

As stated in the previous section, we are Constitutionalists and require all public servants, including judges, to abide by their oaths in the performance of their official duties, including those before the court. This protects the American Citizens from government and court abuse, if enforced. The previous challenges are intended to stop any action before it gets to court. Those listed below are intended to be stated or asked by the defendant in court prior to the start of proceedings. They require “yes” or “no” responses; and you must hold the judge, only, to these answers. If you allow him to evade and avoid answering as such, then you, yourself, allow the judge to damage you, your lawful positions and the Powers of and Rights guaranteed in the Constitution to you. As you can see, either a “yes” or “no” answer serves your interests, if you understand the implications.

For the sake of convenience, we shall assume the position as defendant. Please remember that all public servants serve under limited, delegated authority from the Constitution, by and through the People, for the best interests of the People. The American People must gain courage, en masse, and stand up to and challenge all forms of government, especially the courts, which are supposed to be the last bastion of justice. Since the Constitution cannot conflict with itself, the limited powers delegated to government by the Constitution can never supersede the powers of and Rights guaranteed in the Constitution to The American People. “Authority” is an extremely important word and concept. Nothing lawful can be conducted by government and the courts without Constitutional authority, and government has no authority to disparage your Rights. Keep “authority” in mind as you review the following statements and questions.

CHALLENGE IS NOT ARGUMENT.

SOVEREIGNS MAKE DEMANDS

DEMANDS ARE MET OR NOT MET.

SUBJECTS MAKE REQUESTS

REQUESTS CAN BE EITHER GRANTED OR DENIED.

CHALLENGES IN COURT BEFORE PROCEEDINGS START

These statements and questions can be directed to the judge, for himself, the prosecuting attorney and state witnesses, such as police, etc., and to each one, individually. Not all of these need be asked, so ask those with which you are most comfortable. If both you and your opposition fully understand the very serious, lawful positions and Constitutional implications of the statements and questions, usually, only the first one is needed for Constitutional justice to be served.

1. A. You have taken an oath of office. Is that correct? Yes – No

- B. Pursuant to your oath, in your performance of your official duties, including those before this court, you are required to abide by that oath. Is that correct? Yes – No

Note: If the judge, or the prosecuting attorney or other state witnesses say “no”, then, obviously, they must be disqualified and/or removed from the bench, position or impeached as witnesses, along with their testimonies, for obvious reasons. This answer is evidence that the one who answered “no” will not abide by his oath in the performance of his official duties, therefore, by his own answer, his oath is meaningless to him. He is a traitor and a danger to the American People, and must be removed from power.

All those who have taken oaths are required to answer “yes”. This answer is consistent with the requirements under the oath, the bond which binds the oath and requirements of the Constitutions. A “yes” answer means that ALL actions taken by the public servant, PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE must be consistent with Constitutional requirements, specific to the Bill of Rights. If the public servant’s past actions failed this, and if those actions are used in an action or as evidence against the defendant, then those actions were not taken pursuant to his oath and were done in opposition to Constitutional requirements. Therefore, the public servant perjured his oath, invoked the self-executing sections 3 and 4 of the

14th amendment, vacated his office, and forfeited all benefits of that former office, including salary and pensions. All charges must be dismissed, with prejudice.

He must be disqualified from his position, and if a witness, he and his testimony must be impeached and all his unconstitutional, unlawful actions and evidence against the defendant must be denied, and the charges dismissed. All present and future actions by the judge and court must be conducted pursuant to the Constitutions, federal and state. In this situation, if you are fully aware of your Rights and the full extent of the “yes” answer, you will prevail. However, if the judge were to then after violate his answer by his actions, you must inform him of his answer and his Constitutional requirements thereto, and his liability if he were to fail in his duty.

**Remember they have nothing - they want everything
and they want you to give it to them!**

"Language creates spooks that get into our heads and hypnotize us."

-- Robert Anton Wilson, Introduction to *The Tree of Lies* (by Christopher S. Hyatt. Ph.D.)

"It is hard to fight an enemy who has outposts in your head."

-- Sally Kempton

"The most potent weapon in the hands of the oppressor is the mind of the oppressed."

-- Steve Biko

What Nietzsche said,

The state? What is that? Well then! Now open your ears, for now I shall speak to you of the death of peoples.

The state is the coldest of all cold monsters. Coldly it lies, too; and this lie creeps from its mouth; 'I, the state, am the people.'

2. Does this court abide by all the powers of and Rights guaranteed to American Citizens in the federal and state Constitutions, including due process of law? Yes – No

Note: A “no” answer carries the same conditions as above. A “yes” answer is in compliance with Constitutional requirements for American Citizens and is consistent with the “yes” answer to #1 above. Again, if you are fully aware of your Rights and the conditions underlying the affirmative answer, you will prevail. Remember - bind the judge by his answer.

Due Process, defined under GOLDBERG v. KELLY, 397 U.S. 254 (1970)

- ✓ Timely notice;
- ✓ Confront adversarial witness;
- ✓ Oral arguments;
- ✓ Oral presentation of evidence;
- ✓ Cross examination of adverse party;
- ✓ Right to assistance of counsel;
- ✓ Disclosure of evidence;
- ✓ Determination of outcome of a Court of Record (so you don't have to do it again.);
- ✓ Right of finding facts and conclusions of law (Right to have the reasoning as to why the Judge did whatever was done.);
- ✓ Right to impartial judge.

Due Process: An orderly proceeding wherein a person with notice, actual or constructive, and has an opportunity to be heard and to enforce and protect his rights before a court having the power to hear and determine the case. Kazubowski v. Kazubowski, 45 Ill.2d 405, 259 N.E.2d 282, 290. Phrase means that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, property or of any right granted him by statute, unless matter involved first shall have been adjudicated against him upon trial conducted according to established rules regulating judicial proceedings, and it forbids condemnation without a hearing. Pettit v. Penn, LaApp., 180 So.2d 66, 69. The concept of “due process of law” as it is embodied in the Fifth Amendment demands that a law shall not be unreasonable, arbitrary, or capricious and that the means selected shall have a reasonable and substantial relation to the object being sought. U.S. v. Smith, D.C.Iowa, 249 F.Supp. 515, 516. Fundamental requisite of “due process of law” is the opportunity to be heard, to be aware that a matter is pending, to make an informed choice whether to acquiesce or contest, and to assert before the appropriate decision-making body the reasons for such choice. Trinity Episcopal Corp. v. Romney, D.C.N.Y., 387 F.Supp. 1044, 1084. **Aside from all else, “due process” means fundamental fairness and substantial justice.** Vaughn v. State, 3 Tenn.Crim.App. 54, 456 S.W.2d 879, 883.

3. I am entitled to and guaranteed a fair and impartial trial presided over by a fair, unbiased and impartial judge, before and decided by a jury of my peers. Is that correct? Yes – No

Note: A “no” answer is consistent with conditions stated above. A “yes” answer confirms the conditions of the statement, including: (1) Right to a fair and impartial trial; (2) unbiased and impartial judge; (3) a jury of my peers; (4) which jury decides guilt or innocence.

A bad faith prosecution violates constitutional rights.
Cornet v. Longois, 871 F.Supp. 918, 921-922 (E.D. Texas 1994)

There are two types of ignorance: The first type of ignorance is that brought about by nature where an individual doesn't have the mental capacities to seek and/or understand it. The second type of ignorance is chosen ignorance. This is the byword of fundamentalist Christianity. Through half-truths (half-truths are whole lies), purposeful semantic manipulations, and feigned knowledge and wisdom they "trap(ped) you with guile (lies)" (as Paul said to the Corinthians). The Truth is out there. You need to find it for yourself. No one has it for you.

4. I am presumed innocent of all aspects of the alleged charges, presumptions and assumptions in, by and of this court, unless proven guilty by a jury of my peers, beyond a reasonable doubt, based solely on verified evidence and proof. Is that correct? Yes – No

Note: Either answer is consistent with conditions as stated above. However, in this statement, with a “yes” answer, you are confirming several vital positions: (1) presumed innocent of all ASPECTS of the alleged charges; (2) presumed innocent of ALL PRESUMPTIONS and ASSUMPTIONS of this court; (3) unless PROVEN guilty by a JURY OF MY PEERS; (4) proven guilty BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT (5) based SOLELY ON VERIFIED EVIDENCE AND PROOF.

...and further,

Texas Penal Code section 2.01, Texas Code of Criminal Procedure Article 38.03 and the United Nations’ UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, Article 11 clearly state [that] all persons [read, people] are presumed to be innocent – I go with that - I will not make any admissions or confessions to the contrary at this time.

5. A. "Proof" consists of verified and demonstrated competent evidence, and not opinion, especially opinion unsupported by fact, law and evidence. Is that correct? Yes – No

Note: In this statement, by the judge's answer, you are confirming the nature and status of "proof". It is highly unlikely that any judge will, on the public record, answer "no" to this statement, since his answer will defy the very loudly proclaimed concept of American justice, will defy due process of law, deny Constitutional Rights and allow 'opinion', unsupported or otherwise, to be used as "proof".

A "yes" answer will be consistent with the judge's oath, Constitutional requirements and his other "yes" answers. He will confirm the statement, and the fact that opinion, verified or otherwise, is not proof. This is a major position, a major lawful gain and benefit. Many "testimonies" by witnesses are simply opinions, usually unsupported and unverified. The defendant can now be assured that only verified and documented proof, and not opinion, from anyone, can be used against him.

B. "Beyond a reasonable doubt" consists solely of decisions and verdicts from a jury of my peers based entirely on proof that absolutely and conclusively confirms guilt, without any reservation or questions whatsoever from the jury. Is that correct? Yes – No

Note: A "no" answer is consistent with conditions above stated. A "yes" answer confirms ALL the conditions of the statement, due process of law, Constitutional requirements, the judge's oath, and assures that a jury of your peers will make its verdict based solely on PROOF, not opinion, that absolutely confirms guilt, without any questions, whatsoever.

6. Opinion from any witness or prosecuting attorney unsupported and unverified by fact, law and proven evidence is simply opinion, and opinion, as previously established, is not proof. Is that correct?

Yes – No

Note: A “no” answer is consistent with conditions stated above. A “yes” answer again confirms the status of “proof” as different from opinion. Thus, any plaintiff, (or opponent), prosecutor or witness MUST have verified proof, as described, and not opinion to support his statements. This is of vital importance to American Citizens. Therefore, “proof” by the prosecutor and testimony of witnesses is only opinion, unless supported as above stated, and if not, it is meaningless, frivolous, null and void and not accepted by the court as proof of anything, including guilt.

“ ... a judgment must be proved only by evidence entered on the record through a competent witness”; See American Red Cross v. Community Blood Center of the Ozarks, 257 F.3d 859 (8th Cir. 07/25/2001)

“The statements of counsel in brief or in argument are not true facts before the court and are therefore insufficient for the court's summary conclusion,” Trinsey v. Pagliaro, D.C. Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647.

7. A. Since I am guaranteed a fair and impartial trial, how is that possible when you, the presiding judge, the prosecuting attorney and all the witnesses against me work for and are paid by the state that is the plaintiff in this case, and my opponent? In this situation, it is impossible for me to have a fair trial. Is that correct? Yes – No

B. Further, any data used against me is obtained from sources who are also paid by the state, the same plaintiff against me. At minimum, conflict of interest takes place. Yes – No

Note: A “no” answer is consistent with above conditions. If the judge were to answer “no”, he is essentially saying, on the public record, that it is possible for a defendant to have a fair trial, even though he, the judge, the prosecutor and the state witnesses all work for and are paid by your opponent, and that all the so-called “evidence” against the defendant was obtained from sources paid by the state, again, the opponent. Even the most avowed critic can see through this fraud.

A “yes” answer confirms the conditions of the statement, and conclusively demonstrates that a presiding judge recognizes, on the public record, that the referenced court conditions are not fair, not partial, and, as such, unconstitutional. This is a major Constitutional and lawful victory for the people, with far reaching implications.

A fundamentally fair trial is a basic requirement of Due process

Ester v. State of Texas, 85 S.Ct. 1628 (1965)

...and pursuant to Ward v. Village of Monroe, 409 U.S. 57, 61-62, 93 S. Ct. 80, 83, 34 L. Ed. 2d 267 (1972); & Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, 520, 47 S. Ct. 437, 440, 71 L. Ed. 749 (1927)

“It is a fundamental right of a party to have a neutral & detached judge preside over the judicial proceedings.”

8. Since I am presumed innocent of the charges and all aspects, presumptions and assumptions of those charges and this court, I have challenged the jurisdiction of this court, which is an aspect of the charges and a presumption of this court. This court has failed to prove jurisdiction, on the public record. Therefore, since I am presumed innocent of all aspects of the charges and presumptions of the court, I am presumed innocent of jurisdiction, and since this court has not proven jurisdiction, on the record, this case must be dismissed. Pursuant to the foregoing, and to numerous federal and Supreme Court rulings, this case must be dismissed, with prejudice, and I hereby move for dismissal of all charges and this case, with prejudice. Yes – No

Note: By prior “yes” answers, it has been established that the defendant is presumed innocent of all assumptions and presumptions of the court. Jurisdiction is both an assumption and presumption of the court, of which the defendant is presumed innocent. The defendant challenged the jurisdiction of the court, which the court failed to prove, on the record. Therefore, since the defendant is presumed innocent of jurisdiction, has challenged jurisdiction, which the court has failed to prove, on the public record, the court lacks jurisdiction and since jurisdiction does not exist, the charges must be dismissed, with prejudice. ...and pursuant to Hagans v. Lavine, 415 US 528 at 533 (1974)

“Once jurisdiction is challenged, it must be proven.”

If the judge were to deny this lawful position and insist that his court has jurisdiction, without his having proven it, on the public record, the following could be stated:

Since the judge has stated that this court conforms to all Constitutional requirements, then this court conforms to the Bill of Rights, Article III of the federal Constitution and to due process of law. Jurisdiction is directly related to the foregoing, is an aspect of the charges, and a presumption of this court, of which the defendant is presumed innocent, yet this court has failed to prove jurisdiction, on the record, thus, this court defies Constitutional requirements, due process of law, federal and Supreme Court rulings, and therefore forfeits any “perceived jurisdiction”, has no Constitutional authority to hear this case, and this case must be dismissed, with prejudice, or the presiding judge, pursuant to his oath, perjures that oath, commits insurrection and sedition against the Constitution, on the public record, and treason against the American People.

9. A. The jury swears an oath to the Constitution. Is that correct? In its deliberations and in its verdict, the jury is required to abide by its oath. Is that correct? Yes – No

Note: Since the jury swears an oath and is required to abide by that oath, it is obvious that a “yes” answer is required. The Constitutional and lawful position here is that the jury must abide by its oath in making its verdict. If it fails to do so, then the jury perjures its oath; its actions and verdict are unconstitutional and the jury verdict null and void, without force or effect, whatsoever. Just as a public servant is required to abide by his oath in the performance of his official duties, so is the jury. **However, we the People must know and demand our Rights, or we have none.**

If the judge were to answer “no”, which is highly unlikely, then as a defendant I would move for immediate dismissal of all charges, with prejudice, because any judge or court that permits an unconstitutional jury to perjure its oath and reach an unconstitutional verdict, pursuant to its oath, operates as an open fraud upon the People, denies and defies the Constitution and the powers of and Rights guaranteed therein to the American people, denies due process of law and has no jurisdiction over any American Citizen, whatsoever.

B. If the jury, pursuant to its oath, makes its verdict in perjury of its oath or in opposition or contradiction to the Constitutions and the Rights guaranteed therein to American Citizens, or based in false information and fraud, that verdict is plainly unconstitutional, thus null and void, frivolous, and without force or effect, whatsoever. Is that correct? Yes – No

Note: Answer given in previous note. Further, pursuant to oaths taken, any jury verdict based, either in whole or in part, in fraud, deception, manipulation, lies or false information is null and void.

If the judge were to say that this is not correct, then I, as a defendant, would inform him, pursuant to his oath and pursuant to his preceding “yes” answers, why his response is not only incorrect, but unconstitutional and unlawful. Further, I would inform him that he has no Constitutional authority to deny, on the public record, the very Constitution to which he and the jury swore an oath, bound by bond. It is obvious that the judge is not a higher authority than the Constitution.

If the judge were to insist that the jury verdict, even when based in fraud, etc., as above described, is valid, I would remind him of his first “yes” answer to statement #1, in which he is required to conduct his professional duties pursuant to his oath, as is the jury also required. I would then remind the judge of his other “yes” answers, in which he confirmed, including, but not limited to, the Constitutional duties of the court. His response is made in contradiction to his oath, as is the jury’s verdict, thus, both are unlawful, unconstitutional, without force or affect whatsoever, and not binding in a Constitutionally compliant court, which the judge stated, on the public record, is the status of this court.

At this point, I would move for immediate dismissal of all charges and this case, with prejudice, for, including, but not limited to, lack of jurisdiction, lack of Constitutional authority, defiance of the federal and state Constitutions, denial of due process, perjury of oath, insurrection and sedition against the Constitution, and treason against the American People, in the instant case, the defendant.

If the “judge” were to remain firm, then, as a defendant, I would inform him that I am entitled to a fair and impartial trial, by a jury of my peers, as he has previously agreed, and as is Constitutionally guaranteed, yet this jury is not a jury of my peers for many reasons, including, but not limited to: (1) jury members are not part of my ethnicity; (2) they do not work in the same profession I do; (3) they do not come from the same background and education that I do; (4) they are not Constitutionalist and supporters of the Supreme Law of the Land, as I am; (4) they are traitors to the Constitution and to the American People, which I am not.

I would then, again, move for dismissal of all charges and the case, with prejudice, based upon previously stated grounds, and further include the fact that the judge would permit an unconstitutional verdict by a lawless, unconstitutional jury not of my peers. The Constitutions guarantee me a jury of my peers, yet this judge denies this Constitutionally-guaranteed Right to me. Pursuant to his oath, he has no Constitutional authority to overrule the very same Constitution to which he swore an oath, and, further, is not a higher authority than the Constitution. If the judge were to remain firm, I would again inform him that, by his own actions and responses, he committed insurrection, sedition and treason against the American People, is a traitor to this Nation and its People, and must be removed from the bench for his treason. I will immediately file criminal and civil charges against him, personally, and in his professional capacity, and take action against him in an Article III federal court, which I will demand, by Motion.

Questions To Ask The Jury

1. Pursuant to your oath, is there anyone on this jury who will not abide by his / her oath in the performance of his / her official duties, including, but not limited to, jury deliberations and reaching jury verdict?
2. Are there any jury members who believe and will abide by the belief that the government is superior to the People and that government is Sovereign in this Nation, and that the People are required to obey the government in all situations, no matter how unlawful and unconstitutional that government or its actions may be?
3. Are there any members on this jury who are lawyers, government officers, or work for any form of any government, in any capacity, or are employed by corporations or companies that work for government? Federal employees are not allowed to sit on a jury, so if they have a social security number they are disqualified, they get government benefits.
4. Are there any paid informants, paid or otherwise, spies or agent provocateurs on this jury, for any one, anybody or anything?
5. You have been asked these questions and are expected to and will be held to your answers, pursuant to your oaths. Does anyone wish to change his / her answer?

Extra

Do you discriminate? Do you discriminate in favor of judges and policemen?

How many are prepared to vote right now to find me innocent? Then turn to the judge and say, your code of criminal procedure says I'm entitled to the presumption of innocence. Back to the Jury, How many of you are ready to vote right now to find me innocent?

...and pursuant to Howlett v. Rose, 496 U.S. 356 (1990)

“Federal Law & Supreme Court Cases apply to State Court Cases.”

...and pursuant to U.S. v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196, 220 1 S. Ct. 240, 261, 27 L. Ed 171 (1882)

"No man in this country is so high that he is above the law. No officer of the law may set that law at defiance with impunity. All the officers of the govt., from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law & are bound to obey it." And, "It is the only supreme power in our system of govt., & every man who, by accepting office participates in its' functions, is only the more strongly bound to submit to that supremacy & to observe the limitations which it imposes on the exercise of the authority which it gives."

...and pursuant to Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. (6 Wheat) 264, 404, 5 L. Ed 257 (1821)

"No state legislator or executive or judicial officer can war against the Constitution without violating his undertaking to support it".

...and pursuant to Prieto Bail Bonds v. State, 994 S.W. 2d 316

“Without the taking of the oath prescribed by (Article 16, § 1 (c) (oath of office), (d) (anti-bribery oath) of) the Constitution of this State, one cannot become either a de jure or de facto judge, & his acts as such are void.”

...and pursuant to State vs. Jordan; 28 S.W.2d. 921, 922

“A person elected or appointed to an office or other public position must qualify by taking an oath or making affirmation & by giving bond, if so required by law.”

...and pursuant to Texas Transportation Code § 543.008. Violation by Officer

“A violation by an officer ...is misconduct in office & the officer is subject to removal from the officer’s position.”

Further, the exercise of a Constitutional Right cannot be converted into a crime. *SEE: Miller v. U.S.*, 230 F, 2d 286, 489. **“The claim and exercise of a Constitutional Right cannot be converted into a crime.”**

Miranda v. Arizona, 384 U.S., 436. **“Where Rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.”**, and *Shapiro V. Thompson*, 394 U.S., 618. **“The mere chilling of a Constitutional right by a penalty on its exercise is patently unconstitutional.”**

Let me comprehend you -

For your job position are you employed under a collective bargaining agreement?

Yes – No

In your job position does your paycheck include federal funding or federal grants?

Yes – No

Likewise do you accept any funding from private enterprises to pay your paycheck?

Yes – No

In addition, do you have an oath? Yes – No

To support the United States Constitution? Yes – No

...and the Texas Constitution? Yes – No

I am sure your Principle gave an oath and the Principle - Agent Rule [under doctrine of respondeat superior] applies here.

Let me comprehend you correctly:

Are you intending to make a legal determination that

_____ and...

You can hold me, a sui juris freeman, liable for anything you think I am liable for, without My agreement for which I have not, will not and do not agree for any liability or to be compelled for any unrevealed contract, commercial agreement or bankruptcy that I have not entered into knowingly, voluntarily, and intentionally from any administrative agencies of government, Federal, State, & Local like this agency here.

Or that you do not have to file these papers

Or that you are ruling contrary to _____ Higher court' s case cite.

Because if you are intending to make any of those assumed Legal Determinations concerning Me you just MAY be placing yourself into committing an Article III Impeachable Felony Offense.

Is that really what you want to do? Yes – No

Is that really your intention? If so, please state so for the Record.

If so, please state so in front of my witness here. _____

And any silence right here and now is your acquiescence of your intentions to do so and if you continue here today without dismissing this malarkey I will and do charge you with administrative and constructive TREASON -- isn't that right John Doe and Mary Smith.

John and Mary must each stand up and say, "YES" and I do charge you likewise with administrative and constructive TREASON - Bailiff take them away. Then SHUT UP.

If anyone makes a move to touch you SHOUT VERY LOUD, I am a non combatant neutral in itinere [in nigh tan arie] [on a journey] suri juris, freeman status and if you TOUCH ME you will be in violation the Geneva convention and Field Manual 27-10. Hearing nothing this matter is dismissed and concluded. LEAVE THE COURT ROOM

Treason: (Simply put - a betrayal of trust.) Adherence to the enemy, and rendering him aid and comfort. *see Cramer v. U.S.*, U.S.N.Y. 325 U.S. 1, 65 S.Ct. 918, 932, 89 L.Ed. 1441. See 18 U.S.C.A. § 2381. Article three, Section three U.S. Constitution. **Misprision of treason.** The bare knowledge and concealment of an act of treason or treasonable plot by falling to disclose it to appropriate officials; that is, without any assent or participation therein, for if the latter elements be present the party becomes a principal. 18 U.C.S.A. § 2382. In other words if I have knowledge of what I believe to be treason and I don't report it I can be guilty of it myself.

CHISHOLM, Ex'r. versus GEORGIA, Dall. 2, 440, 418 (1793)

This principal was espoused by Chief Justice John Jay
"...at the Revolution the sovereignty devolved on the people: and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects (unless 472*) *the African* slaves among us may be so called) and have none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens. and as joint tenants in the sovereignty. "

(this case promulgated the eleventh amendment)

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

"People of a state are entitled to all rights which formerly belong to the King, by his prerogative."

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

"The people, or sovereign are not bound by general words in statutes, restrictive of prerogative right, title or interest, unless expressly named. Acts of limitation do not bind the King or the people. The people have been ceded all the rights of the King, the former sovereign ... It is a maxim of the common law, that when an act is made for the common good and to prevent injury, the King shall be bound, though not named, but when a statute is general and prerogative right would be divested or taken from the King [or the people] he shall not be bound."

Juilliard v. Greeman, 110 U.S. 421 (1884)

*"There is no such thing as a power of inherent sovereignty in the government of the United States ... **In this country sovereignty resides in the people [living in the states of the Union, since the states created the United States government and they came before it], and Congress can exercise no power which they have not, by their Constitution entrusted to it: All else is withheld.**"*

Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 118 US 356, 370 (1886) (with >150 cites to date)

"Sovereignty itself is, of course, not subject to law, for it is the author and source of law; but in our system, while sovereign powers are delegated to the agencies of government, sovereignty itself remains with the people, by whom and for whom all government exists and acts. And the law is the definition and limitation of power."

"Bind down the Public officials with the chains of the Constitution" Thomas Jefferson

Citizens of the American Constitution

c/o 739 Dalbey Drive

Las Vegas, New Mexico

Web site: www.CitizensoftheAmericanConstitution.org

E-mail: constitutionalcitizens@yahoo.com

(505) 425 – 0659

Additional material as well as updates to this publication may be found at:

www.freedom-school.com/acceptance/

Let me comprehend you, by Maria Moffet, Washington State usA

Additional material and editing by James-Marlin, Ebert, proceeding *Sui Juris*, unrepresented
without prejudice, on the land Austin, Travis county Texas, June 2006