Notes on Apostille

Display your flag and invoke the Law of the Flag on your documents. The Law of the Flag is very powerful.

Congress has lawful authority to make constitutionally compliant treaties, which become the laws of the United States of America and all of the fifty (50) sovereign states of the union. All aspects of the governments of both USA, the States, and US Inc. are obligated to comply with said laws. Indeed, the courts cannot rule on treaty law, nor speak to it, nor negate it, whereby when we have invoked treaty law and have our document apostilled, our position becomes unassailable in law.

There is no greater authentication procedure than an Apostille, inasmuch as virtually the entire Family of nations has agreed that this procedure offers the best method of authenticating a country's documents. Consequently, when you invoke the 1787 Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the laws of the USA Republic, etc., all of that is foreign law, indeed a foreign country, to US Inc. and the agencies and courts thereof. Without actualizing an effective process for doing so, no current tribunals, which are private, commercial agencies of US Inc., can address, speak to, or recognize anything we place before them from USA, which is essentially all of the rights, privileges, immunities, and laws we would like to invoke for our remedy. We have no recognized rights or standing in law as long as we are presumed to be a "citizen of the United States" and have never properly established our position to the contrary. The way to inseminate our position into the courts of US Inc., should the need arise, is to establish ourselves in the venue/jurisdiction of USA by the administrative process, apostilled, and thereby render our position as mandatory admissibility into a US Inc. tribunal. The jurisdiction/venue of the USA Republic is vastly superior to that of US Inc.; operatives of US Inc. are aliens, enemies, and imposters who have expatriated from the USA Republic and its law.

Everything about USA is foreign to US Inc. except the deceitful similarity of names, forms, trappings, and appearances that are retained to confuse and deceive the people. It is a principle of all systems of law that a foreign jurisdiction, such as US Inc., cannot subject any Citizen of another country, e.g., Citizen of the USA Republic, to its law. Thus, the private, commercial, corporate, colorable admiralty-maritime of US Inc. is irreconcilably at odds with the Republic and everything about it. If you wish your law, which preserves your unalienable rights, sovereignty, and standing in law, to prevail, you must establish your position in international law, ratified by treaty, through the apostille process—preferably <u>before</u> you ever get hauled into one of their revenue-raping, rights-abolishing courts.

The greatest weapon we have is our factual statement of who we truly are, our lawful and reasonable expectations as to our treatment by our guaranteed form of government, our spiritual convictions and creed, our true identity, our grounds for asserting plausible deniability of authority for abrogating our position, and a statement of the sum-certain amount of penalties that will be incurred by our adversary in the event they deny, ignore, or attempt to prevail over the ultimate facts set forth in our apostilled documents.

"Trademark infringement" is defined as anything that is likely to cause confusion concerning one's identity. We can create a procedure that not only identifies us, i.e., who and what we are or have established ourselves as being in law, in an unassailable manner, but also set forth (if we desire) numerous examples of the "ingenious subterfuges and devices" employed to ensnare us surreptitiously to deftly gut us of our rights and standing in law and place us squarely into their domain as their commercial chattel property, debtor, and slave. Our adversary has deployed over

an extended period of time unimaginable cleverness, supremely skilled perversion of language, magical symbols and rituals, and assaults occurring in the realm of the invisible.

Both federal and state Rules of Evidence describe, without identifying, the supreme and irrefutable nature of a "self-authenticated foreign public document," a/k/a Apostille. A "public document" that emanates from the USA, like the Constitution (1787, 1791) is a superior, foreign, official document, whereas the "authenticated documents" of US Inc. are inferior to our internationally recognized nation. It must be remembered that US Inc. is not a country or nation; it is a private, international corporation.

When our apostilled paperwork from USA is introduced into proceedings of US Inc., it is revealed that it is US Inc. that has expatriated—knowingly, intentionally, and voluntarily—from USA, and that US Inc. is not only foreign and alien to USA but a mortal enemy thereof. We have allowed corrupt ministers, posing as our protectors and loyal public servants, to remove us from our own throne, render us slaves in our own kingdom, plunder us blind, and wreck havoc to every aspect of our lives, law, money, and nation. We did this by going to sleep, indulging in complacency, and, most of all, foolishly trusting the most untrustworthy beings in the universe by attempting to do what is disastrous to do in any case: surrender our own power, self-reliance, and self-responsibility so we could "be taken care of." The result is that they have indeed "taken care of us" by treating us as their slaves and property. In a sense they are justified: We gave our lives and sovereignty away and they willingly accepted our gift. Nevertheless, inasmuch as it is operatives of US Inc. who have sworn oaths to the Constitution of US Inc. and are administering it against sovereign Americans have expatriated from USA, it is they, not us, who are "stateless persons," "aliens," or even "outlaws," "pirates," or "saboteurs." Let them all minimally be deported into the imaginary corporate domain of their own non-existent nation and get off our throne and out of our kingdom.

We can make our documents apostilled affidavits that are literally an "Act of State," defined as:

> "An act done by the sovereign power of a country, or by his delegate, within the limits of the power vested in him. An act of state cannot be questioned or made the subject of legal proceedings in a court of law." *Black's Law Dictionary*, 6th Edition, pp. 33-34.

Court cases confirm the above, *inter alia*:

> Bando Nacional de Cuba vs. Sabbatino, 376 U.S. 398
> Ricaud vs. American Metal Co., 246 U.S. 304
> Oetjen vs. Central Leather Co., 246 U.S. 297
> F. Palicio y Compania, S.A. vs. Brush, 256 F.Supp. 481; 375 F.2d 1011; 389 U.S. 830

Why can we execute documents that are recognized as an "Act of State"? Because in the law of the Republic we are the sovereign and king and the government is our servant. In other words, we are the real government while the outward/formal government is merely an instrumentality we deploy to protect our rights. Whether this condition is in fact currently recognized in practice, it has been upheld by innumerable court rulings from the inception of this country, is established in treaty, and, conclusively in any case, become a position to which all operatives of US Inc. have stipulated upon issuance of an apostilled Certificate of Agreement. Remember, their colorable system functions entirely by stipulations. Indeed, countless patriots waltz into tribunals of US Inc. and argue that black is not white and the judge dismisses all arguments out of hand. The reason for that is that whether black is white is not the issue. The issue is that the parties have stipulated that black is white, whereby that equivalence is established as a fact of the case. The parties could equally well stipulate that the Tooth Fairy pays better on Saturday nights

and that stipulation would be established as fact and upheld as if it were sacred writ—which, indeed, it is, based on the stipulation of free-will beings.

Inasmuch as the present "government" has demonstrated that it has expatriated itself from all responsibilities of being our legitimate government, it is obvious that anything they have to say, adjudicate, legislate, enforce, etc., is absolutely none of our concern. It is foreign to us. Do we concern ourselves, for instance, with the laws of France or Russia if we are not within the venue and jurisdiction of France or Russia? We are the absolute sovereigns of our own government, and can engage in a method of administrative redress that is not only mandatory and binding upon the usurpers/enemies/aliens masquerading as the United States Government, but do it in such a way that elevates our "request" into and absolute mandate. Utilizing internationally authenticated (apostilled) affidavits is possibly the most expeditious, inexpensive, autonomous, and effective tool for accomplishing this. I know of nothing remotely comparable.

The current US Government would have Americans believe that this so-called "government" is legitimate and our actual government when it is nothing but a usurping enemy. Operatives of US Inc. know, in fact, that their law is of no force and effect over a private, sentient, sovereign inhabitant of the USA Republic, nor over any of the fifty (50) states thereof, and that any statements we make in our *de jure* capacity cannot be questioned and cannot be made subject to any legal proceeding in their courts, simply because their law is not our law and they cannot speak to or adjudicate law that is not theirs.

US Inc. has no lawful courts or even court members. We need not recognize any bogus public servants who are enemies in sheep's clothing, nor be compelled to support those who implement tyranny over us, nor do we have any requirement to recognize their legitimacy.

Yet further, not a single member of US Inc. or any of its organizations, departments, States, municipalities, or sub-functions possesses a bonded, constitutionally prescribed Oath of Office, and so-called "judges" are also devoid of the mandatory qualification of a lifetime of good behavior tenure with undiminished compensation. All of them are paid by, and in the service of, the alleged creditors in bankruptcy of the civilly dead, insolvent US Inc., collecting revenue at increasingly monstrous amounts for the benefit of their foreign principles who already own the bulk of the monetary wealth of the world.

Consequently, in the case of "public servants," their absence of valid oath and bond signifies "Neglect of Office" and means that upon purportedly taking office (color of office) they suffered a civil death and rendered null and void any and all acts performed under color of office thereafter, so that any and all such acts are null, void, moot, and are as if they were never actually done because no valid qualifications for doing those acts ever existed in the first place. In the case of a "judge," he is not only civilly dead, but practicing law from the bench, a felonious (high) crime.

Indeed, Title 8 USC 1481(a)(2) states that one may expatriate by:

> "taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state or a political subdivision thereof, after having attained the age of eighteen years."

All alleged "public servants" today have thereby expatriated by swearing an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of a foreign State, i.e., the bankrupt, foreign-owned corporation entitled "United States," and acting in the service thereof. They are thereby self-proclaimed aliens "eating out the substance" of the American people by impersonating government officials, occupying only pretend imitations of office, and acting under color of public office.

The *Criminal Resource Manual* issued by the Department of Justice states, in No. 664, October 1997, "Territorial Jurisdiction":

> Prior to February 1,1940, it was presumed that the United States accepted jurisdiction whenever the state offered it because the donation was deemed a benefit. *See Fort Leavenworth R.R. Co. v. Lowe*, 114 U.S. at 528. This presumption was reversed by enactment of the Act of February 1, 1940, codified at 40 U.S.C. § 255. This statute requires the head or authorized officer of the agency acquiring or holding property to file with the state a formal acceptance of such "jurisdiction, exclusive or partial as he may deem desirable," and further provides that in the absence of such filing "it shall be conclusively presumed that no such jurisdiction has been acquired." *See Adams v. United States*, 319 U.S. 312 (district court is without jurisdiction to prosecute soldiers for rape committed on an army base prior to filing of acceptance prescribed by statute). The requirement of 40 U.S.C. § 255 can also be fulfilled by any filing satisfying state law. *United States v. Johnson*, 994 F.2d 980, 984-86 (2d Cir. 1993). The enactment of 40 U.S.C. § 255 did not retroactively affect jurisdiction previously acquired. *See Markham v. United States*, 215 F.2d 56 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 348 U.S. 939 (1954); *United States v. Heard*, 270 F. Supp. 198, 200 (W.D. Mo. 1967).
>
> COMMENT: In summary, the United States may exercise plenary criminal jurisdiction over lands within state borders:
>
> A. Where it reserved such jurisdiction upon entry of the state into the union;
>
> B. Where, prior to February 1, 1940, it acquired property for a purpose enumerated in the Constitution with the consent of the state;
>
> C. Where it acquired property whether by purchase, gift or eminent domain, and thereafter, but prior to February 1, 1940, received a cession of jurisdiction from the state; and
>
> D. Where it acquired the property, and/or received the state's consent or cession of jurisdiction after February 1, 1940, and has filed the requisite acceptance.

All State courts are really junior federal courts, note the gold-fringed United States flag displayed in the courtroom signifying jurisdiction in the Emergency War Powers of the Federal United States Executive under the President as Commander In Chief of the Armed Services. Did the *de jure* state ever cede the land over which the State bureaucracy asserts "plenary power" over the people to the Federal Government, a/k/a Washington, DC? Where is the proof of filing a "requisite acceptance"? If they cannot prove venue and jurisdiction, their silence is admission that they have no legitimate venue or jurisdiction on your turf. Even more devastating is that they can prove no venue or jurisdiction over a free, sovereign man on the soil of any geographical area of the Republic not ceded to Washington, DC, and are thereby devoid of capacity to impose any of their corporate codes and by-laws, deceitfully termed "law," over you as someone with domicil in a jurisdiction and venue that is a foreign country to US Inc.

Remember, you have never executed any formal expatriation from USA—have you? If you have not done so, your citizenship within the Republic of the United States of America is extant and operational and US Inc. is impotent to alter, diminish, alienate, abrogate, impair, deny, or suppress it. Your *de jure* citizenship and all of the rights, privileges, defenses, and immunities that you, as a sovereign and king, possess may be utilized and asserted. To establish your position and the agreement of US Inc. therewith, use the Private Administrative Process, i.e., "PAP," and get the resulting Certificate of Agreement apostilled. Inasmuch as the system

functions by stipulations (agreements), once a matter is mutually stipulated by the parties, the presumption of any dispute or controversy is nullified in entirety. Thereby, having their stipulations established in International Law, secured by Treaties to which no court, judge, or agent can even speak, renders all attempts to adjudicate a controversy null, void, and moot since the controversy has been dissolved, just as one's lap disappears when one stands up. Attempting to litigate a stipulated matter is—minimally—a felony on the part of a "judge," barratry on the part of any attorneys involved, and champerty on the part of any agents or law-enforcement types who act on the stipulated matter. It is an attempt to arbitrate a non-existent dispute.

We wish to establish our position by obtaining mutual agreement, which can be done via the PAP. When we provide official notice to them administratively of our position, by notarized and apostilled affidavit, and they do not rebut/refute our position with documentary material proof, they stipulate by silence that our position is correct in entirety and they concur with it. They cannot rebut or refute our position because that position is irrefutable and mere bluff and deceit does not constitute verification of any contrary position they may wish to assert. At this point we can provide them with a notarially issued "Certificate of Agreement" with another affidavit in support, all of which we get apostilled, and voila!, we have an official agreement of our position between all parties established on the international record and upheld by Treaty and International Law. Inasmuch as fulfilling this procedure is something we can do of our own power, without having to go to court or petition anyone, and is private, inexpensive, relatively easy to do, and can be finalized expeditiously, it may be deemed optimum among all available options.