights in behalf of said Beneficiaries in perpetuity.

¹⁶*Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 U.S. (2 Dall.) 419, 472 (1793).

“The governed.”

territorial jurisdiction. . . . Jurisdiction over cases arising in or involving persons residing within a defined territory. . . .¹⁷

forum . . . 2 a : a judicial body or assembly . . . b : the territorial jurisdiction of a court forum before personal jurisdiction may be exercised — National Law Journal¹⁸

To secure said unalienable Rights for *the People* (Beneficiaries), *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* (Declaration of Trust) institutes a novel species of government (Trusteeship) in which the powers thereof are neither divinely ordained nor imposed by force of arms, but derived from the consent (voluntary agreement) of *the governed*.

As of July 4, 1776, the Trust (*the United States of America*) has only intangible Property, the *Confederation* (the 13 *Free and Independent States* are free and independent), no defined territory over which *Congress* can exercise territorial legislative power (rule), and therefore no residents over whom *Congress* can exercise personal legislative power (govern) in their efforts to secure for *the People* (the Beneficiaries) of the respective states of the *Confederation*, the ends with which they are charged by *the good People of these Colonies* (Trustor) via *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* (Declaration of Trust).

Following the Revolution and as of advent of the *Constitution for the United States of America* March 4, 1789 (hereinafter the “*Constitution*”), as confirmed in the Second Article of Amendment thereto and the above-cited 1793 Supreme Court case (*supra*, n. 16), the Americans living within the geographical limits of one of the several states of the Union are self-protecting, self-governing sovereigns who, in collective capacity, are constituent members of the real and natural sovereign corporation and Trustor known as *the good People of these Colonies*; and, in individual capacity, Trust Protectors known as *the People*, who, in alternate role as Beneficiaries, enjoy Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness under common law without interference from their servants (such as *Congress*) in Government.

Upon establishment of the District of territory comprising the seat of the Government of the United States, later known as the District of Columbia,¹⁹ as provided in Article 1 § 8(17) of the *Constitution*, the Trust acquires, for the first time in history:

- Defined territory (geographical property by the name of the District of Columbia) over which *Congress* exercise absolute exclusive legislative power (rule); and
- Residents (denizens of District of Columbia) over whom *Congress* exercise absolute exclusive personal legislative power (govern) via the consent of said residents.

As of February 21, 1871 (*infra*, p. 20), when a particular American takes up residence in the defined territory (e.g., District of Columbia) of the Trust he agrees to relinquish the guarantee of unalienable Rights theretofore enjoyed by him as a Trust Beneficiary (one of *the People*), abdicates standing as a Protector of the Trust, and joins the ranks of *the governed*, i.e., those Americans who have forgone their innate sovereignty and placed themselves under the absolute exclusive personal legislative power of *Congress*.

¹⁷*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Jurisdiction.”

¹⁸*Merriam-Webster’s Dictionary of Law*, 1996 ed., s.v. “Forum.”

¹⁹Congressional provision for “a district of territory . . . for the permanent seat of the government of the United States” appears in the Act of July 16, 1790 (1 Stat. 130) and is referred to unofficially as the Territory of Columbia; later given the official name District of Columbia as of the Act of May 6, 1796 (1 Stat. 461).

Two species of legislative power.

The totality of the legislative power of *Congress* (the Trustees) is set forth in Articles 1 § 8 and 4 § 3(2) of the *Constitution*. In an 1821 case the Supreme Court reveals that all said legislative powers are properly categorized into two distinct species; *to wit*:

It is clear that Congress, as a legislative body, exercise two species of legislative power: the one limited as to its objects, but extending all over the Union: the other, an absolute exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia. . . .²⁰

The species of legislative power “limited as to its objects, but extending all over the Union” is known as *subject-matter jurisdiction*; the other, “an absolute exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia,” is plenary²¹ and includes, in addition to subject-matter jurisdiction, *territorial* and *personal jurisdiction*; *to wit*:

JURISDICTION . . . Power of governing or legislating. . . . *Jurisdiction*, in its most general sense, is the power to make, declare, or apply the law . . . *Jurisdiction* is limited to place or territory, persons, or to particular subjects. . . . [*Webster’s Dictionary*, 1828 ed., s.v. “Jurisdiction”]

The *Constitution* authorizes *Congress* to exercise absolute exclusive legislative power over the District of Columbia in Articles 1 § 8(17) and 4 § 3(2) thereof, which provide, respectively and in pertinent part:

The Congress shall have Power . . . To exercise exclusive Legislation . . . over such District . . . as may . . . become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and . . . like Authority over all Places purchased . . . for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; . . .

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; . . .

Articles 1 § 8(17) and 4 § 3(2) of the *Constitution* maintain fidelity to, and are in keeping with, the letter and spirit of *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* (Declaration of Trust) and so, are lawful.

Whereas, *Congress* (the Trustees) have no legislative power or jurisdiction over any of the geographical property of the several states of the Union or *the People* (Trust Beneficiaries) who live there, there is nothing prohibiting a particular Union-state man or woman from taking up residence in the defined territory owned by *the United States of America* (the Trust), such as the District of Columbia, and voluntarily rendering himself (1) personally subject to the absolute exclusive legislative power of *Congress*, (2) bereft of the guarantee of the God-given unalienable Rights enshrined in *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* (Declaration of Trust), (3) a member of that class of former Trust Protectors/Beneficiaries who give their consent for the United States Government (Trusteeship) to exercise absolute legislative, executive, and judicial power over their life, liberty, and property in exchange for, evidently, civil rights, protection, and care for their welfare, and (4) one of *the governed*.

Nearly all non-insiders labor under the belief that the constitutional authority for income tax and enactment of the Internal Revenue Code (hereinafter “IRC”) is Article 1 § 8(1), based solely on mention of the word “taxes” therein—to the exclusion of the other constitutional authority for Congress to lay and collect taxes, the territorial clause, Article 4 § 3(2); each of which provides, respectively and in pertinent part:

²⁰*Cohens v. Virginia*, 19 U.S. 264, 6 Wheat. 265, 5 L.Ed. 257 (1821).

²¹*plenary jurisdiction*. . . . A court’s full and absolute power over the subject matter and the parties in a case. *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Jurisdiction.”

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises . . .

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; . . .

The former, Article 1 § 8(1), authorizes *Congress* to exercise legislative power over the subject matter specified therein throughout the several states of the Union. Per the two species of legislative power of *Congress* identified in *Cohens* (*supra*, n. 20), this clause cannot be the constitutional authority for income tax because prosecution of criminal charges in income-tax matters requires *personal* jurisdiction, and Article 1 § 8(1) authorizes exercise of no such power.

The latter, Article 4 § 3(2), authorizes *Congress* to exercise absolute (territorial, personal, and subject-matter) legislative power, but only in the territory/places/property belonging to the United States, such as the District of Columbia.

Irrespective of the veracity of the above observations, in his landmark monograph *Why the Citizens of the Several States of the Union Are Not Generally Liable for the Federal Income Tax*, legal scholar Timothy McCrory demonstrates beyond sufficiency that the constitutional authority for income tax is Article 4 § 3(2), not Article 1 § 8(1). As summarized by McCrory therein:

One should also be fully aware that when Congress lays and collects taxes pursuant to Article 1 § 8(1), Congress is acting in its capacity as a national legislative body, is bound by the Constitution, and has limited, delegated powers. When Congress lays and collects taxes pursuant to Article 4 § 3(2), it is acting as a quasi-state legislature with plenary powers, which are granted by that constitutional clause, over its territory and other property . . . [and] can pass any law that is not repugnant to the Constitution. So there are two different constitutional authorities to lay and collect taxes and those two different authorities provide two totally different sets of rules Congress can use in laying and collecting taxes. Because few Americans are aware of these two different constitutional authorities and two different sets of rules, many Citizens who make arguments against the Federal income tax are making arguments that would apply if it were an Article 1 § 8(1) tax while IRS authorities, the United States courts, and Department of Justice personnel fully realize and understand that the Federal income tax is pursuant to Article 4 § 3(2). While those Citizens' arguments might be correct if applied to a direct tax laid and collected under the constitutional authority of Article 1 § 8(1), those arguments are in error because the constitutional authority they believe is being relied upon for the tax is in error.²²

All Matrix insiders know that Article 4 § 3(2)—not Article 1 § 8(1)—is the constitutional authority for income tax, but have no duty to disabuse uninitiated litigants of their defective premise—which explains said litigants' unmatched legacy of failure in income-tax cases.

Why nearly every American is one of the governed and no longer a Trust Protector or Beneficiary.

Anyone entitled to receive Social Security retirement or survivor benefits, a *franchise*,²³ abdicates his position as Trust Protector/Beneficiary and becomes (1) a member of the class defined as *Federal personnel* and United States Government employee,²⁴ (2) a so-called *individual*²⁵ and

²²Timothy McCrory, *Why the Citizens of the Several States of the Union Are Not Generally Liable for the Federal Income Tax* (Blackwell, Okla.: Self-published, 2007), 41.

²³FRANCHISE. A special privilege conferred by government upon an individual or corporation, and which does not belong to the citizens of the country generally. . . . In a popular sense, the political rights of subjects and citizens are franchises. . . . [Emphasis added] *Black's Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. "Franchise."

²⁴the term "Federal personnel" means . . . individuals entitled to receive immediate or deferred retirement benefits under any retirement program of the Government of the United States (including survivor benefits). [Emphasis added.] United States Code Title 5 *Government Organization and Employees* § 552a(a)(13).

²⁵the term "individual" means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence . . . [Emphasis added.] *Ibid*, § 552a(a)(2).

citizen of the United States,²⁶ (3) a so-called *person*,²⁷ with political and civil rights conferred by Congress (*supra*, n. 23), (4) a legal resident of the District of Columbia, DBA United States®,²⁸ and the subject of all legislation therein,²⁹ (5) a citizen of the federal government,³⁰ and (6) a taxpayer³¹ liable to income tax³² and, by definition, one of *the governed*.

Liberation occurs upon one's presentation of proof that his apparent consent in the Social Security contract was given and obtained through his *mistake*, based on, among other things, misrepresentation and willful concealment of material risks, duties, and facts³³ by officers, employees, and elected officials of the United States, rendering impossible a meeting of the minds (mutual agreement and assent of parties to substance and terms of contract), thus constituting sufficient grounds for unilateral extinguishment of the Social Security contract by rescission, as authorized by law.

Principal part of Social Security Act is income tax.

***Unumquodque est id quod est principalius in ipso.
That which is the principal part of a thing is the
thing itself.***

People have been carted off to jail screaming "Show me the law!" (that makes them liable to income tax). If they had read the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935, they would have discovered that they "volunteered" to pay income tax upon acceptance and execution of the Social Security franchise and contract; *to wit, in pertinent part*:

In addition to other taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of the wages received by him . . . [n. 32, *infra*]

Whereas, Social Security is a "retirement program" wherein a franchisee contributes 6.2% of his paycheck (12.4% if he works on his own) in payroll tax for the retirement of third parties unknown to him and 0.0% for his own personal retirement, he is liable for as much as 35% of his earnings in Federal income tax (plus income tax in most States). Wherefore, the principal part of the Act of August 14, 1935, is liability for income tax, not payroll tax, and the Act is misnamed; the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935, is rather the *Income Tax Act* of the same date.

²⁶The United States is located in the District of Columbia. Uniform Commercial Code § 9-307(h).

²⁷"person" includes an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or public or private organization other than an agency; . . . [Emphasis added.] [United States Code Title 5 § 551(2)]

²⁸United States Department of Commerce Census Bureau form entitled "United States® Census 2010."

²⁹*And be it further enacted*, That the legislative power of the District shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation within said District . . . [U/L emphasis added.] Ch. 62, Sec. 18, 16 Stat. 419, February 21, 1871.

³⁰A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government . . . *Kitchens v. Steele*, D.C.W.D. Mo., 112 F.Supp. 383 (1953).

³¹The following case comes nine years after the 16th Amendment and "taxes on incomes"; *to wit*:

The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws. [Emphasis added.] *Long v. Rasmussen*, [9 Cir.] D.C.Mont. 1922, 281 F. 236.

³²In addition to other taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of the wages received by him . . . [Emphasis added.] Social Security Act of August 14, 1935 [H. R. 7260], § 801 *Income tax on employees*.

Slater's protestations to the effect that he derives no benefit from the United States government have no bearing on his legal obligation to pay income taxes. . . . Unless the defendant can establish that he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS possesses authority to attempt to determine his federal tax liability. [Emphasis added.] *United States v. Slater* (D. Delaware, 1982), 545 F.Supp. 179, 182.

³³Detailed with particularity in the sample instrument to Commissioner of Social Security, *infra*, p. 36.

Disparata non debent jungi. Dissimilar things ought not to be joined.

This writer posits that the entire Social Security Act—whose so-called retirement program is administered at no cost or risk to the United States Government—is conceived, composed, and enacted to establish a political vehicle (franchise) whereby *the People* of the several states of the Union can be duped into assuming, unwittingly, liability for income tax, an element unrelated to the advertised purpose of Social Security and matters of retirement and Social Security benefits.

For more than one reason (*infra*), the Social Security Act of August 14, 1935, is the type of fraud known as “fraud in the inducement”; *to wit, in pertinent part*:

fraud in the inducement. Fraud occurring when a misrepresentation leads another to enter into a transaction with a false impression of the risks, duties, or obligations involved; an intentional misrepresentation of a material risk or duty reasonably relied on, thereby injuring the other party without vitiating [³⁴] the contract itself . . . [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Fraud”]

Social Security Ponzi scheme.

We know that “Those things which agree in substance, though not in the same words, do not differ” (maxim of law, *supra*, p. 2). The so-called Social Security retirement program agrees in substance with, and does not differ from, what is defined as a *Ponzi scheme*; *to wit*:

Ponzi scheme. . . . A fraudulent investment scheme in which money contributed by later investors generates artificially high dividends for the original investors, whose example attracts even larger investments. • Money from the new investors is used directly to repay or pay interest to old investors, usu. without any operation or revenue-producing activity other than the continual raising of new funds. . . . [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., s.v. “Ponzi scheme”]

The basis of all Social Security revenue is the labor of Social Security payroll taxpayers, “new investors.” Retirees and survivors (hereinafter collectively “R&S”) entitled to benefits are “old investors.” In other words, current workers (new investors) contribute benefits (dividends) to R&S (old investors) and, since 1957, the disabled. As of 2012 there are 2.9 workers supporting each R&S and disabled; the projection for 2036 is 2.1, a 24% decrease over 24 years.

All surplus payroll taxes are invested daily in *special-issue Treasury securities*—a kind of IOU that can be redeemed for cash at any time—from the Department of the Treasury, who get and spend the cash at present value, before further devaluation from inflation; the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and Disability Insurance Trust Fund get IOUs.

As of 1937 (advent of Social Security benefits), most Americans are current workers (new investors) and benefits require only 0.13% of revenue. In 1957, 20 years later, the increase in R&S requires benefits totaling 104% of revenue, an 8,000% increase. By law, Social Security is prohibited from paying out more than it has, so trust-fund IOUs are redeemed to cover the 4%.

Scheduled benefits are projected to exceed revenue by 2019, requiring redemption of more IOUs, which are projected to be exhausted by 2049 due to retirement of Baby Boomers (surge of American babies born between 1946 and 1964): a reasonable population anomaly/variable for which there is no provision in original Social Security proposals or legislation. [Source of foregoing data, statistics, and projections: www.ssa.gov]

President George W. Bush casually discloses what *Congress* will not: The earlier generation (R&S) is 100% dependent on contributions (“investments”) from the later generation (current

³⁴*vitiate* . . . to make ineffective either wholly or in part : destroy the validity or force of (as an instrument or transaction) : INVALIDATE <fraud vitiates a contract> *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Vitiate.”

workers), who, in turn, are 100% dependent on future contributions from the next generation (new immigrants, children yet to enter the workforce, and the unborn); *to wit*:

At a rally in North Carolina last month, the president said, “Some of you probably think there is a kind of bank, a Social Security trust bank.” In fact, Bush said, “there are empty promises, but there’s no pile of money that you thought was there when you retired. That’s not the way the system works.”

It is a fact, he said, that each individual does not have a segment of the Social Security trust fund reserved in his or her name. . . .

Each generation of workers pays payroll taxes to support retirees and the disabled in return for the expectation that the next generation will support them when they retire. [*Los Angeles Times*, “Real Bonds, and Worries, Draw Interest,” March 6, 2005]

Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts says the same thing in fewer words; *to wit*:

Calling Social Security a “sacred compact between generations,” Kerry repeated his charge . . . [*Los Angeles Times*, “Social Security checks to increase next year,” October 20, 2004]

Income tax pays interest on the national debt,³⁵ a joint liability of residents of the District of Columbia: *co-debtors*. Payroll taxes pay benefits to R&S co-debtors (old investors) and disabled, a joint liability of *co-debtors still working* (new investors), and acts as a (1) reward to *R&S co-debtors* for paying their “fair share” of interest on the national debt over their lifetime, (2) incentive for *co-debtors still working*, and (3) attraction for new Social Security applicants.

A more likely reason Texas Governor Rick Perry “decided” to drop out of the race for the 2012 Republican presidential nomination is his opinion of Social Security; *to wit*:

Campaigning in Corona del Mar, Perry . . . attacked Social Security as an unsustainable “Ponzi scheme” and “monstrous lie” to younger Americans counting on its benefits. . . . [*Los Angeles Times*, “GOP rivals still clashing over Social Security,” September 8, 2011, A17]

The Social Security franchise is a species of contract called a *conditional contract*; specifically, an *assessment contract*—and “contributions” are *taxes*. When collections of payroll taxes are insufficient to support retirees, the Ponzi scheme is insolvent and nobody has any recourse; *to wit*:

—assessment contract. One wherein the payment of the benefit is in any manner or degree dependent on the collection of an assessment levied on persons holding similar contracts. [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Assessment”]

To engraft upon the Social Security system a concept of “accrued property rights” would deprive it of the flexibility and boldness in adjustment to ever-changing conditions which it demands. [*Fleming v. Nestor*, 363 U.S. 603 (1960)]

Participation in Social Security is a tacit confession that one is unable to care for himself and requires *Congress* to provide/arrange for his welfare—and the fact of acceptance of the franchise (political right) of entitlement to receive Social Security benefits alone, that (1) establishes one’s legal residence in the District of Columbia, no matter where in the world he may live, work, or travel, (2) constitutes his apparent consent for *Congress* to exercise absolute legislative power over his life, liberty, and property as a citizen of the federal government and United States, and (3) signifies that he is bereft of constitutional guarantee of all God-given unalienable Rights, supplanted by civil rights and political duties, as conferred and dictated by *Congress*.

Social Security payroll taxes are classified as *contributions* (Federal Insurance Contributions Act, FICA) because the private Federal Reserve, as creditor, requires the United States Government, its debtor, to reward those retiring taxpayers (co-debtors, old investors) who have

³⁵National debt. The money owing by government . . . the interest of which is paid out of the taxes raised by the whole of the public (i.e., out of general revenues). *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 5th ed., s.v. “National debt.”

supported the Federal Reserve System over their lifetime—by paying, in the form of income tax, their “fair share” of interest on the national debt—with retirement benefits (“dividends,” derived from Social Security payroll taxes contributed by current workers, new investors); *to wit*:

CONTRIBUTION. In common law. The sharing of a loss or payment among several. The act of any one or several of a number of co-debtors, co-sureties, etc., in reimbursing one of their number who has paid the whole debt or suffered the whole liability, each to the extent of his proportionate share. . . . [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Contribution”]

contribution. . . . The right that gives one of several persons who are liable on a common debt the ability to recover ratably from each of the others when that one person discharges the debt for the benefit of all. . . . [*Ibid*, 7th ed.]

Contribution. . . . When one of several debtors pays a debt, the creditor is bound in conscience, if not by contract, to give to the party paying the debt all his remedies against the other debtors. [*Ibid*, 6th ed.]

The Social Security paradigm is the same today as in 1937; *to wit*: “Later investors” (current workers) contribute “artificially high dividends” (unsustainable levels of benefits) to “original investors” (R&S plus, since 1957, the disabled) “without any operation or revenue-producing activity other than the continual raising of new funds” (continual recruitment of new Social Security account holders from the ranks of newborns, children, and immigrants, who start contributing payroll taxes upon entering the workforce).

Today, multiple current workers support one R&S/disabled, a ratio that is gradually leveling off; meaning that today’s R&S (old investors) are receiving *artificially high dividends* and current workers (new investors)—who retain no accrued property rights to their payroll taxes/contributions—ultimately end up with nothing but empty promises, a textbook Ponzi scheme. Payroll taxpayers who are okay with these facts need not be concerned.

If one would prefer, however, to reclaim his innate standing and rejoin *the People* as one of the Protectors and Beneficiaries of the Trust, *the United States of America*, he need merely dissolve/extinguish, as authorized by law, the contract that fixes his legal residence in the District of Columbia and binds him as one of *the governed*.

Congressional stratagem and linchpin³⁶ of the Matrix.

Whereas, a *word* is a sound or combination of sounds that symbolizes and communicates a meaning, a *term* is rather a word or group of words, especially a technical word or expression, with a restricted, precisely limited meaning; *to wit*:

word . . . a meaningful sound or combination of sounds that is a unit of language or its representation in a text . . . [*Encarta World English Dictionary*, 1999 ed., s.v. “Word”]

term . . . a particular word or combination of words, especially one used to mean something very specific or one used in a specialized area of knowledge or work . . . [*Ibid*, s.v. “Term”]

When a *word*, as found in the dictionary, is given a specific meaning within a particular context or specialized area of knowledge, its ordinary definition is moot and, as a *term*, no longer means what the dictionary says, only what the restricted definition provides.

**Ex facto jus oritur. The law arises out of the fact;
that is, its application must be to facts.**³⁷

³⁶linchpin . . . a pin inserted in the axletree outside of the wheel to prevent the latter from slipping off . . . something that serves to hold together the elements of a situation *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Linchpin.”

³⁷*Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

Sicut natura nil facit per saltum, ita nec lex. As nature does nothing by a bound or leap, so neither does the law.

Nil tamere novandum. Nothing should be rashly changed.

Proprietates verborum observerandæ sunt. The proprieties of words (i. e. proper meanings of words) are to be observed.

Verba ita sunt intelligenda, ut res magis valeat quam pereat. Words are to be so understood that the subject-matter may be preserved rather than destroyed.

Uno absurdo dato, infinita sequuntur. One absurdity being allowed, an infinity follow.

Congress, on June 30, 1864, under cover of full-scale military conflict, for no discernible reason, and in express contravention and defiance of certain cardinal rules of statutory construction and interpretation, *infra*, strip the word “state” of its ordinary and popular meaning, as understood by all Americans and used in all legislative instruments ever since July 4, 1776, by converting it into a specialized term and defining it to mean the same thing as its constitutional and statutory opposite, i.e., Trust Property, namely the territories and District of Columbia, and shortly thereafter revise said new term to “State” (and “territories” to “Territories”)—an absurdity still used to this day against *the People* (of the several states of the Union) as prima facie evidence of residence in the District of Columbia, i.e., a “State,” a lexical artifice that violates both letter and spirit of the *Constitution*; *to wit, respectively and in pertinent part*:

The words of a statute are to be construed with reference to its subject matter. If they are susceptible to several meanings, that one is to be adopted that best accords with the subject to which the statute relates. . . .³⁸

The words of a statute are to be taken in their ordinary and popular meaning, unless they are technical terms or words of art, in which case they are to be understood in their technical sense. . . .³⁹

SEC. 182. *And be it further enacted*, That wherever the word state is used in this act it shall be construed to include the territories and the District of Columbia . . .⁴⁰

SEC. 3140. The word “State,” when used in this Title, shall be construed to include the Territories and the District of Columbia . . .⁴¹

The rule of statutory interpretation that determines the full extent of the meaning of “State” as defined in Section 3140, *supra*, reveals that said definition is exhaustive as given and means only what is provided therein—that associated group of properties other than Places purchased for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings, over which Congress exercise exclusive territorial jurisdiction—and is known as *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* (“the inclusion of the one is the exclusion of the other”); *to wit, in pertinent part*:

³⁸Henry Campbell Black, *Handbook on the Construction and Interpretation of the Laws* (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1896), § 56, 125.

³⁹*Ibid.*, § 57, 128.

⁴⁰“An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government, to pay Interest on the Public Debt, and for other Purposes,” Ch. 173, Sec. 182, 13 Stat. 223, 306, June 30, 1864.

⁴¹*Revised Statutes of the United States, Passed at the First Session of the Forty-third Congress, 1873–’74*, Title XXXV, Internal Revenue, Ch. 1, Officers of Internal Revenue, p. 601, approved retroactively as of the Act of March 2, 1877, amended and approved as of the Act of March 9, 1878.

§ 47:23 Expressio unius est exclusio alterius

As the maxim is applied to statutory interpretation, where . . . the persons or things to which it refers are designated, there is an inference that all omissions should be understood as exclusions. The maxim does not apply to every statutory listing or grouping. It has force only when the items expressed are members of an associated group or series, justifying the inference that the items not mentioned were excluded by deliberate choice.⁴² [Emphasis added.]

Congress embark on a policy of fraud, deceit, theft, and violence (organized crime) against the People.

Fraus est celare fraudem. It is a fraud to conceal a fraud.

Once a fraud, always a fraud.⁴³

The greatest torrent of statutory, fiscal, and legal chaos, contention, and controversy in American history, unleashed a century ago, February 3, 1913, in the wake of the Sixteenth Article of Amendment to the *Constitution* and still raging to this day, is reduced to *much ado about nothing* upon application of the meaning of the statutory term *Congress* define 49 years earlier as “state” and revise as of 10 years thence to “State”; *to wit*:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

Whereas, the express, solitary object of the 16th Amendment is taxes on incomes in the so-called several States, i.e., the Territories and the District of Columbia, the proper legislative act is a federal rule or regulation under authority of the territorial clause, Article 4 § 3(2) (*supra*, p. 9), not a constitutional amendment per se, which is legally inapposite and therefore fraudulent.

Further, were the 16th Amendment not to read “several States” but “several States of the Union,” such language would expressly contravene the letter of the *Constitution* and require its immediate annulment. As written, the 16th Amendment conceals that “States” no longer means the several states of the Union, only the Territories and the District of Columbia.

Wherefore, as of the Sixteenth Article of Amendment to the *Constitution*, *Congress* officially abjure their fiduciary responsibilities as Trustees under the Declaration of Trust and set about to defraud, deceive, and extort/incarcerate *the People* of the several states of the Union, the very Trust Beneficiaries whom they are sworn to serve, in behalf of foreign bankers.

Since converting the word “state,” and shortly thereafter “State,” into a term, each and every subsequent controlling definition thereof in congressional statutes comprehends only the District of Columbia and certain of the Territories, to the exclusion of the several states of the Union.

Notwithstanding *Congress*’ alchemical transmutation of Territories-into-States in the *Revised Statutes*, all subsequent enactments rather infer that Territories are not States; *e.g.*:

The term “United States” means only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia; . . . [Ch. 463, Sec. 200, 39 Stat. 756, September 8, 1916]

Whereas, in 1916, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and the District of Columbia are all States⁴⁴ of the United States per definition [Ibid, Sec. 15], it is misleading to enumerate all three

⁴²Norman J. Singer and J.D. Shambie Singer, *Statutes and Statutory Construction*, 7th ed., 2007 new ed., vol. 2A, Thomson – West, 398–412. [Extensive footnoting of Federal and State cases in Singers omitted here.]

⁴³*Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

⁴⁴Upon admission to the Union in 1959 (43 years after the subject Revenue Act of September 8, 1916), Alaska and Hawaii lose their status as *States* of the United States; *to wit*:

individually in combination with the term “States” in the same definition; *to wit*: The passage “the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia” may be deleted from the definition without changing its meaning. Such usage infers that said Territories and the District of Columbia are different from “States”—which they are not—and constitutes (1) what is known as a *pleonasm* or *tautology*, (2) a violation of grammatical precision, and (3) an instance of the practice of *obscurantism*; the definition of each of which provides, in pertinent part:

ple'o-nasm . . . *Rhet.* The use of more words than are needed for the full expression of a thought; redundancy, as in saying “the very identical thing itself” . . . a violation of grammatical precision. . . . [Funk & Wagnalls Dictionary, 1903 ed., s.v. “Pleonasm”]

tau-tol'o-gy . . . *Rhet.* That form of pleonasm in which the same word or idea is unnecessarily repeated; unnecessary repetition, whether in word or sense . . . [Ibid, s.v. “Tautology”]

ob-scu-rant-ism . . . *n.* 1. Opposition to the increase and spread of knowledge. 2. Deliberate obscurity or evasion of clarity. [Random House Dictionary, coll. ed., s.v. “Obscurantism”]

Modern statutory meaning of “United States”.

Most Americans believe that they live in the United States. Not according to IRC: When used in a geographical sense the term “United States” means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the District of Columbia *and no other thing*. All statutes, legislation, code, and regulations (including those of each of the so-called *50 States*⁴⁵) define “United States” to mean either the foregoing or, in certain segments thereof, simply the District of Columbia. The missing link is standard application of the principal rules of statutory interpretation (e.g., n. 42, *supra*).

Whereas, *Congress* define those insular U.S. possessions with their own government and tax system to be States in IRC, the Secretary of the Treasury not only fails to identify the same as States in IRS.gov, but rather propounds that they are *not* States. One or the other, either IRC, which is legislation enacted by *Congress* in official capacity, or IRS.gov, which is commentary posted by the Secretary of the Treasury in personal capacity as one who does not work for the United States Government (*infra*, n. 59), is false; *to wit, respectively and in pertinent part*:

The term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.⁴⁶ [IRC § 3121(e)(1)]

U.S. territories are islands under the jurisdiction of the United States which are not States of the United States. U.S. possessions can be divided into two groups:

1. Those that have their own governments and . . . tax systems (Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands), and
2. Those that do not have their own governments and their own tax systems . . .

The governments of the first group of territories impose their own income taxes and withholding taxes on their own residents. . . .⁴⁷ [Emphasis added.]

When used in the regulations in this subpart, the term “State” includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii before their admission as States . . . [Emphasis added.] 26 CFR § 31.3121(e)-1(a).

⁴⁵Each of the *50 States* (sans “of the Union”) forgoes its proper name and goes by “state” in all legislation.

⁴⁶The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (hereinafter “CNMI”) is a State of the United States based on application of (1) another IRC term used within IRC § 3121(e)(1), “includes” (*see* IRC § 7701(c)), and (2) another of the principal rules of statutory interpretation, *ejusdem generis* (literally, “of the same kind,” *infra*, n. 90). Note: CNMI appears with the other four island-States of the United States in paragraph 1 of the n.-47 citation, *infra*. Exhaustive exposition of this particular point exceeds the scope of this discourse and is not included here. Residents of the five insular States are not liable to federal income tax; only residents of the State of District of Columbia.

⁴⁷<http://www.irs.gov/Individuals/International-Taxpayers/Persons-Employed-In-U.S.-Possessions>, “Persons Employed In a U.S. Possession / Territory - FIT,” IRS.gov.

Exactly what the definition of the IRC term “United States” means is a matter of absolute, paramount importance to the existence of the Matrix. Morpheus counsels that no one can be *told* what the Matrix is, that he has to see it for himself. The procedure for anyone to “take the red pill” and see the Matrix for himself is prescribed in Part Two, *infra*.

A personal and national remedy for the Matrix.

Invito beneficium non datur. No one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent. But if he does not dissent he will, in many cases, be considered as assenting.

Adjuvari quippe nos, non decipi, beneficio oportet. For we ought to be helped by a benefit, not destroyed by it.

Exceptio ejus rei cujus petitiur dissolutio nulla est. There can be no plea of that thing of which the dissolution is sought.⁴⁸

Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se inducto. Any one may renounce a right introduced for his own benefit.

If one does not desire to receive retirement or survivor benefits via the Social Security contract, legally he cannot be compelled to accept such or retain right (entitlement) thereto. Similarly, if one party to a contract wishes to sever ties with the other, said other has no right to compel him to remain so bonded against his consent for the sake of the relationship.

Wherefore: No matter the stream of naked, unsupported insistences from actors in the United States Government that one can neither extinguish nor dissolve the Social Security contract, disavow the apparent consent given and obtained through his mistake, nor divest himself of the right (entitlement) to receive Social Security benefits, **the senior-most important factor in any such verbal or written exchange is one’s personal certainty of the truth that he is authorized by law to do so and that he can**—the selfsame truth and spirit that authorized British subjects in the American colonies in 1776 to dissolve all political connection with Great Britain and proclaim sovereignty over their own existence.

The reason one can expect a convulsive, if not psychotic,⁴⁹ reaction from Matrix operatives upon departure from Social Security is because he is converting from taxpayer⁵⁰ (one of *the governed*) back to nontaxpayer (one of *the People*) and shattering the bonds of the Matrix; thereby, to that degree, nullifying the Federal Reserve’s control of *Congress*⁵¹ (*infra*, nn. 72–75).

The most important purpose of income tax is the removal of a significant portion of the sums (digits, book entries) created and loaned into circulation by the creditor of *Congress* and the United States Government, the private Federal Reserve—without which, inflation runs unchecked.

Beardsley Ruml, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (*infra*, n. 75) and key Matrix insider, in a speech delivered to the American Bar Association in 1945, later reprinted in the January 1946 edition of *American Affairs* magazine (published by the Council on Foreign Relations) in an article entitled “Taxes for Revenue are Obsolete,” explains, in euphemistic terms, why income tax is essential to the existence of the private Federal Reserve; *to wit*:

⁴⁸*Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

⁴⁹The reader is reminded of the Northern response to the lawful Southern withdrawal from the relationship March 27, 1861, an act not dissimilar to that which established *the United States of America*, July 4, 1776.

⁵⁰The Social Security account number is converted into a taxpayer identification number by Secretary of the Treasury via IRC § 6109(d) *Use of social security account number*.

⁵¹“[The banks] are still the most powerful lobby on Capitol Hill, and they, frankly, own the place.” Sen. Dick Durbin, WJG Radio 1530 AM, Elmhurst, Ill., April 2009, quoted in *Thrive: What on Earth will it take?*, directed by Stephen Gagné and Kimberly Carter Gamble, distributed by www.thrivemovement.com, 2012.

[T]he most important single purpose to be served by the imposition of federal taxes is the maintenance of a dollar which has stable purchasing power over the years. Sometimes this purpose is stated as the “avoidance of inflation”; and without the use of federal taxation, all other means of stabilization, such as monetary policy and price controls and subsidies, are unavailing. All other means, in any case, must be integrated with federal tax policy if we are to have tomorrow a dollar which has a value near to what it is today.

In exchange for unlimited amounts in loans of credit (keystrokes of digits), *Congress* (the Trustees) pledge to the private Federal Reserve the full power of the United States Government to impose income tax on taxpayers (i.e., on *the governed*, not on nontaxpayers, *the People*), otherwise known as the *full faith and credit* of the United States Government; *to wit*:

FULL FAITH AND CREDIT phrase meaning that the full taxing and borrowing power . . . is pledged in payment of interest and repayment of principal of a bond issued by a government entity. U.S. Government securities . . . are backed by this pledge.⁵² [Emphasis added.]

The “credit” part of “Full faith and credit” is meaningless as a pledge per se because it signifies only that the United States Government, via *Congress*, agrees to inflate the currency even further by borrowing more credit (digits) from the same creditor, the Federal Reserve (who, enjoying a private monopoly over the banking industry, issues “loans” of credit at no cost or risk to itself via book entry of digits in the account of the United States Government, as borrower).

It is the United States Government’s pledge of its full power to impose income tax on taxpayers (*the governed*) alone that allows *Congress* (Trustees) to issue their promises-to-pay in unlimited quantity and amounts in exchange for loans of credit (book entries of digits) from the Federal Reserve. *U.S. Government securities* (promissory notes called Treasury bills, bonds, and notes), mentioned in the definition of “Full faith and credit,” *supra*, are called *Treasuries*; *to wit*:

TREASURIES NEGOTIABLE debt obligations of the U.S. government, secured by its FULL FAITH AND CREDIT 1. *Treasury bills*—short-term securities with maturities of one year or less issued in minimum denominations of \$10,000 2. *Treasury bonds*—long-term debt instruments with maturities of 10 years or longer issued in minimum denominations of \$1000. . . . 3. *Treasury notes*—intermediate securities with maturities of 1 to 10 years. Denominations range from \$1000 to \$1 million or more⁵³ [U/L emphasis added.]

The only reason *Congress* can continue such promiscuous borrowing practices⁵⁴ with the Federal Reserve, and why the Federal Reserve agrees to make such “loans,” is because of *Congress’ absolute exclusive legislative power to impose income tax on residents of the District of Columbia*: those Americans who have departed their role as nontaxpayers and “the sovereigns of the country,”⁵⁵ forgone the largesse (“Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness”) enjoyed by Trust Beneficiaries (*the People*), and abandoned their responsibilities as Protectors of the Trust (*the United States of America*) in exchange for, evidently, civil rights and arranged care for their welfare by their former servants, the Trustees (*Congress*), now their absolute masters.

As shown below, one cannot be “One of the sovereign people” (*the People*) and nontaxpayer and at the same time a member of the class defined as *Federal personnel* (*supra*, n. 24) and a United States Government employee (n. 24), citizen of the federal government (n. 30), citizen of the United States (n. 26), and taxpayer (nn. 31–32) whose legal residence is the District of Columbia (nn. 23, 26, 29) and one of *the governed*; *to wit*:

⁵²John Downes and Jordan Elliot Goodman, *Dictionary of Finance and Investment Terms*, 6th ed. (Hauppauge, N.Y.: Barron’s Educational Series, Inc., 2003), s.v. “Full faith and credit.”

⁵³*Ibid.*, s.v. “Treasuries.”

⁵⁴Loans taken in amounts that defy comprehension, with neither the ability nor intention to repay them, as is the case with loans taken by *Congress* from the Federal Reserve, are fraudulent by nature.

⁵⁵*Chisholm v. Georgia*, 2 U.S. (2 Dall.) 419, 472 (1793). See n. 16, *supra*.

CITIZEN. . . . In American Law. One of the sovereign people. A constituent member of the sovereignty, synonymous with the people. Scott v. Sandford 19 How. (U.S.) 404, 15 L. Ed. 691. [Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. "Citizen"]

The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws. . . . [Long v. Rasmussen, [9 Cir.] D.C.Mont. 1922, 281 F. 236]

Slater's protestations to the effect that he derives no benefit from the United States government have no bearing on his legal obligation to pay income taxes. . . . Unless the defendant can establish that he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS possesses authority to attempt to determine his federal tax liability. [United States v. Slater (D. Delaware, 1982), 545 F.Supp. 179, 182]

United States District Judges in (1) *Long*, a 1922 case—nine years after the 16th Amendment, advent of the Federal Reserve, and first concerted push to convince *the People* of the several states of the Union that they are personally subject to congressional legislation and liable to income tax—provide indisputable evidence that, fiscally speaking, there are two distinct classes of Americans, *taxpayers* and *nontaxpayers*, and (2) *Slater* provide the disenchanting taxpayer with all the impetus he needs to establish that he is *not* a so-called *citizen of the United States* (i.e., member of the class defined as *Federal personnel*, United States Government employee whose legal residence is the District of Columbia, citizen of the federal government, etc.) and depart *the governed* and rejoin other nontaxpayers in his native group of Americans, *the People*.

If you still believe that income tax is used to build roads and run the country, please take notice of the *President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control: A Report to the President* (commonly known as the Grace Commission Report), commissioned by President Ronald Reagan to identify and suggest remedies for waste and abuse in the Federal Government; *to wit, in pertinent part*:

Resistance to additional income taxes would be even more widespread if people were aware that . . . 100 percent of what is collected [in income tax] is absorbed solely by interest on the Federal debt [supra, n. 35] In other words, all individual income tax revenues are gone before one nickel is spent on the services which taxpayers expect from their Government.⁵⁶

The primary and ultimate beneficiaries of income tax are its creators, the principals behind the private Federal Reserve (*infra*, nn. 72–75), who, as creditors (masters) of *Congress* and the remainder of the United States Government, require its operation in order to remove and retire from circulation a substantial portion of the “funds” (ledger-credit page-entry “money”) artificially and continually created and injected into circulation by Federal Reserve banks in the so-called loan process (fictitious digits, typed into the account of the borrower).

As one of *the People*, one enjoys (1) as a Trust Beneficiary, all of the unalienable Rights with which he is endowed by his Creator, among which are “Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness,” and (2) jointly with other Trust Protectors, the Right to (a) alter or to abolish, summarily and without litigation or recourse, any *form of Government* that is destructive of the ends of securing said Rights for the Beneficiaries, (b) fire Trustees, i.e., individual members of *Congress*, summarily and without litigation or recourse, for violation/breach of the Declaration of Trust, *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*, and (3) “institute new Government, laying its foundation on such Principles, and organizing its Powers in such form, as to them [*the People*, Beneficiaries of the Trust] shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.”

⁵⁶J. Peter Grace, “President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control: A Report to the President,” dated and approved January 12 and 15, 1984, 3.

What and where is the Matrix?

Etymology of the word “matrix” is as follows:

ma-trix . . . LL., womb, public register, origin; L., breeding animal < stem of *mater*, a mother . . . [U/L emphasis added.] [*Webster’s New World Dictionary*, encyc. ed., s.v. “Matrix”]

In legal terms, *the Matrix* is the omnipresent menace of supra-territorial personal jurisdiction facing *the People* of the several states of the Union, acquired upon their respective execution of the Social Security contract and enrollment in the public register of political franchisees of the parent municipal corporation of the United States®,⁵⁷ the District of Columbia, incorporated continuously since February 21, 1871 (16 Stat. 419, as amended: 20 Stat. 102 (*infra*), 49 Stat. 430 (District of Columbia Code § 1-102 (1940)), and doing business as United States®.

In political terms, *the Matrix* is the public register of corporately styled, all-capital-letter corruptions⁵⁸ of the respective full true name of American men and women, “property” of the United States® and, by default, its creditor, the Federal Reserve, maintained by the (1) United States Social Security Administration, each of which NAMES is assigned its own serial (Social Security account) number, and (2) Department of the Treasury,⁵⁹ each of which NAMES is assigned the same serial number, but called a taxpayer identification number (*supra*, n. 50).

The all-capital-letter NAMES derived from the Full True Name appearing on the respective birth record submitted at the time of application for enrollment in Social Security, political franchisees known as *juristic persons*,⁶⁰ are nominal account holders for the respective Americans who authorize, usually unwittingly and tacitly via their silence upon attaining the age of majority (18), the opening of the Social Security account, thereby constructively accepting and executing the Social Security franchise and contract, and comprise, with their respective serial number, the public register and body politic⁶¹ of the municipal corporation and **second national government** known as “District of Columbia”; constituted via the Act of February 21, 1871, later legislated June 11, 1878 (20 Stat. 102), to “*remain and continue a municipal corporation, as provided in section 2 of the Revised Statutes relating to said District*” (brought forward from the Act of 1871, as provided in the Act of March 2, 1877, amended and approved March 9, 1878); *to wit*:

The District is created a government by the name of the “District of Columbia,” by which name it is constituted a body-corporate for municipal purposes, and may contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, have a seal, and exercise all other powers of a municipal corporation . . .” [*Revised Statutes of the United States Relating to the District of Columbia . . . 1873–’74*, § 2, p. 2]

⁵⁷E.g., United States Department of Commerce Census Bureau form entitled “United States® Census 2010.”

⁵⁸The rules of English grammar make no provision for the writing of a proper noun in all-capital letters.

⁵⁹Whereas, the Department of the Treasury’s senior official, the Secretary of the Treasury, is appointed by the President and also the senior executive, Governor, of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (both of which are located in/instrumentalities of the geographical/political District of Columbia) and exercises the same plenary powers over the Federal Reserve banking system as does the President (12 USC § 95b), said Secretary of the Treasury does not work for the United States Government; *to wit, in pertinent part*:

The second part of the amendments prohibits the [Secretary of the Treasury] from receiving salary or other compensation from the U.S. Government. . . . The U.S. Secretary of the Treasury receives no compensation for representing the United States. Senate Report No. 94-1148 of Oct. 1, 1976, re amendment of Bretton Woods Agreements Act, P.L. 94-564, 90 Stat. 2660, re § 2 of House Report 13955 [p. 8], 5942.

No person [e.g., Secretary of the Treasury] shall be entitled to receive any salary or other compensation from the United States for services as a Governor . . . 22 USC § 286a(d)(1).

⁶⁰juristic person . . . a corporation . . . or other legal entity that is recognized by law as the subject of rights and duties called also *artificial person, conventional person, fictitious person* Merriam-Webster’s *Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Juristic person.”

⁶¹body politic . . . the whole people united and organized under a single political authority : a politically organized society . . . Ibid, s.v. “Body politic.”

Misera est servitus, ubi jus est vagum aut incertum. It is a miserable slavery where the law is vague or uncertain.

Ubi jus incertum, ibi jus nullum. Where the law is uncertain, there is no law.

Fraus latet in generalibus. Fraud lies hid in general expressions.

Wherefore, as of February 21, 1871, “District of Columbia” has three distinct senses or meanings: (1) *geographical*: seat of the Government of the United States; (2) *governmental*: novel government created out of the *territory* comprising the seat of the Government of the United States; by definition, and (3) *political*: municipal corporation constituted for political purposes from the *name* of the government created out of the territory comprising the seat of the Government of the United States; *to wit*:

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION. A public corporation, created by government for political purposes, and having subordinate and local powers of legislation . . . [Emphasis added.] [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Municipal corporation”]

If not identified with particularity in official pronouncements/legislation it is impossible to know exactly which sense or meaning of “District of Columbia” is intended or applies.

As observed by dissenting Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan in 1901, a second national government, run by *Congress*, but operating outside the restrictions of the *Constitution* (via the “discretion” afforded by Article 4 § 3(2), however inimical to the principles enshrined in *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* the effects of which may be), portends loss of constitutional liberty or worse under the specter of legislative absolutism, a scenario that is long since upon us; *to wit, in pertinent part*:

[W]e are now informed that Congress possesses powers outside of the Constitution . . . that we have in this country substantially or practically two national governments; one to be maintained under the Constitution, with all its restrictions; the other to be maintained by Congress outside and independently of that instrument . . . The glory of our American system of government is that it was created by a written constitution which protects the people against the exercise of arbitrary, unlimited power . . . It will be an evil day for American liberty if the theory of a government outside of the supreme law of the land finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence. [*Downes v. Bidwell*, 182 U.S. 244 (1901)]

The political District of Columbia is a *form of Government* not unlike another certain municipal corporation and autonomous, independent nation, also with its own flag, law, citizens, and borders, the ancient, one-square-mile City of London (est. 1141 A.D.), home of the Bank of England—the plenary power of each of which obtains only against its respective citizen-inhabitants (franchisee-residents), political subjects under municipal law; *to wit*:

mu-nic’i-pal . . . Of or pertaining to the internal government of a state, kingdom, or nation. . . . [F., < L. *municipalis*, < *munus*, duty, + *capio*, take.] . . . [*Funk & Wagnalls Dictionary*, 1903. ed., s.v. “Municipal”]

Political corporation. A public or municipal corporation ; one created for political purposes, and having for its object the administration of governmental powers of a subordinate or local nature. . . . [*Black’s Law Dictionary*, 2nd ed., s.v. “Political”]

Municipal law, in contradistinction to international law, is the law of an individual state or nation. It is the rule or law by which a particular district, community, or nation is governed. . . . That which

pertains solely to the citizens and inhabitants of a state, and is thus distinguished from political law, [62] commercial law, and the law of nations. . . . [Ibid, s.v. “Municipal”]

As franchisees whose legal residence is the District of Columbia, the aforesaid juristic-person NAMES are nominally liable (*see etymology of “municipal,” supra, p. 21*) for payment of the debt obligations of the United States (interest on the national debt in the form of taxes, mainly income tax, *supra, n. 35*), which is located/situated in the District of Columbia (*supra, n. 26; infra, n. 89*), and, as artificial persons whose NAME is derived from the Full True Name of a particular American man or woman, are presumed to be the property of their “creator,” the United States Government, and, by default, its creditor, the Federal Reserve.⁶³

Although authorized to do so,⁶⁴ American men and women rarely refuse to accept mail matter bearing a corruption of their Full True Name (e.g., FULL T NAME) or United States Post Office™ identifier known as a ZIP Code™,⁶⁵ use of which is voluntary⁶⁶; thereby confirming (1) proper delivery, and (2) residence in “Territory or other Property belonging to the United States.” All United States Post Office™ P.O. Box™ holders “reside” in federal territory.

All mail *delivery areas* without the “Territory or other Property belonging to the United States” within the limits of the several states of the Union (not the so-called *50 States*, each of which, such as the so-called “State of California,” is an amorphous *political subdivision*,⁶⁷ i.e., political society, of the District of Columbia) receive *free carrier delivery* of mail⁶⁸ and comprise the theoretical, abstract portion of the domain and “homeland” of the Matrix, the United States®, code name (DBA) of the political District of Columbia.

The Americans over whose life and mind the Matrix exerts an invisible hold do not draw a paycheck as an officer, employee, or elected official of the United States or District of Columbia or political subdivision thereof (one of the *50 States*) or agency or instrumentality of any one of the foregoing, or physically reside or realize gains/profits/income from a source located in the geographical District of Columbia (as do true citizen-residents thereof), but nevertheless do not know how to avoid or escape personal subjection to the absolute legislative power of *Congress* and, in abject consternation or fear of being foreclosed from earning a living, agree (“volunteer”) to use a personal serial number (Social Security account number) and work as a wage slave and pay, in the form of income tax, their “fair share” of interest on the national debt (*supra, n. 35*) incurred by *Congress* (the Trustees) and owed to the private Federal Reserve (*infra, nn. 72–75*).

American wage slaves, toiling in bondage (voluntary servitude) to the Matrix via personal serial number, are, as taxpayers, the primary source of power/energy for the creditor of the United States Government, the private Federal Reserve, holder of the national debt of the United States, whose principals (*infra, nn. 74–75*) are the ultimate beneficiaries of income tax.⁶⁹

⁶²Political law. That branch of jurisprudence which treats of the science of politics, or the organization and administration of government. Ibid, s.v. “Political.”

⁶³Notwithstanding any such presumption, no one has a greater right to any permutation of the full true name (e.g., FULL T NAME) of a particular man or woman, given by his/her parent/s at birth or shortly thereafter, than the selfsame man/woman; *to wit: Qui prior est tempore, potior est jure. He who is prior in time is stronger in right.*

⁶⁴*Domestic Mail Manual* §§ 508-1.1.2–1.1.3.

⁶⁵The ZIP (Zone Improvement Plan) Code system is a numbered coding system that facilitates . . . mail processing. *All Post Offices are assigned at least one unique 5-digit ZIP Code.* . . . [Emphasis added.] Ibid, § 602-1.8.1. [I.e., United States Post Offices™ have ZIP Codes™; mail delivery areas do not.]

⁶⁶We note that under section 122.32 of the U.S. Postal Service Domestic Mail Manual, the use of a zip code remains voluntary. See United States Postal Service Domestic Mail Manual § 122.32, at 55 (Mar. 1992). . . . *Joseph Peters v. National Railroad Passenger Corporation*, 966 F.2d 1483, 296 U.S.App.D.C. 202, 22 Fed.R.Serv.3d 1123 (1992).

⁶⁷See IRC § 3401(c) *Employee* for use of the expression “political subdivision.”

⁶⁸*Domestic Mail Manual* § 508-4.2.1. (Postage covers transportation of mail between postal facilities only.)

⁶⁹*Nul ne doit s'enrichir aux dépens des autres. No one ought to enrich himself at the expense of others.*

Necessitas publica major est quam privata. Public necessity is greater than private.

Conclusion.

Whatever *form of Government* (Trusteeship) of the *United States of America* (Trust), such as the political doppelganger⁷⁰ national government and city-state by the name of District of Columbia, is instituted by *Congress* (the Trustees), whose just Powers are derived solely from the consent of *the governed* (those whose residence, actual or legal, is the geographical District of Columbia), as memorialized in *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* (Declaration of Trust), the lawful object of each and every such Government is invariable: to secure for *the People* (the Beneficiaries) of the several states of the Union, all unalienable Rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator, among which are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness, and to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do in order to secure these ends.

Any *form of Government* that diverges from the aforesaid prescriptive ends or causes any act of War, conclusion of Peace, contraction of Alliance, establishment of Commerce, or other Act or Thing which Independent States may of right do, that does not have as its direct and immediate object, maintenance or increase of security of the aforesaid unalienable Rights of men in behalf of *the People* (Trust Beneficiaries), is subject to alteration or to abolishment by Right of *the People* (Trust Protectors).

Former Trust Protectors/Beneficiaries who find themselves in the ranks of *the governed*, whose apparent consent in the Social Security contract was given by them and obtained by *Congress* and the United States Government through their *mistake*, are authorized by law to (1) extinguish, by rescission, the Social Security contract, (2) disavow their apparent consent for *Congress* to exercise absolute exclusive legislative power over their life, liberty, and property, (3) divest themselves of the right (entitlement) to receive Social Security retirement or survivor benefits, and (4) rejoin *the People* and exercise, as Trust Protectors, any Right authorized them by that certain seminal Declaration of Trust creating *the United States of America*, i.e., *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776

The reason things are so far off the rails today is that nearly all Americans have yielded, almost always unwittingly (through tacit authorization of the opening of the Social Security account and constructive execution of the Social Security contract via silence upon attaining the age of majority), their innate sovereignty to their servants in Government by constructively confessing incompetence to manage their own personal affairs and, evidently, opting for civil rights as a citizen of the United States®, a/k/a District of Columbia (*infra*, n. 89), and arranged care for their welfare in the form of right (entitlement) to receive (not realize) Social Security benefits, in exchange for their apparent consent for *Congress* to exercise absolute exclusive legislative power over their life, liberty, and property, an unconscionable bargain.

Derativa potestas non potest esse major primitiva.
The power which is derived cannot be greater than
that from which it is derived.

Whereas, *Congress*' (the Trustees') history of repeated injuries and usurpations, beginning, in form, as of the Act of June 30, 1864, and undertaken, in substance, as of the Sixteenth Article of Amendment to the *Constitution*, appears to have in direct object the establishment of nothing less than an absolute tyranny over the several states of the Union and those Trust Beneficiaries and

⁷⁰doppelganger . . . a ghostly counterpart and companion of a person; *especially* : a ghostly double of a live person that haunts him through life and is usually visible only to himself *Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. "Doppelganger."

other Americans who make their home within the respective geographical boundaries thereof, that exceeds in degree those injuries and usurpations that inspired American colonists 236 years ago to dissolve all political connection between themselves and the State of Great Britain: The time is nigh for Trust Protectors to consider exercise of their Right to alter or to abolish the instant *form of Government*, i.e., that certain political city-state, commercial enterprise, bank sanctuary (Federal Reserve, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, et al), and de facto second national government whose raison d'être and war cry is "National Security!"—*the municipal corporation by the name of District of Columbia*—and fire delinquent Trustees and institute new Government (Trusteeship), summarily and without litigation or recourse, as duly authorized by that certain foundational instrument from which every lawful *form of Government* in America is derived and upon which all Americans since July 4, 1776, rely and depend for good order in their daily lives, *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*.

Contractus legem ex conventionione accipiunt. The agreement of the parties makes the law of the contract.

Le contrat fait la loi. The contract makes the law.

The parties to the contract are *the good People of these Colonies* (Trustor), *the People* (Trust Protectors/Beneficiaries), and *Congress* (Trustees); the agreement is *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* (Declaration of Trust), i.e., the law of the contract, instrument of creation, and supreme law between the parties, from which all descendant Trust instruments, including the *Articles of Confederation*, *Constitution*, *Bill of Rights*, and all other legislative acts of *Congress*, derive their authority and power.

The rich rules over the poor, and the borrower is the servant of the lender.⁷¹

The Federal Reserve is not an agency of government. It is a private banking monopoly. . . . [T]he policies of the monarch are always those of his creditors.⁷²

Either those Social Security payroll taxpayers who joined *the governed* by mistake will shed the bonds of voluntary servitude and rejoin *the People* (nontaxpayers and Protectors of the Trust, *the United States of America*), perform their responsibilities as charged by their forebears, and rid the Trust of those Trustees who violate the Declaration of Trust (*The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*) and serve the interests of private bankers rather than those of the Beneficiaries (*the People*)—or *the United States of America*, as an easy mark for certain swindlers—principals of the formerly private (1694–1946) Bank of England,⁷³ parent bank of the

⁷¹Proverbs 22:7.

⁷²Rep. John R. Rarick, "Deficit Financing," *Congressional Record* (House of Representatives), 92nd Congress, First Session, Vol. 117—Part 1, February 1, 1971, 1260–1261.

⁷³Predecessors of principals of the former private Bank of England ("nationalized" in 1946) devise income tax in Holland in 1622, but fail to get it instituted; their successors succeed in doing so January 9, 1799, in England. Income tax is indispensable to modern "lending" (keystrokes of digits typed into the account of a borrower at no cost or risk to the "lender"). The monetary policy of the Bank of England (interest-bearing currency), enforced on American colonists via its debtor-servant, King George III, is the primary cause of the American Revolution.

private Federal Reserve,⁷⁴ and their front men in *Congress*—is doomed to the same or worse economic, industrial, cultural, ethnic, political, military, and national emasculation as the previous dominant world-power borrower-servant-victim of the selfsame lenders at the private Bank of England,⁷⁵ Great Britain (the next borrower-servant being groomed by said bankers for world hegemony is China⁷⁶), and civilization as a whole to a dystopia such as any of those so callously postulated with increasing frequency in Hollywood films.

Part Two hereof, *infra*, consists of identification of the situation and commentary as to how one can go about fixing it, including the unilateral instrument and supporting documents by which any ordinary American⁷⁷ can rectify personal error and, as authorized by law, recover and maintain his original station in *the United States of America* (the Trust) as one of *the People* (Trust Protector/Beneficiary). ■

⁷⁴The Federal Reserve Act of December 23, 1913, is the creation of Baron Alfred Charles de Rothschild (1842–1918), Director of the Bank of England [Eustace Mullins, *The World Order: Our Secret Rulers*, 2nd ed., 1992 election ed. (Staunton, Va.: Ezra Pound Institute of Civilization, 1992), 102], implemented via his straw author, Paul Moritz Warburg [Ibid, 128], a German banker and Rothschild confederate awarded United States citizenship in 1911 specifically for this purpose; later dubbed “Father of the Federal Reserve” by the *New York Times*. The private Federal Reserve, incorporated under aegis of the District of Columbia, is modeled by its architect, Baron Rothschild, after the private Bank of England; *to wit*:

Federal Reserve Banks . . . are not federal instrumentalities . . . but are independent, privately owned and locally controlled corporations. *Lewis v. United States*, 680 F.2d 1239 (9th Cir. 1982).

⁷⁵An extremely rare public disclosure (Rothschild proxies own 96% of all media worldwide) reveals unilateral Rothschild control of the American economy (via controlling interest in each of the private Federal Reserve Bank of New York’s nominal-stockholder banks, which, collectively, own controlling interest in the stock of the remaining 11 regional private Federal Reserve Banks; thereby securing Rothschild control of the entire private Federal Reserve System and documenting the reality of unilateral, alien domination of the Fed’s primary borrower-servant, *Congress*, and *Congress*’ employer, the United States Government, and, by virtue of the Fed’s private ownership of the currency, Federal Reserve Notes, the American economy); *to wit, in pertinent part*:

This said Rothschild [i.e., the Rothschild Dubai office, institutional proxy of Sir Evelyn Robert Adrian de Rothschild] is not getting directly involved but will act through commercial banks in which it has equity or has connections with, like JP Morgan and other ones. Moreover, through the same commercial banks, Rothschild has a say, and a powerful one, over the Federal Reserve Bank of New York (FRBNY).

By law the latter plays a key role in the Federal Open Market Committee (FOMC) and thus has a crucial role in making key decisions about interest rates and the US money supply.

Through the FRBNY Rothschild is in a privileged position to influence US monetary policy and shaping US monetary supply, crucially important since the US dollar remains the main reserve currency in the world. *AsiaNews*, “Signs of a new financial storm for September coming from Dubai and Saudi Arabia,” June 1, 2009, <http://www.asianews.it/index.php?l=en&art=15402&size=A>.

⁷⁶E.g., this February 28, 2012, *Los Angeles Times* article (p. B1) and its censorious headline, “China told to reform its economy,” reveal that those controlling the Chinese economy are not from/in Beijing but the political/geographical District of Columbia, DBA the so-called World Bank (whose senior executive is its Governor, the Secretary of the Treasury, *supra* n. 59, not its nominal President, Robert Zoellick); *to wit, in pertinent part*:

World Bank calls for the nation to reduce state sector power to ensure stability.

The World Bank, taking aim at one of China’s most entrenched interest groups, told the country’s top leadership that it had to reform the nation’s powerful state sector to ensure stability in the world’s fastest-growing major economy.

China’s economic model is “unsustainable,” and . . . in danger of falling into a so-called “middle-income trap” if it fails to launch meaningful remedies, said World Bank President Robert Zoellick. . . .

. . . The project was conceived nearly two years ago by Zoellick and Vice Premier Li Keqiang, who is widely presumed to be China’s next premier.

⁷⁷Important note: The within material is not intended for true officers, employees, or elected officials of the United States or the District of Columbia or its political subdivisions, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing or residents thereof or those who acquire citizenship of the United States by way of naturalization: *to wit*:

(a) General rule. (1) Section 1 of the Code imposes an income tax on the income of every individual who is a citizen or resident of the United States [of the political or geographical District of Columbia] . . .

(b) Citizens or residents of the United States liable to tax.

(c) Who is a citizen. Every person born or naturalized in the United States [i.e., in the geographical District of Columbia] and subject to its jurisdiction is a citizen. [Emphasis added.] 26 CFR 1-1.1.

Part Two: Liberation from Bondage.

Any party to any agreement has the right to dissolve, unilaterally, any contractual relationship in which he is involved and divest himself of any right thereby acquired. To claim otherwise is to admit of peonage, involuntary servitude, and slavery—which can be effectuated only through arbitrary application of deadly force, the hallmark of a police state.

Whereas, any ordinary American (*supra*, n. 77), such as one laboring under a Social Security contract, has the right, and is authorized by, among other things, ancient and timeless principles of contract law, to rectify personal error and recover his original station in that certain voluntary trust known as *the United States of America* as one of the Trust Beneficiaries, *the People*, and liberate himself from the effects of certain acts of treason to that certain Declaration of Trust, *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776, by the Trustees, *Congress*, via abjuration in substance, deed, and fact of the responsibilities with which they are charged by the Trustor, i.e., the real and natural sovereign corporation known as *the good People of these Colonies*, and to which end said Trustees are under solemn oath to uphold, perform, and secure, wherein *Congress*, as of:

- February 3, 1913, perpetrate actual and extrinsic fraud, fraud in the inducement, and fraudulent concealment in the form of the 16th Amendment to the *Constitution*, against *the People* of the several states of the Union, Beneficiaries of the Trust, as facilitated by the *constructive fraud* (ref. *Black's Law Dictionary*, 1st–6th eds. (only), s.v. “Fraud”) of:
 - The Act of March 2, 1877, amended and approved as of the Act of March 9, 1878, i.e., the *Revised Statutes of the United States, Passed at the First Session of the Forty-third Congress, 1873–’74 . . . Title XXXV Internal Revenue, Chapter One Officers of Internal Revenue, Section 3140, page 601*; and
 - “An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government, to pay Interest on the Public Debt, and for other Purposes,” Chapter 173, Section 182, Volume 13 of the *Statutes at Large*, page 306, June 30, 1864,

via illicit manufacture of prima facie evidence, effectively commandeering through lexical stratagem, under color of law, via intentional production of confusion in the public mind as to the meaning of a certain word/term, extra-constitutional geographical territory over which to exercise absolute exclusive legislative power, dating to June 30, 1864, as aforesaid, by causing, with malice aforethought, *the People* to believe, as of February 3, 1913, that the said Sixteenth Article of Amendment to the *Constitution*, legally inapposite as a constitutional amendment and therefore fraudulent on its face, obtains against *the People* of the several states of the Union—who, beginning July 4, 1776, and continuing to and beyond February 3, 1913, are nontaxpayers in substance and fact, without the scope, and neither of the subject nor of the object, of the revenue laws of the United States—in order to deceive and coerce *the People* into, among other things, the banker contrivance and commercial artifice known as income tax, for the aggrandizement of private creditors of the United States when, per statutory definition and meaning of that certain term of art created by *Congress* via the Act of June 30, 1864, *supra*, and resulting in Section 3140 of the *Revised Statutes* as aforesaid, namely “State,” the Sixteenth Article of Amendment to the *Constitution* applies only to residents of “Territory or other Property belonging to the United States,” i.e., the geographical District of Columbia and the Territories, thereby imposing and enforcing on *the People* through misrepresentation and willful concealment of material facts, a fraudulent interpretation, in letter and spirit, of the organic Declaration of Trust of *the United States of America*, namely *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America*, and each and every

subsequent de jure Trust instrument derived therefrom, e.g., the *Articles of Confederation*, *Constitution for the United States of America*, and *Bill of Rights*, resulting in incalculable, catastrophic damage to the Trust, the Beneficiaries of the Trust, and myriad others of Mankind in general, adversely affected, directly or indirectly, by said congressional mischief and treason since and including June 30, 1864; and

- August 14, 1935, and the Social Security Act of the same date, i.e., H. R. 7260 and Title VIII § 801 thereof, under the pretext of a personal retirement program for the benefit of *the People* of the several states of the Union, but principally to establish their liability for income tax—whose sole purpose is the payment of interest on the national debt incurred by *Congress* and owed to private lenders, the primary and ultimate beneficiaries thereof—in the nature of a Ponzi scheme (in which funds contributed by later investors generate artificially high dividends for the original investors), in concert with other actors in the United States Government, dupe *the People* (“new investors”), into “volunteering” to pay, as empirical evidence indicates, as much as 35% (and more in some cases) of their earnings in so-called income tax; 6.2% to the retirement of third parties (12.4% if a particular Social Security account holder works on his own) whom they do not know and have never met (“old investors”), to which contributions they retain no accrued property rights; and 0.0% toward their own personal retirement, concealing that (1) the principal part of the scheme is liability for income tax, an element bearing no relation to the purported purpose of the Social Security retirement program, and (2) the prospect of their realizing a “benefit” (dividend) from the so-called retirement program is a *gamble*, dependent on the United States Government’s success in drawing into the scheme, ever-increasing numbers of other participants (“investors”) who contribute Social Security payroll taxes in amounts sufficient to cover scheduled retirement benefits (artificially high dividends for “earlier investors”; less and less dividends, culminating in none, for “later investors”) at the time of their own retirement, an unconscionable bargain and fraud perpetrated through, among other things, misrepresentation and concealment of material risks, duties, and facts by *Congress* and the United States Government.

Wherefore, the within *Extinguishment of Contract by Rescission by Reason of the Giving of Consent by Mistake, Disavowal of Apparent Consent, and Divestment of Right (Entitlement) to Receive Social Security Retirement or Survivor Benefits*, following herein below, is authorized by certain timeless and universal principles of contract law, maxims of law, and, in pertinent part, *California Civil Code*, which code is *in pari materia* (i.e., in complete accord, despite any difference in wording) with the civil code of all other jurisdictions and in keeping with the letter and spirit of *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776, i.e., the supreme, organic Trust instrument from which all descendant Trust instruments issuing over the last 236 years derive their authority and power.

Commentary on application.

Pertinence of the common law in America is the same today as in 1776; what is different is access to courts of common law. All courtrooms, both federal and those of the so-called *50 States* (political subdivisions, n. 67, *supra*, of the District of Columbia), display, and not by accident, the golden-yellow-fringed personal flag of the Commander-in-Chief⁷⁸—the flag of a

⁷⁸The placing of a fringe on the national flag, the dimensions of the flag and the arrangement of the stars in the union are matters of detail not controlled by statute, but are within the discretion of the President as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy. *Official Opinions of the Attorneys General of the United States advising the President and Heads of Departments in relation to their Official Duties*, vol. 34, “National Flag of the United States,” May 15, 1925, 483–487.

military courtroom⁷⁹—not the de jure flag of the United States,⁸⁰ and no longer issue judgments in actual money, i.e., gold or silver coin,⁸¹ but so-called Federal Reserve Notes, i.e., the commercial *scrip*⁸² of a private business, the so-called Federal Reserve (*supra*, nn. 51, 72, 74–75).

Notwithstanding lack of access to a true common-law judicial forum in the several states of the Union, ordinary Americans (*supra*, n. 77) need only dissolve their contractual relationship with the political District of Columbia, DBA United States®, via universal principles of contract law and common law,⁸³ which are antecedent to *the United States of America*, and remove the prima facie evidence of legal residence in the geographical District of Columbia (*supra*, nn. 23–26, 29–30), **the sole basis of claim of personal jurisdiction over said Americans.**

There are personal choices to be made if one wishes to secure his standing in the Trust, such as that of his mailing location. Acceptance of mail matter bearing a ZIP Code™, which legally attaches only to United States Post Offices™ (*supra*, n. 65), not physical locations or structures located in the several states of the Union, is prima facie evidence of residence in the District of Columbia. Alien bankers have invaded and colonized, through instigation of indebtedness and insidious incrementalism, every organ of the de jure American Republic—and extraordinary effort, on both a personal and national level, is needed if *the People* are to purge America of the Matrix and restore it to the bright light and safe place it once was, populated by nontaxpayers.

Actors in *Congress* and the United States Government pursue their agenda in accordance with the policies of their creditor-lender, the private Federal Reserve (*supra*, nn. 51, 72), which acts in behalf of its nominal stockholder-banks and their banker principals (*supra*, nn. 73–75), not the Trust, *the United States of America*, or the Beneficiaries thereof, *the People*, through illicit manufacture and use of fraudulent prima facie statutory evidence to justify application of deadly force based on the presumption of personal jurisdiction, beginning with the constructive fraud of the Act of June 30, 1864, and resulting in the status quo. We are at a crossroads in history—and it is a certainty that every American man and woman will be faced, in the not-too-distant future, with the choice of whether to submit to the tyranny or do something about it.

⁷⁹Chapter 1 General . . .

3. Unauthorized use of official flags, guidons, and streamers. There is no law that permits the sale, loan, or donation of flags, guidons, or streamers to individuals or organizations not in the military service . . . Display or use of flags, guidons, or streamers or replicas thereof . . . by other than the office, individual, or organization for which authorized, is prohibited . . .

Chapter 2 Flag of the United States . . .

2-3. Sizes and occasions for display . . .

b. National flags listed below are for indoor display and for use in ceremonies and parades. For these purposes the United States flag will be rayon banner cloth, trimmed on three sides with golden yellow fringe, 2 1/2 inches wide. . . .

c. Authorization for indoor display. The flag of the United States is authorized for indoor display for . . . (4) each military courtroom. [U/L emphasis added.] Army Regulation 840–10, “Flags, Guidons, Streamers, Tabards, and Automobile and Aircraft Plates,” 1 October 1979, effective 15 January 1984.

⁸⁰SECTION 1. The flag of the United States shall have thirteen horizontal stripes, alternate red and white, and a union consisting of white stars on a field of blue.

SEC. 2. The positions of the stars in the union of the flag and the union jack shall be as indicated on the attachment to this order, which is hereby made a part of this order.

SEC. 3. The dimensions of the constituent parts of the flag shall conform to the proportions set forth in the attachment referred to in section 2 of this order. [Emphasis added.] United States Code, 1994 ed., vol. 1, Title 4—Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States (enacted by Act of July 30, 1947, ch. 389, § 1, 61 Stat. 641), 473.

⁸¹MONEY. Gold and silver coins. The common medium of exchange in a civilized nation. . . . *Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Money.”

⁸²scrip. . . . a certificate to be exchanged for goods, as at a company store. *Webster’s Dictionary*, encyc. unab. ed., s.v. “Scrip.”

⁸³*Statutum affirmativum non derogat communi legi.* An affirmative statute does not take from the common law. — When the common law and statute law concur, the common law is to be preferred. *Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. “Maxim.”

Rerum ordo confunditur, si unicuique jurisdictio non servatur. The order of things is confounded if every one preserves not his jurisdiction.

Personal jurisdiction over ordinary Americans derives strictly from presumption of residence in territory/places/property belonging to the United States (*Constitution*, Articles 1 § 8(17), 4 § 3(2)), *defined territory* (*supra*, nn. 17–18) over which Congress exercise absolute exclusive legislative power (*supra*, n. 20), facilitated by the contrived definition of “State” (*supra*, nn. 40–41), which excludes geographical Union states and embraces only the Territories and the District of Columbia and its so-called political subdivisions, a type of entity, like the executive-branch alphabet-soup *agencies* (a commercial term) of the political District of Columbia, for which there is no provision in any foundational Trust instrument), the so-called *50 States*.

Municipal corporations function under municipal law, which descends from Roman civil law and “pertains solely to the citizens and inhabitants of a state” (*supra*, p. 21), such as the political and geographical District of Columbia, and under which there is little difference between a citizen and a resident/inhabitant. Citizens/residents of the District of Columbia are simultaneously citizens/residents of the United States—which is located in, geographically identical to, and also known as the District of Columbia (*supra*, n. 26; *infra*, n. 89).

Each of the *50 States* (e.g., the “State of Maine,” “State of Texas,” “State of Ohio,” etc.) is a non-geographical political subdivision of the District of Columbia, a society comprised of Federal personnel (Social Security franchisees, *supra*, nn. 23–24, 30–32) living within the limits of a particular Union state. The Union states, like the common law, still exist in substance, but are moribund, relegated to obscurity in favor of the second national government whose “territory” is designated by the ZIP Codes™ of the United States Post Offices™ of that certain independent corporation run by the CEO of the District of Columbia⁸⁴ (President of the United States), the United States Postal Service®. The government of each of the *50 States* claims, by way of use of ZIP Code™—and not by mistake—to be part of a political subdivision of the District of Columbia, i.e., a society of United States Government employees (*supra*, nn. 24, 67) purportedly “located in a certain ZIP Code™” (for enumeration of the only taxpayers whose salary or wages are subject to levy/seizure for non-payment of income tax, *see* IRC § 6331(a)).

When one handles a situation with a government agent, attorney, taxman, debt collector, etc. with correspondence, he is producing evidence that can be used at a later date, if needed, to substantiate everything he claims or does. It is not written and sent to “get even” or strike back; it is composed and sent in order to create a record of evidence (just like that in a court case) that cannot be surmounted by anyone. It comprises the sender’s estimation of the exact amount of knowledge and power—no more, no less—needed to seal all avenues of attack and dissolve to zero-point—*without displaying any sign of weakness in the process*—any and all claims, actual or potential, thereby causing the recipient to decide to withdraw out of a sense of hopelessness.

Written instruments or correspondence fueled by hostility, irrespective of the specific words used in the writing, display weakness, only work against the sender, and, ultimately, serve more as a source of regret than anything else. To be most effective, all such written communication should be composed in a matter-of-fact, businesslike manner and devoid of emotion.

Essentially, we are not writing for the recipient per se, but for a judge—an objective that is not lost on the recipient. Whether a judge ever sees the instrument is irrelevant; the recipient sees what he is facing if he makes the wrong choice after receiving it. What we are doing is letting Matrix actors know that there is no more impunity for violations of the Declaration of Trust and they are personally liable under common law, irrespective of liability under statute.

⁸⁴*See* Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967, Eff. Aug. 11, 1967 (in part), 32 F.R. 11669, 81 Stat. 948, as amended Pub. L. 90-623, § 7(b), Oct. 22, 1968, 82 Stat. 1315. Title 5A United States Code (Appendix).

What makes evidence is a sworn statement. One can use the signatures (with legibly printed name) of two (sufficient) or three (better) witnesses to his signature on a sworn statement to produce evidence. A copy of ordinary correspondence can be converted into evidence by way of an oath to the effect that “the attached photocopy of [a particular document] is a true, correct, and complete copy of the original.” Each of the so-called *50 States* makes provision in its codes for a notary public (officer of the State) to produce such evidence, called a “Copy Certification by Notary,” “Verification of a Copy of an Original Document,” etc. Use witnesses for sworn instruments going to government officials, a notary public for copy certifications of such sworn instruments. Be prepared if the notary asks for a ZIP Code™ (*supra*, n. 66). A passport is preferable ID because it does not display an address or ZIP Code™.

Wherefore, whenever sending correspondence as aforesaid, always make two (2) originals of both instrument and Affidavit of Mailing: one each for recipient and record, which is maintained by you. A certified copy of each can be produced with ease via notary public if ever needed.

In the instant matter—extinguishment by rescission of the Social Security contract, disavowal of apparent consent, and divestment of right (entitlement) to receive Social Security benefits—it is possible that one could receive a letter from Social Security saying something to the effect of “*Anyone who works in the United States is required to pay Social Security taxes*” or “*You cannot voluntarily end your participation in the Social Security program*”; the implication being that it is impossible for one to terminate his relationship with Social Security, the bait-and-switch hook used to ensnare him in income tax. Whereas, both statements could be construed to hold true for actual residents of the geographical United States, legally defined as the District of Columbia and five insular possessions (*supra*, nn. 46–47), neither is true for ordinary Americans who make their home in a particular Union state. Considering what is at stake for the principals behind the private Federal Reserve—i.e., their inflationary, fraudulent, so-called *fractional-reserve-lending scheme* (“loans” of fictitious digits, created in multiples of “reserve funds” and “deposited,” i.e., typed, into the accounts of borrowers), perpetuated via imposition of income tax (public loss for private gain) on *the People* of the several states of the Union who are lured into the so-called Social Security retirement program—how could one expect any other reaction?

As mentioned above, one composes his instrument as though it will be read by a judge. If matters were to arrive at such station for any reason—an unlikely prospect—any such exercise would be self-defeating for those whose power depends on the ongoing ignorance of Social Security participants; filing of the evidence into the record of the case only works against them. Their best option is to dismiss/close and seal such a case as quietly as possible.

The supreme factor at play is one’s personal certainty of the legitimacy of his actions, not official written confirmation that he is absolved of his duties under the former Social Security contract and no longer a taxpayer or citizen and political subject and resident, for legal purposes, of the District of Columbia. If these characters would orchestrate a fraud of this magnitude and duration, is there anything they would not say or do to perpetuate the racket?

The biggest mistake one can make is to doubt, in the face of naked invalidation or implied threats of violence, what he knows. To do so is to forfeit his integrity to himself, whereupon, in his own estimation, his life becomes worth a little less. Actual owners of the Matrix believe they have an inherent right to your property, wealth, and labor and that you are placed on this earth to serve them. If you do not agree with these premises you have the option of recovering your standing under that certain Declaration of Trust of July 4, 1776—**an instrument with which no one can disagree**—and restoring order established as of that day.

Send by Certified Mail™ only and **do not request a return receipt.** Use same mailing location on envelope as correspondence, including “(Be advised: ZIP Code™ declined.),” and affix a Certified Mail™ Receipt sticker (PS Form 3800) and sufficient postage and seal and deposit the envelope in a blue United States Postal Service® collection box. For evidence of delivery go to www.usps.gov, “Track & Confirm,” and print/save details to your computer in PDF format.

America is well down the same path that the same line of banker-parasites led their former primary host, the State of Great Britain, but with the specter of far more disastrous consequences based on technology. Business owners have been duped just like everyone else and may need to be served with a *Notice and Demand* and certified copy of your executed instrument and proof of mailing in order to make a more informed choice about tendering what you are owed for your work (you are the creditor; the company is the debtor), based on your labor contract. Upon execution of the instrument and service on the Commissioner of Social Security and retention of a duplicate original of the instrument and Affidavit of Mailing and proof of delivery thereof, one has in his hands documentary evidence that cannot be surmounted by anyone.

If one sues the company for which he works for failure to tender earnings as agreed, it is more than likely he will prevail because his apparent consent for the company to do anything with his paycheck other than tender 100% of the sum he is owed for his work, no longer exists. The various forms, cards, documents, and contracts bearing his signature, given by him and obtained by the company and IRS through his *mistake*, are voided by the within instrument.

The Supreme Court, Department of Justice, and everyone else in Government agrees and routinely trumpets the fact that in America (beginning July 4, 1776) sovereignty resides in the people. If this is so, why is it that the people are so helpless in the face of Government mischief? A sovereign must be willing to create the law of the contract, rule, judge, and enforce the judgment; there is no other alternative. Presently, owners of a private business are using *Congress* and a dictatorial *form of Government* (municipal corporation) to ride herd on the American people for their own personal and fraternal aggrandizement. How does that square with the principles set forth in the Declaration of Trust, the instrument upon which *the United States of America* is founded? In 1776, American colonists revolt in order to escape the tyrannical policies of the same line of British bankers who will found the Federal Reserve in 1913, enforced via their primary debtor-servant-puppet at the time, King George III.

To be free one must be willing to establish and enforce the law of the contract. Failure to do so is a sign of weakness and a cue to attack. E.g., acceptance of mail matter (especially from Government, State or Federal) bearing a two-character State-identifier or five-digit ZIP Code™ is prima facie evidence that one is a “resident” (citizen) of a so-called political subdivision of the District of Columbia. If one does not wish to provide evidence of his legal residence in the District of Columbia, he should take measures to avoid doing so.

Beginning with only two of the Founding Fathers in 1776, but spreading beyond belief since that time, *the People* have been turned into *subjects* (a British term) by private bankers (*supra*, nn. 51, 74–75) through entrapment, bribery, and blackmail of members of *Congress*, and various other related intrigues resulting in installment of their agents in the highest levels of all three branches of Government. The only ones in *Congress* who might be worthy of trust are those who have put their name to legislation that eradicates the Federal Reserve; the rest are either complicit with the takeover/occupation or too effete to be trusted with anything.

The within process is a unilateral action; *to wit*: Does a wife need the agreement of her cheating husband to call it quits and leave? Does one who is being extorted need the approval of the extortionist to cease making payments? Once one drops the envelope in the mail (with proper address and postage) the extinguishment by rescission, disavowal of consent, and divestment of right (entitlement) is complete and he is no longer one of *the governed* (resident of the District of Columbia) but one of *the People* (“sovereigns without subjects,” *supra*, n. 16). (Note: Every other contract, license, or instrument in which one assents/gives his consent by mistake based on erroneous belief as to the meaning of “State” or “United States” is likewise invalid and subject to extinguishment by rescission like the Social Security contract, *infra*, p. 36.))

Based on the evidence and material facts placed into the record of the matter, the only way things can be otherwise is if the sender doubts the fact and truth of the citations in this discourse or veracity of the sworn statements in the instrument—and Matrix operatives can be expected to

say and do anything and everything to attempt to persuade the former United States Government employee (*supra*, n. 24), citizen of the federal government (n. 30), and volunteer taxpayer (nn. 31–32) with legal residence in the District of Columbia, that escape from the Matrix (public register of the political District of Columbia) is impossible and he is trapped for life. This, of course, is a hoax and a lie—but to be expected from those whose career and character is founded on a policy of deceit. It is only “true” if one agrees it is. There is nothing in law or anywhere else that supports such position except naked assertions such as those suggested above. What else would you expect from an extortionist?

Ubi jus, ibi remedium. Where there is a right, [85] there is a remedy.

Unumquodque dissolvatur eodem ligamine quo colligatur. Everything is dissolved by the same mode in which it is bound together.

Non impedit clausula derogatoria, quo minus ab eadem potestate res dissolvantur a qua constituuntur. A derogatory clause does not prevent things from being dissolved by the same power by which they were originally made.

In respect of the within-contemplated exercise of Right, the following additional maxims of law are offered for the reader’s erudition:

- *Lex est ratio summa, quæ jubet quæ sunt utilia et necessaria, et contraria prohibet.* Law is the perfection of reason, which commands what is useful and necessary and forbids the contrary.
- *Nihil quod est contra rationem est licitum.* Nothing against reason is lawful.
- *Origo rei inspicere debet.* The origin of a thing ought to be inquired into.
- *Quæras de dubiis, legem bene discere si vis.* Inquire into doubtful points if you wish to understand the law well.
- *Actio exteriora indicant interiora secreta.* Outward acts indicate the inward intent.
- *Intentio inservire debet legibus, non leges intentioni.* Intentions ought to be subservient to the laws, not the laws to intentions.
- *Quæ ad unum finem locuta sunt, non debent ad alium detorqueri.* Words spoken to one end, ought not to be perverted to another.
- *Omnis definitio in jure periculosa est; parum est enim ut non subverti possit.* Every definition in law is perilous, for there is very little that cannot be overthrown. (There is no rule in the civil law which is not liable to some exception ; and the least difference in the facts of the case renders its application useless.)
- *Prætextu liciti non debet admitti illicitum.* Under pretext of legality, what is illegal ought not to be admitted.
- *Ex malificio non oritur contractus.* A contract cannot arise out of an illegal act.
- *Ex uno disces omnes.* From one thing you can discern all. [*Bouvier’s Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., s.v. “Maxim”]

⁸⁵The Declaration of Trust guarantees *the People* multiple unalienable Rights.

- *Consensus facit legem.* Consent makes the law. A contract is a law between the parties, which can acquire force only by consent.
- *Quod meum est sine me auferri non potest.* What is mine cannot be taken away without my consent.
- *Non consentit qui errat.* He who errs does not consent.
- *Error qui non resistitur, approbatur.* An error not resisted is approved.
- *Qui non propulsat injuriam quando potest, infert.* He who does not repel a wrong when he can, occasions it.
- *Qui sentit onus, sentire debet et commodum.* He who bears the burden ought also to derive the benefit.
- *Contractus ex turpi causa, vel contra bonos mores nullus est.* A contract founded on an unlawful consideration or against good morals, is null.
- *Non est certandum de regulis juris.* There is no disputing about rules of law.
- *Actor qui contra regulam quid adduxit, non est audiendus.* He ought not to be heard who advances a proposition contrary to the rules of law. [Ibid.]
- *Regula pro lege, si deficit lex.* In default of the law, the maxim rules.
- *Dolus versatur in generalibus.* A deceiver deals in generalities.
- *Dolus versatur in generalibus.* Fraud deals in generalities.
- *Qui male agit, odit lucem.* He who acts badly hates the light.
- *Qui molitur insidias in patriam, id facit quod insanus nauta perforans navem in qua vehitur.* He who betrays his country, is like the insane sailor who bores a hole in the ship which carries him. [Ibid.]
- *Qui per fraudem agit, frustra agit.* He who acts fraudulently acts in vain.
- *Qui non libere veritatem pronunciat, proditor est veritatis.* He who does not willingly speak the truth, is a betrayer of the truth. [Ibid.]
- *Dolus circuitu non purgator.* Fraud is not purged by circuitry. [⁸⁶]
- *Plus peccat auctor quam actor.* The instigator of a crime is worse than he who perpetrates it.
- *Est autem vis legem simulans.* Violence may also put on the mask of law. [Ibid.]
- *Ei nihil turpe cui nihil satis.* Nothing is base to whom nothing is sufficient.
- *Sublata veneratione magistratuum, respublica ruit.* The commonwealth perishes, if respect for magistrates be taken away.
- *Qui accusat integræ famæ sit et non criminosus.* Let him who accuses be of clear fame, and not criminal.
- *Ea est accipienda interpretatio, quæ vitio caret.* That interpretation is to be received which is free from fault.

⁸⁶circuitry . . . roundabout circuitous procedure . . . lack of straightforwardness Merriam-Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, inc. version 2.5, s.v. "Circuitry."

- Statutes in derogation of common law must be strictly construed. [Ibid, 8th ed., 3rd rev.]
- Quicquid est contra normam recti est injuria. Whatever is against the rule of right is a wrong.
- Ubi est injuria, ibi damnum sequitur. Wherever there is a wrong, there damage follows.
- Quando verba et mens congruunt, non est interpretationi locus. When the words and the mind agree, there is no place for interpretation.
- Cum adsunt testimonia rerum quid opus est verbis. When the proofs of facts are present, what need is there of words. [Ibid, 6th ed.]
- Nemo potest contra recordum verificare per patriam. No one can verify by the country against a record. (The issue upon a record cannot be tried by a jury.)
- Posito uno oppositorum negatur alterum. One of two opposite positions being affirmed, the other is denied.
- Quod per recordum probatum, non debet esse negatum. What is proved by the record, ought not to be denied.
- Qui jure suo utitur, nemini facit injuriam. He who uses his legal rights, harms no one.
- Salus populi est suprema lex. The safety of the people is the supreme law.

Insurmountable evidence.

Based strictly on the definition of “United States,” every United States District Court is a *District of Columbia legislative forum* (under Article 4 § 3(2) of the *Constitution*) and *municipal-political field unit* (*infra*, n. 89), with no territorial jurisdiction in Union states and no personal jurisdiction over *the People* who make their home there. The content of the within instrument (*infra*, p. 36) demonstrates sufficient knowledge of these and other facts to prevail against any adversary.

Life in the legal jungle is essentially the same as it is in the equatorial kind: Predators are merciless and looking for any weakness in their prey they can exploit. Any sign of weakness is an enticement to attack. Like the poker player with the winning hand who folds, not knowing that one is holding all the legal Aces is also a sign of weakness and a signal to attack. The within instrument can prevail against any party in any situation because no one can produce evidence that can overcome that which is sworn to and provided or indicated therein.

In this writer’s opinion freedom is a function of responsibility and one can be as free only so far as he is responsible. Etymology of the word “responsibility” is, in pertinent part, as follows:

L *respondere* . . . (L: to promise in return, reply, answer) = *re-* *re-* + *spondere* to pledge, promise . . . [Random House Dictionary, coll. ed., s.v. “Respond”]

re-, a prefix, occurring originally in loan words from Latin, used with the meaning “again” or “again and again” to indicate repetition . . . [Ibid, s.v. “Re-”]

If one wants to live in a free society such as that envisioned by *the good People of these Colonies* (the Trustor) and almost all of the Founding Fathers, for *the United States of America* (the Trust), he must be willing to be responsible for that freedom against all would-be usurpers, all of whom, ultimately, are British bankers doing business in the District of Columbia. A certified copy of an executed original of the within instrument is an unimpeachable indictment that no judge wants admitted in evidence, no attorney/prosecutor wants to confront, and no officer, employee, or elected official of the United States or District of Columbia can negate or surmount.

“Taking the red pill”.

*The Matrix is everywhere. It is all around us. Even now, in this very room. You can see it when you look out your window or when you turn on your television. You can feel it when you go to work, when you go to church, when you pay your taxes. It is the world that has been pulled over your eyes to blind you from the truth. (Neo: What truth?) That you are a slave. Like everyone else, you were born into bondage, born into a prison that you cannot smell or taste or touch. A prison for your mind. Unfortunately, no one can be told what the Matrix is. You have to see it for yourself. This is your last chance. After this, there is no turning back. . . .*⁸⁷

Morpheus (circa 2000 A.D.).

The exposed weak link of the Matrix is the statutory term around which everything revolves: “United States,” primary DBA of District of Columbia, the governmental-political Frankenstein created February 21, 1871, by quislings⁸⁸ in *Congress* in service of principals of the then-private Bank of England. Demonstration of its actual meaning in any IRS civil case or federal criminal case⁸⁹ against an ordinary American (*supra*, n. 77) can (1) eliminate presumption of residence in “Territory or other Property belonging to the United States,” (2) obviate assertion of, respectively, subject-matter or personal jurisdiction, and (3) result in summary dismissal or unilateral judicial closure of the case for lack of jurisdiction of the court.

To “take the red pill” all one need do is clear up the meaning of “United States” and “State” as defined in IRC §§ 7701(a)(9), (10) and 3121(e)(1), and that of another IRC term used in the definition in two of the three aforesaid subsections of IRC, i.e., “includes,” a term whose definition is a hybrid composite of the two rules of statutory interpretation mentioned in Part One, *expressio unius est exclusio alterius* and *ejusdem generis*,⁹⁰ and defined in IRC § 7701(c).

Whereas, it is possible to free oneself through use of the appended instrument, from bondage as one whose legal residence is the District of Columbia and a so-called *taxpayer*, member of the class defined as *Federal personnel*, United States Government employee, citizen of the federal government, and so-called *individual, citizen of the United States*, and *person*, political wage-slave, and one of *the governed* and recover his standing as a constituent member of *the good People of these Colonies* (in real and natural sovereign corporate capacity) and one of the self-protecting (*ref.* Second Article of Amendment to the *Constitution*), self-governing sovereigns (*supra*, n. 16) known as *the People* (in individual capacity) who enjoys the unalienable, God-given Rights of Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness under common law, free of molestation by his servants in Government; there is no other way for one to free his mind of its self-imposed prison cell in the Matrix than to clear up the meaning of the three aforesaid statutory terms: “United States,” “State,” and “includes.”

“Remember, all I’m offering is the truth. Nothing more. . . .”⁹¹ ■

⁸⁷Morpheus, *The Matrix*, directed by The Wachowski Brothers, distributed by Warner Bros. Pictures, 1999.

⁸⁸quisling . . . a traitorous national who aids the invader of his country and often serves as chief agent or puppet governor *Merriam-Webster’s Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. “Quisling.”

⁸⁹Nearly all crimes (“Federal or State,” *ref.* 27 CFR 72.11; i.e., “State” means District of Columbia) are *commercial* crimes; criminal prosecution thereof is *debt collection*; and, in such matters, “United States” means the *municipally incorporated (political) District of Columbia*; to wit: “United States’ means— (A) a Federal corporation; . . .” USC Title 28 *Judiciary and Judicial Procedure*, Ch. 176 *Federal Debt Collection Procedure*, Sec. 3002(15).

⁹⁰EJUSDEM GENERIS . . . A rule of statutory construction . . . providing that where general words follow enumerations of particular classes of persons or things, the general words shall be construed as applicable only to persons or things of the same general kind as those enumerated. *Barron’s Dictionary of Legal Terms*, 1983 ed., s.v. “Ejusdem generis.”

⁹¹Morpheus, *The Matrix*, *supra*, n. 87.

[Full True Name]
[Street identifiers]
[City, Union-state]
(Be advised: ZIP Code™ declined.¹)

[Current Commissioner/Acting Commissioner's Name]
[Commissioner/Acting Commissioner] of Social Security
6401 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21235

Former account number
[Nine-digit number]

**Extinguishment of Contract by Rescission by Reason of the Giving of Consent by Mistake,
Disavowal of Apparent Consent, and Divestment of Right (Entitlement) to
Receive Social Security Retirement or Survivor Benefits.**

Be advised: You are hereby charged with knowledge of the contents hereof.

This *Extinguishment of Contract by Rescission by Reason of the Giving of Consent by Mistake, Disavowal of Apparent Consent, and Divestment of Right (Entitlement) to Receive Social Security Retirement or Survivor Benefits* (this "*Extinguishment by Rescission, Disavowal of Consent, and Divestment of Right (Entitlement)*") is authorized by certain universal principles² of contract law and equity, maxims of law³ and equity, and, in pertinent part, *California Civil Code* ("CCC"), which part is *in pari materia* with the civil code of all other jurisdictions.

Be further advised: 42 USC Chapter 7 *Social Security* §§ 1301(a)(1), (2), (3), and (b) re, respectively, the terms "State," "United States," "person," and "includes"; 5 USC *Government Organization and Employees* § 552a(a)(2) re the term "individual"; and 26 USC *Internal Revenue Code* ("IRC") § 3401(c) re the term "employee," apply herein *non obstante*.

Be further advised: Herein, bold, italicized text, whether in English or Latin (and followed by text in English), appearing within brackets, e.g., "[*Regula pro lege . . . In default of . . .*]," signifies a maxim of law or equity, each of which, unless noted otherwise, is found in *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. "Maxim," pp. 2122–2168.

Universal contract law and, in pertinent part, CCC provide:

1550.

It is essential to the existence of a contract that there should be:

1. Parties capable of contracting;
2. Their consent;
3. Lawful object; and,
4. A sufficient cause or consideration. [Emphasis added.]

¹We note that under section 122.32 of the U.S. Postal Service Domestic Mail Manual, the use of a zip code remains voluntary. See United States Postal Service Domestic Mail Manual § 122.32, at 55 (Mar. 1992). . . . *Joseph Peters v. National Railroad Passenger Corporation*, 966 F.2d 1483, 296 U.S.App.D.C. 202, 22 Fed.R.Serv.3d 1123 (1992).

²*Contra negantem principia non est disputandum.* There is no disputing against or denying principles. *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 6th ed., s.v. "Maxim."

Non est certandum de regulis juris. There is no disputing about rules of law. *Bouvier's Law Dictionary*, 3rd rev., 8th ed., s.v. "Maxim."

³*Regula pro lege, si deficit lex.* In default of the law, the maxim rules. *Ibid.*

Maxime ita dicta quia maxima est ejus dignitas et certissima auctoritas, atque quod maxime omnibus probetur. A maxim is so called because its dignity is chiefest, and its authority the most certain, and because universally approved by all. *Ibid.*

1565.

The consent of the parties to a contract must be:

1. Free;
2. Mutual; and,
3. Communicated by each to the other. [Emphasis added.]

1567.

An apparent consent is not real or free when obtained through:

1. Duress;
2. Menace;
3. Fraud;
4. Undue influence; or
5. Mistake. [Emphasis added.]

1688.

A contract is extinguished by its rescission.

1689. . . .

(b) A party to a contract may rescind the contract in the following cases:

- (1) If the consent of the party rescinding, or of any party jointly contracting with him, was given by mistake, or obtained through duress, menace, fraud, or undue influence, exercised by or with the connivance of the party as to whom he rescinds, or of any other party to the contract jointly interested with such party. [Emphasis added.]

As verified herein, there exists no evidence that at the time I gave my apparent consent and authorized the opening of that certain account and accepted that certain franchise (collectively the “Former Account”) with and from the Government of the United States (“USG”), via USG’s agency, the United States Social Security Administration (“USSSA”), that was assigned the above former account number (the “Former Account Number”), and appeared to enter into that certain former conditional (*specifically*: assessment) contract (the “Former Social Security Contract”), I was located or born or naturalized in, or a resident or citizen of, the United States, or subject to United States’ jurisdiction or eligible for such account or number (20 CFR § 422.104).

I recently discovered that at the time I was induced to authorize the opening of, and accept, the Former Account [*Qui tacet consentire videtur. He who is silent appears to consent.*] and give my apparent consent and enter into the Former Social Security Contract with USSSA:

- Neither the United States nor District of Columbia nor any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of either or both of the foregoing, nor USG nor any officer, employee, or elected official of any one or more of the foregoing, e.g., *Commissioner of Social Security*, nor any other thing otherwise within the meaning of any one or more of the foregoing (all of which of the foregoing are collectively “USG”), disclosed to me, nor was I seized of knowledge, that:
 - Per §§ 1101(a)(1), (2) of the Social Security Act, only residents of the District of Columbia or Territory of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands are eligible therefor;
 - The principal part of the Former Social Security Contract is liability not for payroll tax but *income tax* [*Disparata non debent jungi. Dissimilar things ought not to be joined.*], a feature unrelated to the advertised purpose of the Social Security retirement program [*Intentio inservire debet legibus, non leges intentioni. Intentions ought to be subservient to the laws, not the laws to intentions.*];
 - Though promoted as a *personal* retirement program, Social Security is rather more akin to a *third-party* retirement program in that a Social Security payroll taxpayer contributes funds exclusively for the retirement or benefit of third parties whom he does not know and has never met, retaining no accrued property rights thereto [*Qui sentit onus, sentire debet et commodum. He who bears the burden ought also to derive the benefit.*], only the right to *receive* (not realize) Social Security benefits funded by others, an unconscionable bargain [*Nemo agit in seipsum. No man acts against himself.*];

- Upon giving my apparent consent and entering into the Former Social Security Contract, USG would corrupt my full true name, [Full True Name], which is properly written in accordance with the rules of English grammar, into a corporately styled, all-capital-letters NAME, a franchisee of the District of Columbia, also known as United States (*infra*, n. 7), and *juristic person*,⁴ i.e., [FULL TRUE NAME] [*Talis non est eadem, nam nullum simile est idem. What is like is not the same, for nothing similar is the same. — Proprietates verborum observerandæ sunt. The proprieties of words (i. e. proper meanings of words) are to be observed.*], without my consent, and thereafter classify [FULL TRUE NAME], and me by implication, to be a:
 - member of the class defined as *Federal personnel* and United States Government employee⁵;
 - so-called *individual*⁶ and *citizen of the United States*⁷;
 - so-called *person*,⁸ with political and civil rights conferred by Congress;
 - legal resident of the District of Columbia, doing business as United States®,⁹ and the subject of all legislation therein¹⁰;
 - citizen of the federal government¹¹; and
 - taxpayer,¹² personally liable to pay interest on the national debt¹³—*which debt is held by private bankers*—in the form of income tax.¹⁴

⁴juristic person . . . a corporation . . . or other legal entity that is recognized by law as the subject of rights and duties called also *artificial person, conventional person, fictitious person* Merriam-Webster's *Unabridged Dictionary*, inc. version 2.5, s.v. "Juristic person."

⁵the term "Federal personnel" means . . . individuals entitled to receive immediate or deferred retirement benefits under any retirement program of the Government of the United States (including survivor benefits). 5 USC *Government Organization and Employees* § 552a(a)(13).

⁶the term "individual" means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence . . . Ibid, § 552a(a)(2).

⁷The United States is located in the District of Columbia. UCC § 9-307(h).

U.S. Const. Art. 1 § 8(17); 16 Stat. 419, Rev. Stat. D.C. § 2, and 49 Stat. 430; and 28 USC § 3002(15).

⁸The term "person" means an individual . . . 42 USC § 1301(a)(3).

"person" includes an individual . . . 5 USC § 551(2).

The term "person" shall be construed to mean and include an individual . . . 26 USC § 7701(a)(1).

⁹E.g., United States Department of Commerce Census Bureau form entitled "United States® Census 2010."

¹⁰*And be it further enacted*, That the legislative power of the District shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation within said District . . . ch. 62, sec. 18, 16 Stat. 419, February 21, 1871.

¹¹A citizen of the United States is a citizen of the federal government . . . *Kitchens v. Steele*, D.C.W.D. Mo., 112 F.Supp. 383 (1953).

¹²The revenue laws are a code or system in regulation of tax assessment and collection. They relate to taxpayers, and not to nontaxpayers. The latter are without their scope. No procedure is prescribed for nontaxpayers, and no attempt is made to annul any of their rights and remedies in due course of law. With them Congress does not assume to deal, and they are neither of the subject nor of the object of the revenue laws. *Long v. Rasmussen*, [9 Cir.] D.C.Mont. 1922, 281 F. 236.

¹³. . . 100 percent of what is collected [in income tax] is absorbed solely by interest on the Federal debt . . . In other words, all individual income tax revenues are gone before one nickel is spent on the services which taxpayers expect from their Government. J. Peter Grace, "President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control: A Report to the President," dated and approved January 12 and 15, 1984, 3.

¹⁴In addition to other taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the income of every individual a tax equal to the following percentages of the wages received by him . . . Social Security Act of August 14, 1935 [H. R. 7260], § 801 *Income tax on employees*.

Slater's protestations to the effect that he derives no benefit from the United States government have no bearing on his legal obligation to pay income taxes. . . . Unless the defendant can establish that he is not a citizen of the United States, the IRS possesses authority to attempt to determine his federal tax liability. *United States v. Slater* (D. Delaware, 1982), 545 F.Supp. 179, 182.

- The Secretary of the Treasury, who does not work for USG,¹⁵ would convert, for purposes of income taxation, the Former Account Number into a so-called *taxpayer identification number* without my consent via application of IRC (i.e., IRC § 6109(d) *Use of social security account number*), a species of the revenue laws of the United States with which, prior to being induced to authorize, via my silence, the opening of the Former Account by the giving of my apparent consent to the Former Social Security Contract, I had no duty to know;
- Using the pretext of a retirement program, USG intended [*Intentio inservire debet legibus, non leges intentioni. Intentions ought to be subservient to the laws, not the laws to intentions.*] to induce me to remain silent and thereby give my apparent consent to the Former Social Security Contract in order to:
 - Transform me into a member of the class defined as *Federal personnel* and a USG employee and citizen, political franchisee, and subject of the political, municipally incorporated District of Columbia, and therefore a so-called *citizen of the United States* and taxpayer over whose life, liberty, and property USG exercise absolute legislative, judicial, and executive power and jurisdiction;
 - Obligate me, as a constructive citizen of the District of Columbia, with legal residence therein, to pay interest, in the form of income tax, on the national debt incurred by Congress and owed to private bankers; and
 - Make me responsible for the funding of Social Security retirement, survivor, and disabled benefits to third parties whom I do not know in order to attract more payroll taxpayers into the Social Security retirement program (political movement) and, thereby, more income taxpayers to pay interest on the national debt incurred by Congress and owed to private bankers; and
- USG intended to impute to my labor a zero dollar-value (\$0.00) [*Intentio caeca, mala. A hidden intention is bad.*] in order to justify construing all my earnings to be 100% gains/profits/income for calculation of income-tax liability under the revenue laws of the United States [*Nemo debet rem suam sine facto aut defectu suo amittere. No one should lose his property without his act or negligence.*], despite the fact that there is zero gains/profits/income (12 Stat. 432, §§ 90–91, pp. 473–474, July 1, 1862) in what one receives for his labor, an equal exchange of consideration between parties;
- The Social Security retirement program has all the elements of a Ponzi scheme [*Non differunt quæ concordant re, tametsi non in verbis iisdem. Those things which agree in substance, though not in the same words, do not differ.*], a fraudulent investment scheme wherein the prospect of a program participant realizing a retirement benefit is a *gamble* [*Nemo tenetur seipsam infortuniis et periculis exponere. No one is bound to expose himself to misfortune and dangers.*], dependent upon USG finding and luring into the scheme *ever-increasing numbers* of additional participants (“new investors”), who enter the workforce and contribute (“invest”) sufficient payroll taxes to offset loss of contributions (“investments”) from retiring payroll taxpayers (“old investors”) and still meet scheduled Social Security benefits (artificially high dividends) for retirees/survivors/disabled, each of which beneficiaries requires the contributions of multiple current workers (“new investors”), a scheme projected by you at www.ssa.gov to be operating in the red by 2019 and bankrupt by 2049;

¹⁵The U.S. Secretary of the Treasury receives no compensation for representing the United States. Senate Report No. 94-1148 of October 1, 1976 (re amendment of Bretton Woods Agreements Act, P.L. 94-564, 90 Stat. 2660, re § 2 (p. 8) of House Report 13955), 5942.

No person [e.g., Secretary of the Treasury] shall be entitled to receive any salary or other compensation from the United States for services as a Governor [of the World Bank, IMF, etc.]. . . 22 USC § 286a(d)(1).

- The ultimate beneficiaries of the principal part and object of the Social Security retirement program—*income-tax liability and revenue*—are private bankers;
- USSSA is a quasi-constitutional agency run under the direct ownership and control of the municipal corporation, political state, and second national government known as District of Columbia (16 Stat. 419; 20 Stat. 102; 49 Stat. 430), doing business as United States®, which DBA is located in/synonymous with the District of Columbia (*supra*, n. 7); and
- As of the Act of June 30, 1864 (*infra*), Congress are acting in bad faith toward the American People residing throughout the Union in that Congress pervert the word “state” into a *term of art* with a constitutionally opposite meaning to the only meaning of which it is reasonably capable, and thereafter revise it to “State” in the *Revised Statutes of the United States . . . 1873–’74 (infra)*, the controlling definition of which in all subsequent congressional legislation, e.g., the Civil Rights Act of 1866, 14th and 16th Articles of Amendment to the Constitution, IRC of 1986, and every current federal title, comprehends only the District of Columbia and certain of the Territories [***Actio exteriora indicant interiora secreta. Outward acts indicate the inward intent.***]; to the exclusion—per universal rules of statutory construction and interpretation (e.g., *expressio unius est exclusio alterius, ejusdem generis, noscitur a sociis, in pari materia*,¹⁶ etc.) [***Statutes in derogation of common law must be strictly construed.***]¹⁷—of the several states of the Union¹⁷; *to wit, respectively and in pertinent part:*

And be it further enacted, That wherever the word state is used in this act it shall be construed to include the territories and the District of Columbia . . . [“An Act to provide Internal Revenue to support the Government, to pay Interest on the Public Debt, and for other Purposes,” ch. 173, sec. 182, 13 Stat. 223, 306, June 30, 1864]

The word “State,” when used in this Title, shall be construed to include the Territories and the District of Columbia . . . [*Revised Statutes of the United States, Passed at the First Session of the Forty-third Congress, 1873–’74*, Title 35, ch. 1, p. 601, approved retroactively as of the Act of March 2, 1877, amended and approved as of the Act of March 9, 1878]

The term “United States” when used in a geographical sense includes only the States [*identified in ¶ 2, p. 7 hereof*] and the District of Columbia. [26 USC 7701(a)(9)]

Obligations imposed by universal law and, in pertinent part, CCC § 1709, provide:

One who willfully deceives another with intent to induce him to alter his position to his injury or risk, is liable for any damage which he thereby suffers.

Relying on representations from numerous disparate promoters, all of which run to USG, before and at the time I was induced to authorize the opening of the Former Account and give, by my silence upon attaining the age of majority, my apparent consent to the Former Social Security Contract [***Qui tacet consentire videtur. He who is silent appears to consent.***], I was induced to alter my position from:

- Constituent member of that certain body corporate and real and natural sovereign corporation known as *the good People of these Colonies*, successor sovereign to King George III of England and trustor of that certain voluntary trust known as *the United States of America*, under that certain declaration of trust known as *The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America* of July 4, 1776, and joint tenant in sovereignty who, in personal capacity as one of *the People* and beneficiaries of said trust, enjoys all unalienable Rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator, among which are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—and *nontaxpayer*,¹⁸ i.e., [Full True Name], without the scope of the revenue laws of the United States;—***to***

¹⁶*A Dictionary of Law*, 7th ed., Jonathan Law and Elizabeth Martin, eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), s.v. “Interpretation, Rules and Principles of Statutory.”

¹⁷The “50 States” are not *geographical areas* but *political societies* of Social Security franchisees residing within the respective exterior limits of the 50 Union-states: political subdivisions of the District of Columbia.

¹⁸*Supra*, n. 12.

- Member of the class known as *Federal personnel*, USG employee, political franchisee with residence, for certain legal purposes such as taxation, licensing, and a species of criminal jurisdiction not provided for by law, in the District of Columbia, citizen of the federal government, and so-called *individual, citizen of the United States*, and *person* with civil rights conferred by USG, wage-slave liable to income tax and subject to the absolute legislative, judicial, and executive power and jurisdiction of USG, and *taxpayer*, i.e., [FULL TRUE NAME], both of the subject and of the object of the revenue laws of the United States and the subject of all legislation within the District of Columbia.

Wherefore: It is not unreasonable to conclude that I assumed the political liabilities and obligations that came with the Former Social Security Contract and Former Account unwittingly [*Nemo praesens nisi intelligat. One is not present unless he understands.*] and gave, against interest [*Nemo agit in seipsum. No man acts against himself.*], USG apparent consent to exercise absolute legislative, judicial, and executive power over, among other things, my life, liberty, and property, an unconscionable bargain, thereby altering my position to my injury and risk, relinquishing, unintentionally, *right of property* of my labor, earnings, and wealth and suffering loss of a substantial portion thereof, based on representations from numerous disparate promoters, all of which run to USG—e.g., “You can’t get a job without a social security number,” “We require a social security number for a 1099 before we can pay you,” “You can’t remove your newborn from the hospital until he has a social security number,” etc.—and willful concealment of material risks, duties, and facts in the Former Social Security Contract, cited *supra*, and gave my apparent consent to USG via the Former Social Security Contract and Former Account by mistake as a consequence thereof [*Non consentit qui errat. He who errs does not consent.*]*—*which apparent consent I certainly would not have given had such representations not been foisted on me or the material risks, duties, and facts cited *supra* disclosed to me—thereby rendering it impossible to secure the mutual agreement and assent of the parties to substance and terms of contract [*Omnia praesumuntur legitime facta donec probetur in contrarium. All things are presumed to be done legitimately until the contrary is proved.*].

For the above reasons and on that basis [*Ignorantia facti excusat. . . . Acts done and contracts made under mistake or ignorance of a material fact are voidable and relievable in law and equity. 2 Kent, Comm. 491 . . . Black’s Law Dictionary, 2nd ed., s.v. “Ignorantia facti excusat”*], as authorized by law:

I hereby extinguish, as of the date by me last-below written, the Former Social Security Contract and Former Account by rescission [*Exceptio ejus rei cujus petitur dissolutio nulla est. There can be no plea of that thing of which the dissolution is sought. (Bouvier’s Law Dictionary, 6th ed., s.v. “Maxim”) — Ubi jus, ibi remedium. Where there is a right, there is a remedy. — Æquilas sequitur legem. Equity follows the law. — Equity suffers not a right without a remedy. — Perpetua lex est, nullam legem humanum ac positivam perpetuam esse; et clausula quae abrogationem excludit initio non valet. It is a perpetual law that no human or positive law can be perpetual; and a clause in a law which precludes the power of abrogation is void ab initio. — When the common law and statute law concur, the common law is to be preferred.*] and disavow, *ab initio*, the said apparent consent given by me and obtained by USG through my mistake, and expressly disclaim and divest myself and any and all corruptions of my full true name, e.g., [FULL T NAME], now and forever, of any and all right (entitlement) to receive immediate or deferred Social Security retirement or survivor benefits [*Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se inducto. Any one may renounce a right introduced for his own benefit.*] under the Social Security retirement program of the Government of the United States, also known as the Government of the District of Columbia, and expressly disavow and disclaim, as one ineligible therefor, all such right (entitlement) thereto and retain none [*Tout ce que la loi ne defend pas est permis. Everything is permitted, which is not forbidden by law.*], and disavow all purported duties, liabilities, and obligations associated with the political franchisee, juristic person, and purported constructive citizen created via the Former Social Security Contract, i.e., [FULL TRUE NAME], whose residence, for certain legal purposes, is the District of Columbia, effective the date of the opening of the Former Account [*Errores ad sua principia referre, est refellere. To refer errors to their origin is to refute them.*].

Wherefore: I hereby declare void all forms, cards, documents, and contracts and other instruments bearing my signature that may appear to evidence my consent or authorization re the Former Social Security Contract and Former Account, given by me and obtained by USG through my mistake [***Non consentit qui errat. He who errs does not consent.***].

Be advised: Notwithstanding any provision that allows for termination of the Former Social Security Contract (*infra*), but not for termination/cessation of the express object thereof, i.e., the franchise of right (entitlement) to receive immediate or deferred Social Security retirement or survivor benefits [***Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se inducto. Any one may renounce a right introduced for his own benefit.***—effectively nullifying any such provision via compelled acceptance of the selfsame “right (entitlement) to receive Social Security benefits” and therefore void ab initio [***Perpetua lex est, nullam legem humanum ac positivam perpetuam esse; et clausula quae abrogationem excludit initio non valet. It is a perpetual law that no human or positive law can be perpetual; and a clause in a law which precludes the power of abrogation is void ab initio.***] that purported to make me a USG employee, citizen of the federal government, and franchisee whose residence, for certain legal purposes, is the District of Columbia [***Contractus ex turpi causa, vel contra bonos mores nullus est. A contract founded on an unlawful consideration or against good morals, is null.***], rendering the Former Social Security Contract an unconscionable bargain [***Adjuvari quippe nos, non decipi, beneficio oportet. For we ought to be helped by a benefit, not destroyed by it.***—such provision nevertheless is rendered moot by the fact that at the time I gave my apparent consent and appeared to execute the Former Social Security Contract I was located without the United States [***Locus contractus regit actum. The place of the contract governs the act.***], which in a geographical sense consists of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and Northern Mariana Islands [42 USC §§ 1301(a)(1), (2), and (b)] and excludes all Union states, such as Alaska [42 USC § 1301(a)(8)(D)], but in a political sense means the District of Columbia (only) [42 USC § 1301(a)(8)(C)], the so-called *50 States* being *50 non-geographical* political subdivisions thereof, of which the State of Alaska (political society of legal residents of the District of Columbia residing within the exterior limits of Alaska) is one, but Alaska (geographical area) is not; thereby rendering otiose, nugatory, and non-existent any right (entitlement) to receive immediate or deferred Social Security retirement or survivor benefits and barring assertion of any claim to the contrary [***Quod alias bonum et justum est, si per vim vel fraudem petatur, malum et injustum efficitur. What is otherwise good and just, if sought by force or fraud, becomes bad and unjust.***] by either or both of the doctrines of *equitable estoppel* and *legal estoppel*; to wit, in pertinent part:

Each agreement shall contain provisions for its possible termination. If an agreement is terminated, entitlement to benefits and coverage acquired by an individual before termination shall be retained. . . . [Title 20 CFR *Employees' Benefits* § 404.1905 *Termination of agreements*]

Be further advised: This *Extinguishment by Rescission, Disavowal of Consent, and Divestment of Right (Entitlement)* and its contents are binding on every principal and agent re the subject matter set forth herein; and shall, along with the accompanying Affidavit of Mailing, be entered in evidence in any civil or criminal proceeding that may arise in connection therewith.

Be further advised: As one without the scope of the revenue laws of the United States, e.g., Titles 42 and 26 of the United States Code, I enjoy all rights and remedies in due course of law against officers and employees of the United States who, in discharge of discretionless ministerial duties, commit without authority, contrary to their duty, and in violation of the due process of the Constitution and the revenue laws of the United States, positive acts of trespass for which they are personally liable¹⁹ [***Nemo damnus facit, nisi qui id fecit quod facere jus non habet. No one is considered as committing damages, unless he is doing what he has no right to do.***].

¹⁹[7] The distinction between persons and things within the scope of the revenue laws and those without them is vital. See *De Lima v. Bidwell*, 182 U. S. 176, 179, 21 Sup.Ct. 743, 45 L.Ed. 1041. To the former only does section 3224 apply (see cases cited in *Violette v. Walsh* [D.C.] 272 Fed. 1016), and the well-understood exigencies of government and its revenues and their collection do not serve to extend it to the latter. It is a shield for official action, not a sword for private aggression. . . . *Long v. Rasmussen*, [9 Cir.] D.C.Mont. 1922, 281 F. 236.

[Full True Name]
[Street identifiers]
[City, Union-state]
(Please be advised: ZIP Code™ declined.)

[Date (Must be sent at least **one day** before *Extinguishment of Contract by Rescission . . .*)]

[Name of Postmaster], Postmaster
United States Post Office™
[City, State, ZIP Code™]

[20-digit Certified Mail™ No.]

Re: Declination of ZIP Code™

Notice of Authorized Mailing Location and other Things

Dear Postmaster [Postmaster's Surname]:

This is Notice of my true, correct, complete, proper, and authorized mailing location, set forth hereinabove with specificity. In respect thereof, I hereby authorize you to deliver to me, mail matter displaying any of various innocuous alterations or abbreviations of the name and street identifiers set forth therein.

Notwithstanding the foregoing authorization: As authorized by law,¹ you are hereby expressly forbidden to deliver to [Full True Name] or any variation in the spelling thereof, any mailpiece bearing, as part of said [Full True Name]'s mailing location, any (1) United States Postal Service® two-character State identifier, e.g., "[2-capital-letter State identifier]," or (2) United States Post Office™ or delivery-unit numerical identifier² known as a ZIP Code™.³

Attempted delivery of mail matter in contravention of the above order will result in undue expense and burden to the United States Postal Service® in that any and all such mailpieces will be returned at time of delivery⁴ or thereafter (marked "No such address").

Abuse or neglect of the order in this *Notice of Authorized Mailing Location and other Things* by you shall constitute, without limitation, an act or acts of bad faith, fraud, and trespass on your part for which, in the event of damage, you are personally liable.

This *Notice of Authorized Mailing Location and other Things* and its contents are binding on every principal and agent re the subject matter set forth herein and shall be entered in evidence in any civil or criminal proceeding that may arise in connection therewith.

Please understand the extreme seriousness of this matter and conduct yourself accordingly.

Sincerely,

[*Full True Name* (signed)]
[Full True Name (printed)]

¹*Domestic Mail Manual* § 508-1.1.1.

²*Ibid*, § 602-1.8.1.

³We note that under section 122.32 of the U.S. Postal Service Domestic Mail Manual, the use of a zip code remains voluntary. See United States Postal Service Domestic Mail Manual § 122.32, at 55 (Mar. 1992). . . . *Joseph Peters v. National Railroad Passenger Corporation*, 966 F.2d 1483, 296 U.S.App.D.C. 202, 22 Fed.R.Serv.3d 1123 (1992).

⁴*Domestic Mail Manual* § 508-1.1.2.

