

## John Bryant Show with Howard Griswold - 07/16/03

030716-4-X-Howard Griswold

[John] Good afternoon, everyone, you're tuned to Liberty Forum here on Truth Radio Network, your solutions oriented on-air search for the nature with our relationships out here, including knowledge especially that we've not been taught about in the public fool system. We continue, today, with Howard Griswold and we're just absolutely blessed as far as I'm concerned with a few great guests that have so much to offer and they have taken time to share what they've got with us, at least give a glimpse of what they got. You can pursue further what's going on if you have a special situation or need to follow up further and I would guess that would fit just about everybody's bill. But it looks as though, there is the understanding out there being gained at least by a few people and they've acknowledged to do something about most of the situations that we find ourselves in where there is, what I would classify as abuse by the powers that be.

Before we join Howard I thought I would mention David Barr who is up to his eyeballs in problems in Missouri with the travel issue, has been communicating with Al Adask. Al has been in jail in Missouri about ten months, now, since September of last year, if I remember correctly. It might even be even longer than that. I got an address for Al and, apparently, he's doing ok, but he's feeling a bit lonesome and neglected and I'll give this address out. I'm sure he would be glad to hear from any and all of you, especially with those that might be able to add to his body of knowledge as to what to do. He has not been, I don't know if he's been charged, but he has not had an arraignment and not pled into this case, it has been since September, last year. But he's been in jail in Missouri. And if you'd like to write to Al -- again, Al headed up the *Anti-Shyster* for many years and has been looking into these same issues and problems for many years. Now he finds himself in jail again, it looks like, without any due process over some past child support issue. I'm not sure it's even been defined; I'm not sure if he's been charged. So you can write to him, Alfred Adask, BK#2006371, c/o Jefferson County Jail, P.O. Box 100, Hillsboro, Missouri 63050. And apparently Al has not been very well taken care of there; he's got some medical needs including development of a couple of boils on his arms which he's concerned about some blood poisoning there. So, anyway, it would be good if you've got the time and inclination to write to Al Adask. The sheriff is at the same address. His name is Oliver Boyer, P.O. Box 100, Hillsboro, Missouri 63050. And the phone for sheriff Boyer if communications becomes something that you feel like should be done, is 636-797-5519. [Ed. Note: Al Adask is not now, in the year 2011, an incarcerated man.]

Ok, and very quickly, David Barr in Missouri, with the traffic problems and, again, they've got them stacked on him like a criminal, repeat offender. His phone number is 573-468-3283. He can use any help that you might be able to send there. Ok, needed to get those things out and periodically things do come to us that we do want to pass on to you.

Been about three weeks since we've visited with Howard, extensively anyway. We had him on for an hour one week but he's had some things to deal with that have come up and hopefully that won't get in the way of future visits. But we've been talking about entities to be an interface, especially a limited liability company to be an interface between the natural man and commercial activity, bank accounts and so on. And it's pretty interesting, Howard has talked about a blind LLC, I believe that's the decent term to use that doesn't indicate who established it and it's available through the State of Delaware or Nevada. Also, apparently, it's limited to the amount of funds that were used to establish the thing. So it basically limits liability pretty severely. There's some other things that maybe we can get into too with Howard, we'll see what he's been doing, but land issues, I know he's got some things to say about land and we've got, I know, a lot of people with mortgage problems, with foreclosure problems due to either mortgages, taxes, or zoning problems, code enforcement tickets and on and on it goes. We have been looking, of course, at some courtroom procedures which are, I believe, absolutely essential. With as much knowledge as you've got on a particular subject if you don't know what to do if you're brought into a courtroom, it really doesn't do you a whole lot of good. So maybe we could touch on those things. Another thing I haven't run by Howard, I know that people have family problems, too, child protective services in various places seem to be interfering to a large degree in great numbers around the country with people and their families. So, let's just see what's on Howard's mind.

Howard, welcome back, glad to have you back.

[Phil] John, this is Phil. I could not reach Howard at the number that I have.

[John] Ok, let's see, sounds like we're having a little trouble.

[Phil] Getting him, yes. I dialed up that number and it said that the number had been changed.

[John] Ok, are we going out on the air right now?

[Phil] Yes, so I will talk to you in private, real quick, alright?

[John] Excuse us a moment. Ok, a little miscommunications but we should have Howard on in just a moment. I could tell somebody was back there, it was Phil. We will be having Rick Stanley on, on Monday. He's got such an ugly situation going on, but based on some rights issues and I'm afraid that Rick has entered the jurisdiction of the administrative courts and he's finding out that they do exactly as they please. The rules are there, not for them, but for us and he is been making a very loud and strong statement regarding what will happen if they try to come get him. And that's just what the system seems to like. It's a situation, too, that is very difficult make a judgment on, at least for me right now. I felt that at some point if the system really does violate the law and pursue us that we have an obligation to self defense. And I'm not sure if this

situation proves that or not, we'll find out what his story is. I'm afraid it's very dangerous. Taking place right here in Colorado, in Denver. So what's happened there, in a nutshell is we got an appeal of a weapons charge where he actually went out and tested the law and the – since that time the state legislature has confirmed that he's right but the city of Denver can't rise above the state law as far as the right to bear arms openly. So anyway this is the case, he's now got on appeal and the local judge decided to withdraw or cancel his bond, put him back in jail. He's got a warrant out now since Rick did miss a hearing, so, anyway, that'll be what we look at on Monday this week. Howard, have we connected?

[Howard] Yes.

[John] Hey, welcome back. Here I am jabbering away, here, thinking you're on the line and glad to have you back.

[Howard] Well, thank you.

[John] What sort of things have been foremost on people's minds here in the last three weeks or so, Howard? Any particular thing or is it all over the map?

[Howard] Property tax. Everywhere in America the property taxes are soaring. It's particularly disturbing the elderly because they're on a fixed income and they don't know how to pay what they've got to pay now and it's going up. They don't know they're going to possibly pay what it's going up to. The elderly are the one's that are suffering most, of course, they give the elderly a tax break.

[John] They thought they bought and paid for a house and now they're going to be out on the street if they don't pay their annual ....

[Howard] Oh, it's been happening, too. They're out on the street, some of them.

[John] What are those rates, Howard? I'm not familiar, but I heard just in passing that they are horrendous, I mean, just multiple of thousands a year in some of these eastern urban areas.

[Howard] All over the country it's way above what it used to be. In the rural areas where the tax wasn't real high, it's going up but it hasn't gone up near as it has in some of the, what they call, metropolitan areas. Some of the metropolitan areas it is unbelievable, I've heard, \$16,000 a year for taxes on the house.

[John] I was afraid that that was the case. Here we are into our break, anyway we'll come back with Howard Griswold in a couple of minutes. You're listening to Liberty Forum here.... [20 min., 17.097 sec.] [end of segment one]

[start of segment two]

[John] Back with Howard Griswold here on Liberty Forum. And Howard says that property taxes are an issue that's really coming up and I can see why. Here I am, a guy that's not had a mortgage and has not owned any property and so I don't know what the people are facing but that's kind of what I heard that it's in the thousands, \$16,000 a year for a house in town. That is insane.

[Howard] The house that I'm sitting in downtown Baltimore city is a 20 foot wide by 40 foot long row house and the tax on it is \$3000 a year.

[John] And what does she get for that? I mean she pays for every other service that she uses, I would say, separately almost.

[Howard] Oh, yes. About all the only thing you get for that is schools for the children and she doesn't have any children, she's eighty years old.

[John] City streets, what do they fall under?

[Howard] In disarray around here, they're poorly maintained. Raggedy, to say the best. And we get trash pickup, twice a week.

[John] When the last time the street was paved was thirty years ago you wonder where that money's going.

[Howard] Thirty years ago, I bet you some of these streets around downtown Baltimore haven't been paved in fifty or sixty years.

[John] Anyway, you did say something to me about land and we've had, I would guess, Howard, that it gets complicated with mortgages...

[Howard] Indeed it does. You really can't do much when you're under the debt of a mortgage. The only property that you can remove from the public records filing is property that is free and clear of attachments of any kind, liens or mortgages. If there's a lien or mortgage against the property they would foreclose on the mortgage as you were trying to remove the deed and take the property away from you because it would be their last chance to do it. Once you get it out of their records, then they can't go into court because the law says, you got to look far enough to find this, but there is law on it, it says that the property must be within the jurisdiction of the court. And then there's an explanation by a couple of law professors that explains what that means, it means it must be filed in the government records in order to be within the jurisdiction of the court because the court is governmental, and it's jurisdiction is limited to what's in government. They can only regulate and tax what they can create. They can't regulate and tax private property. They didn't create private property, they have to get it into

their records and have it recorded in order for it to be within their jurisdiction and regulateable because they created the interest in it.

[John] You used the word, 'filed' and 'recorded', here, is there a difference?

[Howard] Not really, they both mean the same thing. I use them interchangeably.

[John] Others have made a distinction, but people need to research these things, too, independently.

[Howard] Well, if you file it you take it in for filing and the court clerk files it and once she does that, it has been recorded. So it's sort of interchangeable, isn't it?

[John] Sounds like, and that's the way it has been used a lot. Ok. So, is there a way – once you pay that mortgage, and it's a long haul for most people, where it truly is free and clear or is there still some sort of...

[Howard] Well, no, it's just clear of encumbrances or liens or attachments if it's free of any loans being charged against it like a mortgage. It's not free and clear because the state still has a claim on it because you got it recorded.

[John] And so it seemed to me that one way to deal with that is to sell it back to yourself or sell it to someone else in the household or whatever.

[Howard] Well, that's one way. We did that in the past and it has worked, but other people have tried it and it didn't necessarily work for everybody. Some people are not forceful enough to follow through on something like that.

[John] They say that, 'well, that was a fraudulent transaction or something,' right?

[Howard] Well, the county or the state just ignored it and just proceeded on and they didn't know how to be forceful enough to create enough of a ruckus about it. There's all kinds of law suits that can be filed, but you'll never get the help of a lawyer to sue to get your personal, private property back in your hands away from the state. The lawyer's job is to get the personal property out of your hands and into the state. We're asking them to do the reverse of their normal job. It's not their job to secure your private property for you, it's their job to get it away from you. In reality, if we really tie down the details of what they're doing, they're a bunch of thieves stealing people's property. But I'm sure a lawyer listening to us over the phone, especially a good Christian lawyer would think I was wrong about that, he's a good guy, he really believes he is, he doesn't even know he's stealing your property. He's just doing what he's been taught to do, get it recorded. He'll tell you that the law says that it's got to be recorded, but the law does not say that it has to be recorded. People do not understand the meaning the meaning of words. And you can't read, even if you can pronounce the

words, you cannot read unless you know what the words mean. Then you can read. The state codes in every one of the states in this country says all property in the state of blank, being any one of the fifty states, must be recorded. Where is the State of Blank? Well let's pick on the state that I lived in for the longest time, the State of Maryland. I guess it was almost 20 years ago, my wife and I decided to take our daughter, Pamela, out of school and home-school her. Twenty years ago that was not a popular thing to do. People were being persecuted for doing it, prosecuted they call it in court. It wasn't a good idea to get involved in something like that because they actually shot and killed a guy in Utah because he wouldn't send his kids to their school.

[John] Oh, I remember that one.

[Howard] Yes, somebody was enforcing what they thought what the law says, an honest, decent sheriff who had no idea of what he was doing because he couldn't read. And it was dangerous to do something like that, but we just decided that as bad as we saw as was going on in the school, it was better to take the dangerous chance than it was to leave them destroying my daughter, so we took her out of school. Well, I started preparing immediately for a suit of some kind or some kind of an attack by them on me, charges or something. I started looking up cases filed against the Department of Education of the State of Maryland and I found one in Harford County, Maryland, dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. I found one in Carroll county, Maryland, dismissed for lack of jurisdiction, found one in the Superior Court of Baltimore city, dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. I said, 'what the hell, they won't allow any suits against the Department of Education, what's going on here?' Finally I found a whole slew of cases against the Department of Education that had been heard and resolved in Anne Arundel County Maryland. I said, 'oh, wait a minute, I just learned something, Anne Arundel County, Maryland is where Annapolis is and that's the capital of Maryland. The State of Maryland, the State of Maryland exists only in Annapolis and Anne Arundel County and you can't sue it in any other county court except Anne Arundel County Court. That's why they dismissed all the cases. Well, I checked further on cases against the state and I found the same kind of a thing in every type of a case, not just against the Department of Education, but even against the State Police. The State Police are out in every one of the counties, doing things, but once in a while, one of them does something that really is wrong and they get sued for it. Every case that was filed against a State Police Officer in any one of the counties except Anne Arundel County was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. The State, then, is the government and the place it's located in and not the place where you live in the name that is similar. The fact is the State of Maryland does not encompass all of Maryland. You following me?

[John] Not completely. I have seen a situation though here, that kind of rings a bell, Howard, where they were suing a friend for state income tax and, of course, the capital in Colorado is in Denver and it was out of a Denver municipal court. It seemed really strange because he's fifty miles from there.

[Howard] Well, see, it's not strange, because the only place where the state has any jurisdiction, then, would be in Denver. They wouldn't have jurisdiction out in Ding-a-ling County, I don't know the name of all the counties, so...

[John] Why is that?

[Howard] Because they don't have authority outside of where they are. The 'State OF' is only located in the capital for the State of ....

[John] Ok, the State of ... being the Commercial overlay?

[Howard] Yes, ok, you can call it the commercial overlay, but what they call the government, the corporation's headquarters.

[John] Thank you, the corporation's headquarters.

[Howard] That's where it becomes a commercial overlay. Everybody thinks it's a government, these things are not governments at all. They're corporations and if you study a little bit about corporations you'd find out that every corporation is self-governing. So if we were to set one up and call it 'The State of Colorado', it would be self-governing, wouldn't it? If we were to set one up and called it 'The United States of America', it would be self-governing, wouldn't it? Well, let's set one of them up and call it 'America', instead of the united States of America and we now have a competing corporation against The United States. I don't think that they would like that so, I believe, there would end up being a war because one of the corporations, probably the one called The United States would attack the one called America and try to do away with it and over-power it because they want the governing power. And they wouldn't want a second governing power, would they?

[John] No, they would probably employ shock and awe.

[Howard] Yes, shock and awe.

[John] Anyway, but these state corporations are subsidiaries, aren't they, of the larger one?

[Howard] They're the children or subsidiary corporations of the parent corporation called The United States of America. As a matter of fact, because we got on to that, I happened to bring something up here to Baltimore with me because I want to go to the library and pull several of these cases and read the whole case, but I got a case cite from – now I've got this case, I can't pronounce it, Ngiraingas', do you want to take a stab at that?

[John] I was trying to write it down but I missed a few letters.

[Howard] Ngiraingas. Now people mispronounce my name but I don't mind that but I hate mispronouncing somebody else's name.

- Anyway, *[Ngiraingas] v. Sanchez*. The case is 495 US reports, page 182. This is a 1990 case. And it says that the United States may be termed a corporation,
- *Brockland v. Tennessee*. The United States is a great corporation ordained and established by the American people,
- *United States v. Boreiss* [?] 495 US 182 is repeating the *[Ngiraingas] v. Sanchez*. In that case, they also said that it was a corporation. The United States is a corporation,
- *Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward*, and that case goes all the way back to 1819. And we got cases from 1819 all the way to 1990 saying that the United States is a corporation.

Anybody want to argue with that? The United States is a corporation, a self-governing body, that's what a corporation is.

[John] Very good; you would think it would show up, a lot of places.

[Howard] Oh, no, I don't think they want us to know that. They want us to think that this was the government and the government is, what you just said it was, 'shock and awe'. We have the power, you'll do what we say. You'll register your property with us because we say that you're in the State of..., and you have to register it. No, you're not in the State of..., you just need to go to the court cases and be able to look it up and prove that you're not in the State of.... And your private property didn't have to be recorded; it never had to be recorded. There was never a law that said your private property had to be recorded. All it says is all the property in the State of Blank must be recorded. Well, what property is in the State of Blank? Well, the Police Department's office buildings, the fire department's buildings, they're agencies of the state. That's state property. That property is in the state when they buy it because they buy it for the purpose of the state using it, right? Then that property must be recorded.

[John] Yes, sir, this is – we have seen parallels to this, Howard, we've seen it with the income tax. Rice McLeod has brought it to our attention, the requirement to sign under penalties of perjury is not for us but it's for them.

[Howard] I forget the name of the case, let me see if it'll come back to memory, some pipeline company, *Colonial Pipeline Company v. ....* All right, it won't come back to mind, but, anyway, I just stumbled over it this week and I used it in a brief that I was writing. *Colonial Pipeline Company v. somebody or another*. The case says that the income tax can only be laid on corporations. Rice was right, then, wasn't he?

[John] Now, that expounds on that further.

[Howard] The corporation government can only create a tax upon a corporation that the government created for somebody.

[John] And that goes to an excise, essentially, in other words, the government....

[Howard] Right, an accepted privilege.

[John] Right.

[Howard] Now, that brings us to something else that we've been working on lately, we have drafted an affidavit, none of this silliness about an affidavit of truth, an affidavit is supposed to be truth, why would you call it an 'affidavit of truth'? Sort of contradictory or a waste of time, anyway to call it that. We just called it an affidavit for non-corporate status. Not 'of', but 'for non-corporate status'. The rules of court, Rule #52, of the federal rules of criminal procedure which is duplicated in every state's rules almost with identical wording states that when the judge makes a finding of facts that's conclusive, that's it, no further chance for rebuttal. And he makes this finding of facts at the end of a trial. And there's a Texas Supreme Court case, Texas Court of Appeals, that ruled that under Rule 52 if a individual was being sued in the name of a corporation or as though he were a corporation and he didn't rebut by an affidavit that he wasn't a corporation then it was presumed that he was and the presumption became a fact by the end of the trial because he failed to rebut the presumption.

[John] And, Howard, that used to be Rule 51, at least in Louisiana and Texas they apparently pulled that out of the publications now.

[Howard] Well, they may have pulled it out of Rule 51 but they've put it in Rule 52 because it's still in the Texas rules under Rule 52.

[John] And I might be thinking wrong, I might have my numbers off, maybe it was 52 right along, but anyway...

[Howard] I think that case was only 1987 that the court of appeals of Texas ruled on that -- that you must rebut it with a sworn oath which is an affidavit, a sworn oath. Ok, it can be an affirmation, I've heard these religious people say that they're not supposed to swear, I don't think that that's what the Bible meant about swearing.

[John] It may have been taken too far, there...

[Howard] I think it was, but if you want to say that it was, ok, call it an affirmation instead of calling it an oath, it's the same thing. It amounts to the same thing.

[John] For judicial purposes I think that it's appropriate, it's a solemn oath and it's one that you recognize as being under your Creator and it's not something to be taken casually. So, go ahead.

[Howard] Well, now all these cases, I don't care if it's property tax, or you're accused of possession of a deadly weapon that I heard you talking about earlier with this fellow there in Denver or traffic tickets. I don't care what kind of a case it is. If you look at the case they always spelled your name in all-capital letters in the top part of the case. If you look at the state the state's all spelled in capital letters. Now, we know the state is a corporation, now some lawyer will probably tell you that that's for emphasis, yes, to emphasize the fact that it's a corporation. If the state is spelled in all-capital letters and it's a corporation and they spell my name in all-capital letters then isn't there a presumption that I'm a corporation? What do you think?

[John] Well, I guess corporations can talk, now, they got...

[Howard] No, corporations require natural beings to move the corporation in any way, at all. The corporation can't talk, it can't walk, it can't write contracts, it can't shake hands, it takes a natural person moving the corporation.

[John] They call them officers?

[Howard] Pardon -- yes, officers or agents of the corporation, natural people to move the corporation. So what they're doing is they're suing this corporation and summoning you to come in and move that corporation. So what we've been doing, I don't know how this is going to work because we just started doing it, so don't take this as being gospel, alright?

[John] This is adding another dimension to the understanding of jurisdiction in the administrative tribunals. Repeat what you just said.

[Howard] Yes it is.

[John] Repeat what you just said, they're looking for a live, natural man or women to come in there and move the corporation.

[Howard] Right, and they want to substitute you for the corporation that they sued in all-capital-letters. Am I clear?

[John] Can they do that with an officer in every case?

[Howard] Yes, as long as you're willing to do it and I think willingness actually comes out of my own personal stupidity. I didn't know any better so I was willingly

participating. No, I went in there many a time fighting different issues and the case was spelled in all-capital letters and I went in there and said, 'I'm here to argue the points of that case.' So what did I do?

[John] ...you just like to fight, like a lot of these guys.

[Howard] I willingly let them substitute me for that corporate fiction because I went in there and wanted to argue for it and I shouldn't have. I'm finally learning that everything in this world is backwards and I've been teaching this for years that it's backwards. It's the reverse of what you think it is. They're not suing you even though your name is on the front of the paper, it's spelled the same way but it's not spelled in the same fashion, it's spelled in all-capital letters which means that really they're representing that as a corporation by the same name that you have. But it's not really you. Now, any lawyer will argue this because this is beneficial to the lawyers to keep the system going, so naturally they're going to deny this. They've been denying it every time we tried to bring it up in every case in the past. But we put together enough case law in this points and authority to support the affidavit for non-corporate status to show that they're lying. Now we....

[John] Yes, it's a powerful tool, let's pick up here. Wait, wait we shouldn't be having this.... Phil, what happened here? [end of segment two]

[start of segment three]

[John] ...just have be flexible around here. Anyway, that was a shorter break. Thanks, Phil. Let's continue, Howard, you were – and others have called this an affidavit of corporate denial or ...

[Howard] Yes, I've heard that, but what they've tried to do is deny the existence of the existing corporation such as the state or the United States or the attorney's office and ....

[John] Well, what was done there, as I understand it, was that it just made a distinction between the natural man or woman and an artificial entity. An artificial entity is not on the same basis as the natural man or woman and wouldn't you say that it's not?

[Howard] Well, yes, I would say that it's not but I would also say that the way that denial of corporate existence was done that it was too broad, it didn't narrow the point down and I found case law that says that you cannot deny the existence of a corporation that exists. If it's functioning in a corporate manner you can't deny its existence.

[John] Even though its fundamental status is not the same as --- and that brings up another question --- it would not be the same as the natural man or woman, it's a creation of the state and therefore it's inferior.

[Howard] Right, and it may well have been done in a name that's similar to mine.

[John] Howard, let me ask you along those same lines, can a contract between a natural man or women with an artificial entity be enforced?

[Howard] Yes, sure can. That's exactly what they're doing, they're enforcing these contracts between you and the state that you signed called applications for registration of property. Any kind of property, your birth certificate, registering the body, the deed registration being registered, the automobile registration for the car, the driver's license registration, the labor registration through social security, they're just enforcing those contractual agreements. And that's between you and these corporations. So, yes, indeed.

[John] Most of those contracts not only are with artificial entities but they are adhesion contracts, they're unilateral contracts, in other words, they're put forth, there's no negotiating, there's no meeting of the minds and there's other laws in there too with what would be called a contract at law.

[Howard] Well, again, we're back to the law of presumption, there's a presumption that there was a meeting of the minds and if there was a meeting of the minds then it's not an adhesion contract or a bi-lateral contract.

[John] Ok, so there's a presumption, that's interesting.

[Howard] Well, here's what we've been doing. All of this stuff starts with that security agreement that we talked about several weeks ago. You must be able to prove that you have a secured interest in the specific property that is subject of this court case. Second of all, you should do a document that terminates the registration of that property which is the contract that they're relying on. Then when they create a case of some kind against that property and name you to come in and argue for the property, you do a request for a more definite statement and that request is very simple: just produce the contract that this claim is based on because there is only two allowable causes of action in the common and the civil law and those two are both bases on contracts. They're either ex contractu, which means a promise rising out of the contract, or ex delicto, which means a duty rising out of the contract, but either way the two causes of action, ex contractu and ex delicto, both arise out of a contract. There has to have been a contract before there can be a cause of action. So you ask for the contract. They won't produce it, then you know that this thing is contractual. They're not going to produce it. We've been asking for the contract for years, but they wouldn't produce it. We just didn't know what to do to follow up. So it takes time to learn these things, it takes a lot

of reading and I don't get a lot of help with that reading even though I ask for it, I don't get a lot of help with it. And, finally, somebody did find this stuff on ex contractu and ex delicto and the causes of action and when they did, we realized that what you got to do is put in a motion to dismiss because, first of all, I'm not a corporation and because I'm not, there can be no contract between them and I and they didn't produce the contract. So because they didn't produce the contract and I'm not a corporation this case should be dismissed for failure to state a cause of action. Are you following me, or did I go to fast?

[Russ] John?

[John] That was pretty fast, but there are the archives, I can go back through and I hear someone else's voice, here.

[Russ] Hello, John. This is Russ from Rockport, West Virginia.

[John] By New Jersey.

[Russ] Well, John, you're man made me a little upset, here because the paperwork that he's talking about is exactly the paperwork that I filled in and I've been told the same thing about, well, I deny the existence of, it's not denying existence that the corporation exists, but that they have control over me. Does that make sense?

[John] Well, Russ, Russ, instead of getting upset why don't you just listen a little bit and see if maybe what was done could be refined a little bit.

[Russ] But that's what I think that this all is but it sounds to me like he's trying to butcher what somebody else has already come up with that got us this far. I think he needs to be on our side...

[John] Russ, Russ, come on. Hey, Russ, just because you heard it somewhere else, first, doesn't mean that that's where it originated. Please...

[Russ] Alright, John.

[John] Just listen, don't get upset, we might learn something here. We're getting some good details on a concept that we have heard somewhere else.

[Russ] I understand.

[John] Howard, listen Russ, Howard Griswold has been at this thirty years.

[Russ] I understand, the problem is we're fighting amongst ourselves.

[John] Well, who's fighting amongst whom? I'm not fighting with anybody. Anyway, Russ, please, think a little bit and listen instead of getting upset and then we can work things out and we're into our top of the hour break, already. If you brought up, basically what I – unless I'm misunderstanding you, a non-issue.

[Russ] Ok, well, we'll let it go at that because I got hot under the collar, I admit that.

[John] Well, I'll guarantee you, in my own personal experience...

[Russ] ...it sounds to me there's a separation, here.

[John] I don't know why you got hot, just listen and see, anyways.

[Russ] Alright, I'll listen and I'll call you later and we'll talk it out.

[John] Time is of the essence, here.

[Russ] I don't want to waste time, I understand, thank you.

[John] Got about six minutes and we'll be back with Howard and we'll work out your problem. [7 min., 58.888 sec.] [end of segment three, end of first hour]

[start segment four, start second hour]

[John] ...continue here on Liberty Forum and Howard Griswold is our guest. Looking at the issue of property and land, property taxes. I'm sure Howard was beginning to take us into other issues here, too, in dealing with jurisdiction of these administrative tribunals and what it takes for them to get jurisdiction, what it takes to prevent their presumption from carrying the day and I think we have something to learn, here, some refinements and maybe some general concepts that have been brought forward in the past. Maybe that some of those presumptions were not completely correct so got to keep an open mind, here, and listen to the details. Anyway, Howard has done a heck of a lot of study, you need to take advantage of it, if possible. And that was interesting, it was fast and Howard, you might kind of zing through that again relating to the cause of action for one of these administrative tribunals.

[Howard] Ok, if anyone out there that's listening has a Black's Law Dictionary just look up the word, *ex delicto* and under it, it explains that there are only two causes of action. One of them is called *ex contractu*, and it explains within that definition that that means a promise from a contract, a breach of the promise from a contract. And then *ex delicto* means a breach of a duty arising out of a contract and it explains in that definition that these are the only two causes of action that exist under the civil and the common law. There are only two classes of causes of actions, *ex contractu*, a breach of the promise and *ex delicto*, a breach of a duty arising out of the contract. So they are

basically contractual. Now, the point is that you cannot deny the existence of a corporation, there are court cases upon court cases upon court cases that say that. You can't deny the existence of a corporation as long as it's a functioning activity that appears like a corporation. You can't deny the existence of it. What you can deny is that the corporation that they're suing has a contract with a corporation that's doing the suing and show that they did not produce a contract which is the essence of the cause of action. Thus they did not have a cause of action.

[John] And one of the corporations here is what we refer to as government.

[Howard] Right, the state.

[John] Ok, so they got to produce a contract. Ok, let's finish this thought and then we've got a caller.

[Howard] Ok.

[John] Is there any more to that, that's a mouthful.

[Howard] Yes, that was rather a mouthful and I'm sure the gentleman that called in didn't listen long enough to hear all of what I said before he started calling in and he missed part of it. And I assure you he has the right to object because some people think that that denial of existence of the corporation work because in some cases it did work. But it doesn't work in most of the cases because too many of the judges are aware that you can't deny the existence of a corporation that is functioning like a corporation. And if you're in the world of commerce trading commercial paper then you're acting like a corporation.

[John] Well, the important part of your affidavit is that you're declaring that you are not a corporation.

[Howard] I'm not that corporation, I don't deny the existence of that corporation that's spelled in similar letters as my name.

[John] Ok, the next step, here, relating to a cause of action is the state corporation would have to show in order to bring you in as an agent or officer of the corporation of the all caps name...

[Howard] They would have to show a contract.

[John] They have to show a contract.

[Howard] And the contract would have to be signed by me representing that corporation. They have them...

[John] Ok, so we got a number of things. You're denying that you, the natural person, are a corporation but the all-caps name still exists on there and there can be a contract with that all-cap name and it has to be signed by you, the natural man to bring you in as an agent. So there is a possibility that they can draw you in, and this makes sense because everybody's been talking about the contractual connection and how we contract with them all the time, we contract with them in the courtroom, even. They get you to agree to do something and you entered a verbal contract, right?

[Howard] Sure, a court is nothing but a place where a contract is renegotiated into a new contract.

[John] And that court is an artificial entity called a corporation.

[Howard] Yes, it's agency of government and government's a corporate entity.

[John] Right.

[Howard] So, it's dealing in fiction.

[John] To me this is clarifying things a lot, Howard. Let's see who's calling.

[Guy] Hey, John, this is Guy, Guy from Texas. Hey, how you doing?

[John] Does this make sense to you, Guy?

[Guy] Oh, it makes perfect sense. He's right on target, everything that he has said, I through my own research, which I don't know everything, but he's absolutely correct in everything that he says. Especially, let me jump back to Rule 52, the denial of corporate status. That is the rule in Texas.

[John] Rule 52, I was off, yes.

[Guy] Yes, it's Rule 52 and in Ken Evan's copyright material it specifically addresses Rule 52 and the establishment of the corporation, the denial thereof. I figured I'd call in and give you a little support there.

[John] Well, no, I appreciate that and this is not denigrating, I mean, we're kind of referring to what Rice has brought up in the past.

[Guy] Oh, absolutely,

[John] Now, Rice has blessed us with some very, very fundamental knowledge and this doesn't take anything away from Rice, he's doing more than six normal people could in

a year, in a week. But Rice has some things that he could learn and does on a regular basis and so can we. And so I think one of the things that I have continually – well, I basically let Rice go because he has got a lot of offer and I don't want to interrupt his train of thought. But my one objection has been that he has maybe glossed over some detail at times and he's glossed over the basis for some of the things that he says. Normally that's pretty dangerous but Rice still has this intuitive knowledge of who he is in relationship to other things and he's got quite a perception of the big picture which I believe is essentially accurate. That doesn't mean that he or any one of us can't be corrected at some time or another. So, anyway this is just filling in gaps for me and I appreciate you calling, Guy, with that.

[Guy] Well, I just – I wanted to let you know about Rule 52 and I support Howard and virtually everything he says and the man, he's paid his dues, spent his time in the books and there's a number of us out here that have been studying this stuff for years. And, once again, everything that he has said, he's right on target. I'm going to cut loose.

[John] We're all trying to go the same direction and the fight shouldn't be amongst us, we've got enough of a fight and enough of a challenge understanding what's going on against us. Anyway...

[Guy] I didn't see anything where there was any kind of a fight going on; maybe I missed something but you're all doing a fine job, I appreciate it.

[John] Ok.

[Guy] I'm going to cut loose, talk to you later, thanks.

[John] So that's good, Howard. So you... now we got another caller. Hello. We got a caller. Speak up. You're on the air.

[Joyce] Hello, hello, yes, John, this is Joyce in Michigan.

[John] Hi, Joyce.

[Joyce] I have a question for Howard and it relates to what he was saying. I had to turn my computer off when I made the phone call. But he said something about when we're dealing in commerce with money. Do you recall what he said, there?

[Howard] I didn't say money. I said dealing in commerce, commerce is contracts.

[Joyce] Oh, then you weren't speaking about money.

[Howard] No, but if you contract to use that money such as through social security to go get a job then you've contracted into the commerce.

[Joyce] Well, the point that I wanted to bring up here, because I did misunderstand you, but I was wondering how that relates to what Lee Brobst has been teaching us in regard to not writing any checks into commerce although we could still have a bank account.

[John] Well he said that writing checks creates debt in interstate commerce because the check is cleared out of state.

[Joyce] That's correct, see I thought that was where Howard was going.

[Howard] No, I wasn't.

[John] No, I don't think so

[Joyce] Ok, then I'm off track, I shut my computer down too quickly. I'll go back and listen.

[John] That's an interesting area and maybe we'll get to that.

[Howard] Yes, that could be the subject of a whole conversation one night.

[John] Right, and I'll make note of that.

[Joyce] Ok, I'll go back. Thank you, bye-bye.

[John] Ok, good to hear from you, Joyce, alright. Now, folks, I'm going to ask, tricky when you're listening on the internet and you're using your only phone line.

[Howard] Yes, it is.

[John] Call in if you want, but really focus on an issue here and listen and try to focus on something that was said and try to be brief so we can we get as much in here as we can with Howard. Ok, so. Yes, so the nature of commerce and the nature of currency. We will hopefully look at what you got figured out on that.

[Howard] Well, to clarify something for that lady who just called and asked that question, I imagine she thinks that anything to do with money is commerce. And in reality, money is nothing but the medium of exchange to keep commerce accounted for. It's not the commerce, the commerce is the contracts. It's commerce when I give you my property to hold for me on a document -- that's commerce. Now if I pay you for it and you say it's a certain price that I got to pay you for you to hold it for me then that's the medium of exchange that we use to keep the accounting straight of the

commercial agreement that we've made. Am I clearing that up or did I confuse it worse?

[John] Let me add one more question in there along the same lines. Commerce, does that include contracts of all kinds between natural men and women and artificial entities or is it just between artificial entities and go ahead.

[Howard] It's either between artificial entities and artificial entities or between artificial entities and natural people. But it's contracts; in all cases, commerce is contracts. As a matter of fact, let me tell you something that helped me to learn a little bit about this law, the world of law was all about. Back in the late '50's in the early years of my being in business in the construction business, a number of customers came to me with a zoning problem. I want to build an addition, but I can't do it. The zoning department won't let me expand my building unless I go appeal to the zoning board for what they call a variance, a permission to do something that would normally be against the law. In other words they were asking, really, for a license to break the law. And I got involved with it just out of curiosity and I helped them to go into the court and ask for this variance and I helped them to put together an argument of why they should be allowed to do what they were doing because their business shouldn't be interfered with by laws. If they were capable of expanding the law was going to prevent the government from making additional taxes that they could have made off of the expansion of this man's business. See, I took the government's side. Guess what, I won the cases. I won the cases every time that I went in there and asked for these variances for people to do things that were against the zoning laws like build an addition on a piece of ground that wasn't big enough to have enough parking for the business. And they were taking out more of the parking space by building the addition and making fewer parking spaces available and that was really violating the law. But the property wasn't capable of sustaining a larger parking area because it wasn't big enough for that. So they were putting the person in the position where he couldn't expand his business and interfering with his commerce, his ability to contract and expand his business, bigger and more contracts. I don't know if you've ever read Farnsworth on contracts or not but it's a 900 page book on the law of contracts. And he explains, similarly, to what I explain in there, that buying theater tickets is a contract. The sign on the wall in front of the theater made an offer, Fred Astaire, showing tonight; that's an offer. You walking up and saying give me a ticket and offering the money for it is an acceptance. You understand how easy it is to get into a contract now?

[John] Oh, boy.

[Howard] Now that's Mr. Farnsworth's explanation of it. My explanation of it was, it's as simple as getting on the bus. You stand at the bus stop and wait until the bus comes up. The bus pulls up, that's an offer to take you somewhere. It says on the front of the bus that it's going to Ding-a-ling town. Right? It's an offer, you step on the bus, that's

an acceptance. The bus driver says a dollar and thirty-five cents, you put \$1.35 in, now we have a fair consideration, they offered to take you somewhere for \$1.35 and you paid the \$1.35 in exchange for them taking you somewhere. There's a fair and equal consideration here. There's an offer and there's an acceptance. This is what the law of contracts is all about. Now think about how this applies to everything you do in life. Everything you do, buying a house, somebody put it up for sale, that's an offer, you come along and accept. You go to the bank and you say, 'I want to make a mortgage,' that's an offer, the bank accepts, lends you the money. The whole thing is contractual, isn't it? Now, you fall behind in the payments on it. In the contract it said if you fall behind it, they can take you to court and foreclose on the loan and sell the property. So you go to court, the court sits there and renegotiates the deal. If you can make up the payments, we'll let you keep the property. That's an offer, isn't it. You say, 'well, I can make up the payments but you have to give me extra months on the end of the mortgage.' The bank says, 'ok.' That's an acceptance, isn't it? But anywhere along the way during an offer and acceptance situation like that, there can always be a refusal and a refusal does not constitute a refusal for cause or a dishonor because you can't dishonor an offer, you can only dishonor a demand. Am I clear about that, I know darned well that's going to upset a couple of listeners.

[John] You can't dishonor an offer.

[Howard] Right, you can refuse an offer, but you can't dishonor it. But you can dishonor a demand. Once there's an offer and acceptance been made and then one of the party demands their consideration and you refuse to give it to them, now that's a dishonor.

[John] This is crucial to understand what dishonor is.

[Howard] Yes, it is.

[John] It's been batted around quite a bit.

[Howard] I know, I've heard some comments about you're dishonoring them when they send you an offer if you refuse the offer. That's hogwash, you cannot dishonor an offer. You can refuse an offer and that's all you can do to it, or accept it. Now, if you accept it, according to the law books, you assume the liability for having accepted the offer. Whatever liability goes along with it, you've accepted it. It's my contention you should decide whether or not you want to assume that liability. In some cases you may want to, it's beneficial. For instance, at one time in my life I owned a bar business. It took in about \$7,000 a night and cost me about \$3,000 a night to run it and of course the profit of \$4,000 had a tax of 25% which is \$1,000. But at the end of the night I had \$3,000 left. Now this didn't last very long, but it went on for a while and it made me some good money for one little period of time in my life. In order to have that bar business, I had to consent to pay the taxes on the business. And I had to pay the

\$1,000 a night in taxes, otherwise I couldn't get a license to sell alcohol which was what a bar business was all about. It was worth....

[John] A thousand dollars a night.

[Howard] Yes, that might sound terrible but did you listen to what I said? I cleared \$4,000 a night.

[John] But still, they didn't put up anything for that thousand, you did. Anyway, ok.

[Howard] They made me an offer, they let me break the law, they gave me a license to sell alcohol which was otherwise against the law without their license in exchange for that privilege. I had to pay the tax, it was worth paying the tax. Where else can you make \$3,000 a night, clear?

[John] Well, there probably are a few places, but we can't talk about them here. Ok.

[Howard] No, we can't.

[John] It's a similar sort of a deal. They don't sell licenses for most of those. Ok, so we'll take another short break, this is extremely interesting, Howard Griswold is our guest and we're learning at a rapid pace, here tonight. [21 min., 20.441 sec.] [end of segment four]

[start of segment five]

[John] Here with Howard Griswold, tonight, on Liberty Forum and this talk about contracts is very interesting. I might mention something that I have been remiss in doing and that is this applies to everything as far as I'm concerned and especially here over time is that you need to exercise caveat emptor, buyer beware, and just take it all in. If there's something that seems to be a little bit incomplete maybe it'll get completed someplace else. If it seems to be a little bit contradictory maybe there isn't a full understanding. And we've had plenty of these things over time. This is an on-air search and you can only do so much, here, you really got to go back and do the homework that Howard has done ultimately, and he has kind of pointed us in some directions so anyway that's just kind of a context to put all this stuff into. And speaking of which we started out looking at the property tax and what subjects property to that and we've gotten along, I mean, this all applies especially, here, with the last half hour's information to what happens, I think, in the courtroom and this is really important. What does commerce consist of? It's contracts and therefore there's a potential for disputes that have to be resolved. And, anyway, it brings these other entities in, but understanding what is dishonor, what is not, what's an offer and what's acceptance. And that shows you how important, it seems to me, Howard, it is to not enter into any exchange in a courtroom, if at all possible. To stay out from behind the bar and stop it

at that name and the question, where is the contract? Until they prove that, I wouldn't say or sign anything in one of those administrative tribunals. Yes.

[Howard] The judges have said many times to us when we ask, 'where's the contract, they don't need to produce the contract.'

[John] And?

[Howard] Well, we got around this because we didn't know enough, procedurally, to do something to make him have to produce the contract until we came up with this motion to dismiss because they haven't created a cause of action. Now, he doesn't have jurisdiction if there's no cause of action before the court, now we got his hands tied. Now, he's got to say, ok, you got to produce the contract in order to prove to me that I've got jurisdiction to hear this case.

[John] So you say a motion to dismiss. Normally, it seems to me that a motion is entering into – I mean, you're asking them to decide something.

[Howard] Yes, you are asking them to decide something and something I found in studying jurisdiction was that a court has limited jurisdiction at all times to determine whether or not it has jurisdiction over the subject and the person.

[John] Alright, alright, ok.

[Howard] So when the judge says to you, 'I guarantee you I have jurisdiction,' I would say, 'yes, sir' or 'yes, ma'am,' whichever type of judge I got in front of me, 'yes, indeed you do, but it's limited jurisdiction to determine whether or not you have jurisdiction.' If there is no cause of action before the court nobody has raised the jurisdiction of the court so the judge couldn't possibly have jurisdiction. Now that we know this, we can put the judge in an awkward spot where he has to make the other party produce the contract in order to prove that he's got jurisdiction. Well, I'm telling you they're not going to produce these contracts because they don't want us to know that this stuff is contractual. If we all woke up and realize it was contractual we wouldn't contract, we would refuse their offer. Well, not all of us, but most of us would or most of us would in different situations. Like I told you, owning that bar business was a contract that was worth getting into. Even though I had to pay all that money in taxes I made a lot more money than I would have doing anything else.

[John] Ok, so this motion to dismiss, lay that again because there is not .... What? I'm trying to write all this down, Howard, and I can't, I don't know short hand.

[Howard] Now, we can't do that on television or radio, there's not enough time for me to dictate it slowly over a television show or a radio show.

[John] ...let's do this again, but this is an extremely important point so the court has jurisdiction that's limited to its ability to determine jurisdiction and so you can make a motion to dismiss because they have no cause of action.

[Howard] Right, now that's what's known as a collateral issue and not addressing the immediate issue that's in front of the court. Consent and acceptance comes from addressing the issue that's before the court in any way at all. For instance, you were speeding and they gave you a speeding ticket and the judge says, 'how do you plead?' And you say, 'not guilty.' Didn't you just address the issue?

[John] Sure did.

[Howard] You pled to it, didn't you? Well, you just consented to the entire case. You consented to go ahead and argue with them about the case or accept the entire case and just say, 'ok, I'm guilty, I'll pay the fine.' Isn't that amazing, you pled, not guilty, but in their eyes the way it works you consented to being guilty by pleading 'not guilty.' That's backwards, isn't it?

[John] Sure is.

[Howard] It took me the longest time to figure this out, though, but...

[John] Can you agree in that courtroom to anything and not avoid jurisdiction?

[Howard] As long as you don't address the issue that the other party has brought into the court.

[John] Ok.

[Howard] You can agree to other things like, well, we'll agree to put in an argument about the collateral issue of whether or not they have a contract.

[John] Or agree to come back or something along those lines.

[Howard] Uh huh. Whether or not they have a contract has a whole lot to do with the issue but it is not the issue, the issue is you were speeding. Well, where did I agree with you that I wouldn't speed. Huh? Dumb question, isn't it?

[John] No, no, no, no, not dumb, at all. Profound is what it is.

[Howard] Back to that little story I was starting to tell and for some reason I either cut myself off or we got on to another point or something, but I was talking about when my customers were having these problems with zoning and I won all the cases. I won the cases without studying anything about law, I just went in there with common

sense. But that prompted me to think, I studied physics, strength of materials in college, I studied landscaping, I studied construction and how buildings are put together and may I ought to study this law stuff so I found a match flap back in those days when they used to have no bull crap about cigarettes being so harmful and they sold cigarettes in a machine with a pack of matches that would come with it and the pack of matches had an advertisement on it. And the pack of matches had an advertisement on it and the advertisement was for a law school. I forget the name of it now, it's been so many years ago, it was way back when I was twenty years old, so that was forty years ago. But anyway,

[John] I remember.

[Howard] You remember?

[John] Yes, I remember those packs of matches...

[Howard] Oh, you remember the packs of matches, but anyway, ok, well, this one said, 'study law,' and it gave the name of the place. So I wrote to the name of the place and they sent me back a little pamphlet and I read their pamphlet and I filled out the information in it and I sent them, I think I sent them \$500 and I bought the course. I bet you couldn't start a course like that today for that kind of money. But, anyway it was a \$500 course and they sent me the law books but they sent them to me one at a time. As I completed a book, they'd send me the next book. And to my great surprise the first book was an introduction to law and then the law of principle and agent was covered, not the constitution. I would think that if there's law and Congress makes the law, the first thing they would talk about would be the constitution. None of the books talked about the constitution, none of the whole course talked about it. The second book they sent me was the law of contracts. And the entire gambit of law revolves around principle and agent and contracts. If I contract representing my company, my company becomes responsible for what I said or did in a contract. That's the law of principle and agent. I'm the agent, they're the principle, but they're liable for any contracts that I get into, any agreements that I make. Likewise, if the company makes an agreement with a customer of mine and says that I'll do something for him, I'm required to do it because as the agent, the principle said I'm going to do it and agent is liable to the principle to do what the principle says. And it's all contractual because I agreed to be the agent for the company by contract in going to work for them in the first place. Are you following me?

[John] Yes sir.

[Howard] That was quite an enlightening thing to me even when I was in the world of business and commerce and doing those things that everybody else did instead of doing this silly stuff I do today sitting and read law books and try to figure out how when got in all this trouble. I don't do what's normal today, I don't even work for a

living. I just read these books and look for this information and I've been doing this for twenty-three years and I retired from that world of commerce twenty-three years ago. Didn't think I was going to take this long trying to unwind this fraud but you know what, this fraud is so well perpetrated that it will deceive the elite and think the Bible tells us this.

[John] Yes, it does.

[Howard] I think in the book of Deuteronomy it says in one of the paragraphs in there and I'm not a preacher so I don't quote verse and chapter. Read the whole book of Deuteronomy, you'll find it. That's the way I tell, I think you'll learn more by reading the whole book anyway. But, anyway, somewhere in that book it says, 'in the last days the deceptions will be so intense that the wisest of man will not even recognize right from wrong.' That's a profound statement, isn't it?

[John] Sure is.

[Howard] The wisest of man won't even recognize – well, I'm sure not the wisest of man. And if I'm not and he isn't going to recognize it, how do I know what's right and what's wrong? We can argue all we want about what think is right and wrong, but how do we know what's right and wrong? There's so much deception, today, that things that appear to be right are absolutely wrong. Things that appear to be wrong are probably right.

[John] And the problem is that they've got policemen who got that all turned around, too, and most people.

[Howard] Most of society has it turned all around. I didn't get born knowing all this stuff; I had to learn it the hard way, the school of hard knocks.

[John] Well, that goes to the notion that most people are acting in what you'd call causally good faith. They think that they're doing the right thing and their intentions are good.

[Howard] I agree.

[John] But when they have some sort of force over you then ...even at the wrong place, go ahead.

[Howard] If you listen to what Rice McLeod said and then listen to what I said, you're bound to find some conflict in what the two of us have said.

[John] Nothing major.

[Howard] No, I doubt if it is major. We're both fighting for the same thing, we're looking for the truth and that doesn't mean that Rice is wrong and it doesn't mean that I'm wrong. It might mean that neither one of us have studied far enough. We'll learn, in time and we might be off point, right now, either one of us could be off point, but why should we argue with one another, why don't we just say, 'ok, you might have a point there, let's study further and see instead of arguing.' Arguing doesn't get anything accomplished. Studying gets things accomplished. Go study and look and see. I would say that I agree with probably 95% at least of what I've heard Rice say because I've studied far enough to know that he's studied far enough to know what he's talking about.

[John] The main thing, here, is we're getting a context in which to put a lot of these questions, we didn't even have a context before this.

[Howard] Oh, we didn't have a procedural concept of what to do with some of the concepts that we did have. The concepts were not necessarily wrong, we just didn't have the proper way to – the procedural way to apply them. We're starting to learn how to apply them procedurally because we're beginning to recognize the deceptive theory behind all of this stuff. The deceptive theory is presumption. They have a presumption, you fall into the category of that presumption and if you don't rebut the presumption it becomes a fact. A lot of these facts are absolute lies, deceptions, absolute cheating, but you agreed to it; I agreed to it. What's a bar license? It's a fiction and I accepted that fiction, I went along with all the fictitious rules that go along with the fiction that I accepted. But guess what, when I stepped into that fiction I had to cooperate with those rules or I would have lost my fictitious license then I couldn't have made the fictitious money. And surprising enough the fictitious money actually purchases real things for me.

[John] Yes, at least for the time being, it does.

[Howard] Yes, I mean, I might owe my soul to the company store for using their money but at least I got to feed my body so I could keep the soul alive.

[John] Now, Howard, with this motion to dismiss, is this something you're finding is a good closure to ....

[Howard] I told you, we just started doing this and putting this altogether. We're just starting to use it so I'm not trying to tell you that this is a magic wand that's going to stop all these silly problems from occurring.

[John] It looks like to me, Howard, that you need to give the court something that it can hang it's hat on or something it can save face with or something that it can rule on or something that gives it the authority, actually it preserves the image that they do have authority. Let's put it that way.

[Howard] Yes, and like you said, you got to give them something that they can hang their hat on, but it's got to be something that they can recognize.

[John] Ok.

[Howard] It has to be from their rules and procedure so they can recognize it. Don't ever get me wrong, I firmly believe there is a higher authority, a Creator, God, whatever you want to call Him, all these different religions have different views of what to call Him but I believe, I know for a fact that there is a higher being above us. But if you take some concept of the higher being and that He gave you rights of some kind in property into the court and try to argue it, they're liable to try to put you in a mental institution. They don't recognize those kind of things, 'you must be some kind of a nut to come in here and even bring that up.'

[John] Well, they got to have rules that they recognize so that they can break those rules, right?

[Howard] Well, that's correct because the rules were made to be broken and the courts break them all the time but they follow them, too, when you point them out. They know they can get in trouble if they don't follow those rules if you are smart enough to recognize what the rule means. If you're not smart enough they can break the rule and you'll never know it and they get away with it.

[John] And they – oh, yes – they've gotten pretty bold with that and bolder all the time.

[Howard] Why certainly because, look, we've had twenty to thirty years of people going into the courts arguing these things incorrectly and bringing up their common law rights which don't exist, it's been done away with by the Erie Railroad decision, bringing up your constitutional rights. If you go back and look at *Barron v. the City of Baltimore* in 1832, I think it was. The Supreme Court of the United States stated that the constitution and the Bill of Rights applied only to the government that it created and to nothing else. Well, if it applied to nothing else, then it didn't apply to me.

[John] Well, people casually refer to the Bill of Rights as their constitutional rights, well, their rights are not constitutional rights they're rights that are recognized by the government that was established by the constitution and those rights are much broader than what's listed there.

[Howard] I forget exactly who said it, so I can't give proper credit but I'll try, it was either Thomas Jefferson or Ben Franklin or one of those guys back in the time of the writing of the Declaration of Independence and the writing of the Constitution that said that rights are founded in property. They're not founded in beliefs, they're founded in property. If you don't have any rights to the property then you can't even argue about

the property. That's why the security agreement that we've been talking about is so terribly important. You must secure the interest in order to prove the right in the property.

[John] Ok, let's see if we can bring this to a close when we come back. Howard Griswold is our guest. [19 min., 44.589 sec.] [end of segment five]

[start of segment six]

[John] Ok, down to the home stretch, here. Howard, you got to give out here. ...right along, we haven't done that, if you'd like to contact Howard and, well, just contact Howard by mail and include your phone number. Write to Gemini Investments Research Group, P.O. Box 398, Delmar, Delaware [19940]. Put your phone number in there, that'll give Howard an option in getting back with you and you can find out what Howard is got to offer as far as assistance or programs, if you will. Now, you're talking about the importance of having a secured interest. There's those out here that are very leery of the UCC, Howard, as being something that would take them out of their natural status or standing. Is that a valid fear or are there other ways?

[Howard] What natural status or standing? They don't have one, they're all involved in commerce. They all got birth certificates recorded; they all got applications for social security on record. They all got driver's licenses, this is all commerce, they're all involved in commerce and they don't realize it. I agree with wanting to think that you're a free person, but you're not free when you're under contract, contracts create obligations, liabilities. Am I clear?

[John] Yes, people are trying to work out of those things, though, and they say, 'well, I don't need another contract or another commercial...'

[Howard] Well, if you don't secure an interest in the property that you gave away by the contract that you made of registration then you have no way of terminating the registration and the only way to terminate the registration and get rid of the contract is to prove you have a right in the property and that's what the security agreement does. It proves you have a right in the property. Rights and interest are the same thing.

[John] It's been said, Howard that, it may have been by you, that registration is for foreign entities and enrolment is for domestic or, for the lack of a better word, entities.

[Howard] Well, registration and enrolment are the same identical thing. You've enrolled the property by registration. So, I don't know who wants to separate the meaning of those words, but the end result is they mean that you did the same thing and anybody can register or enroll property. You might have a purpose in doing it, like I said about the bar business, it was worth enrolling or registering myself for the license in order to make that much money in a night, even though I had to pay that much money in taxes

every night, it was worth it. So I did it; I wouldn't do it, again, but I did it that one time, anyway.

[John] Yes, well then, going back to land or your home, you've indicated that it's as simple as removing that home or that land or that property from the enrolment or the filing or the recording of that property with the county in order to avoid the taxes and avoid the jurisdiction of the code enforcement, and so on.

[Howard] Correct. As a matter of fact I've got court cases that say that the only purpose of registration is to put the property within the court's jurisdiction so that it can be attached. That's a Delaware Supreme Court case.

[John] Got to be free and clear of mortgages. This is significant, this is absolutely profound. But this can be done through a security agreement or a sale to another party. How can that be accomplished where you get rid of the registration?

[Howard] The sale to another party works, but it takes a lot of effort on your part to go in there and argue with them about it. The security agreement works a little bit easier, it's not quite as much effort, but you got to understand commercial law in order to even prove your point on the security agreement. So, whoever wants to get involved in something like this and set themselves free has got to get it in their mind that they're going to have to spend a little time studying, they're the one that's got to go into court and argue this, no lawyer's going to do this for you and no other person is allowed to go into court and argue for you but a lawyer, except yourself. So you got to understand it to go into court.

[John] You sure do and you have to understand enough about the court procedures to stay out of their trap.

[Howard] The courts are commercial in nature. When you go into court it's a commercial case, every bit of it. Didn't somebody find something that said that all crimes are commercial or income tax crimes are commercial or something like that and spread it around the country? And sure enough, it's in Title 27, the CFR of Title 27 of the US Code that says that income tax is a commercial crime.

[John] Well, Howard, have you had success in dealing with land issues?

[Howard] I have, yes.

[John] Ok, so you've got a little bit of a track record here in... Here we are at the music. We'll pursue this some more and, Howard, I'll give you a jingle here as soon as we get done and we'll get the next date set up. Thank you, it's really moving good.

[Howard] Ok, I thank you.

[John] Good night, everyone thanks for being there. [6 min., 59.134 sec.] [end of segment six, end of 2<sup>nd</sup> hour, end of show]

# # #