

# An Educational Question:

by Michael H. Keehn - January 21, 2001

Before the question may be asked the stage must be set to put the question into perspective.

If I were to encounter you on the street and put a gun to your head, I am putting your life in peril or at risk. And if I then use this peril that I hold over your life to take your money (property) from you, you would conclude that I have committed a robbery. And if you were to sit upon a jury in which these actions are to be judged, you would find me guilty of robbery. It would not matter what I did with the money (property) that I took from you, I am guilty of robbery. I could have used it to help under privileged families, or the sick, or the needy and regardless of my noble intents, the crime still remains robbery. If for some reason you don't quite get it, go stick up a bank and distribute the money as described above and see if that noble action will set aside the criminal act of robbery.

With all the noble or selfish excuses stripped away, robbery is using a threat of force to put your life at risk in order to take your property.

Is it not the same crime to threaten through law, to place your body in prison where your body will be brutalized and raped on a regular basis by other more powerful and aggressive prisoners, to deprive you of your liberty and ability to provide for yourself and your family, all to take your property from you? Law is force, period. And when that force is used to place your life at risk as a means to take your property from you and give it to whom it does not belong, a crime of robbery has been committed. This is called 'perversion of law'.

The difficult task is getting the populace to accept this criminal practice as legitimate. But once the populace has been indoctrinated to this practice they will exonerate the government for the same criminal practice for which they would put a 'street criminal' in prison. The primary reason that they will exonerate government is because this criminal behavior on the part of government has the potential to benefit them to some small degree. And so the average citizen gets 'his piece of the action' by sanctioning this criminal behavior.

Returning now to a focus on education.

If you and I had lived in 1885 and we wished to have our children 'formally' educated, you and I and other parents with children went together and hired a teacher whom we paid for the service. Education was a privilege. We did not expect our neighbor, who has no children, or maybe no children in the school, to pay for the education that our child was receiving. We certainly could have held a gun to our neighbors head and took his money to pay for our child's education but someone might have called that robbery and put us in prison.

Children generally worked hard because their parents were paying for them to be there and learn. The children knew their parents were sacrificing their hard earned money and so the children

generally did their best to take advantage of what was being offered.

The teacher had a good environment for he or she was teaching people who mostly wanted to learn. Students who were enthusiastic and working hard to learn. The teacher would use the more advanced students to teach (help) the struggling students and by providing this student instruction those students became even more knowledgeable by teaching various subject material. Because no one was under any sort of threat from government, their attitudes were a reflection of this freedom from punishment and intrusion by that government.

But then we make laws that require children to be in school. The children are now essentially a prisoner. And in some cases, mostly in older children, their attitudes have reflected this change. Often they resist learning, resist the school's efforts to indoctrinate them, resist the authority the school exercises over them. The result is that many schools in our country are now a dangerous place to be. The teachers are now faced with a different student attitude from those of 1885 and are trying to teach people who, in many cases, don't want to learn. Because of this there has, for many years, been a continual lowering of acceptable standards on achievement tests. This frustrates teachers and so their attitude also changes. Often evolving to an openly hostile atmosphere between student and teacher.

And this whole thing is funded by holding a 'lawful gun' to my neighbors head to help pay for the education my child is required to have by law. Through 'force of law' we put our neighbors life at risk to take his property (money) to pay for our child's education. But that is ok because we see that even though this is a criminal activity, we will receive a 'piece of the action' through payment for our child's education.

And so the question is: "How can we have an 'educational environment' that is based in and funded by a criminal activity?" The answer, of course, is that we can not have true education when it is based in and funded by criminal behavior. You can not have an educational system based on an immoral premise. By doing so we teach our children that it is ok to plunder and pillage your neighbor when it is to your benefit.

And then we whine when we are pillaged and plundered by government for the benefit of someone else who will receive our property (money) as a farm subsidy, or receive our property as a welfare payment, or receive our money as part of the payment on a low income home, or receive our money as an educational grant.

And after we've taught our children to participate and benefit from criminal behavior, we tell everyone how much we love them. Perhaps we should teach our children that:

"Wrong is wrong... even if it helps you"

## **The Solution:**

I have often heard teachers complain about the lack of support they receive from parents. Why should the parents be supportive? They have no volunteer contribution to the funding that educates their child. The money comes from all of us, taken with force if need be. But suppose

the parent were paying for the education of their child as was done when education was a private enterprise, not a public one. If the parent were paying the teacher for the education of their child and the teacher were having a problem with that child, you can bet that the parent would be more than willing to help and lend support.

If the teacher had a totally uncooperative and/or disruptive child in class, they could refuse to work with the child and have the parents keep the child at home, then concentrate on the children who DO want an education. What a thought... a teacher in control. Not the school administration, not the Department of Education, not the principle... the teacher.

So teacher, how do we get there? Conventional wisdom suggests that we need a license to teach. This is not so. You only need a license to teach in 1) a public school or 2) a school which is licensed. You may engage in any *common law* occupation without license, and teaching in a privately owned, un-licensed school is a common law occupation. This was clearly put forth in the Slaughter House Cases, a supreme court decision, in which the court put forth the following:

In the Slaughter House cases of 1873, the court [Supreme] ruled that freedom of enterprise was not a Fourteenth Amendment Privilege or Immunity. Such basic and fundamental rights that do not owe their existence to the Federal Government are not privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. It then went on to rule that only rights owing their existence to the United States government would henceforth be treated as privileges or immunities "of citizens of the United States".  
- Modern Constitutional Law by Antieau. (Available from *West Publishing*)

And the occupation of *School Teacher* does not owe its existence to the Federal Government. This occupation existed before the Federal Government. So, with this understanding, anyone, including *trained teachers*, could open a school of their own and begin teaching. They would be in control, and they would be responsible for the outcome.

And therein lies the **solution**. Now, which of you teachers on the public dole really want to teach? Which of you really wants control of the class room? Which of you truly want to stop dealing with those students who disrupt the education of the other students and concentrate on those who really want an education? Which of you want a safer environment, conducive to the process of learning for all the students who attend your school. Which of you really wants responsibility?

I suspect that if one, or two or three people, who really want to teach and can teach, got together, they could find someone to provide a building to get started. It could be a barn for heavens sake. Anywhere where learning can take place. Be inventive. Exercise your rights. Maybe some of you have a spouse that makes sufficient money that you could get started with only two or three students. Once you do well, other parents who care about the education of their children will enroll their child in your school. And if you are a professionally trained teacher who starts a school, **DO NOT** exclude other people who may be fine teachers because they are not professionally trained. Often, people who are not **trained** are excellent teachers. Teaching is more in the heart than in the training.

Once this idea takes root, I would expect to see privately owned schools popping up all over the country. Of course, government, and perhaps the teachers union, will do its best to road block this process. But, if you properly exercise your rights, you will prevail. Remember and use the *Clearfield Doctrine*. In this case the supreme court ruled that when government began dealing in *private commercial paper* [Federal Reserve Notes], it loses its *sovereignty status* and takes on the character of a private corporation or even a mere private person. Which means, that if the Municipal Corporate Government is going to compel a specific performance [such as you must have a license to engage in this occupation... this would be a specific performance requirement], then this Municipal Corporate Government must be the *holder in due course* of a contract or other commercial agreement between itself and the one upon who the demand for specific performance is made. And further, this Municipal Corporate Government must be willing to enter this document into evidence in court in order to enforce their demand in court. Also relevant, of course, is the *Slaughter House Cases*.

If government were to take action against you, immediately make your demand for the contract or commercial agreement being *held in due course* that requires this specific performance. Do so in writing, through certified mail, return receipt requested. Courts and proceedings generally move very slow, so give them ample time to respond. When they do not, and they generally will not for they have no such document being held in due course, write and sign under penalty of perjury, your own affidavit on this matter and file it with the court clerk on your case number. Remember, the court is a place of doing business this action is civil.

A document worth your time to read because it contains considerable legal information is *Sui Juris... pardon me but #5*. Available at <http://mhkeehn.tripod.com/sj5a.pdf>. This document authored by Nord Davis, Jr.

Some of us can do the research and provide support, and some of you will have to do the walking. The path may be a little rough at first, but very rewarding in the end. All the best in your endeavor.

---

June 2008 Update:

Recently a California panel of three judges ruled that parents or tutors of children who are home-schooled must be certified by the state. This begs the question, “to whom do the children belong, their natural parents or the state (government)?” Unfortunately, I know the answer to this question and that answer is approximately as follows.

The government can not create a natural person (human being), they can only create an “*artificial person*” (corporation for example). An *artificial person* is a *legal fiction*, that is, it is a creation of the mind of man. Allowing the government to issue a *birth certification* (birth certificate) and Social Security number alters the status of your newly born child. Once the birth certificate is issued, it is *registered* (not recorded) with the *Department of Vital Statistics* (most states, but may be a different department in some states). Registration of the child is just like registering your car, it makes the government the owner (new parent in this case). You have now placed your child in *international commerce* through your ignorance, just like I did when I was young.

With this action you have relegated yourself to the position of *babysitter* and made the government *the parent*. And the *government parent* will allow the *babysitter* to keep the child so long as the *babysitter* does everything that the government parent demands. When the *babysitter* fails to do as the government parent demands, the government parent will come and get *its asset* and put *its asset* where it wants *its asset*, with no input from you, thank you. Your child has been converted into an *artificial person*, that is why you typically see your name, and your child's name spelled in all capital letters, or abbreviated in some form (like a middle initial instead of a middle name), but never fully spelled out with proper upper case and lower case letters with a colon (":") or comma (",") separating the surname from the first and middle names.

You may wonder why I refer to the baby as *an asset*. It is because once the *birth certificate* is registered, a *bond* is issued on that *instrument of international commerce* and that bond is sold on a *securities and exchange*. The amount, the last time I could find information on it, now several years ago, was \$630,000. The value of the bond being taken from an *actuarial table*. The bond is always purchased by the same entity, the *Federal Reserve Bank*. This is, in part, how our government finances itself in bankruptcy. The baby then becomes the surety, or guarantor, that the bond will be repaid. That is why you are required to put the child in a *child seat* when traveling in the car. Why the child is required to wear a *helmet* when riding the bicycle. That is why everyone is required to wear seat belts. The government is protecting their *assets*. The *birth certificate* opens the account, the *death certificate* closes the account. But we don't want the account closed before the bond is repaid, therefore numerous rules are made to *protect the asset* and *keep the asset un-educated*.

Now we know why they say, "*Ignorance of the law is no excuse.*" Our *ignorance* gives others tremendous control over our lives, and the lives of our children. But before you go overboard chastising government workers and employees, keep in mind that only a handful of people in government know about this scheme. The vast majority of government workers are just as uninformed as the rest of the nation on this matter.

The one thing that can be said about this that stands out above all other commentary (in my opinion), is that this obligation is accomplished under fraud and deception. Which would seem to provide a means of defense to those parents who are determined to remain in control and charge of their own children. Of course, the best solution would be *not* to put a child into that status with the government issued birth certificate and social security number. A *hospital issued birth certificate*, or an entry of *live birth* into the *family bible*, will suffice. If you don't make the government responsible for the child (social security contract), then you don't make them the parent.

Probably the best description of this insidious activity is the term "*evil.*" It is the kind of behavior that we would expect from the psyche of Jeffery Domer (a serial killer).

So, I guess the question is, how much do you love your child, and how far are you willing to go to protect them?