

Study Notes



For

Servant King 'Confusion' Videos

Edited for Content by *NCOY*:

Some deletions and additions have been edited into these notes by *NCOY* (*Natural Congregation of Yahweh*) for clarification and correctness of some few aspects of the Biblical related content. Most Biblical quotes appear to be from the King James Version, which in our humble opinion, is adequate for this application. Better translations are available for serious students. See ***NIBEV*** for example.

These transcripts are provided to supplement the Videos NOT to replace the Videos. The videos should be viewed in their entirety, in order to gain a full understanding and should be viewed prior to using these notes. These notes will also enable the viewer to locate portions of videos they wish to go re-view.

The numbers in **red represent minutes into the video at the beginning of each section in these notes. This is the point to go to on a particular video, to locate and re-view that section.**

To view the videos, please select the site that best suits your preferences:

- Servant King @: <http://servantking.info/> or,

- YouTube @: <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC3PMtl-h6TVYvkEglwtLZiQ/videos>

These notes and transcripts of videos shall not be construed as being any form of legal or financial advice given or offered. They are provided for informational and educational purposes only.

Table of Contents

Who I am and Who Should Watch These Videos (from website)	Page 4
The Masters of Confusion WHO ARE THEY? (from website)	Page 6
<u>Introduction Video:</u> The Perfect Swindle Intro Video 1 of 23	Page 11

Confusion of Mind: [Video 1 \(2 of 23\)](#) **Page 16**

Your Mind: Marcus begins his presentations with great news about your alienated inheritance. He then makes some unbelievable statements that will shock you and foreshadows things to come in the Unraveled presentation with two analogies. He continues with a caution on learning and what you may experience when long held beliefs are challenged. He explains the problem in solving a problem using your mind, when the problem is in your mind.

Confusion of Being: [Video 2 \(3 of 23\)](#) **Page 23**

Being: Marcus tells you his story. He tells you what woke him up and led to his unusual quest. Again he tells you some confusing and unexplainable things about your being. He explains what it means to own property and to not own property. He tells you what the two concepts are that required further investigation.

Confusion of Voice: [Video 3 \(4 of 23\)](#) **Page 35**

Words: Marcus talks about "Words", the first concept that led to his discoveries. He shows you the power of words and how you can find hidden things through words. You will begin to see the power of words and how they are used to control you and make you believe the unbelievable. He explains how words will make you see things, but also how easily words can be used to deceive you.

Confusion of Face: [Video 4 \(5 of 23\)](#) **Page 46**

Person: Marcus looks at one of the most common words used today by everyone, yet no one knows what it means. Neither philosophy or the law can explain it. Marcus gives you one half of the elusive concept. The other half is shown in the Unraveled presentation. Marcus insists that your fate hangs upon grasping this one concept.

Confusion of Law: [Video 5 \(6 of 23\)](#)

Page 55

Law: Marcus explains the basic concept of law and government as you are presumed to know it. If you are one of the many groups who are just fed up with everything or are demanding changes, he explains why your protests are futile. He explains why the law as you know it, does pertain to you, and breaking it will only make you the proximate cause of your own injury. He explains who the government really is, the source of all your problems. It is not wise to let your conscience be your guide when you are asleep. The program ends with a clear example to prove you own no property and more details on how the swindle works.

Confusion of Things: [Video 6 \(7 of 23\)](#)

Page 63

Things: Marcus shows you three components of the swindle which require your ignorance, but also your co-operation. Attorney, Licence and Name. He breaks down the meaning of what an attorney really is, and how you lose everything by turning away from who you are. He shows you what a licence is and why we use them. And he shows you the misfortune that awaits you when you have a "confusion of being" and act in the wrong name. Exposing these forgeries will help you grasp and see the life you have been leading as they are later exposed in the Unraveled Programs.

Confusion of Money: [Video 7 \(8 of 23\)](#)

Page 78

Money: Marcus shows you how the blatant lie of owning property leads to your "Confusion of Money". He explains that the "love of money as the root of all evil" was dictated upon the premise of owning property. He shows you the two sides of money and why your flip of the money will always bring you up "tails". And he explains how your continued efforts to make the corruptible, lawful, only increases your penalty and suffering needlessly. There is a better life than your civil life, and that is your real life.

Confusion of "God": [Video 8 \(9 of 23\)](#)

Page 91

"God": Marcus looks at the concept of "God" as found in constitutional and other legal documents. This is the second concept that led to his discoveries. He shows you the contradictions which the greatest legal minds cannot or will not explain. Marcus shows you "God" in government buildings, in churches, on money, in courts. "God" seems to be everywhere but in the law.

"Unraveled" Presentations: (from website) [\(Videos 10 to 23 of 23\)](#)

Page 106

Who I am And Who Should Watch These Programs



I was the Man behind the MASK !

For the purposes of these programs, who I am, is irrelevant. What difference does it make who I am? Are you going to believe the information I give you based on who I am or on the information, facts, evidence and proof?

We have all been trained to believe or not believe information based on the credibility of who gives it to us. We take by faith what we are taught without proof and make it our knowledge, but belief is only a poor and foolish substitute for knowledge. You can believe all kinds of things and **still know nothing !**

But if you really must know who I ammy name is Marcus.

I am a simple man who does nothing in person. I found that, out of body experiences, did not suit me. I came into the world by labour of a natural birth, but I have been raised Caesarean. In the past, I held the power of an attorney and exercised a master's privilege in public law. I was a registered member of a law society but on October 21, 2007, I personally died and was disbarred. I no longer plead at the bar for anything.

In my former life I was also a professional actor who performed according to billing. Today, I do not have a role to play in any of the Acts as my part has been eliminated. You may be familiar with some of the Acts I previously appeared in, like..... The Vital Statistics Act.... The Marriage Act..... The Highway Traffic Act..... Bills of Exchange Act... etc.

I no longer have the means necessary to appear in person or the time for such nonsense. I recently received an inheritance that keeps me preoccupied.

If who I am sounds confusing to you, then you are normal. This is the reason the two sets of programs are named **"Confusion"** and **"Unraveled"**.

Who should watch these presentations and Study this information?

- Everyone who owns no property and that would be everyone.
 - Everyone who lost their birthright and cannot find it.
- Everyone who knows what is legal and illegal as opposed to what is right and wrong.
- Everyone who wonders how 1% of the people legally obtained 99% of your debt.
 - Common law freemen and that would be everyone.
 - People who love their religion and that would be everyone.
 - Teenagers, so they can explain it to their parents.
 - Aboriginal people who think they have been cheated.
 - People who are just fed up with everything.
 - John Doe and Jane Roe. In Roe vs Wade and Doe vs Bolton.
 - Those who wish to be a servant-king instead of a king's-servant.
- And finally, those who have nothing better to do and are just plain nosy.

Who should NOT watch these presentations?

- Those who want something for nothing. Commonly called "thieves".
 - Those who know it all. Commonly called, "know it alls".

The Masters of Confusion

(Who are they?)

In the earliest history of America there was one group of people that were feared with reason--a society, you might say, whose often **"insidious"** craft had claimed a multitude of victims, ever since the middle ages in Europe.

One group of people were hated and feared from Massachusetts Bay to Virginia. The Magistrate would not burn them at the stake, although surely a great many of the colonists would have surely recommended such a solution. Our forefathers were baffled by them.

In the first place where did they come from? Of all who sailed from England to Plymouth in 1620, not one of them was aboard.

"Vermin," that's what the Colonists called them. **"Parasites"** who fed on human misery, **spreading sorrow and confusion wherever they went.**

"Destructive," they were called.

And still they were permitted co-existence with the colonists, for a while, anyway. Of course there were colonial laws prohibiting the practice of their infamous craft. Somehow a way was always found around all those laws.

In 1641, Massachusetts Bay colony took a novel approach to the problem. The governors attempted to starve the **"devils"** out of existence through economic exclusion. They were denied wages, and thereby it was hoped that they would perish.

Four years later, Virginia followed the example of Massachusetts Bay and for a while it seemed that the dilemma had been resolved.

It had not, somehow the **"parasites"** managed to survive, and **the mere nearness of them made the colonists skin crawl.**

In 1658, in Virginia, the final solution; banishment; exile. The **"treacherous ones"** were cast out of the colony. At last, after decades of enduring the **"psychological gloom"**, the sun came out and the birds sang, and all was right with the world. And the elation continued for a generation.

I'm not sure why the Virginians eventually allowed the outcasts to return, but they did. In 1680 after twenty-two years, the despised ones were re-admitted to the colony on the condition that they be subjected to the strictest surveillance.

How soon we forget!!

For indeed over the next half century or so, the imposed restrictions were slowly, quietly swept away. And those whose treachery had been feared since the middle ages ultimately took their place in society.

You see, the **"vermin"** that once infested colonial America, the **"parasites"** who preyed on the misfortunes of their neighbours until finally they were officially banished from Virginia, those dreaded, despised, outcasts, **"masters of confusion"** were **LAWYERS.**



Lawyers and the Legal Trade

(as distinguished from the LAW)

28 “Quotes” from the man who trained them.

A prominent Law Professor who taught lawyers for over 40 years.

“The whole legal trade is made up of lawyers, by lawyers, and for lawyers, for private gain, in order to perpetuate their Hocus Pocus regarding the phoniness of the whole legal process.”

“I outlined my ideas about the book, and about the law, to a lawyer who is not only able, but also extraordinarily frank and perceptive about his profession. “Sure,” he said, “but why give the show away?””

“Of all the specialized skills abroad in the world today, **the average man knows least about the one that affects him most** – about the thing that lawyers call “The Law.””

“It is the lawyers who run our civilization for us – our governments, our business, our private lives. Most legislators are lawyers; they make our laws. Most presidents, governors, commissioners, along with their advisers and brain-trusters are lawyers; they administer our laws. All the judges are lawyers; they interpret and enforce our laws. There is no separation of powers where the lawyers are concerned. There is only a concentration of all government power – in the lawyers. As the schoolboy put it, ours is “a government of lawyers, not of men. We all live in it, but the lawyers run it.””

“And in our private lives, we cannot buy a home or rent an apartment, we cannot get married or try to get divorced, we cannot die and leave our property to our children without calling on the lawyers to guide us. To guide us, incidentally, through a maze of confusing gestures and formalities that lawyers have created.”

“There are several reasons for this mass submission, One is the average man’s fear of the unknown – and of policemen. The law combines the threat of both. A non-lawyer confronted by The Law is like a child faced by a pitch-dark room. Merciless judges lurk there, ready to jump out at him.”

“Yet lawyers can and often do talk about their product without telling anything about it at all. And that fact involves one of the chief reasons for the non-lawyer’s persistent ignorance about the Law. Briefly, The Law is carried on in a foreign language.”

“Much of the language of the law is built out of perfectly respectable English words which have been given a queer and different and exclusively legal meaning. It is, in short, a language that nobody but a lawyer understands. Or could understand.”

“For the lawyers’ trade is a trade built entirely on words. And so long as the lawyers carefully keep to themselves the key to what those words mean, the only way the average man can find out what is going on is to become a lawyer, or at least to study law, himself. All of which makes it very nice – and very secure – for the lawyers”.

“And it is only because the average man cannot play their game, and so cannot see for himself how intrinsically empty-of-meaning their playthings are, that the lawyers continue to get away with it.”

“The legal trade, in short, is nothing but a high-class racket. It is a racket far more lucrative and more powerful and hence more dangerous than any of those minor and much-publicized rackets.”

“Furthermore, the lawyers – or at least 99/100 per cent of them – are not even aware that they are indulging in a racket, and would be shocked at the very mention of the idea. Once bitten by the legal bug, they lose all sense of perspective about what they are doing and how they are doing it. Like the medicine men of tribal times and the priests of the Middle Ages they actually believe in their own nonsense. This fact, of course, makes their racket all the more insidious. Consecrated fanatics are always more dangerous than conscious villains. And lawyers are fanatics indeed about the sacredness of the word-magic they call The Law.”

“Yet the saddest and most insidious fact about the legal racket is that the general public doesn’t realize it’s a racket either. Scared, befuddled, impressed and ignorant, they take what is fed them, or rather what is sold them. Only once an age do the non-lawyers get, not wise, but disgusted, and rebel. In every revolution the lawyers lead the way to the guillotine or the firing squad.”

“It should not, however, require a revolution to rid society of lawyer-control. Nor is riddance by revolution ever likely to be a permanent solution. The American colonists had scarcely freed themselves from the nuisances of The Law by practically ostracizing the pre-Revolutionary lawyers out of their communities – a fact which is little appreciated – when a new and home-made crop of lawyers sprang up to take over the affairs of the baby nation.”

“If people could be made to realize how much of the vaunted majesty of The Law is a hoax and how many of the mighty processes of The Law are merely logical legerdemain, they would not long let the lawyers lead them around by the nose. And people have

recently begun, bit by bit, to catch on. The great illusion of The Law has been leaking a little at the edges”.

“And perhaps if the ordinary man could see in black and white how silly and irrelevant and unnecessary it all is, he might be persuaded, in a peaceful way, to take the control of his civilization out of the hands of those modern purveyors of streamlined voodoo and chromium-plated theology, the lawyers.”

“For practically every lawyer thinks and talks of The Law as a sort of omnipotent, omniscient presence hovering around like "God" over the affairs of men. Yet every lawyer purports to be able to understand and interpret a large part of that presence for the benefit of those who are not lawyers – at a price.”

“The mass of practicing attorneys and little judges are fooling themselves and the public when they claim that The Law as they know and use it is a logical science instead of a pseudo-scientific fraud”.

“No single fact is so essential to the life and lustiness of the legal racket as the sober pretense on the part of practically all its practitioners – from Supreme Court judges down to police court lawyers – that The Law is, in the main, an exact science. No pretense was ever more absurd.”

“For the lawyers know it would be woe unto the lawyers if the non-lawyers ever got wise to the fact that their lives were run, not by The Law, not by any rigid and impersonal and automatically-applied code of rules, but instead by a comparatively small group of men, smart, smooth, and smug – the lawyers.”

“The sober truth is that the myriad principles of which The Law is fashioned resemble nothing so much as old saws, dressed up in legal language and paraded as gospel.”

“Just as the devil can always cite Scripture to his purpose, so can any lawyer on either side of any case, always cite the law to his.”

“Legal language, wherever it happens to be used, is a hodgepodge of outlandish words and phrases because those words and phrases are what the principles of The Law are made of.”

“Yet why – if you think it over for a minute – should people not be privileged to understand completely and precisely any written laws that directly concern them, any business documents they have to sign, any code of rules and restrictions which applies to them and under which they perpetually live?

“Why then should The Law use a language – language being, remember, no more than a means of communicating ideas – which those ordinary human beings cannot hope to understand?”

“But how can any lawyer afford to admit that fact, even to himself, when his position in the community, his prestige among his fellow craftsmen, and his own sense of self-respect all hang on the assumption that he does know what he is talking about?”

“Consequently, the hope of The Law – that is, the hope of the lawyers that their game will go on indefinitely, undiminished and undisputed – lies with the law schools.”

“Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law.”

If you changed your Law-maker, that would change your Law, and you would own your Property.

Who do you think would get the pink slip?

Now you know the rest of the story !

Introduction Video

The Perfect Swindle

The purpose of this short introductory video is to give you a gist of what these videos are about.

I've made a great discovery. It is something that a lot of people are looking for but can't quite figure out. Now, this discovery I made is not a good discovery. In fact, it was a bad discovery but it led to something really great. This discovery is the greatest hoax that has ever been played on man. I call it "The Perfect Swindle". Yes, we've all been swindled through an elaborate scheme.

Now, this is not a hoax, like a joke. This is a cruel hoax and deadly serious. The effects of this hoax have caused almost all the pain and suffering in the world and it is world-wide. A hoax is a trick and its intention is to deceive you, to gain an advantage over you and a swindle deprives you of something through deceit and is accomplished through a fraudulent scheme. What makes this hoax and swindle extremely evil is you don't even know you've been tricked or deceived.

So, what is this hoax? How have I been deceived? Well, here's the answer. You have been tricked into voluntarily giving up something while believing you still have it. In the end you will discover it is just an illusion, but does it ever work well. It works 100%. It is complete. In other words, you've been cheated out of something and don't even know you've lost it. Now, you must admit, that's a good trick when you believe you still have it, when in fact, you've lost it. To add insult to injury, it turns out you gave it up voluntarily.

Now, get ready for the real shocker. The thing that you gave up voluntarily, you had to steal it first. The most perfect swindle. Only the most diabolical mind could think this up and get you to do it without you even knowing and in a moment I will tell you what you did. First I will tell you who I am and the reason for this introduction video.

I'm just a normal, regular type of guy, born in a ready-made society, raised in our family's religion, went to school to be educated, average right across the board, worked hard, played by the rules. Then something happened that felt like it stripped me of all my dignity. This thing that happened was wrong and no matter how I tried to conform my mind to the fact that it could be right ... naw, it was still wrong. Nobody could help me, not the court, not a lawyer, not my member of parliament, not the Prime Minister, the Queen, the Pope, not even my mom. I just had to know how something that is wrong could be right, so I started looking. I went on a quest and as I was looking, strange events occurred, things that would make you say 'what's going on here, what's this really about, what's the big secret, something is going on that I'm not supposed to know about'.

So, on my quest, I discovered things that were unbelievable. But then I confirmed that these unbelievable things were actually happening. So, I decided that I needed to expose these things through a series of presentations for reasons you will learn as we go along.

Now, I've never done a presentation before and how do you present things that are unbelievable. Nobody will believe it. Why? Because it's unbelievable. So I read on the internet about presentations. It said the two key elements of a presentation are to inform and

persuade. This article said that the credibility of the speaker is more important than the information to make people believe. The problem I have with that is how do you know the information is true. The answer is, the credibility of the speaker. So, if I told you that I have a doctorate degree in linguistic studies, both in English and in Greek. I also have a Masters Degree in Public Law, Family Law, Gravitational Law and I've published four peer review articles in the Journal of Universal Knowledge, you would probably believe what I tell you. We are trained this way. In fact, if I tell you something, you would believe me because of my credibility. Then you will go tell your friends. You will take what you believe and make it what you know. But belief is the absence of knowledge. You do not need to believe what you know to be true. So, if I persuade you to believe what I am going to tell you, that would only change your belief. You still would not know anything.

So, I will be giving you the evidence, the facts and the proof. No persuasion. Then you will not say, I do not believe that. You will say, I did not know that. This article and presentation also said you should have some sort of grabber. Tell them something that is shocking, that will grab their attention. Well, I think I have a few grabbers. They may grab your attention.

05:22

1. No one in Canada or the U.S. or in any country owns any property. You do not own your house, car, TV, your pizza, socks or underwear. You do not own your children, somebody does, but it is not you; you do not even own your own name. How does that grab you....and I will be giving you the facts, the evidence and the proof.
2. Everyone in Canada is above the law. I know it is hard to believe but absolutely true.
3. Money is not a store of wealth, it is a store of someone's debt.
4. You have never paid money for anything in your entire life. I know it's hard to believe but when you understand what money is, you've never paid for anything in your entire life.
5. Everyone in Canada and U.S. is licensed to give legal advice. In fact, your right to give legal advice is protected. It is needed. It is required or you couldn't have a legal system.
6. When you receive something, you are getting it for the second time. Funny, huh!
7. When a police officer stops you for speeding, it's because you told him to.
8. No court in Canada or the U.S. can or will take judicial notice of the law that says "Thou shalt not steal." Not a single court anywhere. Your legal system cannot work with that law. It is impossible.
9. Every man being held in jail is there because of what they believe. Their conviction. Overturn your conviction with the proper authority and you can get out.
10. Your birth certificate does not certify the birth of a living individual. What? No, you think that is your birth, certifies your birth? No, no!

11. A license is permission to do something illegal. It is the intent to commit a crime. Now we just need the Act. So, if you have any licenses, that's the prima facie evidence, the proof of your intention to commit a crime. I want to commit a crime. I want to break the law.

12. Any job requires you to transact public business dishonestly for private gain. How does that grab you?

13. Words are a secret code, unless they are defined.

07:51

No one that is deceived has ever known it, for if you did you wouldn't be deceived any more. You see, deception is not the lack of knowledge. Not knowing something and then learning it does not mean deceived. You just did not know it until now. Deception is when you are misled deliberately from something that is true to something that is false, tricked on purpose and you don't even know you've been tricked. That is deception, deception is a fraud and fraud is a crime.

The swindle can only work if you are an unwitting accomplice, a party to it. And when you realize you've been deceived, the lying deceiver, the real fraudster, the master of confusion, looks at you and says 'this is what I thought you believed and you're entitled to believe whatever you want'. Free will ... gotta love it.

I've come to know that people do not even know why they believe what they believe. People do not even know why they've given up something so why go looking for an answer to a problem when you don't even know there is a problem. You are not confused. So, maybe you don't want to know and remain in ignorant bliss.

I need to tell you that being deceived has nothing to do with being stupid. You can only discover deceit by learning the truth. What you believe will not do it. When you learn how and why you were deceived and the choices you made and then continue in them, then you can no longer claim you were deceived or scream fraud. Then if things do not go well for you, then you can say "Boy, was I stupid". You and I both have a very good, sound brain. It's just that it has been messed up a bit, deliberately and for a purpose.

09:45

There are many people who feel there is something wrong in the world, concerning all sorts of things. You will learn that every one of these problems is the result of owning no property....every last single time. But, to understand why you own no property is the reason why this is going to be a long story. And the story gets even longer to understand the solution.

There are patriot groups, common law groups, tax protesters, freeman societies, occupy wall street movements, aboriginal groups and religious groups all who say things are wrong in this world. Then there are those who think everything is fine, or even if they think it's not 'what can I do about it'. But, at least these groups are looking for answers, they know something is

wrong and this is a commendable start, but they need to change direction, they are going the wrong way. There are many groups and individuals out there that have found and exposed things that just make no sense to them. But, they are written off by the majority as abnormal, peculiar, radical extremists. Much of what they've discovered is, in fact, true but they are trying to make the corruptible, incorruptible and that will never happen.

Knowing the problem is not enough, you need to know how it happened and why it happened to find the solution.

11:08

Everyone looks for someone to blame for their misfortune. If you own no property, you have a misfortune. But, the choices you made were not forced on you, although you were only enticed and suborned, although through fraud. In other words, the stage was set for you, prepared for you, now just choose it. The reason you were enticed to participate in the swindle is because, the illusion, the trick, the swindle cannot work without you. It cannot work otherwise. It would have no value. It requires YOU.

So, what did we do? Well, in a nutshell "You lost what was yours, because you took what was not yours." What did we take that was not ours? Everything! What did we lose that was ours? Everything! What did we take that was not oursPower. What did we lose that was not oursPower. What did we take that was not oursA trust. What did we lose that was not oursA trust. It doesn't matter what you put in there, it works the same. A swindle is always the opposite of the truth. So, it doesn't matter what you put into that equation, it works out the same. It is always something backwards, the opposite of the truth. This is how a swindle works.

How can this be if it was given us? We were to accept it, not to steal it and make it our own. We are totally unaware that we bear and suffer daily the penalty of a breach of trust. Today, all that you have or hold is borrowed from a misplaced trust. You are borrowing and you are using what is not yours

You own nothing and the borrower is always servant to the lender.

Because of this choice you made, you are barred for life, and must plead at the bar for all you desire. This is called Beggary. Well, you can call it pleading, praying, whatever; it is Beggary. You have to beg when you own nothing. I see people in courts every day pleading and begging for things. I see people in banks every day begging for money. I see people in the streets carrying signs every day, begging for something to change. I see people every day lined up trying to get a license to do something illegal. Yes, you are all beggars and you've turned your children into beggars too.

People who own property do not beg. They work and they mind their own business.

13:46

There is a way to regain what you've lost. But there is only one way and it is not a matter of law. There is only one solution, there are not two, three, four or five solutions, but you must

accept the solution to receive it. The answer should be self-evident, but it's not. This is the genius of the swindle.

Only by understanding how this all works will you understand the solution. There's a subtlety to this. It's very hard to grasp.

I must warn you that much has been done to keep you from finding it. Second, much has been done to be sure that if you do find it or were shown it, you will not accept it. You will reject it. Now that is someone's extraordinary good control of your mind.

My only guarantee to you is that after you go through these programs, you will never be the same again. You better be sure you want to be changed. For those who are content in their way of life, I'm sorry to have bothered you. Goodbye. Please go back to whatever you were doing. For those who need to know, take your time and listen carefully to the programs. They are confusing.

It is important to watch the presentations in the order they are presented.

I hope these videos will become, for you, a blessing in disguise.

CONFUSION OF MIND Video 1

The reason I'm doing this first program about your mind is not so much for the Confusion programs but for all of them, including the 'Unraveled' programs. By the time you go through all the 'Unraveled' programs, you will feel different and I just want to make you aware of some things and some things that I experienced as I learned these things.

00:38

So, this first program is called 'Confusion of Mind' and we'll get to your mind in a minute. I'd like to start with this.

The reason this website is called Servant King is because it is the highest status any man can have. It is the most high you can be. When you were born you were a Servant King but you were subjected to something that made you abandon it. You made a choice in which you voluntarily abandoned your birthright and automatically descended. You chose to become a descendant of something, but did not know you were making that choice. The good news is you do not need to re-ascend. You only need to stop believing what you have been subjected to. The ascension is automatic or by default.

Now, my programs are not a bunch of discoveries that add to confusion and leave you hanging as to what you should do. No, I will be giving you the solution in the 'Unraveled' programs; but whether you take it and act on it will be your choice, just as you have already made a choice by taking something and acting on it which resulted in the loss of all your property. You now will need to make a new choice.

1:58

Now, I'm not going to beat around the bush here. I'm going to make some statements up front. Unbelievable statements.

If you are a member of any country, then you own no property. It is just not possible.

If you own no property, then you practice the Occult.

If you practice the Occult, then you see things that are not there, that is called hallucinations.

And if you practice the Occult, you do not see things that are there, that is called blindness.

And if you are suffering from hallucinations, that is a severe mental disorder, called delusions.

If you are suffering from blindness, you just need to open your eyes.

So, if you are a member of any country, you are suffering from hallucinations, and that is a severe mental disorder. You are delusional.

Now, that is quite a statement to make, isn't it? But, being the nice man I am, I prefer to call it confusion.

Now, I know you don't believe what I just told you. I wouldn't have believed this years ago, either. But what you believe doesn't change a thing unless you change what you believe, and who cares what you believe? Well, let me answer that for you. The answer is those who rely on what you believe to pull off the greatest swindle ever. Those who go to great lengths to be sure you will never reclaim your birthright. We were all born with a birthright. We still have that birthright. Just gotta figure out how to get it back.

Birthright is something people never think about. I don't know about you but I thought it would be nice to own something ... anything; maybe a dog. Right now, I don't even own my dog and neither do you.

04:11

The other thing I would like to tell you before we get to your mind is what many call the greatest news ever. You've probably heard it before, but nobody believes it. Here's the news. "The Truth will make you free." Everyone's heard that but who said it and what does it mean. In layman's terms it would be called a 'get out of captivity free card'.

Now, listen very carefully. You only get one card. There is no second card.

It's a one-time offer and the offer has already been issued, but do you know how to claim it.

Now, if you find yourself in captivity today, what you need to know, is that you are in a prison within a prison. Those who think they are free are also in captivity, but if you use this card, you do have to depart and promise never to return.

Just so we are clear about this, If you use the card, you can never return to who you are and where you are. If you do, you will have ensnared yourself again because of your conviction.

How do I know all this I have it on very, very good authority.

05:34

I would also like to show you the shadow of a couple of things. But, not the things itself. In order to see the thing I will need to shed a bit more light on it as we go. When the light goes on in your head, then you'll be able to see it.

Could you imagine one day getting a letter from a lawyer in the mail and the letter said that you are the beneficiary to a will. You are the heir to an inheritance. The letter goes on to say that you were disinherited and barred from your inheritance when you chose to be estranged from your dad and when you were adopted by a new family. However, I am pleased to inform you that your dad still loves you and according to the codicil of the will, your dad will forgive you, but you must return home.

In addition, the will stipulates that you are to be given exclusive control over your inheritance provided you adhere to the complete and perfect terms of the will. This is an open standing offer which you can claim at any time but you can only claim it in person. P.S. I should also inform you that your dad is really wealthy. What would you do? Would you continue trying to make it on your own? Would you continue to try to make a name for yourself or would you act in the name of your real father and return and adhere to the terms of the will?

So, to be sure you claim your inheritance in person, you look up the word 'person' in Webster's Dictionary and it says "A person is primarily a MASK used by an actor on stage." OK! So, you go out and buy a mask and you put it on and you return home for your inheritance. When you get home, you say 'Hi Dad, I'm here for my inheritance'. Your dad looks at you and says 'I don't recognize you. Depart from me you who practices iniquity. Iniquity means pretending to be who you are not. WOW, wouldn't that be a shocker.

The letter you got from the lawyer explained the terms of the will and you thought you did everything correct and right. You even looked up the word 'person' to make sure you did not make a mistake. Wouldn't that just blow your mind?

You see, the word "Person" is one of the keys to understanding the confusion, to seeing the illusion and learning how you have been swindled out of your inheritance. And I will be confusing you more before we completely unravel it.

I should tell you that a "person" is not a noun, it is an adverb.

08:20

The other thing I would like to tell you, like the inheritance story, is this. One day, somebody shows you something and it looks beautiful. You really want it. You desire it. Now, he's willing to give it to you but you have to ask for it. You have to apply for it. You have to request it. So, you ask for it and he gives it to you. Then he tells you that you should keep it in a safe place. .. very valuable... like a safe deposit box, a treasure box.

One day you decide to show your friend your treasure and he looks at it and says 'Well it sure looks nice, but it's a counterfeit'. A forgery. A copy. A duplicate. You've been duped'. And you say, 'no, I can't believe that. Look at it, it's beautiful.' And he says 'Yes, I know it looks beautiful, but I've seen the real one, the genuine one and I can tell you that this one is counterfeit'. Wouldn't that just rot your socks off.

You see, there is no way humanly possible to recognize a counterfeit or a forgery of anything unless you have seen the real genuine thing. You have to see both of them in order to compare and this is why I must show you in my presentations both the counterfeit and the genuine or you can never know or see the SWINDLE.

09:50

Now, your mind. There is a battle going on for your mind. This is nothing new. This battle has been going on as old as mankind, himself. In reality, the battle is over because I can find no one who has not lost their mind. By the time you watch all these videos, both the Confusion videos

and the Unraveled videos, you will say to yourself 'I must have lost my mind'. But to be fair, and in reality, you have only lost control of your mind. So, I need to briefly speak about your mind so you are aware of how you make choices. I also need to mention some of the things I experienced in my own mind as I discovered these things. What you will feel and experience as you go through these programs

I've given much thought to whether I should do these programs. I also gave much thought as to how to explain the things I've learned and discovered. As I discovered things, I repeatedly said to myself 'This is unbelievable. Who else knows this. Nobody seems to know this.' But, of course, somebody must.

11:12

What makes the unbelievable, believable, is the evidence, the facts and the proof. Proven facts become knowledge. If I were to just give you what I've learned without laying a foundation, people would take it, run with it, maybe for the right reasons, maybe for the wrong reasons and could end up hurting themselves. It is best to act when the confusion is gone.

You see, the law is a very serious thing. In other words, if you were involved in something that was bad, you'd be best to get out of it before you criticize it. Someone may hurt you. That is just a prudent warning. You see, these things that I learned came to me slowly over many years. You will need time to absorb and grasp these things so you will need time to think and think and think a little bit more, until you can clearly see them, understand them, feel them and live them.

Knowing something to be true without the why, is not knowledge at all. That is just believing someone who told you it is true. Belief is not knowledge. Belief is only what you accept as true.

The few people I have spoken to about these things, in just a brief way have said "Well, just explain it to me, I'm not stupid". I can hear a sarcasm, a discomfort in their voice, because I just told them something that they know is true but they don't know why and that makes them feel uncomfortable.

Deception has nothing to do with being stupid. It has to do with mind control in ways that we are all subject to.

13:07

As we go through these programs you will experience an emotion of frustration and confusion. You may feel a betrayal of something you feel dear and sacred, like losing the love of something really great. Your first reaction may be to reject what you are learning and think it is crazy. If you are human, this is normal. Your mind has been controlled in ways to make you react to things that are contrary to your beliefs. You will feel uncomfortable. You may feel angry, maybe even towards me. You may reject what I present, but ultimately you should feel deceived. Why did nobody ever tell me this? I'll be answering that question, also, as we go along. If and when you grasp these things, you will feel fear and scared to act upon what you know to be true.

All I can say about fear is that the cause of any fear you feel has already happened to you. Think about it. The fear of doing something in the future is always based on a past experience and the deceivers know this too. They rely on it.

It took me a few months each time I felt these things to finally overcome them. I almost stopped my quest but I reviewed the few things I knew to be absolutely true and each time it made me continue. When you feel these emotions just continue at your own pace, because things that are true will not go away just because you do not believe them.

14:42

Renewing your mind will be the hardest thing you will ever do. And the lying deceivers know it. Again, they rely on it at your expense. Let me say it again. You will feel fooled, deceived, some will get angry, some will think it's funny but everyone will feel frustrated and scared to do anything about it. But, when you can clearly see the effects of this, however, why it is done, you will see the extreme evil in it.

Can you change your mind? People always think they are big enough to change their mind. I don't know.

The first thing I need to address is this. If the information I present to you will change your mind, you have to be willing to change your mind. Stubborn, stiff-necked people cannot be turned. But, when you start to see the facts, as they say, facts are stubborn things. It is very difficult, nearly impossible, to solve a problem using your mind if the problem is in your mind. The problem is your mind. How are you going to use your mind to solve the problem in your mind? It's like a disease trying to cure a disease. Sort of like a mental guy who thinks he is normal, or a man with multiple personality disorder trying to get rid of them.

These programs have concepts that are hard to grasp...things that you are not supposed to know. It's simple when you see them.

There are only two ways to see things. One is with your eyes, and the other is with your mind, called imagery or imagination. It is the second one that is controlled by law. You are not aware of that. But, it will require you to think, think, think, because right now they are foreign to your way of thinking. We do and say many things every day without even thinking what it is all about because it is normal. But when you look below the surface as I have, you will find things you wish you never knew or saw.

We never think, we have no time for that and this is done on purpose too. People believe many things. What you believe will determine how you act. You can change what you believe but you cannot change what you know because what you know is a fact. What you know will determine how you act for sure. If you can change belief to knowledge, now you know something for sure.

17:30

Mind Control is what you let your mind be exposed to. Every waking moment, experience and association is taken in through your senses and it is mind altering. When you expose yourself to

things, either good or bad, no matter how strong you think your mind is, they are mind altering to some degree. So, mind control begins with you. What will I expose myself to?

When we were born our minds started developing. What we think will change. When things are done to your mind for your own good, that is good mind control but it is still mind control. But, who decides what is good for your mind? You decide what TV shows your kids can watch. This is mind control. We have a government controlled education system. This is mind control. We have news programs, the most trusted name in news. This is mind control. When your mind is developed by and through someone who loves you and you trust, that is probably good. When someone who you do not know or trust tries to control your mind, you will probably not let your mind be controlled. You will not believe them. You will reject it. So, winning someone's heart and mind is very important.

Religion and patriotism uses the same process called make-believe. What can I make you believe? Believe me, it's true. I have to tell you, though, that some things are just make-believe. They are not true at all, like pretending and acting. This is why all con men who want to sell you something are always friendly, nice, compassionate, tell you something you want to hear, stroke your ego, your self-esteem, they care for your well-being, they're concerned about your public safety. You may believe what I tell you because you like me. If you don't like me, even if I told you the truth, you wouldn't believe it. But, these con men, they only met you a moment ago, can they really feel these things for you, they don't even know you. They really want something else. A salesman wants your money. A politician wants your power.

When knowledge is purposely put in your mind or purposely kept from your mind; that is also mind control.

19:50

New concepts are usually easy to understand unless your mind already holds concepts contrary to them. A well-educated mind will have great problems with these concepts I will be presenting. They already know too much. My blessing, in disguise, was my brain was pretty well empty. Not that I was stupid, I just did not know very much.

When I say something you may see something totally different than what I intended, based on your experiences, associations and so forth or just reject the concept outright. No room in my brain for a new or contrary concept. I do not want to change the way I do things, it's too hard, it's the only thing I know, it is the only way I know.

Most of how to learn will happen in the first seven years of your life. After that it will be hard. Have a look at your child's report card. Do it. Year after year, your teachers are writing in there 'this child is grasping this concept, this concept, this concept. They keep using the word 'concept'. We've all been taught concepts.

21:05

Can you be cultured without being a member of a cult? Any society or culture is a cult. They hold beliefs in common for peace and harmony and that may be good, but it proves that you

don't think. Free thinkers cannot all hold the same beliefs or knowledge. Those exposed to the same stimuli or are mind controlled will think alike. We think of mind control and a cult is something bad. It can be bad or good. It is just what will you expose your mind to and that requires you to think. Common sense is just what everyone does. Monkey see, monkey do.

Explaining my discoveries to you will be for me, like speaking to a cult. But you do not think you are a member of a cult. This is the genius of the occult. It is hidden and hard to see. I will show you something to be true and you'll be able to see it but you will try to reject it or ignore it because of your long-held beliefs. I just want you to think about this and keep it in mind when you feel yourself becoming uncomfortable or ready to reject something.

You've absorbed many things over the years because of your beliefs, trusts, patriotism, loyalty, love, vanity, jealousy, greed, lust, fear. These are the human motivators. These motivators will make you act one way or another and they all come from your mind.

Remember what I said early on, overcoming a mind problem with your mind is very difficult, almost impossible. I would like you to prove me wrong.

CONFUSION OF BEING Video 2

00:23

I told you in the last program that I'm just an ordinary type of guy living a normal life. I guess you would say I'm middle class, doing OK for myself, basically average right across the board. Now, I know I'm slightly better looking than average, but otherwise I'm just totally average. I'm a common guy, a commoner, a member of the House of Commons. Today, I think I'm peculiar. Other people think I'm peculiar. But, back then I was nothing special. My mom thinks I'm something special, but that's my mom. I'd also like to think that my wife thinks I'm something special, but I know that she's only legally required to like me because of our marriage contract.

A few years ago, I'm this normal, ordinary guy competing like all of you for the common wealth. I had a business where I bred falcons, hawks, eagles, owls, vultures and sold them to people all over the world. It was a farming operation of livestock, but in my case, people think of them as wild-life animals as opposed to domestic animals.

Then, one day, new laws are passed...legislation...and I now need a license to keep all my birds. It's the law. Now, being dumb as a box of rocks, I react to this like I'm supposed to. 'Hey, this isn't right, I think I will protest.' How can my government pass a public law regarding my private property. Of course, today, I can think clearly and I can see things. Today, I think rather than react. But, I need to tell the story as it happened then.

So, I thought my birds were my private property. You see, I worked hard. I contributed to society. I paid my taxes. I paid my share and then what's left is my commission for working, my disposable income to do with as I please, at my pleasure. So, instead of buying maybe a TV or a snowmobile or whatever people buy with their money, I bought falcons and hawks. I could never have a bird from the wild. There was no harvest. The birds in the wild are public resources and they are vested here in Canada in what is called 'the crown' and there are rules about that and if there is any use or consumption of them you pay a fee for it and they are regulated. I could never have any. Even the birds that had a broken wing or sick or injured and couldn't survive in the wild. Just kill them, can't have them. I could have bred from them and made them useful, but no can't have them. So, I went and bought my own birds. So, my birds are not a public resource because they didn't come from the wild.

Then the law changed and I read the new law and it says, no, your birds are the same as the birds in the wild. My red-tailed hawk, my snowy owl, my bald eagle....no difference in the law with my birds and one flying out in the wild. So, now it's against the law to have these birds. Yesterday it was legal. Today it's illegal. The law says 'no person shall keep any of these birds of prey in captivity except under the authority of a license. So, now I have to apply for a license to keep what I thought was my property. It's the law.

Now, you can't just go get a license. You can't just say 'I'd like to have a license to keep what's mine'. No, no, you have to beg for it. You have to plead. You have to request. Not only that, you have to pay a fee for that. So, if I want to keep the fruits of my labour (30 years of work, sacrifice) I have to beg to keep it. I have to pay a fee to keep it. It may be approved, it may not be approved. If I don't get the license, I lose everything. I guess the owner comes and takes them. I'm not sure at this point, how this works.

So, you see, yesterday what was right, today is only just a privilege. It is no longer right to keep birds of prey. When I explain to you what a license is you will understand. This is coming a little further in the programs.

Now that it is a licensed activity, I need permission to do what is illegal. Now there is a public interest in my activities and what I have. Anyone can complain about my activities now and my facility was open to the public for demonstrations and so forth. So now anybody, who doesn't know anything about birds, can come in and complain. They have an interest in my birds, in my facility. And then the complaints start to come in. Once you get so many complaints coming in, founded or unfounded, 'we're not renewing your license'. This is how it's done.

You see, if you have a beautiful facility and you've spent millions and millions of dollars on the care of your animals, how people think an animal should be taken care of, then the animal is healthy. If your facility doesn't look very good (I'm not saying my facility didn't look good but people can complain about whatever) then they think your animals aren't healthy. One has nothing to do with the other. It's only public perception.

So, this is how you are strangled until you die. This is how things are shut down. Just to implement an outright ban and cease all your property would be too obvious. People would start to wake up to this. So it has to be done in a slow, gradual way until it seems normal. By the way, my tax contributions, what I contributed to society, well that's what everyone decides they are going to do with that money. So, they would use that money for some good and upright purpose or organization like studying why a polar bear is white or how the red-headed woodpecker got its name and somebody will do their thesis on that and get a doctorate. So that's how this is done.

So, now my private property is being regulated by the public, but the public doesn't come over and feed or care for my birds. Yet they have a say in all of it. Some committee, some city, some office don't like what you're doing, these are the regulations, this is how you have to do it. If I have a loss, it's not their loss, yet they have a say in all of it. So, if I cannot have these birds without asking permission and care for them as I please, then I guess I do not own them, do I?

And, of course, I'm still confused. I don't know how this all works. Yet, we are told about homeownership and owning your car outright after 48 easy payments. I did not know this at the time, but these are damn lies. Yet we believe it. So, I'm thinking this is not right. This is wrong. Heaven knows, it's legal. So, I was playing by the rules and now the rules changed. Over 30 years into the game, the rules are just changed. This is cheating. You can't just change rules half-way through a game. That's not fair. Think about it. You do all this work and labour and make sacrifices which have all become in vain because the rules have changed. How would you feel? What would you do? You see this going on in society every single day and people just look at it and go 'well, that's awful, he's lost everything, he's got no career any more, what's he going to do, how's he going to survive' and no one ever realizes what the real problem is.

So, you would say 'you are a cheater'. I think you would want to start this game over again and this time you know something, a secret, I won't be confused. This time I won't be deceived. This time I'm ready for you.

But how do you start this game over again In there lies the solution.

08:35

But, back to the story. No one can help me. What do I do? I can beg or I can refuse to pay. My lawyer can't help me. The court can't help me. My member of parliament, my representative, my priest, Prime Minister, Queen, Pope, my mother...nobody can help me.

So, one day I'm in the lawyer's office and the lawyer tells me, 'well, it's the law; the only thing you can do is lobby the government, go and beg, you are a registered beggar, are you not.' He didn't say it quite like that, but that's what he meant. He can see that I'm trying to play lawyer. I'm trying to understand the law. I don't know anything about the law like nobody else does. I don't even know why somebody obeys something they don't understand. So, he gives me a book on property law. Here you are, you poor little dumb idiot, go home and read that and let me do what I need to do for you.

So, I read it and of course it's all gooble gunk to me and I return it in a day or two and while I'm in the front waiting area of this law office, a senior lawyer (*he knows me and he knows what's going on and he can see that I'm upset about this*) he says something to me that's quite shocking. This is what he said. He said "You do not own anything Marcus, not in this country you don't."

And I thought "oh, I didn't know that, I wonder who else knows that". A lot of people think they know that. A lot of people are probably told, maybe by that same lawyer. They walk away, shake their head 'I don't understand that, I don't own anything' and just go back to what they were doing. So, I would never figure that out. I'm not that smart. You see, you cannot figure out deception. This is what I told you before about deception. There is no way to do that. No one who is deceived has ever known it.

This was just a stroke of luck. Just pure luck. How would I know that when I was told the opposite my whole life. I was told a lie. This is fraud! You see, it is not just that I didn't know this, it's that I was told the opposite on purpose, tricked on purpose, deliberately. That's deception and that's a fraud and fraud is a crime.

Now, I've told maybe 50 people since then that 'you don't own any property'. Nobody cares. Everybody likes being a beggar or they go trying to hold some of their own vanity, their whatever and go 'yeah, I know I don't really own anything'. It doesn't bother anybody. It doesn't even bother them who actually owns everything.

So, little do I know at this time, this was just the tip of the iceberg, meaning I couldn't see the rest yet. So, I start writing letters to different government departments and one day I get a phone call from a lawyer in the Attorney General's office. That's the Queen's lawyer, and I call back and we have a little short discussion and set up a meeting and I go down to see this fellow.

When I get there, I tell him about what this lawyer in town told me, this senior lawyer ...that I don't own anything. I said, "is that true?" He confirms it "yeah, you don't own anything". I said, "I don't own my socks"; "No"; "running shoes"; "No"; "my TV"; "No, you don't own anything." So, in fact, I do own something. What I own is nothing. That is what I own.

So, I ask him (*we're sitting at the table in a little board room*) "If I don't own anything, why would I pay for anything I don't own? How could I ever have a debt for anything? He sat there and he looked at me and paused. A good 30 seconds went by. He paused and waited. He did not know

how to answer this question. This little 'master of confusion', he did not know how to answer that question. Finally this is what came out of his mouth after a long pause. He said "If you had never applied for a Birth Certificate, you would still own your property." Now what does that mean? I haven't a clue.

So, when you apply for a Birth Certificate, what does that make you? It makes you a loser. Loser of property, according to him. What I know now, he was sort of right, but not totally right. But again, he didn't know how to answer it.

So, it took me well over a year just to learn that when you want to understand anything you have to go back to the root of the thing. Where it began, the source, the cause of the effect, the origin. It sounds like a simple idea but nobody does it.

So, the word "author" means: One who produces, creates, or brings into being; the beginner, former, or first mover of anything; hence, the efficient cause of a thing. Somewhere I must have authorized something, to start something.

13:56

So, I go to where all information for government things start. It starts with I was born and a Statement of Birth was made. My parents filled out a Statement of Birth. I will show you what one looks like. You don't get your Statement of Birth. They have that now. They won't give it to you. But, they will give you a certificate of the Statement of Birth. A lot of people when they look at this, they think 'oh, that's the Statement of Birth'. No, that's a certificate and what is photocopied on the certificate is the Statement of Birth. So, the Statement of Birth is certified by the certificate.

So, I go into the Office of the Registrar General with my regular small Birth Certificate and I ask them if I could see a copy of the Statement of Birth. They look at my birth certificate, see my name and they went and got a copy. And the young guy comes over to the desk and he is holding it like this (holding it by top two corners) and he goes 'here, have a look'. So, I hold it from the bottom, but he's standing there and he's not letting go of it and I thought, that's weird. So, I said "could I hold it" and he goes "NO" and he wouldn't let go of it. "Why won't you let go of it?" He goes "uh, a little while ago a lady went running out of here with one of these and I thought 'so what, it's just a Statement of Birth'. Somebody filled out a government form. That was the first strange thing.

I look over to the left and there's four police officers standing up against the wall. This is the place where you get Birth Certificates, Death Certificates, Marriage Certificates, want to change your name fill out an application to change your name. I thought there must have been a crime committed here. Why would all these police officers be standing here.

So, I ask them some questions about my birth certificate and he doesn't really know the answers to these. He says 'you have to see a Commissioner'. So, I said "I'd like to see a Commissioner".

So, I wait for about an hour and nobody calls me and finally I have to go down the hallway and I go through another door, unmarked, and I walk in there and it looks like a bank. There's a big front hallway to the room and then there's a counter and then five foot high glass and in the

glass is little round holes you speak through and places where you can slide things underneath, just like when you are doing deposits and withdrawals and there are girls working at desks behind this glass.

Nobody gets up to walk over to see me, so I walk towards the end of it and I can see a room to the left of it so I lightly tap on the glass there. Some lady comes out of the side room and she looks at me and she says "Yes?" and I said "I would like to ask you some questions about my birth certificate. She says "Oh" and she's standing off, she won't even come up to the counter. She says "Is that your birth certificate?" And I said, "well I just want to ask you questions about a birth certificate. "Sir, is that your Birth Certificate?" I said "I want to ask you some questions about a birth certificate. "Sir, is that your Birth Certificate?" I said "Yeah, it's my Birth Certificate". "OK, what?" So, I start asking her questions about the numbers, registration number, certificate number...all sorts of things about it and on the front there's a certificate number and she says "that's the certificate number". I turn it over and there is a great big red number and I said "What's that?" She says "That's the certificate number. So, we're having a nice little conversation ... no cross words about anything. She just seemed hesitant, though.

So, I'm looking at my birth certificate and at the very bottom of the birth certificate it says "Canadian Bank Note" and I thought 'this must be a Canadian Bank Note' and what do you do with a Bank Note, well it's redeemable to bearer, I guess. So, I ask her, "my birth certificate, is this a Canadian Bank Note" and she says "Yes". Wow! So, I take the Birth Certificate and I slide it underneath the glass and I said "I'd like to redeem my Canadian Bank Note, please". And she says to me, she says "Now, you can redeem it if you like, but there is no cash value".

You see, after reading all this stuff on the internet and all these people out there that don't know anything about this stuff either, I thought 'Wow, I've hit the jackpot, just redeem my Birth Certificate, my Canadian Bank Note. If you believe the stuff you read on the internet, she's going to come out with a wheelbarrow full of gold coins or something. This private account has all this money in there for you.

She says you can redeem it but there is no cash value. Just as she says that, all of a sudden there is a voice right behind my head and it said "Excuse me, sir, but I've been asked to ask you to leave." So, I turn around and look and there's a police officer standing right up against me, and I look at him and I thought 'wow'. So, I look back and I said "you can ask all you like" and I turned back to the glass, the girl was gone. So, I tapped on the glass again, she comes back; by now I'm sort of flustered and I asked her a couple more questions and then I left. As I left, the police officer is standing up against the wall and I said "so, you were going to throw me out of here for asking questions?" "No, I was just asked to ask you to leave". So, I thought 'what is this all about; creepy, WOW!' Something strange is going on here.

It should tell you that whatever you're involved with here is none of your business or you're involved in something that is none of your business ...a huge revelation!

20:01

Anyways, about a month later, I go back with Certified Statement of Birth. It's the only document I had left. As I walk into the same room, there's a police officer standing down the hallway a little bit. As he sees me, he backs out of another door and I thought 'wow, do I have leprosy or something'. So, I go over to the counter again, tap on the glass, the girl comes up

and I asked her some questions about this document. She doesn't know the answer. She gets another girl and she gets another girl. Before I know it, there's 3 or 4 girls standing around. They're not going back to their desks. They're all sort of like 'why is he asking these questions'. You know, they're all sort of nervous about this.

So, I asked "this paper here, I can see there's a seal on here and like pre-printed stuff on here and then I can see sort of other stuff put on here. Where does this come from?" This girl, that was the most senior girl she says "Oh, we get this form from the Bank of Canada and we just photocopy the Statement of Birth on there and then we issue it." I said, "Excuse me...Bank of Canada ... why would the Bank of Canada be interested in my birth....what do they have to do with certifying a Statement of Birth?" Well, you should have seen her face. Anyways, from that moment on she was like as nervous as could be. This girl was ready to pee her pants. I've never seen anything like it in my life. I asked a couple more questions and I could see they were just all over themselves, so I said "OK, well thank you very much" and I said "Could you please tell me what your name is for my records so I know who I spoke to?" She goes "NO, NO, NO!" I mean she was ready to cry. So, what's going on here? Some sort of secret. Why are they all acting so nervous? I'm telling you I felt like I was in some sort of conspiracy and this is a government office.

Now, I did a lot of things over the years to learn and discover a lot of things that you're otherwise not supposed to know. So, around this time I took a leap of faith. I figure if this stuff is none of my business and I shouldn't be involved in it ...get rid of it. If no one is going to answer the questions for me, what these documents really are, then I'll just get rid of them.

See, you're told if you want this you need to get this, if you want that you have to get this, if you want to leave the country you have to get this, if you want to take your baby with you, you have to get this, if you want to keep your dog, you have to get this. It doesn't matter what you want to do, if you want to do that you need to do this. What's going on here? Is there some sort of authorization that I'm doing or making some sort of agreement or contract or whatever. I know nothing about the law.

23:08

So, I go back into town and go see my lawyer and I tell him this and of course he's being as evasive as he can be. Whether he knows these things or not, I don't know. He can't answer, won't answer or he just answers in a stupid way.

So, what did I do? I gave him my marriage license, passport, birth certificate, drivers license, social insurance card, health card, credit cards, firearms acquisition certificate, radio telephone operator's license, hunting license, and any other membership card. Anything I had, I gave it to him. He says "you don't want this". I said "No, you can have it, I don't want it, never again". I said "I never asked any questions when I got them. I just did what was common, common sense, monkey see, monkey do."

So, about a month later, I'm thinking 'well, if I don't own any property, I don't need a will, do I?' I mean a will for after I die, where does my property go? It's not my property, what do I need a will for?

So, I went back into the lawyer and I said “You know that will I have registered with you (*like all families do*)”. I said “Let me see it”. He brings my copy of the will and I tear it up in front of him and he goes “Oh, you shouldn’t do that.” “Well”, I told him “I don’t own anything. I don’t need a will. Bring me my power of attorney too.” He brings me that, tear it up, throw it in the garbage. So, that’s all gone.

Now, I know that’s not a common thing to do, but then remember, I’m becoming peculiar. So, next year or two, whatever, as I’m still learning and researching things, you know, I asked some lawyers many different questions because they know things. I pay close attention to the words they’re using. And, of course, I’m like everyone else, I’m talking to various groups and learning stuff off the internet, reading law books or whatever the case may be....stuff like whatever’s wrong, this can’t be right. But all these groups and all these people that seem to know all these things wrong are confused like I am but nobody is getting any results, so what good is this?

So, like I said, I did a lot more things but I still really don’t know at this time that I don’t own anything. I mean I’ve been told it but I don’t understand why I don’t own anything. So, I don’t even know what I am looking for yet. But, in my quest, I learned some things and these things I learned from the Office of the Registrar General, these initial documents about Birth Certificates and this comes both in the form of quotes from government officials and also in correspondence.

25:48

What I learned was that

- the Registrar General does not register people, only events. So, there’s no people registered in Canada only the event of your birth, which of course, is stupid because when you register a cow’s birth, you registered the cow. But it’s just their way of saying ‘no, we don’t register people, we don’t handle them like a piece of commerce or merchandise.
- A birth certificate is a valuable token. Token! A token is a sign or mark of something else, not the real thing. A token is a counterfeit.
- It is an abstract of the birth registration. Abstract means, well, it’s not reality. It’s not specific. It’s not concrete.
- **A birth certificate does not certify the birth of a living individual.** How does that grab you? Hold on for a second. What’s going on here? I’m living. There’s my name, the day I was born, the place I was born. What’s this all about. That’s my birth certificate, it does not certify the birth of an individual. WOW! And, that’s absolutely true. Now, this is going to be one of the main concepts that is going to be very hard for you to grasp.
- **The legal rights to the birth certificate are not owned.** So, the legal rights to your birth certificate, you don’t own them. Nope! Somebody does, but it’s not you.
- A birth certificate is governed by the Vital Statistics Act.
- It may be used as a foundation identity document to prove you were born in Ontario. If it doesn’t refer to a living individual, how can it be your identity? It’s impossible.
- It was never meant to be used as personal identification. Now, I know in Great Britain, they actually put right on it that this is not meant to be used as personal identification.

This is insane! I have to use my birth certificate to prove who I am. I need it to send my kids to school or their birth certificate. I need it to get a driver's license, to get a passport. I need it to vote...all sorts of things. BUT THIS ISN'T ME! This is utter NUTS!

So, what do you think now? Do you still think you know what life is all about ... what's going on? Now, you're probably thinking to yourself 'ah, there's gotta be some reason for this. I don't believe it'. Of course, there is a reason, but you don't know what that is yet. Why has no one ever told me this? Who's going to tell you this? Why was I never given full disclosure to what I was doing or gave any informed consent. This is what all these people say.

Well, you were given full disclosure but you didn't know where it was or if you did, you rejected it. We'll get to that later.

Now you need to think 'what are the effects of this happening'. Remember, the events are recorded. It happened. Maybe this is where the saying comes from when you say someone is certifiable, meaning they're nuts.

Then one day, a little while later, I see in a big major newspaper an advertisement from the Ontario Ministry of Government Services advertising their birth certificates. Come and buy one. Be one of us. It says "Birth Certificates without the Labour". Now, I'm sure every 'master of confusion' that morning over their coffee were looking at that, just laughing their head off. When you figure out what that finally is, it's not anything funny. It's sick!

You see, there was no labour involved in the birth of this being. Your Birth Certificate is the birth of a being, but there was no labour involved in that birth, not like your real birth. In this case the labour comes after the birth. Remember I told you, the trick, the swindle cannot work without you. It would have no value.

So, I also learned that when you use your Birth Certificate as identification, you are only purporting to be this birthed being. I don't even know what purporting means, but I got that off a notarized copy of a birth certificate.

So, what does 'purporting' mean. It means have the often specious appearance of being, intending, or claiming. So, you have the appearance of it.

'Specious' means plausible but false, based on pretense; deceptively pleasing.

A synonym of Specious is 'Spurious'. Spurious means, intended to deceive.

So, when you got yourself a Birth Certificate, you are intending to deceive somebody. Every time you use that document you are deceiving, your intention is to deceive.

31:36

A little while later, I'm going through these records called "Hansard Records". These are the government kept records of all the conversations in Congress in the U.S., or Parliament here in Canada, every word that is spoken by the members of parliament. So, I'm looking through that one day and I see where the Deputy Registrar General, who looks after all these documents in

the Vital Statistics Act. They were amending the Vital Statistics Act, and of course, she has her lawyer with her. She doesn't know anything, only the lawyer knows how this works, and members of parliament asked this lawyer, how does someone become eligible to have a Birth Certificate. And the answer she gave was (this was a lady lawyer) "we have a formula to calculate it but I can't tell you what the formula is or how it's done. So, it must be one of those top-secret things. Even our members of parliament, the people who go there to speak for us, they can't know this. It's a secret.

Now, I've seen on a number of these Statements of Birth, I see numbers down the side, like someone is marking a test or doing some calculation or tabulation or grading system. I wonder what that's all about. Another strange thing.

So, the more I learn, the less I know. Very confused now, what does all this have to do with the law.

So, you don't own anything. You are a professional beggar. Your birth certificate is not you. Someone doesn't want you to know things. Your servants are sworn to some sort of secrecy. Members of parliament cannot know some things. What the hell is going on? I'm starting to feel like I'm in some kind of conspiracy movie. It doesn't matter who I tell this stuff to. I mean, if you believe my story, it's true, it happened. If you don't believe it, so what, it doesn't matter. The truth is it happened. All of this stuff actually happened.

33:38

So, now let me tell you what happens when you don't know how things work and you think 'I don't want to be involved in this anymore. So, let me tell you what happens when you don't own anything and you refuse to be a beggar, to beg for a privilege from the owner.

I had birds for over 30 years, a lifelong work and labour. Something I labored for for my family, their security and so forth. Yesterday it was legal, today it's illegal unless I beg and ask for a privilege and pay money for it, a fee. Please can I keep my birds, I mean Boss, Please can I keepa ma birds. They tell you, fill out an application, maybe we will approve it, maybe we won't. We'll let you know. But I worked my whole life for this. Too bad, it's the law. So, here's the answer.

They come with a Swat Team. They paint their faces like Indians on the warpath, with loaded machine guns. They threaten to taser you if you don't kneel down in front of them. They lock you in a cage and then they take all your birds. Hundreds!

I had hundreds of thousands of dollars in birds when I stopped begging. These birds have been given free of charge to other people. They did nothing for them. They weren't auctioned off. People from the public didn't have to buy them. No, just here you can have them, breed them, sell them, whatever, they are yours now. Here you go, good beggar, here is your reward for begging properly.

If I had tried to resist at all, they would have killed me. I'm serious. I'm not joking about this. I would be dead right now. People who have strong beliefs kill for them. You have to be very careful around them. Now, this doesn't get reported in a newspaper. No. This will never pass the legal department.

You see, it's like I'm sitting at the dinner table one night with my wife and we have some friends over for dinner and I turn to my wife and I say 'Darling, could I please (Marcus bends head down and covers it with arms and hands protecting himself) have some more potatoes?' What do my friends think? They think that if I ask for a little bit more food to eat, my wife hits me. She's a husband beater. This is why they come with the Swat Team. I mean, I have a bird. So what? So, I got a few birds. But, when they come with the Swat Team, it's like 'well, this guy must be dangerous; why would we go with the Swat Team; he must have guns; he's going to kill us; why would we go with the Swat Team; why would we raid the place with 30 Swat guys? You see, this is to make you think things that aren't even true and nobody knows anything about that.

Anyway, that's all the 'woe is me' I'm going to tell you about the story. So now you are probably thinking to yourself 'well, surely they'd have to compensate me for that; you just can't lose everything, can you, or you didn't obey the law, what did you expect?' Well, I don't know what you are talking about. You see, I don't own anything and neither do you. Now, you may not believe all this but believe me, it's a fact. Couldn't happen in your country. Of course it will happen in your country, believe me, it's a fact. Who cares about this? No one! Who will help you? No one! There has to be more to the story. Yeah, there's a little bit more to the story but everything I've told you is absolutely true.

So, this is how my story began. A true story. Are you able to figure out what my problem is yet? I told you. Every problem you will ever have in life is the result of owning no property. But, I had no idea about that back then.

37:44

So, now we need to look at what it means to own property. I did not know this when I began, but I do now. So what does it mean to own property?

Property is the Holy Grail of Law. Property is always in the custody of the law.

Property is a peculiar (*meaning one's own*) right in lands and chattels to the exclusion of all others. It is the sole and despotic dominion which a man exercises over the things of the world to the exclusion of the right of any other individual.

To own property, means that you have the exclusive possession use, control, management and disposal of the thing to the exclusion of all others it is a peculiar right. (*peculiar: one's own, exclusively yours*)

No other man can tell you what to do with what is yours. This is the foundation of all LAW! "Whoever owns it can rule over it?" Now you understand how important it would be to own property. But, who wants to be peculiar? We think of peculiar as someone weird, strange. So some people think I'm a peculiar man. Well, I'm certainly not common. Not anymore. Being peculiar is good if you want to own anything

If you own something, you have the exclusive right to regulate it. Like I said in the Introduction Video, we have all been deceived into abandoning our Birthright.

Our inheritance is in our birthright and our property is in our inheritance. Without property, you can have no liberty. Why? Without property you have no need of dominion. You own nothing to have dominion over.

Everything you think you own must be borrowed or by using it from someone else. A borrower is always a servant to the lender and a borrower is always the user and using what is not yours requires you to take interest in what is not yours. This is called usury. People think usury just has to do with money. No, it's more than that.

Also, if you do not own anything then anything you have must come from the trust of the owner or you stole it from the owner. There is no other choice.

Now, if you do not own anything, then neither does the guy next door. Nobody owns anything. Who then owns everything? This is a good question, don't you think?

Can the owner take back anything I have at any time? This is a serious question!

How could you ever plan for the future with this uncertainty hanging over you? Could everything I've worked for, labored for, actually come to be in vain?

I wonder if I own my life. Could someone legally kill me? Can someone legally sterilize me? Can someone legally inject me with drugs? Can someone legally put a dog collar on my leg and make me stay in my house? Can someone legally tell me I cannot speak to or even see my children? Can my children be legally taken away from me and given to someone else? I can't even know where they are? What could be more important in life than this?

I can tell you that whatever misery or problem you are having or will ever have is because of The Law. This is the question you have to explore and find the answer to. THIS IS IT! Every problem you have ever had or ever will have is because you own no property. You see, right now, whenever there is some regulation about anything, you just say to yourself 'It's the Law.' Everyone is scared of the law. There's going to be a penalty if you don't obey the law. But, nobody even knows what the law is or how the law is made.

It never occurred to you that you do not own anything. Why? Because you were told that you do own things, but it is a lie. That's a damn lie. You see, being told a lie is fraud. You believe you own something when in fact, you don't.

Now I will admit that when you have or hold something that is not regulated, it will feel like you own it, but you do not. This is the exact thing that woke me up. And it should wake you up too.

Explaining why you own no property is complex, but it will become apparent as we go on. I will be giving you all the facts and evidence and proof and many examples to prove to you that you own no property. Basically, anything you could ever go to court for means you don't own it. If you can go to court because someone slandered you, that's proof that you do not own your name. Not even your name! If you can go to court to get custody of your own child, it's not your child. You do not own it.

When I finally reveal to you who owns everything in Canada or the U.S., as a matter of law, YOU WILL FALL OFF OF YOUR CHAIR IN UTTER DISBELIEF. I guarantee it.

Back to my story now, to finish it.

So, now I'm about two years into my quest, completely confused. I know nothing. But, in my quest, two things stick out in my mind that seem relevant somehow. These two things are words, just plain, ordinary, every-day words and this concept of "God". Yeah, "God". What's "God" all about? Now, I'm by no means a religious man, but I can tell you that these two concepts led to all my discoveries. But, not in the way you may think! We are trained to think about words and "God" in a certain way.

As we proceed, you're going to learn that nothing you do in life has anything to do with "God", even you religious people. But, why then, are there references to "God" in courts, on money, in constitutional documents, in law, politics ... it's everywhere. And the problem I'm having with words is that I can't make heads or tail of what words even mean. The more I learn the more I get confused.

So, to you, this is all just a story. It's a true story. And you're thinking, well if this is all true, then there's got to be a good reason for it....something I don't know, something he doesn't know, whatever. Naw! I told you I was going to tell you things that are unbelievable and believe me, I've only just begun.

CONFUSION OF VOICE Video 3

(Words)

Like I've said in the previous videos, I've now been trying for about two years to learn about law and I realize it's hopeless. There is so much information on the internet about all the things that are wrong in the world: conspiracies, one-world order stuff, unjust monies, unjust laws. I realized that if all these people are looking for answers and getting no results, then they are all doing the same things. If no one is getting answers or results, they must all be mind-controlled. They all think alike.

We always want someone to give us answers to everything. So, we must all be members of the same cult. But, nowhere on the internet or from any of these self-taught gurus on law, do I ever hear anyone say, "the problem is that we do not own property". Because they do not know. They believe the lie. So, the answer I'm looking for has to be more simple. But, I don't know what I'm looking for yet. I know I own no property, but I don't know why I don't own any property.

I stopped listening to everybody and I just sat down and ... think, think, think. And then I think some more. So, I did something unusual. I accepted the fact that I was brainwashed, mind-controlled, that I think like everyone else. Can I salvage anything from my mind before it was irreparably harmed.

Most people wouldn't think of an approved education or established religions or the media or history books as damaging their minds, but I do. So, I went back to my childhood, prior to indoctrination before my mind was altered in certain ways; before non-sense and the absurd became my new normal. What was my first impression of things when I heard them? So, I tried to remember these things. So, I went back to my childhood and I sort of needed to wash my brain, clean it up a bit. So, here's a few things I thought about.

Corporations. The first time I ever heard the word 'corporation', it's a company and it's a separate thing, a separate legal person (*I didn't know that back then*) and if the company went bankrupt, couldn't pay its debts, even though I owned the company, the people I owed money to...ah, too bad, you just lose everything and I could keep all my other things, personal, myself and I wouldn't have to pay these debts. Well, I thought 'that's not right; it's wrong'; how can you do that if you owe somebody something.

Second thing was Lawyer's Advice. I remember my Dad had to go see a lawyer about something. I'm very young. And I remember my mother saying 'make sure you know how much you have to pay him before you go there' and I thought to myself 'why would you pay somebody any money if they're just going to tell you something. It's not like he's doing any work for you, so you just go ask somebody something, they tell you and why would you give them money for that. So that was my first impression of that.

Church Hypocrite. I was an altar boy for nine years ...Roman Catholic. At the end of one mass, the Priest was doing the announcements. He said "I'd like to introduce a special visitor we have here today" and he introduced a United Minister or Methodist Minister, Baptist Minister or whatever and this man stood up and I was walking towards the back of the church getting ready for the procession out and I stopped dead in my tracks and I thought 'why is this Priest

doing this, this is our enemy, I hate him.” Now, I’m just a little boy, 7 or 8 years old maybe. Who put those ideas in my head? Never seen this man before but somehow I hate him. So where did these ideas get put into my young mind?

Our Enemy. I’m a little bit older, getting to learn about the world, all these different countries hate each other, they’re at war, got nuclear missiles pointed at each other and then I’m watching TV one night and I see the leaders of two of these countries that hate each other, ready to kill each other and they’re sitting there laughing with each other, slapping each other on the back, sharing a meal together; I thought ‘they’re not enemies, they like each other. So, what’s going on there?’

Voting. The first time someone explained voting to me. If I was someone who lived in the United States of America, I get one vote out of 300 million. People tell you, it makes a difference. I think ‘yeah, like a lottery’. How can one vote out of 300 million make any difference at all. I didn’t believe that either.

Son of Canada. The first time I heard ‘you’re a son of Canada or the sons of Britain’ I thought ‘What? How can you be the son of a country. That’s stupid. It’s not possible.’

So, you see, these are just a few things that I did ...just an exercise to begin the process of getting control of my mind.

05:51

Now you will recall from the previous videos how I needed to learn about words. The meaning of words, words are all over the place, I couldn’t make heads or tails out of them. The more I learned the less I realized I knew. So, I knew there was something funny going on with words. So, let me tell you about words. I know words and dictionaries is all nerd stuff. When we were growing up we wanted to go outside and play baseball or whatever.

But as I’m trying to learn law and play lawyer and all this stuff, I realized this is hopeless ... reading all these legal definitions and meanings. I would read a whole paragraph to explain a word and I couldn’t understand it. I thought to myself ‘this is going to take more than a lifetime’. Not even a lawyer can know all the law. They specialize in various parts of the law. But I have to obey and understand all the law. Now at the time I had no idea that in fact I am an attorney at law, but just a dumb one.

If I looked at a normal dictionary vs. a law dictionary, words would mean different things. An ordinary word would be defined as this or that, but in law it would mean something else. How can words mean different things. I remember looking at the word ‘raptor’ in Canadian law and it said it was a bird of the order of strigiformes falconiformes and included eagles, falcons, hawks, owls, vultures and so forth and included their eggs. I go to another law book and I look up the word ‘raptor’ and it says see ‘ravisher’. I look up ‘ravisher’ on the next page, it says one who seeks carnal knowledge of a woman against her consent. WHAT? It makes no sense.

So, I’m looking through various laws, statutes and so forth and it would say that in this Act this means this or that and will include this or that, or in this Act this will be this, which means if it’s not in this Act it will not be this but it will be something different.

Well, now it is getting even more ridiculous. How can a word mean this here and that there. It would be easy to trick you, don't you think?

Now this was written by a law professor a number of years ago, probably an honest one. I'm just going to read this to you. He says "Dealing in words is a dangerous business and it cannot be too often stressed that that's what the law deals in ... words, dealing in long, vague and fuzzy meaning words. Even when the words of a Statute appear, at least to a non-lawyer, to have a perfectly plain and definite meaning, you can never be sure that a court will not up and say that those words mean something entirely different. Yet, why, if you think it over for a minute, should people not be privileged to understand completely and precisely any laws that directly concern them and any business documents they have to sign and any codes or rules or restrictions which apply to them and under which they perpetually live. Why then should the law use a language (*language being remembered as no more than communicating an idea*) which those ordinary human beings cannot hope to understand. The law would lose its dignity and then its power and so would the lawyers.

So, legal language, by obstructing instead of assisting the communication of ideas, is very useful to the lawyers. It enables them to keep on saying nothing with a great air of importance and getting away with it." Now, that was written by a law professor; a man who taught lawyers.

09:48

Now, I am going to go into something that is terribly boring, only mildly interesting but absolutely necessary. This is also going to be a little confusing for you, but for the purposes of this video it is only to make you aware of words and what can be done with them.

Did you know something "necessary" cannot be otherwise?

Did you know that which is "necessary" cannot be, and not be, at the same time?

Did you know that "involve" means to be, and not to be, at the same time?

You see, I liked grammar in school because it had rules, no room for interpretation. That made sense to me. English literature was retarded and I know today why it is mandatory throughout your education. It is to retard you. So, I reasoned that if a word can have six different meanings, how could I ever know what it means. Oh, people say, it's the context of the word, or the way it is used, or the acceptance of the word, or it's used for this purpose, etc.

So, I had a look at characters, symbols, syllables, roots of words, prefixes, suffixes, the tense of words, vowels, consonants, nouns, verbs, adjectives, pronunciation of words, language, speech, speaking, writing, the sound of words, conjunctions, articles, the gender and case of words, the sense of words, etc., etc., etc. I had a look at what could be done with metaphors, similes, all sorts of things about language and speech.

So, what is a word? A word is an uttered sound or written symbol used to communicate. If the hearer or the viewer of the word recognizes the word, as it is written or sounds, he will know what you intended to tell him. Words are a code. If you know the code, then you know what the guy is trying to tell you. If you don't know the code, you don't have a clue of what he is saying. Words can represent to your mind places, things, people, events, concepts, thoughts,

ideas, real things, imaginary things, basically anything the mind can conceive. But, as we will learn, words can also deceive.

Remember, there are only two ways to see. One is with the eyes and one is with the mind. Words work only on the mind, not on the eyes. A word can represent something that is present or absent but it cannot represent something that does not exist. Can you have a word that represents nothing? You could, but it would have no meaning. Could you imagine something and then represent them with words? The answer is 'No' because you can only represent that which is present. How can you communicate something to another that is in your imagination? He can't see it unless he has the same imagination as you.

Webster, Daniel Webster, the dictionary guy, he puts it this way. Imagination: In our simple apprehension means, if present, is sense; if absent, is imagination. We are human, and were given only 5 senses. Seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting and feeling.

If you believe something that makes no sense (*one of the 5 senses*) it is **non-sense**. No sense.

So, since we all have the same five senses, how do we fool or deceive someone to believe non-sense. Well, we use intelligence the ability to perceive non-sense. Now, you're thinking, what's wrong with intelligence or having a high I.Q. Nothing! Remember, we see two ways. We see with the eyes and we see with the mind. The second one is controlled by laws which you're not aware of.

So, words create an image in our mind. This is how we see them when they are not present. But, if the thing does not exist, can there be an image? NO! In other words, can an image have a shadow? The answer is 'no'. A thing can make an image, but an image cannot make an image. An image is only a representation of a thing in a different form. Keep that in mind when you are concerned with how people see you. Is it really your image you want to improve?

14:52

I don't have any props here but if I had some props like a pencil and a cup, OK. Let me explain another concept. I have two things, a pencil and a cup. For the purpose of communication, we will make the symbol for the pencil the letter 'p'. For the cup, it will be the letter 'c'. Can the cup be 'c'? No, it's only the symbol. It will only represent the cup to your mind. 'c' provides or gives your mind an image to see. When I say to you I have 4 'p's' you will see 4 pencils in your mind, even though there are no pencils present. However, pencils must exist somewhere or there would be no image in your mind. It would be non-sense.

An image is like a reciprocal thing. If there is nothing, there is no image. If there's an image, there must be something.

A wise guy once said, "If you think you are something but are nothing, you are deceived."

Now, things can be reciprocal and so can images. An example of a reciprocal image would be a father and son. In order to be a father, there must be a son. In order to be a son, there must be a father. Parent/child is also reciprocal. In other words, if your parents had no children, there's a good chance you won't either.

Some people have said I am the image of my father. I guess the only way you would know that is if you had seen my father.

Can 'c' represent the pencils? No, if it did you would not know what I am trying to communicate to you and you will see the wrong image.

So, can a word have different meanings? No. Because if it did, it could trick you or deceive you. You may see the wrong thing, the wrong image.

If we put four symbols together to form a symbol like the word 'tree (t-r-e-e)' you will see a tree. If I say there are a row of trees along the driveway, you will see a row of spruce trees along the driveway or a row of maple trees ... not specific enough ... lacking information. So what you see will be based on what you know, but also on what you do not know.

In other words, deceit can be achieved by learning the wrong thing as well as by the true or right thing being kept from you. If knowledge is lacking, that is one thing; but if it is purposely kept from you or you are given the wrong knowledge on purpose, that is deceit. What you will see is based only on your past experiences and associations developed during your life. It all depends on mind control.

So, you can only see what you know or believe the word to be. If you did not even know the word, you will see nothing. You see words are a secret code. If I look at Chinese words or somebody speaks Chinese to me and says 'look at the row of trees along the driveway' I won't see anything ... the words are a secret. Not my secret, but the one who spoke them.

The whole idea of words is so that you can see. I know you use your eyes to see ... well, not really. In fact, what you see will determine what you believe. What you believe will determine how you act, and you will believe what you see.

In Webster's Dictionary, Daniel Webster again, he says the following about the meaning of words: "It is the sense of words or expressions;... that which is to be understood; ...that which the writer or speaker intends to express or communicate...Words have a literal meaning, or a metaphorical meaning, and it is not always easy to ascertain the real meaning." People think the literal meaning is the real meaning. You say 'not really'.

Definitions of words are never what they are. Definitions of words only give them definition. The definition sets the boundaries or limits of what the word will mean or be or include. The best we can do is arrive at the sense of a word but in all cases we must know what the writer or speaker of the word intended to communicate.

Black's Law Dictionary explains words like this: "Words: Symbols indicating ideas and subject to contraction and expansion to meet the idea expressed. Such have been referred to as labels whose content and meaning are continually shifting with the times." So, Black's Law is saying the meaning of words are continually changing and shifting. Do you believe that? Or, is that what we are doing?

So, Bob asks me to bring him two chickens. When I get there, he says 'what the hell are you doing'. I tell him 'oh, the word changed since we last spoke, here's two rabbits'.

Two things cannot be represented by the same word. Likewise, one thing cannot be represented by two different words.

I could say to you money, funds, capital, proceeds, revenue, income, credit, currency, cash. You would think these are all money, but if they are all money, why do I need a different word? They may be like money, but they are not it.

20:23

Two things can never be the same. It is not possible.

If two pencils are the same and this pencil commits a crime, we can put the other pencil in jail. WHY NOT? It's the same pencil. I guess, if the innocent pencil appeared to be the same pencil as the criminal pencil, we could impose a sentence on the innocent pencil because it not only appeared to be but assumed and took the place of the criminal pencil. Sort of like a 'forgiveness' thing....stand in the place of. In fact, both pencils would have the same name, but if you looked very closely, you will see one is a numbered pencil. (A little foreshadowing here.)

Two things can never be the same. They can only have the same qualities or attributes. They have the same colour, the same length, etc.

I once read a court record where a guy did not want to pay his taxes. He said 'only persons have to pay taxes ... he's not a person'. The Judge said a person is a human being and you are a human being so you have to pay taxes and the guy shut up and sat down. Why did the law not say all human beings have to pay taxes? Why did it say 'persons'? 'Persons' are not human beings. The Judge said it is a human being. I'm telling you a 'person' is not a human being. They may be the same in some quality or attribute, but they are not the same.

Exactly alike: Incapable of being perceived as different. Being the exact same one; not any other.

It may not be the **same one** but it is the **exact one**.

How can it be one and the same when being the same requires two? This is the same. Same as what? Same as that. So, same requires "this" and "that".

23:40

So, now we need to learn what it means to be 'as'. Very important word to understand in the illusion and how the trick is done.

To be "as" is to become something that you are not. It requires you to be something different and move your position' ... to be in the place or stead of what you will be. (*Think of being "registered 'as' the owner", for example*).

If you act for (*in the place of*), then you are the exact one. But not the same one.

Exact means out of the act.

How are we supposed to know the truth about anything. Do you see how easy it would be to make an error with words, how easy it would be to be deceived?

I opened a law dictionary one day and just on two pages, I wrote down the first few words of a few definitions and this is how they start: "this word as applied to means; in a general sense this means; the radical sense of this word is; this word includes; as used in this Act it means; the legal meaning of this word is; in the popular sense this word means; a term formally applied to; a term sometimes applied to; in Maritime Law this means; the most simple acceptance of this word is; this word signifies; this term exhibits; this word means (*but it's not used anymore*); this word pertains to; in Civil Law this means; this word relates to; this word applies mainly to. These are the beginning words used in the definitions of legal words.

26:00

The legal system can make a word mean whatever they want it to be. You could say that legalism is magic words. In this Act this will be that but for the purposes of the Act that will be this, otherwise it may be something else.

When you talk to kids today they will say things to you like ... you ask them a question and 'well it's like this and like that' and I sit there and I listen and I go 'Is it a zebra?' I mean, you're telling me what it's like and I'm supposed to guess what it is. Why don't you just tell me what it is? People can't speak properly anymore.

We also pronounce words differently and then we're tricked. We violate the rules of grammar.

Then we use words totally wrong and are totally dumbfounded when we hear certain things, like 'Your Birth Certificate does not represent a living individual'. Everyone goes 'oh, how can that be?' The Birth Certificate is just a piece of paper. It can't represent you. You have to represent it. The reason you don't understand that is because you fail to understand what the word 'represent' means.

For all the pro se common law gurus out there that laugh about representing themselves, a Judge once said: "He who represents himself has a fool for a client and an ass for an attorney." Now, go on, try to represent yourself. You can only present yourself and you can only represent something other than you and you can only do it as "appearing as"; it is not reality.

When lawyers are called to the bar for admission, they present themselves. As an attorney they appear for you.

We also say many stupid things every day. Stupid sayings, things like 'where do you live?' 'Well, I live over there (*pointing to the left*).' 'Do you live over there (*pointing to the right*)?' 'No, I live over there (*again pointing to the left*).' So, if you go over there (*again pointing to the left*) you're dead. What does it mean 'where do you live'? Very important to understand in the illusion.

The late John Smith ... if we wait a little longer for him, maybe he'll show up. Is he just late? Late for what? Do you think he died? Well is he late, or is he dead? Did he die, deceased,

depart, perish, pass away, give up the ghost, expire? You see, what is the sense of the word? We use words many times the wrong way.

Another word ... 'used to be'. What did you used to be? What did you use, to be what you were? I used this to be what I am. I used to be used to using it but I don't use it anymore so you can't tax me.

I knew an Indian girl, a native Canadian. She said she lost her Indian status card. She said without it she's not an Indian anymore. She said she used to be an Indian. What did she use to be an Indian. I also knew a black guy, a friend of mine. He had a black status card. He lost it. He said without it, I'm not black anymore. These are only a few examples to make you think very carefully. Go carefully word by word when you're trying to figure out something. Do not forget the little words.

You can be in something, without being of it. Very important statement, again.

33:24

Then I found a short article on the internet. Very rarely do I find anything on the internet that helps me. But this article sort of, in a way, summed up what I'm telling you. I'm going to read it to you.

It says "The deliberate alteration of words, or meaning of words, to achieve political or social ends. The extreme version of this practice was referred to as 'Newspeak', describing the practices and propaganda. 'Newspeak' referred to a practice used by the government to reduce the amount of words and language in order to inhibit the exercise of independent thought by the public. This had the effect of cutting people off from information about their past and limiting their ability to interact with each other regarding present circumstances. Not only were words given limited definitions, many were eliminated altogether. When those in positions of public responsibility and the public do not agree on the definition of words, everyone in the process becomes the political target of political manipulation.

An alternative to 'newspeaks' reduction of words and definitions would be to expand the number of definitions of words until no one is capable of arriving at a certain meaning for what they read. This would be another method to achieve the same objective of controlling communications.

Intentionally or unintentionally ambiguous or altered definitions of words greatly inhibits communication. It confuses matters and removes people from a knowledge of history and the majority of information resources simply because they don't understand the traditional meanings of words. Sure, they have access to information in abundance but what benefit is derived if they cannot understand the definition of words being used. Even more disturbing is the fact that the readers might happen to come away believing their false views and flawed conclusions are absolutely correct.

There's a difference between the use of slang and the deliberate alteration of meanings for political purposes. However, the end result is the same. Those members of the public who are not familiar with the traditional meanings are swept away in a popular tide of modern use. Unless someone enters the picture who can point out the significance of the original meaning of certain

words, the public will benefit but little from efforts to study an historical document such as the Constitution.

Another warning about destruction of language and history is presented by simply burning all the books. As the body of information available for human consumption continues to grow geometrically, while communication becomes more difficult because of the deliberate evolution of the definition of words, anyone who has a vested interest in controlling the masses will find his job mostly done. No one will need to burn all the books when no one is left who understands them."

How are you ever going to know what anything means?

The reason I explained this about words is so that you may understand and see how I discovered things in the subsequent programs

Whenever you read something that makes no sense to you, but apparently is correct; you will instantly know that one or more of the words cannot mean what you think it means.

34:00

So, let's have a look at a few words here.

Proper: Peculiar; naturally or essentially belonging to a man or thing; not common. That is not proper, which is common to many.

Common: Belonging equally to more than one. No separate owner.

Peculiar: Beyond or deviating from the usual or expected; one's own; exclusive property, that which belongs to one in exclusion to others.

Sophisticate: *(What does it mean to be sophisticated...a very sophisticated man. Sounds like a good thing, a man of the world.)* To adulterate; to corrupt by something spurious or foreign; to pervert; as, to sophisticate nature, philosophy or the understanding.

A sophism is a subtlety in reasoning.

Subtle: Also written subtil: Difficult to detect or grasp by the mind or analyze.

Sub'tle: adjective (See Subtle.) Sly in design; artful; cunning; insinuating; applied to persons.

Civilization: the act of rendering a criminal process civil

Realize: the act of making it real. *(You can make anything real, even the unreal, if you realize it.)*

Become ... A very, very, very important word.

Become: To enter or assume a certain state or condition. Come into existence. To pass from one state to another; to enter into some state or condition, by a change from another state or condition, or by assuming or receiving new properties or qualities, additional matter, or a new

character: To become of, usually with what preceding; to be the fate of; to be the end of; to be the final or subsequent condition; In the present tense, it applies to place as well as condition. (*What has become of my friend; that is where is he? Become is what you are and where you are. Remember, when I said, you can never return to who you are and where you are if you use the get out of jail free card?*)

Appear: seems to be as opposed to reality. When somebody says to you that you should appear, the logical question is "appear to be what". It is not reality.

Apparent: Appearing as such but not necessarily so.

Apparition: Something existing in perception only.

Apparitor: one who summons to court. (*That word is not used anymore.*)

Identity: The distinct personality of an individual regarded as a persisting entity. Exact sameness.

Identify: the act of making or proving to be the same.

Go through a few more words for some fun here!

Rome: the capital of the Roman Empire, the seat of the Roman Catholic Church.

Roman: a native of Rome, a citizen of Rome, a countryman of Rome.

Pagan: A countryman (*you aren't going to find that in any new modern dictionary*)

Romance: To forge and tell fictitious stories.

Romancer: One who invents fictitious stories.

Romantic: Not sensible about practical matters; idealistic and unrealistic.

NecRomantic: Given to or produced by or used in the art of conjuring up the dead.

Necromancer: One who practices magic or sorcery. One who practices divination by conjuring up the dead.

Necromancy: The belief in magical spells that harness occult forces or evil spirits to produce unnatural effects in the world Conjuring up the dead.

Conjure: Call up a spirit or devil. Summons into action or bring into existence, often as if by magic.

Have you ever been given a "Summons to Appear?" Maybe in court, as an apparition by the apparitor?

What would you think if I told you that a Summons to Appear is a CONJURATION?

What would you think if I told you that you practice Necromancy every time you appear in Court.

What would you think if you practice the Occult every day of your life and do not even know you are doing it.

What do you think. It would be pretty unbelievable, wouldn't it? Can't believe that. Everyone can't be doing this. THAT WOULD BE UNBELIEVABLE.

The most common words we use every day and we never stop to think about what they mean. Why would we? We're educated. We have an approved education.

CONFUSION OF FACE Video 4

(Person)

01:00

Person: A person is primarily the Mask of an actor used on stage.

Acts and Statutes all apply to 'persons'. I never read anything in Acts and Statutes that apply to a man. I never read a law that says 'no man shall do this' or 'no man shall do that'.

A man is self-evident. Look at somebody and that is a man. But, is a person self-evident.

If there is a word that is more common than the word 'person', I don't know what it is.

We say, 'he's a nice person' or 'he's a bad person'. He showed up in person or I will deal with him only in person. I heard a doctor say 'this disease can be passed from person to person'. I have heard of 'personal property'. I have heard people say 'it's not personal, only business'. So, basically, you would think that everyone is a 'person'.

Then I learned there are many different kinds of persons in Canada, in any country. I heard a cop say 'he had drugs on his person'. That's the possessive case. So, people can have 'a person'. How about 'we have a search warrant to search your office and your person'. Is it possible not to have 'a person'.

I wonder if it is possible to show up somewhere or be present somewhere, but not in person. I know a guy who went to court and talked to the Judge but later was arrested because he didn't appear in person. But, if he was there, why was he later arrested.

I read that in Canada, women became 'persons' in 1929. Prior to that women weren't 'persons'. So, before 1929, women could not catch that disease that the doctor said would pass from person to person and if a cop had found drugs on her, they couldn't have been on 'her person', maybe they would have had to have been in her pocket.

I learned that Corporations are persons. They can sue and be sued in court. But, this person can't drive. This person can't vote. I know they can lobby to government. I wonder how they lobby to government. Some other person must drive them there so they can lobby in person.

I learned that the County of Simcoe is a person. Last week that person said there would be no garbage collection next week.

I learned that the City of Toronto was a person. This person has to apply for a license to keep protected wildlife at their zoo. The law says they have to apply in person.

Some people are put in prison and lose their person. They take their person away from them, probably because there isn't enough room in the small little cages or cells where they keep them.

I saw that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees everyone the right to life, liberty and security of the person.

The U.S. Constitution guarantees that every citizen is secure in their houses, persons, papers and effects.

I also learned that a baby is not a person unless it is born, dead or alive. Baby doctors used to be taught that when pregnant women came in they had two patients. Today they only have one person as a patient.

There are groups that want elephants, chimpanzees and dolphins to be persons. Then if you shoot one, you will have shot a person. Right now, a chimpanzee is the same as an unborn baby ... a non-person. You can shoot either one, there is no legal problem there.

Aboriginals in Australia, prior to 1940, were not persons. You could get a permit or a license from the British High Commission in Australia to shoot one. That's a fact. So, when they shot and killed an Aboriginal, they did not shoot a person. They must have shot a non-person. They shot an animal. If this aboriginal was wearing a pair of shoes they could not have been his personal shoes. If they had talked to him they would have seen he had no personality. I'm sure when the Aboriginal said "Why are you going to shoot me?"; the answer would have been "Well, I paid the fee for a license to shoot you. It's not personal, just business."

Are you confused, do you still think you know what a person is?

07:21

Every law, statute, regulation, ordinance and policy that you have ever obeyed applies to every person. Every obligation, duty, responsibility, debt, liability, omission, neglect, prohibition, punishment, allegiance, loyalty, credit, benefit, right, interest, privilege, account, name, address, title, deed, action, performance etc. etc. etc. applies to every person.

So, what can we learn about 'person'. What does the encyclopedia say about person. It says personhood continues to be a topic of international debate.

The beginning of human personhood is a concept long debated by law, religion and philosophy.

Christianity is the first philosophical system to use the word 'person' in its modern sense.

Thus, the word 'person' was originally a theological term created and defined by Christians to explain ""Christian"" theological concepts.

How can there be a controversy between philosophy and law about a person or what a person is? All of our laws pertain to persons. If no one knows what a person is, how are people being convicted and sentenced to prison.

08:54

So, what do the experts say about a person?

Judge Blackstone, a Judge in the 17th century co-wrote that: Persons are divided by the law into either natural persons, or artificial. Natural persons are such as the "God" of nature formed us: artificial are such as created and devised by human laws for the purposes of society and government; which are called corporations or bodies politic.

Bouvier Law Dictionary going back about 100 years, says: This word is applied to men, women and children, who are called natural persons. In law, man and person are not exactly synonymous terms. Any human being is a man, whether he be a member of society or not, whatever may be the rank he holds, or whatever may be his age, sex, etc. A person is a man considered according to the rank he holds in society, with all the rights to which the place he holds entitles him, and the duties which it imposes.

So, that is saying that not every man is a person, but every person must be a man. But, corporations and cities are not men. So, that couldn't be true.

The Dictionary of Canadian Law says, A person is any being that is capable of having rights and duties, and is confined to that. Persons are of two classes only – natural persons and legal persons. A natural person is a human being that has the capacity for rights or duties. A legal person is anything to which the law gives a legal or fictional existence or personality, with capacity for rights and duties. The only legal person known to our law is the corporation, the body corporate.

Websters Dictionary says the ordinary meaning of this word says "A person is primarily the Mask of an actor used on stage.

So, did "God" make any persons?

He says: Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called? If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well: But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convicted of the law as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. James 2: 7-10

12:11

Person: defined in early 1800's: A human being represented in dialogue, fiction, or on the stage; character. Character of office. A player appears in the person of a character.

In law, a person is one enabled to maintain pleas in court. (*A person is one who can plead/beg for things. Otherwise, you can't beg for anything.*)

So, your birth certificate does not represent a human being. A human being appears as the birthed non-living entity certified by the birth certificate.

Personal: Belonging to men or women, not to things; not real, present in person; not acting by representative; as a personal interview. Personal estate, belonging to the person as opposed to real estate. Personal identity, in metaphysics, sameness of being, of which consciousness is the evidence.

Personate: To represent by a fictitious or assumed character so as to pass for the person represented. To represent by action or appearance; to assume the character and act the part of another. To pretend hypocritically. To resemble. A mask.

Personification: The giving to an inanimate being the figure or the sentiments and language of a rational being; prosopopoeia; as, confusion heard his voice.

Personify: To give animation to inanimate objects. To ascribe to an inanimate being sentiments, actions and language of a rational being. To represent as an inanimate being.

Legal Personality: This is the characteristic of a non-living entity regarded by law to have the status of personhood.

So, what is all this. This is the act of necromancy; invoking the dead, to obtain a remedy in law to receive a justice because of an injustice. Conjuring up the dead as a medium, an instrument to achieve a purpose.

The person is really a dead thing and you are giving it life. You are giving life to the dead.

15:53

Let's see what lawyers have to say:

A person is recognized by law as such, not because he is human, but because rights and duties are ascribed to him. The person is the legal subject or substance of which the rights and duties are attributes. An individual human being considered as having such attributes is what lawyers call a "natural person."

A person by Statute term may include a firm, labour organization, partnership, association, corporation, legal representative, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers.

16:49

Let's see what other encyclopedia's say:

A *person* (*from Latin language is a persona, meaning "mask"*) is a being, such as a human, that has certain capacities or attributes constituting personhood. Personhood, the precise definition of which is the subject of much controversy.

How can there be a controversy when persons are going to jail and being executed in "person."

In ancient Rome, the word "persona" (*Latin*) or "prosopon" (*Greek*) originally referred to the masks worn by actors on stage. The various masks represented the various "personae" in the stage play. In Roman Law, the word "persona" became used to refer to a role played in court, and it became established that it was the role rather than the actor that could have rights, powers, and duties, because different individuals could assume the same roles, the rights, powers, and duties followed the role rather than the actor, and each individual could act in more than one role, each a different "person" in law.

That's a split personality; a multiple personality disorder, schizophrenia. Now you know why you don't have any rights, powers and duties. They follow the role, not the actor.

The concept of a "person" was further developed during the Trinitarian and Christological debates of the first through sixth centuries. Since then, a number of important changes to the word's meaning and use have taken place, and attempts have been made to redefine the word with varying degrees of adoption and influence. Many modern speakers of colloquial English conflate the meanings of role and actor, which can result in some confusion when they try to enter into legal discourse.

So, this has something to do with ""Christ"". So, if you are a Jew or a Muslim or anyone born before ""Christ"" you couldn't be a person. So, we've only had persons for 2013 years if that's what a person is.

19:47

Prosopagnosia (*Greek*: "prosopon" = "face", "agnosia" = "not knowing") is a disorder of face perception where the ability to recognize faces is impaired, while the ability to recognize other objects may be relatively intact. (*Agnosia – an agnostic*)

Prosopopoeia (*Greek*) is a rhetorical device in which a speaker or writer communicates to the audience by speaking as another person or object. The term literally derives from the Greek roots "prosopon" face, person.

So, every time we speak 'in person' we are speaking as someone else, evidenced by the mask we wear. We are speaking in disguise. We are concealing our real identity and putting on another identity.

This term also refers to a figure of speech in which an animal or inanimate object is ascribed human characteristics or is spoken of in anthropomorphic language. Quintilian writes of the power of this figure of speech to "bring down the "God"s from heaven, evoke the dead, and give voices to cities and states. Necromancy again!

Personification: A figure of speech in which inanimate objects or abstractions are endowed with human qualities or are represented as possessing human form. Also called prosopopeia.

Personification: the act of attributing human characteristics to abstract ideas. Incarnation, embodiment – giving concrete form to an abstract concept.

All of this is called the Occult. The supernatural. Witchcraft. And we practice it every day of our lives and do not even know we do it. Whenever we do anything in person we are evoking the dead as a medium, an instrument to do whatever we are doing it through.

As we go on you will see that we act, think and speak for the dead. In fact, we are the medium that is used by the Occult to give life to the dead to make it seem real, to make it believable. Of course if we act by and through the dead, people would be repulsed so we will just call it a 'fiction', an abstract being, an inanimate being. People will never figure it out.

Why do we have to do this Because we are dead in the LAW. In the next series, you will learn the extreme evil in this. At this point, it may seem like it isn't a big deal. It isn't until you can picture the whole thing and the results of this.

23:55

I wonder if there are any people who are not persons. Of course, the unborn baby, Aboriginal and some prisoners are not persons.

A Nonperson – a man regarded as nonexistent and having no rights; a man whose existence is systematically ignored. How stupid is that. I can't see you unless you are a person.

In the first video, I said you will not believe. I said you practice the Occult. You do not see things that are there and you do see things that are not there. Hallucinations and blindness. A severe mental disorder.

You see, the Constitution that you think you are a member of is only make believe. Remember, I told you that there are only two ways to see. With your eyes and with your mind. Members of the Canadian Constitution can only be seen with the mind.

So, a man, a simple, plain, just man is not recognized by the law that you call a legal system.

"God" does not respect persons, and our law only respects persons. So, people who build churches for "God", well your church is a person and that person does not have to pay property taxes.

To have a persona (*to be a person*) was to have a face before the law. That is to say to possess rights and privileges before a court or as being able to give testimony upon the strength of one's own words or as owning a respectable identity. If you have no persona, no mask, you have no face before the law.

So, a mask becomes your identity. It is all the judge can see. You are in disguise. Of course, he only sees it in his mind.

So, what is a non-person – a man who cannot be seen, no face before the law, no mask, a man who holds no public office, a man who is systematically ignored, a man whose presence is not recognized, a man who does not wear a mask, a man who does not give legal advice, a man removed from the memory of the public, a man who has no rights, protections, privileges, responsibilities, duties or legal liability.

I can tell you that a person has no gender and owns no property. A fiction owns no property because it is nothing, it is a fiction, it is not real. You cannot see a person, smell a person, taste a person, feel a person or hear a person.

It is non-sense. In fact a person is not a noun, it is an adverb.

But you can be made to realize (*the act of making real*) a person if you think, speak and act for it. This is of course what is called an insane delusion.

28:40

Now, getting back to the only person known to our law. Let's break down the concept as it is used in our law.

Per: Latin preposition, denoting through, near, close, as, through or with, denoting the agent, means, instrument or cause;

Son: the male issue of a parent, a native or inhabitant of a country; as the sons of Britain.

A son is that which is fathered. The father is he who makes, creates or composes anything. If a country can have sons, then the country must be their father.

Father and son are reciprocal terms. Meaning you cannot have a father without having a son. And you cannot have a son without having a father.

So, per-son is a process not a being. A son is a being. A person is one who did the act in the place and stead of the son, or by means of the son. The use of a medium.

One who acts as the son, in the name of the son, by and through the son, and appears to be the son is the exact person. (Out of the act.)

In court this is called pleading into a fiction of law. Pleading as the dead. It is an out of body experience.

This is why a summons to appear is a conjuration. Evoking the dead. But you are summoned to appear as the son. In the place and instead of. The one who by and through the son, or the dead did the act. The actor fulfilling the role.

This is a "Summons to appear". It is calling the dead to appear. A court only has jurisdiction over the dead.

The "Unravelling" series will show the blasphemy of what this is really about, religious people will go berserk. Remember the Registrar General said that your birth certificate was never meant to be used as personal identification. It only identifies the son. When you use it, you become 'the person'. You became this entity that acted by and through the son (*the instrument*). You have given life to the dead. That is called a resurrection of the dead. ALL RISE. This court is now in session.

A country cannot be a real father and cannot have real sons. It is just pretend. They are called 'fictions of law' or 'paper fictions', or 'per'-sons. These sons have no connection based on blood but based on affinity. The only person known to our law is one to which we give as a lawmaker a fictional existence. Why? Who is going to obey our commands. Fictions do not exist. They are all in your mind only. So we think, speak and act through this fictional son, thus we are a 'natural person'. The thinking, speaking and acting can only be done by you; thus the cause of every effect is done by and through you, the living one. So, the act was done 'in person'. This is the way the legal system was designed. It doesn't mean it is right.

I think therefore I am.

I speak therefore I am.
I act therefore I am.

The evidence of the abstract or fictional son is the Canadian issued identification. You think you are the same or identical to it and you may use it as a foundational identity document.

33:50

Now, let's look at the father-son relationship. All law is based on a father-son relationship.

The legal term is *Parens patriae* – means parent of the country. The *parens patriae* doctrine has its roots in English Common Law. In feudal times various obligations and powers, collectively referred to as the “royal prerogative”, were reserved to the king. The king exercised these functions in his role as father of the country. Whose your Daddy???

What is a ‘fiction of law’? A convenient fiction or a misfortunate truth.

Fiction: [Latin *fictio*, from *finco*, to feign]

Feigned; imaginary; not real. The human persons are as fictitious as the airy ones. Counterfeit; false; not genuine; feigned representation.

Feign: To invent or imagine; to form an idea or conception of something not real. To make a show of; to pretend; to assume a false appearance; to counterfeit. To represent falsely; to pretend; invented; devised; imagined; assumed.

This is nothing more than fraud. But you are the one who is doing it. No one is forcing you to do it. So, it's not a fraud then, is it? But, it's fraud. You are being tricked into committing fraud.

Now, here is man's justification or rationale for this, but it doesn't answer 'why'.

Fictions were invented by the Roman praetors, who, **not possessing the power to abrogate the law**, (*what law are we talking about here*) were nevertheless willing to derogate from it, under the pretense of doing equity. (*Pretense is pretending with the intention to deceive.*) What law couldn't they get rid of? This was the Roman empire. It controlled the whole world. What law couldn't they get rid of? Think about it. And, they did it under the pretense of doing equity.

It goes on to say that a fiction of law is the assumption that a certain thing is true and which gives to a person or thing a quality that is not natural to it and establishes, consequently, a certain disposition, which without the fiction, would be pungent to reason and truth. It is an order of things that does not exist, but that the law prescribes or authorizes.

Fictions of law owe their origin to the **legislative usurpations of the bench**. 4 Bench. Ev. 300. (*the legislative usurpation of whose bench?*) So, somebody usurped the bench, sat on it, and started making laws. Then it goes on to say that the law abounds in fictions ... thousands of them.

See, a fiction of law is like this I make a contract with somebody I make some obligations, some agreements, some promises and they make some agreements and promises back to me, so I get some consideration for the contract because I'm not going to do a contract for nothing,

except we impose a fiction of law to create the contract. There is nobody there, it is pulled out of thin air. It's a pretend person, just so I can get what I want under this contract.

Canadian Law Dictionary – Fiction: A rule of law which assumes something which is false is true, and will not allow it to be disproved. An assumption by law that something which is false is true. A statute may state that X is to be treated as Y. That is a rule of law. So, if you think truth is in law, it is not.

Did you know that there is a 'realistic fiction'? Realistic fiction strives to make the reader feel as if they are reading something that is actually happening; something that though not real, is described in a believable way that helps the reader make a picture as if it were an actual event. This can also confuse the reader into making the reader think it's non-fiction.

So, it said that the law abounds in Fictions. Really? Does not exist in nature.

39:26

The supernatural does not exist in nature. Do you think our law abounds in the supernatural, the occult, witchcraft, necromancy? It's all supernatural. Anything that produces an unnatural effect is witchcraft. That is what witchcraft is.

So, for the trick to work, you have to be an unwitting accomplice. If you knew you were doing this, you would know it's a fraud. Also the trick would have no value unless someone brings to life the fiction. Also, people would ask "Why do I have to do this?" Can we not just be who we are? The answer is 'no'. Those that know would have to tell you the truth about the law and could never take advantage of you. You see, I'm going to explain later, in the "Confusion of Money" your property is being stolen; half through money.

Your whole life you have been acting as an entity that is not alive. You provided all your labour through and as this entity. It is the only entity known to our law. Why? Because it is the only thing we can create in our head. You cannot apply your will to something you do not own. And because you cannot create anything, we have to make you believe so we can steal from you. It is all about stealing. This whole thing is about property and stealing.

I will explain the complete concept of 'the person' in the "Unravelling Series". There is more to the story. It is the key to understanding the whole illusion of how you lost your birthright, inheritance and property.

41:39

Riddle: Remember, 'per' means by or through or by means of, so when I ask this riddle, for some of you people, a light will go off. Here is the riddle.

Can you think of anything that can be obtained, only by means of the son?

CONFUSION OF LAW Video 5

00:29

Our justice system cannot work without the premise that: Everyone is presumed to know it.

There is a reason that over 90% of all our elected representatives in government and Prime Minister are lawyers. Leaders that are not lawyers have an extra pillow in bed with them (*a lawyer*). You see they are the only ones who know how all this really works.

01:14

There are all kinds of groups in the world protesting things, yet none of them even know what the root problem is and what they are protesting. Governments humour them by allowing them to peacefully protest but behind the scenes they are just calling you idiots. When is the last time you saw a group of lawyers out on the street protesting something?

I see Aboriginal groups protesting something they think they own. Why would you protest something you own? I think they are confused. I see groups protesting that 1% of the people own 99% of the wealth, but that 1% don't own anything either. I see abortion groups protesting that they want unborn babies to be declared to be persons. They are confused. I see groups who oppose all statute law and only want to be governed by the Common LawI want my Common Law rights. I think they are confused. I see groups saying I'm a freeman on the land A Common Law freeman ... they already are. They are confused. I see people in court fighting for custody of their own children. I think they're confused. And who do all these groups go to for help The masters of confusion Lawyers.

To govern means to exercise authority; to administer the laws. Government is an organization that exercises authority.

What is law? Blacks Law 1st edition sort of says it best: Law: That which is laid down, ordained or established. A rule or method according to which phenomena or actions co-exist and follow each other. That which is laid down and established by a supreme power or being.

Canadian Law Dictionary: Law: A rule to govern action.

04:49

Some things to think about. Has anyone ever asked if they have to obey the law? Is there a law that says you have to obey the law?

Lawyers and some others make an oath to obey the law. Did you make an oath to obey the law? Why do some make an oath to obey the law and others do not? Are we not all equal under the law? Surely someone who has made an oath to obey the law has a greater duty than one who has not made an oath. Maybe you don't have to obey the law, maybe it's just being forced on you.

06:33

I know lawyers are members of a Law Society. Am I a member of a Law Society. I know I can represent myself in court. Does that make me an Officer of the Court? But, if we're all members of a Law Society, does that mean I'm a lawyer?

Did you know that lawyers are taught in law schools to disregard what they think is right or wrong. They have been taught to only think in terms of what is legal or illegal. Have you been taught to disregard what is right or wrong? If you are going to represent yourself in court, disregarding what is right and wrong would be helpful.

The basic definition of legal insanity rests upon your ability to know what is right and wrong. So, if your lawyer has been trained to disregard what is right and wrong is your lawyer legally insane?

So, what does 'legal' mean. If I do what is legal and refrain from doing what is illegal, is that right or is that wrong? Killing Jews in Germany was legal. Abortion is legal. Sodomy is legal. Hating sodomy is illegal. Legalese: the language of a law society.

08:47

A legal system requires your will. If you cannot form a will, you cannot be held legally responsible for your act. *(If you do not own any property, why would you form a will?)*

A will has no effect while the testator is still alive. I have to wonder why the will of the people, which is the supreme law, has any force or effect while we are still walking around alive.

Real law is always right and proper. I have just told you one of the most important parts of the trick. Making laws is the practice of the supernatural.

So, real law is something that you can scientifically test repeatedly and always get the same result. This is law. Law cannot be changed, it is established, or it is not real law. It is immutable.

What makes law enforceable? The promise.

What makes law? The will. The will of something.

What makes law enforceable? The promise of the will.

What makes a promise enforceable? The right of the promise.

You see the will is always about the future, it is like a prophecy.

Law has nothing to do with morals. So, you can be the most perverted, disgusting, vile human being that ever walked on earth and still not have done anything illegal.

16:58

I went back to a book about 200 years old for the definition of Legal: Permitted by law. According to the law of works, or resting on works for salvation; as opposed to free grace.

A smug Judge once told a man just before he sent him to jail "now if you don't own anything, what are you protesting about. I do not think you are protesting, I think you are begging." If you own property, why are you protesting it, just regulate and manage it yourself.

You only need a lawyer for pleading and procedure. Pleading is begging, soliciting, praying to "God".

In tribal times there were Medicine Men, in medieval times there were Priests, today we have the Lawyers. They are your intercessor to fulfilling the law. Sacrifices and offerings.

When you go to court there is a presumption that you know all of the law because you are the one who made it. A court cannot get a conviction otherwise.

26:04

Citizenship is allegiance in return for protection. It is a protection racket.

If you want to take the claim of another group or territory you go to war and kill them. Today we have rules on how you can kill them.

Civil war is like euthanasia. It's a civilized killing in a nice polite way. We have to kill you but we can be civil about it. A civil war is also like killing your brother. You are in the same family (*Canada*).

28:11

So, let's look at how laws are made in the U.S. and in Canada. The principles are virtually the same for all countries unless it is a pure dictatorship.

Going to tell you a very well-guarded secret. THERE IS NOBODY HERE ON EARTH BUT US PEOPLE.

People came over from England and claimed both countries in the name of the King of England. The U.S. refused to pay the tax to the King. There was an animalistic fight and the King gave up. So, they decided to have representatives from each area of the country to speak for all those in that area. He will carry our voice, so I'm actually saying it, and it will be the same as if I'm there and he will vote for us. This way, we will all equally be lawmakers. We are freemen on the land.

We have formed a SOVEREIGN STATE. You form a "God". One which governs itself independently of any foreign power. Nothing but the people have anything to say about the law. It is exclusive to the people. You do not think you have formed a "God", but in law you have.

So, one of your representatives says we ought to have a law against (*whatever*). All the various representatives, speaking for all the people, debate it and vote on it. Majority rules. They have exercised YOUR will. They write a BILL. It goes to the President. He signs it. Now it is law, your law. That is your conviction, your will. They write an ACT (*like Highway Traffic Act*), it is your

will, your promise and your promise can be enforced by law. Time for you to PAY THE BILL, you wrote. Time for you TO ACT according to THE ACT.

The President holds the Bill, you are the author of the script, you authorized it, you have a character in the act and you are a party to the act. It is your will, you are the boss. YOU MADE THE LAWS. You made a promise and a promise is a contract and a contract can be enforced in law. The promisee has a right to your promise. Who is the promisee? All the other people members of the house, all the members of your society or house (*country*). They all have a right to your promise. You said I will wear my seatbelt. You said you will pay an \$85 fine if I don't do it and get caught.

In court, the executive has to prove your will, what you wanted and that you did not do it. That is your conviction. It is what you believe should be the law, how you should act.

You pay your servants to carry out your will, your desire. Judges are there to administer your will.... not their own judgments.

So, who is the government? You are. You govern yourself. But you do it as ONE. You are the executive, the Judge and the lawmaker. You are all three branches of government. Of course, someone carries out the role for you and you pay them for their service. This is your public servant.

Why do you protest against yourself. The power came from you. This is what you wanted. You should be happy. If everyone knew how it works there wouldn't be hardly anyone in jail. Why would anyone do something against their own will? All disgruntled protest groups are merely protesting their own will.

Now you say, "I don't like that system of law, called democracy." Well, democracy is like 4 wolves and 2 sheep discussing what is for dinner tonight. 51% of the people can, by democracy, make the other 49% do anything by law.

Even your rights are not absolute. They can be taken away too. Isn't that cool. Gotta love free will. Gotta love being a freeman.

36:48

Here is the illusion. "The government is no one; there is nobody here but us people."

In other words, government should be viewed as a public trust, rather than the people who work for it. The servants work for a trust, your trust. You live in a self-governing society.

Even the people who work for the government are part of the government.

You are the governmentYou live in a self-governing society Your servants are administering and executing your will.

Of course, once you have made your government, you have lost all control.

It is done by TRUST. You'd better trust them.

Next time you feel the need to protest your government, just stand in front of a mirror and argue with whoever you see. You would be best to do it in private because if anyone sees you and that information gets to court they may lock you up in an insane asylum and force-feed you some medication.

38:09

Now, let's look at some slight differences in Canada.

In Canada, the sovereignty is not the people. In practice, it is, but not in law. The Queen is a Constitutional Sovereign, which means someone made her a Queen. The Constitution made her a Queen. We are told this is a right she has from "God". we're not sure if it's true, but that's what they tell you, or maybe she's referring to a different "God". We'll find out later. Now, everyone knows she is just a woman, like every other woman. But, when she puts on the crown and the nice dress, we call her a Queen. It's just make-believe. Nobody is really fooled. She knows that too. Her own motto is "she must be seen to be believed".

It is the crown that everyone is really bowing to.

We are no longer a colony. The Queen gave us some more rights and freedoms. We're almost like Americans now.

So, in Canada, the democracy works the same as the USA. In Canada we have a House of Commons as opposed to a Congress. We both have a Senate, like the old Roman law. Do not ever think the Roman Empire died. It just moved across the street to the Church of Rome.

Somebody says 'there ought to be a law against this or that' and they write up a Bill. They debate it for a while and then vote thumbs up or thumbs down. It is passed, they give it to the Queen. She gives it royal assent and it becomes her will, our bill.

The law, or I should say the bill is governed by the rule of Law. At the top of every Bill it says "with the advice and consent of the legislative assembly." We have given the Queen legal advice and our consent.

There you have it ... we have all given legal advice. Why? Because we are all Attorneys. We're not 'learned' attorneys, just 'dimwit' attorneys.

So, does she really need our advice and consent? No, but it makes it more binding as a matter of law. We now have to act and perform just like the Bill says. So, read the Act and act accordingly.

When people say, I don't agree with this. Well, the fact is you are the one who wrote it and voted on it. It was your advice and you gave your consent. What you're really saying is 'this democracy sucks' and you would be right.

So, in a democracy, everything becomes the property of the supreme one....supreme being, the state. Every nation on Earth operates by communism. You just can't see it. You have to give up ownership of all property. You alienate yourself. You alienate your property and you do this thing called an 'attornment'. Everything becomes common, or public. You 'hold' it privately.

You are given some rights, which are not absolute, but better than nothing since you have abandoned your **absolute** birthrights. You want human rights, civil rights, citizenship rights. Governments are not established to secure your "God" given rights, that is a lie. Only the LAW *(of the true God-Creator)* and your promise to perform your duties can secure your "God" given rights.

Governments are formed to lose your God-given rights. To lose your Birthright, Inheritance and Property.

In a democracy you get to pay yourself for everything you think is free and then you get to work even harder to pay all your servants. The people who play the role of government get you to vote for them by saying 'I will give you something for free'. You will get it for free after you pay for it or you will get it for free after it is taken from someone else and given to you.

44:58

Let me explain in more detail why you own no property.

The short answer is because you became a lawmaker. If you had not joined this lawmaking body you would still own your property.

When you became what you are not, you left your Birthright behind. Inalienable rights cannot be transferred. You have to go back to what you were to claim them. What you believe you are and what you claim to be is just an illusion, make believe.

So, let's have a look at an example to prove you own no property. If John Doe stole Fred's lawnmower out of his garage, who charges the thief? Well, the owner has the right to charge him. So, in the U.S. it might be the State of Idaho vs. John Doe, or the people vs. John Doe or the U.S. vs. John Doe. In Canada, it is also the owner. Her Majesty, the Queen vs. John Doe. Fred doesn't charge anybody. He doesn't own anything. He's only the tattletale. If convicted of the crime and a fine is paid, does Fred get the money or does the owner get the money? Who gets the penalty? The owner. Fred doesn't get a penny.

Nobody stole from Fred. Fred doesn't own anything. Fred had it, but does not own it. Fred doesn't even have to go to court. He can stay home and watch cartoons.

Under real law, Fred would accuse John Doe and if found guilty, Fred gets his lawnmower back and he gets another lawnmower as the penalty for the crime. The victim in a democracy is society ... the ONE, not you.

Everything is owned by the society you live in. Everything is public, everything is common.

You only hold public property Privately. You own title to nothing, you only hold title from the owner.

You are not a houseowner, you have a household. You hold it as a tenant.

You do not own your children. You only hold custody. The owner can change the parent, guardian, babysitter whenever they want using the law *(by your advice & consent!)*.

If you ever want to know who owns what you think you own, just look at the image and superscription on the money you hold. You cannot issue money unless you own property.

47:56

This is a good time to look at the trick, the illusion and see how it works.

The fundamental concept of law is that one can only apply his will or rules or laws to that which he made. If it's not yours, you have no say. If you try to control someone or something that is not yours, that's unlawful. So, if you want to be a lawmaker, a governor, you have to create something, but of course, we are human and can create nothing.

Create: from the latin, ex niliho, out of nothing; to bring into being from nothing; to cause to exist.

Creation is magic. A mystery. Creation is a supernatural ability. It does not exist in nature.

"God" is above nature, He is the creator of nature, He is the author of nature.

As a Sovereign, we are practicing the supernatural, that is called the Occult.

And we practice it with magic words.

We create nothing and believe it is something so we can apply our will to it. (*I'll be elaborating on this more later.*)

So, first the people, who had no law, standing around in a field until they got rid of their King in the U.S., they created the U.S. They wrote its constitution and a nation was born ... born of you. The people gave birth to it. Can the U.S. give birth to you? You already created the father, now all you need is the son to do the father's will. Yes, the U.S., the ONE, will give you a birth certificate. It's not a real son, it's only a make-believe son, but it was devised and created to serve the purposes of government and society. Sort of like an immaculate conception. It is basically just magic.

This is exactly what Judge Blackstone said about 'persons'. He tried to codify the Common Law. He said "an artificial person (*a mask, an identity*) was devised and created for the purposes of government and society. It is a non-entity or being created in the image of the U.S., and there will be a date it was issued, a day that this being came forth. At this point you can use it as your proof of claim to be that; but since you cannot actually **be** that, the best you can do is think, act and speak for it, as if you were it, and of course believe you are And when you are summoned to court, or use this false identity anywhere, book a flight, a hotel room, vote, buy gasoline, go to work **you must appear to BE it.**

"I think therefore I am." It is your MASK and that is how the oldest trick and illusion in the book is done. First you created something in your image. Then you claim to be the image of what you created. This is pure Occultism.

You now have a false identity, a counterfeit, a token and you personify it. That means you give body and life to it; a being created in your image, a resemblance of you, a similitude, a graven image, a character. This is a sovereign citizen and a subject. One is above the law and the other is under the law. How do you think your laws are made. Everyone is above the law. Only someone above the law can make the law. Only someone above the law can amend the law, repeal the law, strike down the law. You are the one who made the law so you're above the law BUT you also have to be underneath the law. So you are both lawmaker and law obeyer because there are only us people here.

As a citizen, you have your rights. As a subject you owe your allegiance, your duties.

If you can recall: "A person is any being with the capacity for rights and duties and is confined to that." Of course, with your supernatural abilities you can give it life, or at least appear to. This is divination.

Now, there are two beings, two distinct identities but you can only see one. The mask conceals your true identity because you are confused. One is natural, one is artificial; one is true, one is fiction; one is alive, one is dead; one is real, one is personal; one is private, one is public.

We have to create a double identity in order for our legal system to work. REMEMBER, THERE IS ONLY US PEOPLE HERE.

If you have noticed, nobody ever shows identification when they go to court. You need identification for everything. When you walk into court the Judge looks at you and says 'your name please' and you tell him your name. Why don't you ask him 'do you want to see some identification'? They don't want to see your identification. Know why? Because they don't want the 'son of Canada'. They want the 'person' of Canada. They don't want the dead guy. They want the live guy who did the act.

The legal system that we call law is the practice of Personification and is one of the forms of Witchcraft ... giving life to the dead.

If you want to enroll your child in school you must enroll your child 'in person'. The state will only educate their child. They will not educate yours.

When a cop stops you for speeding, he will charge you for speeding 'in person' because you are driving 'in person'. Do you need to say anything to him. No, just give him your 'person'. When you go to court to fight the charge you will need to appear 'in person'. You need to personify the mask. Why? Because you are the Actor, the man behind the Mask. You are the cause of the effect performed through Witchcraft.

Deception can only be learned by learning the truth. No man that is deceived has ever known it, for if he did, he would no longer be deceived.

Maybe self-governing isn't all it is said to be. Maybe you want to quit. Maybe you want to give back that which is not yours, to restore that which is yours.!!!

The illusion we live is so normal, so everyday, we cannot see it.

Right now, "this is that" and you cannot perceive the difference. When you can clearly see in your mind "this is not that" you have been successfully transformed by the renewing of your mind.

For, without "this" you will realize you are just "that".

CONFUSION OF THINGS **Video 6**

00:19

We're going to be talking about 3 different concepts. They are hard to understand. They are essential components of the swindle.

What I have been showing you is a counterfeit, forged system. Do not think that our legal system is a lawful system. It is not, it is pseudo law. It's a *defacto* law. It is what is happening in fact, but there is no lawful authority for it. That is what *defacto* means.

The three concepts we are going to talk about are Attorney, Licence, and Name.

00:55

We're going to start with Attorney. Everyone knows what an attorney is or has met an attorney, but what really is an Attorney?

The word formerly signified any person (*one*) who did business for another or in transacting other business in which legal rights are involved.

So, an attorney who acts for you, someone who is appointed or assigned in your place.

If I say 'will you get that book off the table and bring it over to me', you are my attorney, you are doing somebody else's business you are acting for them.

Now, if you do not own anything, everything you do must be done as an attorney for another with property belonging to another. You must be conducting their business as an attorney, for which you have to account. This is why we have accountants.

Now, here is a huge revelation. If you owned your property, you have no need for a power of attorney. And if you owned your own property, you would mind your own business and not be conducting someone else's business.

If you have a written will (*will and testament*) you will see in the case of your death, you will appoint your wife or husband as your attorney. Did you know that your husband or wife is an attorney or that you can make them your attorney? After you die, your wife or husband will be running your business, which before you died you were running, but that belonged to somebody else.

When you do not own anything, the best you can do is become an undertaker to manage somebody else's property.... to conduct their business, and become a trustee for their property and maybe a surety for their debt.

03:18

So, let's break down what an attorney really is.

Attorn: to turn, or transfer homage and service from one lord to another. This is the act of feudatories, vassals or tenants, upon the alienation of the estate, (law) acknowledge a new land owner as one's landlord.

So, when you attorn, when you become an attorney, you turn away from one lord to another lord. I used to be your man, lord; now I am this lord's man. I am no longer serving this lord, I am now serving that lord and I acknowledge this new landowner as my superior, my landlord.

During that process you also alienated your estate, so whatever property you had becomes this new lord's property. You alienated yourself, separated yourself or transferred it.

Attornment: The act of a feudatory, vassal or tenant, by which he consents, upon the alienation of an estate, to receive a new lord or superior, and transfers to him his homage and service.

Alienation: (law) the voluntary and absolute transfer of title and possession of real property from one to another.

Homage: did become his man. (*of life and limb*)

Remember, "become" does not only change your being but your place of being. This is where address, residence, abode, your postal service is very relevant to your being. It is your address that signifies what you are "of".

So, today we think of an attorney who is appointed in place of another, a professional person authorized to practice law, conduct lawsuits or give legal advice. Well, we do all those things, everybody does. We are all attorneys. We all have a power of attorney. If you have the power of a carpenter, you are a carpenter. So, if you have a power of attorney, you are an attorney. You can give this power to another to act for you, just transfer your attorney.

05:57

So, when you go into court, who are you representing? Who are you appearing for with your power of attorney?

You cannot appear to be you, you are you. You are appearing in your person. As the Queen's son. As your father's son.

A power of attorney at law is a power of choice. And that choice is to turn or not to turn. That is the question.

A betrayal. A traitor. To assume trait of another character. The choice is treason. Will you turn away from one superior to another. Will I or will I not use my power, my life, to commit treason. A licensed attorney is one who has committed treason. An act of deliberate betrayal.

Perfidiousness. A betrayal of a trust. This act of treason or betrayal of trust has been committed or expressed when they are called to the bar and that is when they do the actual attornment. Your treason is only implied until you express it by assuming it, by attorning to the jurisdiction of a court.

So, when you committed an attornment, and we all have unknowingly, you became a feudatory. You did something that started a feud. With who? With your old landlord. You were born to a landlord. Now, you might be saying 'I wasn't born to a landlord'. Yes, you were, or you could not have the power of attorney because an attorney is one who turned away from one landlord to another. A feud is an extreme hatred. If I used the word enmity you would understand real law. If I used the word adversary, you would understand the legal system.

Feud: Primarily, a deadly quarrel; hatred and contention that was to be terminated only by death.

Feudatory: the relation of a feudal vassal to his lord, a person holding a fief; a person who owes allegiance and service to a feudal lord.

Feudalism: vassals were protected by lords who they had to serve in war.

Vassals: A person holding a fief; a person who owes allegiance and service to a feudal lord. The Queen of Canada is a feudal lord.

Vassalage: The state of a serf.

Serf: a person who is bound to the land and owned by the feudal lord.

Persons do not come from the land, only a man does. The man is not owned by the feudal lord, only the person.

Fief: A fee; a feud; an estate held of a superior on condition of military service. *(Look at the last page of your passport.)*

Fee: An interest in land capable of being inherited. *(The land you think you own, is only held in FEE, contingent on military service.)* So anything you have ever paid a fee for, is a feud. So, if you think you own your land and you pay taxes on it, you don't own it. You hold it in 'fee', you hold it because of an ongoing feud with your original landlord and then this new lord comes in.

That is now your new superior so this is why your new lord is called a feudal lord. So, you don't hold the land you think you own because of the taxes you pay, it is because of your military service. When you hold your land in Fee Simple, you hold it based on your fee and it's only the interest in this estate that you are transferring to your descendants who think they are inheriting.

Liegeman: A person holding a fief; a person who owes allegiance and service to a feudal lord.

Liege, a. [L. ligo, to bind; Gr. To bind]

Lie'ge-man, n. A vassal; a subject. So that would be a man who is bonded, in bondage.

Religion, n. relij'on. [L. religio, from religo, to bind anew; re and ligo, to bind.]

So, based on all this, and we're all attorneys, we've all done this, sorry to tell you this, but we are all scumbags, not just the lawyers. Lawyers are just 'learned' scumbags. They already know they are scumbags. Us dimwits are still figuring it out.

We've all committed an attornment. We've all chosen a new landlord. We've all committed treason. We have all made a re-legion.

So, what is an attorney. Well, an attorney has turned away from his real landlord, a betrayal and that's treason, and became a new man for the new landlord (that's homage); that's an illegitimate son, not the real son, so that's a bastard. So, so far we have an attorney that's treasonous and a bastard.

12:51

Let me impress this on your mind and you should wake up and listen to this carefully. The most fundamental thing in law is property. If you do not own anything, then you do not own anything! If you don't own the good things, you don't own the bad things. If you don't own the bad things, you don't own the good things. If you don't own anything you don't own anything.

So, you don't own any debts, liabilities, responsibilities. You own NOTHING! You were tricked into becoming surety when you engaged in an undertaking. Otherwise, you will never have anything. You alienated your estate when you attorned. You gave up EVERYTHING!

The Swindler cannot have it both ways. Your whole legal and financial system is a SCAM, A FRAUD from its conception to its deception. It is stealing, and you are letting it voluntarily happen.

Let me explain it this way. If you own something, you can rule over it. If you do not own anything, you cannot rule over anything. None of your bills which you are a party to and you think is valid in law are yours, that is impossible. The rule you made cannot be valid in law. Why? Because you cannot own something and not own something at the same time. You cannot be and not be at the same time. You cannot "own something and not own something at the same time".

You do not have a say if you own no property. You own nothing. So, what is your democracy? This is an advisory thing to the Queen. Democracy is a trick.... a trick to bind you under some obligation and undertaking to say this is my advice and I consent to the legislative assembly. It is a trick. It's not your law. You don't own anything. You also can't steal anything. It's impossible. Nobody owns anything.

When love, faith and trust do not work, when winning your hearts and minds does not work, we have to just use a blatant lie. We can't trick you, you're too smart for that so we just have to come out and lie to you and hope you believe it and the bigger the lie the easier it is to believe.

When I show you why we are doing this and where this comes from is a matter of law, and what the alternative is you are not going to feel too well. Some of you will be so angry when you realize the life you have been living and how you have been deceived and cheated and stolen from.

So, what is the best definition for an attorney? A treasonous bastard.

18:31

So, what is a license?

We have licenses to do almost everything. We've been told that a license is a privilege. Not a right, it's a privilege. The fact that you need a license for just about everything ought to tell you, you do not own anything because a license is the authority or permission to do what is otherwise unlawful, illegal, a tort or a trespass. But if you own something and have the exclusive control, management, use, possession and disposal of the thing, with no outside control; if you owned your property you would never need a license for anything. So, again, whatever you are getting a license for, you don't own it.

The legal definition of a license is the permission to do, or have, or act, or be something which would otherwise be unlawful, illegal, a tort, or a trespass. There is no lawful definition for a license, because it is unlawful. A license is inherently unlawful.

It is the permission to break the law. That's a license. Who can give me permission to break the law, to do what is illegal, to commit a tort or a trespass. Even "God" doesn't let you break the law. So, without permission to break the law, it would be breaking the law.

Let's see if I got this right!

Driving is not right, so it can only be wrong, against the law. But I have a privilege to do what is wrong, if I get permission to do what is wrong, and that will make it right and that is a license.

So, you cannot do this because it's against the law. But, if we say you can break the law, then it's not breaking the law. Maybe if I was on some medication that would help make me dumber. This is insanity.

22:52

Forget the legal definition, let's look at what a license really is.

License: Lawlessness, Excessive freedom; lack of due restraint; or used in contempt of law.
"when liberty becomes license dictatorship is near" – Will Durant.

License: pleading. The name of a plea of justification to an action of trespass. A license must be specially pleaded, and cannot, like liberum tenementum, be given in evidence under the general issue. 2.T.R. 166, 108

If you need a license to get married, you are marrying someone else's property. If you need a license to drive, you are driving with somebody else's property. So, how do you drive? Well you drive 'in person'.

Anything you do in per-son is regulated or can be regulated.

After all you have been subsidized with an identity or new face, and government can regulate whatever it subsidizes.

So anything you do by witchcraft or the occult, can be regulated because that is what this is ... personification, witchcraft, occult.

License: freedom to deviate deliberately from normally applicable rules or practices. That would be one who deviates, a deviant.

Licen'tiate, N. [from L. licentia.] One who has a license, as a licentiate in physics or medicine.

Licentious: Using license; indulging freedom to excess; unrestrained by law or morality; loose; dissolute; as a licentious man. Exceeding the limits of law or propriety; unrestrained; as licentious desires.

Licentiousness: Excessive indulgence of liberty; contempt of the just restraints of law and morality. The quality of being lewd and lascivious.

How many times are you charged with something, hauled into court or fined or put in jail because you went beyond, you transgressed the just restraints of law? Well, a license is permission to break the law, to go beyond the just restraints of law.

Lewd: Given to the unlawful indulgence of lust; addicted to fornication or adultery; dissolute; lustful; wicked; vile; licentious.

Lascivious: Driven by lust; preoccupied with or exhibiting lustful desires. Loose; wanton; lewd; lustful; as lascivious men.

Do you think a license is something good? Why are we using licenses?

"Law is the "God" of wise men; licentiousness is the "God" of fools." There is a trickery going on here in the process of a license.

26:36

I'm going to show you what part of the trick is.

So, why do we use licenses in what we call our law? What is its purpose? The short answer is to get around the law. The specific answer is in order to regulate and control ourselves. After all, there is only us people here.

We are both lawmaker and law obeyor. That would be self-governing. I will govern myself. I'm above the law, but I'm also underneath the law..... a sovereign citizen and a subject, the ruler

and the ruled, the protector and the protected; the regulator and the regulated; the guy who pays and the guy who gets it for free; the free man and the slave. You are the owner and the owned. In this self-governing society, you are both of them. Look around and give yourself a shake. There is nobody else here. Are we all on brain-dumber?

There is no "they, or them" which you argue with, protest against, fight with or write to. This is an insane delusion. The government is nobody. There are only us people here. It is only a public trust. The "they or them" that you argue with is you. The people you call the government are not the government. They work for the government. They work for you. So, who is the government ... YOU!

So, in order for us to convict one another of a crime we have to prove your intent and your act. To commit a crime you have to do something that is wrong and you have to know it is wrong. So, a typical statute will read "No person shall drive a motor vehicle except under the authority of a license and subject to the regulations." The law is: No person shall drive a motor vehicle. That's the law. Now, if you want to break the law you need permission. If you exercise your privilege to apply for a license, we now have the proof of your intent to break the law.

You see, it is the license that is the prima facia evidence of 'I want to break the law'. Now we only need to regulate how you act. The intent and the act. These regulations are in the Highway Traffic Act.

So, if you act wrong and we have a crime, because of the license. Act right and there is no crime. The license is the intent and it is already established.

Any license is the proof that you are intending to break the law, now let us see if you do. *(Pretty sick. Are you sure you want to engage in licentious behavior?)*

Now some of you are thinking "I won't get a license to drive or a license to be married or whatever I won't be breaking the law then". NO! The law is that you can't do any of these things. The law is nobody can drive .. period. That is the law! What you don't realize is this. You are completely owned. You have no power. You have nothing. You own nothing. Getting married in Canada is against the law. You need a license. To work in Canada is against the law. You need a license. Just because some things aren't regulated doesn't mean you don't own those things.

31:08

The third part is about NAME. Can't go wrong with the name, can you?

What is a name? A name is that which a thing is called. The sound or combination of sounds used to express an appellation attached to the thing by customary use, by which it may be vocally distinguished from other things. Something that is identical to it for identification purposes, like a label, a brand, a tulle mark, a sign (*like sign your name*), a leg band, an ear tag, anything by which a thing may be known.

So, we could say a name is that by which a thing is known. So a name is not the thing, but only the thing used to know the thing. A proximate thing. In order to identify the thing, it must be

attached to it, like a label, or the thing must bear it or carry it or the thing must claim to be it. *(That's my name.)*

If the name of the thing is changed, the thing is still the thing, only the name changed. But you will no longer be able to know the thing by the name. You may have to actually look at it, to recognize it. A rose is a rose by any other name. A name is not the thing, a name is the same thing.

But, when the thing changes or transforms, then so does the name, obviously, because it is no longer the same thing.

A caterpillar transforms into a butterfly. That is a transformation. Remember, the purpose of these programs is a transformation of the mind. When you no longer believe what you have become, when you no longer believe you are 'this' then you are just 'that', a different thing.

It is impossible to become anything and that is a fact. You can think it or appear as it, but not become it.

When the caterpillar became a butterfly, he can no longer be a caterpillar because it transformed, it became something else.

In your case, what you believe you are or what you became is just in your head. It's in your mind.

34:22

So, do you need a name?

Well, the United Nations says everybody has a right to a name and a nationality. That would be a name and a family name. *(A Nation is a family.)* But, you were already born into a family. You already have a family name, why would you need a new one?

So, a nationality creates a new identity, not the one you were born with which is your Birthright. Your national identity is used to conceal your real identity, to conceal your Birthright. Remember it is a Mask, a person.

What does it mean to make a name for yourself, also called 'making one's mark'. If you have no name, can you just make a mark, an "X", that's my mark. If you're illiterate just make a sign, a mark, something to indicate your approval, your consent.

In 1991 a Swedish couple refused to give their newborn a legal name, in protest of the existing naming laws. In 1996, when fined after leaving their child illegally nameless for 5 years, they submitted the child's name as "Brfxxccxxmnpccclllmmmprrxvclmncckssqlbb11116".

I knew a lady who had identical twins, two boys. One was bigger than the other. They hadn't decided on any names yet, so when they registered their children *(the event of their birth)* they wrote in the forms "Big One" and "Little One" and to this day if you look in their ancestry thing, their registration, it says "Big One" and "Little One". That was their first legal names.

So, who has the right to name a thing. Well, whoever owns it has the right to name it. So, who named you ... your parents. Your parents own you. Do they give you a family or a nationality name? No! Your family is automatic. You were born into a family name....by blood, not by affinity.

But, if they own you, how can Family Services take them away from you? Did you do something to lose dominion over your child? Did you do something to lose dominion over yourself? Did you do something to change your family name? Remember, what attornment is? New father, new lord.

Do you remember my story about your inheritance you can claim if you return home?

Watch the news on TV and wake up. Parents are routinely charged with kidnapping their own children. Who charges them? The real parent? No, the adopted parent a choice you made, something you adopted. Her Majesty, the Queen, will charge them here in Canada. They are her children. They are not yours anymore, according to law.

You people are confused. Why would you raise someone else's child. Of course it is your real child, it's all in your mind. You are mentally incompetent to understand this. You are incompetent to provide for your own child because you don't own anything. Let me give up my child so I can get a child care tax benefit. The owner of the child will start to give the child the necessities of life. Why? Because you own no property. Don't register your child and the State, the Queen, will not take care of your child or send you a child care benefit to feed, clothe or house this child.

I can't even begin to tell you how evil this all is. The needless pain and suffering of families, mothers and fathers and of course, the children all because they do not own anything. All because of your attornment. And now you are probably saying 'there are bad parents out there'. Yeah, but there are laws against that too. You see we are sold concepts, we are sold things that appear right but they are totally unlawful.

This is a cruel hoax that causes almost all the pain and suffering in the world. It isn't until you can grasp the whole picture that you will be able to see it and feel it.

Let me tell you a couple true stories just to emphasize this.

There was a lady in the United States, she was at a meeting where parents were all getting together with trustees and board officials and other government officials on setting up the school curriculum, the government approved education and this one lady was going on and on and on about, she wanted this and she wanted that and one of these masters of confusion is sitting there. He was a senator but he was also a lawyer, an attorney, a treasonous bastard. And he's sitting there bored to tears, like you dumb incompetent idiot why do you keep shooting your mouth off, you don't know anything.

So, I guess he had somewhere to go so he finally just turns to her and he says "Excuse me, ma'am, but do you have a marriage license?" She goes "yeah, of course I do". And he says to her, "has no one ever told you that a marriage license is a privilege from the State and that every child born into that license is a ward of the state?" In other words, sit down, shut up, it's not your child. We'll all decide what happens with this child. So, do you still think that if you

have no marriage license you're living in sin? That's what people actually believe. I don't have a legal marriage license so I'm living in sin.

There was another case where this boy 7 or 8 years old was playing in the backyard and of course it's a school day. We have truancy laws. Every child, by law, has to be educated by the State, government approved education. So, somebody saw this, a tattler, so they phoned Family Services and said this child is not in school and he was of school age. So, the father of this family gets a letter in the mail saying 'your child is not in school. We've become aware of that and under law, this child has to be in school every day. Now, it's your right to choose what kind of education, private, public, whatever, for your child, but the child must be educated and if you don't respond within so many days, we'll be taking legal action against you, and of course all the way to we'll take your child, if we have to.'

Well, this father, he knew some of these things. He knew some things about the world. Him and his wife did not have a marriage license and he never registered the birth of his child. He said this is my child. We'll keep it and I'll raise it and educate and feed it and clothe it myself, even though this man owns no property either. Well, after he sent that letter to the Ministry of Family Services, this lady wrote back to him from the Legal Department saying 'after reviewing your case and the particulars of this we won't be taking no legal action against you and this matter is now closed and resolved.

You see, this man did not give his child, he didn't sacrifice his child to the State. His child did not do an attornment.

41:59

So, what does "in the name of" mean? It basically means, by the authority of. Who is the author of your legal name? When you do something in or on someone's behalf, it means to do it in their name. In Canada everyone does everything in the Queen's name. They act, think and speak in her name. She is the author of your legal name. Your name is the Queen's name. You became her Man when you attorned.

You act in the name of, the name of your father. Father of the country. So, your name is of Canada, of Her Majesty the Queen. You are of Canada, you belong to Canada. You are the property of Canada.

Of: means: From or out of; proceeding from, as the cause, source, means, author. It means to come from or belong to.

Hence "of" is the sign of the genitive case (*the case expressing ownership*) the case that denotes production; as the son of man, the son of Canada. But it is only fictional.

It does not exist in nature or reality. "Anything that produces an unnatural effect is Witchcraft." That is the definition of witchcraft.

So, you can be in Canada and not 'of' Canada.

44:08

Can you change your name? Well, if you own the name, you could change it, of course. But you don't own your legal name, so you can't change it. In Canada, if you want to change your legal name, you have to apply for approval. Well, who do you apply to to change your name? Nobody, because it is not your name, it is the name you are using. So, you apply to the owner.

I must be using the wrong name. It can't be mine. If it were your name, you would just change it. Phone or e-mail all your friends and tell them you're changing your name. If you do not own anything, then you do not own anything.

So, now there are two distinct beings, but the government doesn't recognize the man, only the person. So, your name must be a personal name and when one assumes the body of the dead fiction, to personify it, to give your body to it, it becomes one and the same

You see, when you BECOME something, you no longer are what you were. It is just not possible.

Every time you use your government issued identification as a claim to be or purport to be (*which means intent to deceive*) and every time you go to court and state your name for the record, you are letting yourself be used as a medium for the dead. Every time you use your government identification you are using an identity, a mask.

How do you like the Occult? Conjurations, Sorcery, The Black Arts, Witchcraft, Necromancy? All these things are going on and you do them every day of your life.

46:32

Now, did you make your real name public?

Public means: belonging to or concerning the whole. You do not own your name. The public does. The "one" does. Your name is in the public domain. You are only part of the public. A part of one. A party to it. A participant of the 'one'.

If you do not own your name, whose name are you putting everything in that you think you own? Is your house in your name? Is your car in your name? No, it is not. Nothing is in your name. You don't have a name. You don't own a name.

If you do not own anything, everything you possess is obtained by usury. You even made your name public. Usury is not only charging interest, but taking interest. The one paying interest is as guilty as the one taking interest. More on this in the "Confusion of Money". If you don't own anything, then everything you possess is by usury.

When you are summoned to appear in person in court you are summoned to appear in Her Majesty's name. That is the genitive case. Not your name, in her name. You are her son and she named you. You are her man. She is the author of the son's name....the name of the

countryman. You are commanded to appear in person, in your adoptive name. An adoptive name or parent is a legal fiction.

Can you appear in your own name? No. Appearing to be anything is witchcraft. You can't appear to be you, you are you. You lost ownership to your name when you made it public. When you attorned, you voluntarily transferred title and possession when you became an attorney at law.

Your original landlord does not know or recognize you any more. Do you remember the inheritance story? You have practiced iniquity, pretending to be who you are not. You have a mask on. You have become a fiction of law.

Now, the Registrar General's office deals with four things. They keep the records of births, marriages, death and name changes. They claim to only record events, not people. But, being on brain dumber, I will never figure out that the details of the event that is registered is not the same as registering people.

To register the birth of your newborn baby, you need:
To be the mother, father or parent named on the birth registration, legal guardian or an informant acting on the mother's behalf.

A short form birth certificate includes basic information and can be used as identification (*but not personal identification*).

A baby is a newborn Babylonian. That is where the word 'baby' comes from.

Our legal system doesn't only have its origins from the Roman Empire but it goes back to the Hammurabi Code. Hammurabi was one of the Kings of Babylon. We still use many things in our legal system based on the Hammurabi Code.

51:40

So, let's look at a Birth Certificate. An Ontario Canada Birth Certificate is a certified birth of a countryman. A countryman is a pagan.

If you are a member of any country you are a pagan. That comes straight from the original Daniel Webster's Dictionary. You won't read that today because you're not supposed to know that. You are involved in pagan rituals, the Occult. Sorry to tell you this. So, love of country is love of paganism. Who would ever think that a country is unlawful? Well, we will find out as we go.

So, let's look at the forms of Registration when you register the birth of your child.

There are two required. The first one is called a Notice of Live or Still Birth. There is a witness that is going to fill out this Notice. These are the ones pretending to care for you but are only really there as a spy and a witness. This is the Doctor, Midwife, Nurse, whatever. They are also an INFORMANT.

Then the second form is what your parents fill out and is called Statement of Birth. This comes from the real mother or father. Remember the Statement of Birth cannot be used as identification. That is right on a government website. Now, how stupid is that. You have a "Confusion of Being". So, the Statement of Birth that your parents filled out, that's not identification, that's not who you are. That doesn't identify you. You see, in reality, out of one, we are many. This is your Birthright. Your country is, out of many we are one. This new one has to make the new statement....a new identity. You have transformed yourself, you've become something else.

When a Statement is verified, it is given an 'enrollment number'....an identity number A NUMBER OF THE NAME.

On the second form, the one the parents fill out, you put in the child's name. You are not naming the child, you are naming this invention, if you like. This is a 'letters patent' and your country holds this. It actually holds the patent because you have transferred title and possession. A corporate or account number doing business as 'Justin Dimwit' just like a business doing business as 'Walmart'. The top right hand corner of your registration, once it has been accepted and verified out of the mouth of two witnesses two statements, two informants, the matter is established. Then an enrollment, identity number is put in the top right hand corner. From then on, this will be your unique number, doing business as 'Justin Dimwit'. This will be your number doing business as 'Walmart'. It is an account number to keep track of you.

So you are now an article of commerce and you are an ASSET of the country.

Now, after you register your child, now they send you a receipt, an acknowledgement of registration. So, now you can request, apply for and beg to be a member because they have the registration, the attornment has been done. But, remember, it's a trick. You apply to become a member of this country, to establish a new identity to conceal your real or true identity and of course you fill out a big application.

Well, why would you do that. You see when that Statement was verified by both informants, the Division Registrar General puts a code number on there and it matches the code number on the acknowledgement of registration. You don't have to fill out an application to get a Birth Certificate, you've got a receipt with the code number that will go right to the Statement with the matching code number ...here's your Birth Certificate. Try it ... see if they will give you a Birth Certificate. No ... because you have to request, you have to apply, you have to beg and you have to authorize and consent to becoming this new entity and this is all on this form which you end up signing and making an oath that this is all true and none of this is false or intended to deceive anybody. So, in the end, you become the fraudster, but you are only enticed into doing this.

56:53

So, now there is a trick going on here. You're becoming a fool. You are about to lose all your property. To abandon your birthright. You are about to do an attornment. A transformation of the mind. So, you request a Birth Certificate. When they look at everything ... you put in your name, who your mom is, what her maiden name is, who your dad is, how much baby weighed, eye colour, etc. They don't need this to find the registered Statement. They go straight to the

number. Then you get your Birth Certificate. This is an 'official document' so you have an office now, a franchise, something you have to account for, duties, responsibilities, debts, all sorts of things.

On the very bottom of the section we usually tear off, there are some instructions. They say 'Please refer to the certificate number if corresponding with respect to this certificate. The Registration number contains the number when you enrolled, on the Registration form. But the Birth Certificate is a new certificate, certifying this registration, so now there is also a certificate number. Then there is another number on the back that is called a certificate number, but that is something different. So, when you use your Birth Certificate, whoever is requesting it isn't writing down your name, they are writing down your Certificate Number.

So, we are taught to identify ourselves by name, date of birth and address.

You have a name, address and serial number. These are the things that make up a son of Canada or a person. But, we are all taught, use your name, date of birth, your address. None of these things are unique to you. What are the chances of the same name, born on the same date at the same address are almost nil so, yeah, it's got to be you. Nobody wants to look at you to see if it is actually you, no we're looking for an identity. Your identity is self-evident, we're looking for a person and we need a separate identity for it.

Only your number is unique to you. Nobody else has that number. It doesn't matter if you live in the same house, same address and same name. It is the number that is unique. A number is needed because the family is too big. Daddy can't remember everyone's name and because you are no longer self-evident you require proof of this graven identity. You can change your name but not the number. Only your number is unique to you. Why don't you put in an application for a change of number instead of change of name?

This is direct from government's website. It says "A national identity number is used by the government in many countries as a means of tracking their citizens. Permanent residents and temporary residents, for the purposes of work, taxation, government benefits, health care and other government related functions, sometimes the number will appear on the identity card used by a country. The way in which such a number is implemented is dependent on the country but in most cases a citizen is issued a number at birth. Non-citizens are issued such numbers when they enter the country. Many countries issue such numbers ostensibly for a singular purpose but over time they become a *defacto* national identification number."

For example, U.S. originally developed its social security number system as a means of disbursing social security benefits. Due to functionality creep, the number has become utilized for other purposes to the point where it is almost essential to have one in order to, among other things, open a bank account, obtain a credit card, or drive a car. Don't believe this. It is not functionality creep. The purpose of these programs is to gain control of you to give you a number. It's not the other way around.

Have you ever heard that the government is issuing a real identity number. Well does that mean all my other identity is not real? No, it's not your real identity.

You can record the same kind of events in the front of your Bible. You see, the beings recorded in the Bible, the Book of Life are living. This is why it is called the book of life. This landlord is the Lord of the living.

The beings recorded by the Office of the Registrar General are also living, but the beings issued by the Office of the Registrar General are dead. This is a sacrificial offering of your child. You come in one side of the Registrar General's office living and you come out the other side dead. It's a matter of law.

I should also tell you that in a very old family of records, the children of a marriage are called their issue. On your Birth Certificate, there is also a date of issue along with your date of birth. It is the certified birth of this issue, which is the identity you use to conceal your true identity, your birthright, not the date of your real birth but the date of birth of what you have become, what you wanted to be, what you claim to be, what and who you purport to be.

This is on a government website, again.

What is the difference between a birth registration and a birth certificate?

A birth registration contains information about a newborn and is used to create his or her permanent identity record. In other words, to create (*meaning to make something out of nothing*) something that obviously does not yet exist! (*I thought this was an identity? In fact it's a birthright and you're about to abandon it.*)

The birth registration form cannot itself be used as proof of identity or to request documents such as Passports or Ontario Health Cards. Information found on the birth registration is used to create a birth certificate.

What your parents wrote there ... identity, naming you, this can't be used as identification because you haven't become one of them yet. But, the exact information on the form is put onto their form and they issue it as the author now, as the father of the son and now this is your new identity. Same information, same everything, different identity though.

To become anything is a transformation. A transformation is to change your form, how you were formed. A new maker. A new creator. To be reborn as of the issue date.

But the life of this re-birthed being is not living, it is dead. It is called a Civil Life.

Your Birth Certificate does not certify a LIVE BIRTH !!! Only a civil life.

This is also from their website Birth Registration is free. You do not have to pay to alienate your property because you are giving up something. There is no fee for doing an attornment. It is the attornment that creates the FEE. Remember, a fee is a feud. You have to pay a fee for everything because you lost your inheritance.

Under Birth Registration it says "Birth Registration in Ontario is a two-step process. Two forms must be submitted and matched in order for a birth registration to occur. The first form denotes a live birth form as completed by medical staff and submitted to the Office of the Registrar General. The second form, the Statement of Live Birth Form is completed by parents of newborns and is then submitted directly to the office of the Registrar General. It is the matching of these two forms that create a birth registration.

Now, everything has changed, a total transformation, now you own nothing and have to start begging. I mean pleading. Still think your name is important whose name you put everything in, whose name you are acting in. Very, very important, the name.

CONFUSION OF MONEY Video 7

1:03

Money has no value without property. Money only represents to your mind property. It is an image of property. Do you really want money or do you want property?

If you exchange or trade your property with somebody, there is no need for money.

We are all taught to follow the money. We can learn things by following the money. In fact, it is the evidence of property. If we follow the money, maybe we can find the property. If we can find the property, maybe we can find some liberty, some freedom.

If you ask someone if they love money. I think they will say 'no, I don't love money, but I just need it to live'. I don't think that is true. I think everything you have done in your life has been money related. It may not be done for love of money, but love is probably the strongest emotion that makes you do or not do something. If everything you do, or almost everything you do is related to money, you must be doing it for the love of money. The opposite extreme would be to hate something. To really hate something would make you do or not do something, also.

From the time you were young and started to grow you wanted money. Someone told you that you need it. You cannot get anything without money, and they told you the truth. What you were not told is that you do not own anything. You own no property. Did a parent or teacher ever tell you that you need a good education so that you can get a good job and get lots of things because you do not own anything. No, because they don't know that. Did any of these great teachers or mentors ever tell you that when you get lots of money you can get lots of neat stuff that you will never be able to own, because you have no way to pay for them. No, they don't know those things either. Did any of these great educators or mentors ever tell you that you need a good education so that you will never see how you are stolen from every day of your life? Of course not. Why would an educator teach you something they don't know.

They say money doesn't grow on trees. Apples grow on trees. Maybe I will use some of my money to buy some apples. But, if I owned the apple tree I could just pick apples, I wouldn't need money. If you see a truck on the highway spill some crates of apples on the road, everybody just drives over them and squishes them. If an armored truck spilled crates of money all over the road, people would stop and fight and bite each other in the arms to get as much as they could. They would act like ravenous animals. Nothing polite or civil that you would witness in that case. Tell me again you don't love money. You are obsessed with money. Almost everything you have done is money related.

When I was little I was very happy when I got money for my birthday. I was happy when I got my first piggy bank. I got a paper route and made my own money. I remember when I got my first bank account. Now I'm somebody. Then I went to school to be smart so I could grow up and get a good job and make lots of money. The higher my grades, the better the job I could get and the more money I could make. The longer I stayed in school the better the education and more money. Maybe I should marry somebody who has lots of money or somebody who has the education to make lots of money. Maybe we can put the children in day care so we can have two incomes because we want to have lots of money. Let's get an extra job and work all the time except when we sleep so we can have lots of money. Let's cheat on this exam so I can

get better grades which will lead to more money. Let's steal money if nobody is looking. Let's build a vault out of steel and cement because I want my money to be safe. Everybody wants my money. Maybe I should kill my wife, not because she needs killing, but I can get the insurance money. Let's lie about what this thing really is so that the buyer will give me more money. I better put my seatbelt on because I don't want to lose any of my money. Let's buy insurance because if I cause hurt or injury to somebody, someone else will pay for me and I can keep more of my money. Hey, let's buy a lottery ticket and gamble so I can get more money. Everybody thinks I am really smart so listen to me because I have lots of money. I will sell my body to disgusting vile strangers because I really need some money. I cannot live without money.

You see, I do not own an apple tree. If you give me enough money I will kill for you. Look at all those poor starving people over there. We should send them some money. Have you ever heard of drug-related murders? Oh, it's related to drugs but the murder was done for the love of money. It is really a money-related murder. You will find that almost all crime is money-related. In fact, the penalty for a lot of crimes requires you to forfeit some of your money. The crime and the penalty are both money related. People obey the law because of the love of money. I lost my job and I will go bankrupt, I can't take this anymore, so I commit suicide. This guy cannot live without money. Tell me again how you do not love money when almost everything you have ever done is because of your love of money. I have to speed to work on these icy roads even though it may kill me or I will be late and lose my job and what will I do for money. Now there is the first good question. What will I do for money? You will do just about anything for money.

7:40

There is a reason you were not taught money or law or health care or anything that is a licensed monopoly. MONEY IS A LICENSED MONOPOLY. You see, you have a government approved education. Your education is designed to keep you dependent on society, upon your family. Your education is to train you for society as a human resource, as a trustee of someone's property. What could be more fundamental in any education than learning the necessities of life to produce food, clothing and shelter. How many of you can produce your own food, clothing and shelter. See, you are a dependent. It doesn't matter how big you are. You are still a child. You are a dependent of the state.

A law professor said "you know the least about the things that affect you most ... the law". Can you defend yourself in court? No. You are legally incompetent. Why would you get involved in a system of law that you don't understand. You can't defend yourself. I would withdraw from that. You see, all the most vital, essential things of an education have been monopolized. Why? Because whoever is licensed to do them will make lots of money. Why? Because everyone needs them. They are vital and essential. Learning these licensed monopolies would interfere with these lawyers and doctors livelihoods. They are a monopoly. What would those people do for money if they couldn't have their licensed monopoly?

Learning what money is would interfere with the bankers' monopoly on usury making money from your debts and learning what money is would reveal you own no property and it's that simple. If almost everything you've ever done in life is money-related, how could you claim to have an education when there was no subject in school called 'Money'? And as the law professor says "you know the least about the things that affect you most" how could you claim to have an education, if you've not been taught the law.

You see, your education system is designed to keep you ensnared as a dependent, an incompetent who believes he is the smartest guy in the world and has the diplomas and degrees hanging on your wall to prove it. Meanwhile, you're being stolen from, swindled, every day of your life and you love it, you relish it, and will defend it and even die for it if need be.

10:30

So, let's start with MONEY. What is money and what is its purpose.

In Roman mythology, moneta was a title given to two separate "Goddesses" ... the "Goddess" of memory. The name of the "God" Juno Moneta is a source of numerous words in English and the romance languages, including the word 'money'.

So money was a memory of a debt. That is what money is. You owe me something, here is the memory of it.

The epithet, moneta, given to Juno, more likely derives from the Greek word 'monaris' which means alone or unique, one. So money is 'one'.

The epithet, Juno, was protector of funds. As such, money in ancient Rome was coined in her temple.

The word moneta, is where we get the words money or monetize. In several modern languages, including Russian and Italian, moneta is the word for 'coin'.

A coin has two sides, a head and a tail. I can tell you that the head side is your birthright which you abandoned when you attorned. So, are you the head or the tail? It all depends on who owns the property. Sorry, you are always the tail because you attorned.

A coin is any stamped metal, usually gold, silver or copper and stamped by authority (*in the U.S. it is under the guise of public authority; in Canada it is the Queen's authority*) and it is used as a medium of commerce. So, it's stamped by 'one'. This 'one' is the authority. So, gold, silver and copper are not money. It's the stamp of authority on those things that make the gold, silver and copper into money. So, don't think you own gold and silver if you have attorned. People who thought they lost their property rights when they went to fiat paper money from the gold standard, didn't. There was a reason for that but it had nothing to do with property. It has to do with a different kind of property.

So, money is the representative of commodities of all kinds, of everything capable of being transferred in commerce. It is a token of property. It is a counterfeit of property and it must be able to have different size units of accounts or denominations. It must be fungible, which means equal to units of the same kind. Otherwise, you would have unjust weights and measures.

13:28

How is money used. It is a deferred payment, or a deferred trade. When the payment is done, the trade is finalized. So, money works by faith or confidence. Faith and money have the same

definition. Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Money is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.

Money is any object or record that is generally accepted as payment for goods and services and repayment of debts in a given country or socio-economic context. The main functions of money are distinguished as a medium of exchange, a unit of account, a store of value, and, **occasionally in the past**, a standard of deferred payment. Any kind of object or secure verifiable record that fulfills these functions can serve as money. *(so money is no longer used as a deferred payment)* It used to be a deferred payment. So, if there is no deferred payment, there is no deferred trade of property, is there? We're going to learn how that works. This is part of the swindle.

Money originated as commodity money, but nearly all contemporary money systems are based on fiat money. Fiat money is without intrinsic use value as a physical commodity, and derives its value by being declared by a government to be legal tender, that is **it must be accepted** as a form of payment within the boundaries of the country, for "all debts, public and private". So legal tender is not based on faith or confidence IT MUST BE ACCEPTED. It's a decree, it's an order, it's authority.

Money is supposed to serve you in a lawful trade of property. It's a convenience to do a trade. If you own no property, you must be doing someone else's trade, right? Money should serve a purpose for you, you should not be serving a purpose for money, unless you own no property. Money should be your servant, not your master.

If you think that the love of money is the root of all evil; why is the lack of money the root of all evil? (I gave you a long list of evils that result from lack of money.)

17:34

Have you ever asked what is the root of all money? I think that question is more important.

So, the root of all money takes us back to who owns the property. Are all the evils I listed before caused by the lack of money or the lack of owning property? Well, I'm here to tell you, beyond any doubt, that that is exactly what it is. It is the lack of property that is the root of all evil. Not money, but it is related to it.

So, if you own no property, what is money? And if you did own property, what is money? All of a sudden, money takes on a whole different meaning. Remember, counterfeit, upside down, backwards.

If you do not own property, you can never issue money. If you do own property, you can issue money.

If you own no property, you can never own a debt. *(You can hold a debt, but not own it.)* If you do own property you can own a debt. In fact, if you owned property, the more money you issue, the poorer you become.

If you still think you own something, money will prove you do not. Money is the evidence of who owns property. Look at the image and superscription on the money. Whosoever's image

and superscription is on it, has made a promise to pay. It is their debt, not yours.

We are tricked into assuming and undertaking debts which we do not own. We only assume the debt for the right to have and hold some property. You own nothing, you have been swindled. If you own nothing, how can you buy or sell anything. If you own nothing, what do you own to contract with?

Are you contracting with someone else's property? Are you buying and selling someone else's property? The answer is, yes! That is why you have to get a receipt and account to the owner for all your transactions. Are you eating someone else's food, are you living on someone else's land, are you raising someone else's children, are you sleeping with someone else's wife? You own nothing! You've been swindled.

If you think I am going to explain the financial system and how it works, I will not. First, because I don't know how it all works and second because I don't care how it all works. I'm only going to tell you what is important about the confusion of money.

Just as our legal system is unlawful; so is our financial system. The financial system is based on law. Our legal and financial systems are legal but highly unlawful. If you remember, law has to do with what is right and wrong. Legal ignores what is right and wrong. By the time you grasp what I am going to show you in the "Unravelling" programs you will be able to clearly see how your whole legal and financial system requires stealing, fraud and unjust enrichment.

Money in itself is not a bad thing but there are laws governing money and what you can do with money. When money is used to defer a trade, the law has not yet been fulfilled. When the money is redeemed, the law is fulfilled. When the money vanishes, the law is fulfilled. Money can only be used as a convenient way to accomplish something lawfully.

The biggest prohibition on money is you are not allowed to profit from money. Obtaining gain or benefiting from a debt is unlawful. To gain or benefit from someone's debt is called usury. In other words, the longer someone is in debt, the bigger their debt grows, based on usury.

This is money breeding money. Charging a poor man more than you lent him only makes him poorer. It is a penalty for being poor. It is discrimination against the poor. This is very evil and exactly what banking is all about. So, is it the love of money or is it the love of usury that is the root of all evil?

Currently you think money is a storage of wealth. That is true if you do not own anything. But your storage of wealth is always the storage of someone else's debt.

Money is always a credit and a debt. Whose credit and whose debt depends on who owns the property. Today we use credit as money. I can tell you that money has always been credit. Some people are amazed to learn that we use debt as money. I can tell you that money has always been a debt. Money is always a credit or a debt. Whose credit and whose debt depends on who owns the property.

The reason that people do not understand money is because they do not know that they own no property. It is an outright blatant lie that makes this so evil.

24:27

What adds to the confusion of money, of course, is the confusion of property. Some of your property was lost during the initial swindle ... your inheritance. These are the natural material things of the world that you need to sustain your life. The second loss of your property is an ongoing swindle through labour. This is your property that turns your inheritance into wealth. It is your labour that turns the material things of the world into wealth.

The deceiver needs your LIFE. Not your civil life, but your real life. Here take and have a civil life, while I'm stealing your real life. It is your life that makes labour possible. It is labour that produces wealth from the materials. The deceiver is not your maker, so they have to make you believe he is. A confusion of being.

Every time you give your labour, your property in your adopted maker's name, you are giving it in person, by and through a fictional son and you are receiving no property in return. You only receive a credit in person which you can exchange to have and hold some personal property. This is an ongoing fraud and swindle to obtain your real property unlawfully and we voluntarily accept it. Our whole justice and financial system is based on fraud and exposing the fraud makes it all unlawful.

26:03

So, how is money supposed to work? How is it supposed to serve you if you owned your own property? So, we have three people, Justin, Bob and Fred. They each own their own property. Justin raises chickens. Bob harvests bananas and Fred makes picnic tables. The chickens, the bananas and the trees are their inheritance. You do not pay for your inheritance. It is free and you obtain it by promise. The promise can be enforced by law. Now, the labour of feeding and caring for chickens and the labour in climbing trees and collecting the bananas and the labour of cutting down trees and constructing picnic tables belongs to each man. So each man has complete title of his property.

Now, Justin needs a picnic table. If he just took one from Fred, that would be stealing. So, Justin says to Fred 'I will trade 4 chickens for one of your picnic tables'. That's called an Offer. Fred accepts the offer and they have a contract. They execute the contract by exchanging the property and the law is fulfilled. This process is called 'commerce', a trading of property. If you own property, you regulate commerce. If you do not own property, the property owner regulates the commerce.

Now, let's say Justin offers Fred 4 chickens for a picnic table. Fred tells Justin, he doesn't eat chicken. He hates chickens. But, Justin really needs a picnic table, so Fred agrees to accept an IOU from Justin for 4 chickens. He accepts the money. So, Fred has faith and trust and belief in Justin and thereby gives Justin credit. Credit means to believe on the testimony of another. So, Justin reciprocates by giving Fred a Bill of Credit for the credit that Fred just gave to Justin....a memory of the debt.

So, who gave the credit? The property owner. Who gave the Bill of Credit. The one who was trusted. You see everything is exactly backwards from what you believe today because you own no property. Fred gave the money, credit, which is what we use as money. Fred gave

Justin the picnic table and Fred gave Justin the money, the credit. Now, Justin gives Fred a Bill of Credit. And Fred gives Justin a Bill of Sale to prove he didn't steal it.

Now, when you do not own property, everything changes. Everything is backwards. Now, Fred and Justin are just agents dealing in someone else's property. Now the credit comes from the real owner and they exchange credits of the owner and they give a Bill of Credit with the owner's image on it and the Bill of Sale for the owner, which is really a Bill of Transfer. Why? Because ownership has not changed hands. The owner still owns it all.

All that has happened is the transfer of possession of the owner's property. So, nothing has been bought or sold. Only a charge and discharge to transfer someone else's property and once a year you have to account for all these transactions to the owner. And at the end of the year, the owner still owns everything. It's just a monopoly game. Monopoly means one owner.

Getting back to the trading if you own property. Now, based on the trade I just told you about, only part of the trade is completed. The rest is deferred. This creates an obligation for Justin to fulfill later because he issued a Bill of Credit....money. A medium is used (*need to have a record for a medium*).

This is money..... a memory or evidence of the debt. So now, Fred goes over to Bob and asks for bananas. Bob asks Fred, well what do you have to trade? Fred tells him, picnic tables. But Bob never goes on a picnic. So, Fred says well, I have an IOU from Justin for 4 chickens. Now, Bob loves chickens. So, Fred signs the back of the IOU and gives it to Bob and Fred gets his bananas.

Later, Bob goes over to see Justin and says, you know those 4 chickens you owe Fred, well I now have that promise to pay. I'm holding your promise to pay. And I would like to redeem it for the chickens. Bob gets the 4 chickens and Justin gets back the IOU, which was his obligation which is now fulfilled and destroyed. That was his debt. When he gets the IOU back, he destroys it. The credit is gone. The money vanishes.

People who cannot understand how money is created out of thin air and vanishes into thin air, but I've just given you the answer. People who cannot understand this are having Confusion of Money because of their Confusion of Property. They don't know that they don't own any property. They believe they do, but they don't.

Money in circulation does not pay debts. When money pays a debt it vanishes. The debt is gone.

Now, the question arises 'why can Justin, Bob and Fred issue money?'. The answer is because they own property. When is the last time you issued money? NEVER! Because you practiced the worst crime known to mankind called treason (*attornment*). The penalty for treason is loss of inheritance. That occurred during the attornment. In fact, if you owned property, you would keep issuing money to a minimum and you would do it only as a convenient way to do a trade. The more money you issue, the poorer you become because you will have to give up property to redeem the money and at some point in the future to fulfill the law.

I've seen a video put out called 'Money as Debt' and I've heard people say 'did you know we monetize debt and use it as money?' Yeah! Of course this comes as a huge revelation to most

people because they have purposely never been taught anything about money, except you should do everything humanly possible to get as much as you can.

33:57

Now, here's another bombshell.

If money is always a debt, and money can only be issued by one who owns property, and if you own no property, how can you ever own a debt? It's impossible. You can never own a debt.

Money is always a debt, it cannot be otherwise. Every time Justin, Bob or Fred issued money, they have lost control over some of their property. Justin, Bob and Fred become debtors and whoever has accepted the money or their promise to pay is the creditor. The one who accepted the money is the one who gave the faith, belief and trust ... the credit to the debtor. In other words, the one who accepted the money created the money. Money works exactly opposite to what people believe or know.

Now, that is how it works if you are working, providing your labour (*your property*); but if you go into a bank to obtain credit before you work to obtain something you have not yet earned, now it is exactly backwards again. Just call it living beyond your means. This is what our whole society is about. Why wait 10 years to save up enough money to buy a house or buy a car. Get it now, get it now! Let me charge you on your debt ... usury. Enjoy it now, pay for it later. You end up paying three times the amount of your property in exchange for having something before you should have lawfully had it and this is the penalty you are paying for it. So you are going to pay for it three times, by your labour because you wanted it before you could lawfully have it.

This is what makes the loss of your inheritance extremely evil. People have to do this because they have done an attornment. They have lost their inheritance to property. It's a no win situation. This is what makes this whole thing **EXTREMELY, EXTREMELY EVIL!**

36:23

So, how does money work today, as you know it? Now this is going to either make you laugh or make you cry, but either way it's pretty funny (*I think it's funny anyway*).

In its most basic sense, money is a medium which by and through we exchange something of value, some goods or services. Two entities are trading or exchanging something. And neither one is you. Now, that's funny. A confusion of being, again, because you have a confusion of being. It's a trick. Awful, all this stuff is awful. Both are fictions and you are a third party who is trespassing. We call that an agent or a trustee. Money is a temporary thing. When the exchange is done, the money is gone. It vanishes.

But, I do not own any property, so whose goods and services am I exchanging? If you are starting to grasp and understand how the trick is done and the illusion that you think is real, you will know the answer.

Our money continually circulates within society because no trade of ownership of property is ever done. Ownership never changes hands. If the money you used paid for the thing you obtained, the money would vanish. We cannot pay for anything because we own no property, except the property of your labour which you are giving away freely.

The money we use is only legal tender or an offer which must be legally accepted, thereby transferring the right in the property to another. The owner still owns it all. The owner never loses anything.

There are only two ways to own property. By inheritance and by labour. One is free, the other you work for. There is no inheritance of property ownership in any country on Earth. Going to say that again. There is no inheritance of property ownership in any country on Earth. It is not possible if you practice the Occult. What you think of as an inheritance is the right to have and hold property and not a right to own property.

Look at your country's constitution. There is no right to own property in it.

38:53

Now, your labour can be exchanged for property, that is a property exchange. But, when you exchange it voluntarily by and through a medium, buy it through a son of Canada, in person, this is not your labour, it is the labour of the son, a fictional being. A son is a member of the public. Your labour is now public. It belongs to and concerns the whole. It belongs to and concerns the 'one'. You voluntarily made it public, it is now in the public domain. Your labour has been converted into money by acting as a son who was created in the image of Canada or the Queen. The money is the proof that you acted, worked and labored in her name. Money is anything that is stamped by her authority or in the U.S., public authority. You have voluntarily transferred your labour property into public authority.

This is how your property is stolen. First you are tricked and deceived into abandoning your inheritance by becoming what you are not and believing you are. Then you are tricked into transferring your labour by and through a medium that is dead (*a fiction*), which you believe you are, and you claim to be, through your created permanent identification. That is a Confusion of Face.

Remember, a job is to transact public business dishonestly for private gain. What do you gain? Nothing. You only get to have and to hold that which is public. Even when you can see and understand this, there is something that keeps everyone captive, something that keeps you from leaving, abandoning and departing from the 'one', and that is your education, your training, your indoctrination. You know no other way. You have become dependent. You are a dependent, a child of the State, a ward of the state. You think you know a lot of things and are well-educated. In fact, you have only been trained to fulfill one function as a part of the 'one', society. You need to be part of the 'one' because you need all the other parts to survive. You need a lawyer, a doctor, an electrician, a banker, a teacher, a farmer.

Did you ever think you need money because you are incompetent? I will do the one thing I know for money and I will pay others for all the things I do not know. Money becomes for you the omnipotent power. Or do you need money because you do not own anything? So, now you just admitted you know only one thing but you are very well educated. Ninety-nine percent of

you wouldn't know how to feed, clothe or shelter yourself ... just basic necessities. Did you just get a basic education of the necessities of life? No, you are extremely well-educated. We need you to remain as a dependent because you are the human resource needed to give life to the dead. The trick cannot work otherwise. It would have no value.

You are taught that money is the medium of exchange for goods and services. No, no, no, no, no! It is, if you own property, but not when you own no property.

"For the community does not exist on the fictitious value of money but on the results of productive labour, which is what gives money its value." *Thomas Robert Malthus, Principles of Political Economy [1836]* You are the medium of exchange. Without you there is no value. Money has no value until you give it the value. Money has to pass through the medium to obtain its value. Government only take in revenue after it has been given value.

43:17

Why does government not just print up money and spend it? Because it has no value yet. It is the value that replaces the credit. The value destroys the credit. Now, you can print up money and spend it but it has to go through a different process now. So, in reality, you are paying by giving money value with your property, your labour. But, you do not get to own what you paid for.

A debt discharged is not a debt paid. Remember, when you pay the debt, the money vanishes.

So, here is an actual wording from a court case by a learned Judge and he explained the difference between a debt paid and a debt discharged. In the case of Stanley vs. White in Minnesota or whatever, the court explained the legal distinction between the words 'payment' and 'discharged'. *(It doesn't mean it is a lawful distinction; it is a legal distinction.)*

"There is a distinction between a debt discharged and a debt paid. When discharged, the debt still exists, though divested of its character as a legal obligation during the operation of the discharge. Something of the original vitality of the debt continues to exist, which may be transferred, even though the transferee takes it subject to its disability incident to the discharge. The fact that it carries something which may be a consideration for a new promise to pay so as to make an otherwise worthless promise and equal obligation makes it the subject of transferred by assignment." This is like passing a hot potato around.

45:14

So, let's look at it again, based on charge and discharge. A guy named Bob works for a whole week for a corporation named General Motors. Both are persons. At the end of the week GM says 'I don't have any money to pay you.' Why, because GM does not own anything either. Only an owner can give credit.

Will you accept this Bill of Credit from the owner? You say 'yes' because you are confident that you can use this bill to get what you want and you can exchange it for anything in the owner's kingdom. Remember, within the boundaries of the family.

Now, Bob, you gave GM your labour, which is your property and you gave GM your credit. And what did GM give you? A Bill of Credit, but the Bill of Credit comes from GM's owner. See, the 'one' owns General Motors and also owns Bob. They are all persons. You are now holding a bill from the owner. In the case of Canada, that is Her Majesty, the Queen; call it the crown, you know, the metal ring she wears on her head. Her image is on the bill.

46:31

Why do you not charge interest on an outstanding bill? So, you're holding her 'bill of credit'. So, why don't you charge interest on the outstanding bill. It's her debt. Whatever happened to usury. All of a sudden there is no usury here! Why is there no usury on her debt? After all, the bank charges you usury.... Interest, when they hold your bill, when they hold your promise to pay. Well, here's the answer. Because it is a non-interest bearing promissory note.... legally. Because the owner is the crown. It's a fiction. It is a material effigy which you serve ... it cannot give value to anything. WAKE UP!

Do you know what a crown is? This one woman in England cannot have all the debts here in Canada. She can't work off all those debts. It's impossible, yet she owns everything. NO SHE DOESN'T. When she dies, the crown isn't gone. It's the crown that owns everything. And the crown is a material effigy of something. It's a metal ring. All land is crown land. This metal ring owns everything in Canada. Not her! She assumes the crown. She is not the crown, believe me.

So, you gave property you owned and you got to hold something in return. This is called a 'chosen action'. You are only the holder in due course of a legal tender to discharge your liability. It is a constant giving of property from you and a constant taking of property, giving in return only a promise to discharge your obligation. It is not a promise to pay.

So, money is the evidence of things not seen, remember. So, Bob gave GM credit and his property. GM now gives Bob a bill for the credit. Bob now has the evidence of things not seen. He can exchange this bill for the substance he hoped for. But, GM gave Bob a bill of credit from GM's owner. The bill, which the owner owes, can be exchanged for any other bill you get from the same owner.

When you get your gas bill for \$100.00, you can exchange it for your hundred dollar bill of the credit for the gas bill and your liability is back to zero. Your debits and your credits, balancing back to zero. This is called The Bills of Exchange Act. You did not pay the gas bill. You only discharged it because you own no property. You transferred the owner's liability to the gas company. The gas company will exchange it for another liability and it continues to circulate.

You see, when you get a bill from the gas company, you're getting a bill from the Queen again. And the bill you got from General Motors to exchange that bill also came from the Queen. Everything is owned by the 'one'.

The owner owns Bob, General Motors and the gas company. This is not a payment, but a remittance. Send it back...zero; give you some credit, send some credit back, back to zero.

The owner does not buy or sell anything. He still owns everything.

Are you starting to understand the importance of owning property?

The man, named 'Bob' has not paid for anything, but he has discharged a personal liability, in person. In fact, he has also voluntarily gave his property (*his labour*) by and through his 'person'. THIS IS FRAUD, STEALING AND UNJUST ENRICHMENT. The reason it's fraud is because people don't know they are doing this. They are giving up their property voluntarily to the 'one' constantly and getting no property in return.

You do not own the legal rights to this 'person' so you have to pay a tax, a rent or a charge for using 'it'. These are called 'withholdings'. You, who thinks, acts and speaks for it, gets the disposable income that is left. What a neat way to steal from you, all because you are confused as to who you are. What's left is so little, its even called "disposable"!

How are you going to get the value out of your owner's debt? Your Queen's debt. Well, when you exchange it and she made a law called 'legal tender'. This is a legal offer you must accept. You must accept it if it is offered. Does she make, manufacture or produce anything? No. She doesn't do anything but serve you by ruling over you. I don't know if you realize that is what you did with your attornment, but you want her to rule over you. You be my "God". Does she protect you in exchange for your allegiance? No. She doesn't do anything. She give you a gun and commands you to fight. If you don't fight, she'll kill you. So, who protects and defends you? Who does the work so you can redeem her debt? You do! There is nobody here but us people!

So, in essence, when you hold money, someone is in debt. The more money you have, the harder someone else in society has to work to pay off that debt. Now, is that a nice thing to do to each other? Is that doing unto others as you would have them do unto you?

If people realized this one fact, that 1% of your society who holds 99% of your wealth would have nothing to redeem their money into. They would lose their fortune overnight. Money is a faith game and the deceivers have your faith. This is the reason for Jobs, Jobs, Jobs! You think your job is for your welfare. Not really! It is for the rich to redeem your debt. Your debt too, but they are holding most of the debt. So, someone has to do the work. You will only realize the debt you are holding if someone else in your society will accept the debt. The 1% of the people have 99% of your debt. They are holding the debt of the 99% who have 1% of the debt. You're only holding 1% of the debt. So, that is all you can exchange ... 1% among 99%. So, yes, boys and girls, the 99% of the debt that the 1% hold is your debt.

If the 99% of the people would no longer accept Her Majesty's debt (*in the U.S. the public debt*) from the 1%, Her Majesty would have to get off her butt and start working. It is Her Majesty's debt, not your debt. If you own nothing, you are a beggar who is willing to assume and undertake Her Majesty's debt for a commission and then you are told what you can and cannot do with it.

54:32

This gets even worse ... WAIT! The rich put their money out to work for them, that is usury. **They are using your debt to create for you more debt.** And this is legal. This is stealing, unjust enrichment and unlawful. This is more evil than even lending a poor man something with usury. I CANNOT SAY THIS LOUD ENOUGH! This is more evil than even lending a poor man something with usury. Usury is a penalty for being poor.

The more money they make on their money the more debt the 1% holds. And you get to work even harder. The more money there is the less its value. Your labour is being decreased in value and the rich people's money is expanding through your debt. Wake up. Wake up Justin Dimwit.

Those who control the monetary system, control the value of the natural world and your labour through the representative of it (*which is money*) the monetary system can increase the value and decrease the value of it at will. These are now called Central Banks. The harder you work the more it is turned down to keep you working or the rich would have nothing to redeem their money for.

If you have too much money you will stop working. If everyone has lots of money, nothing gets done or produced. When all this falls into place for you and you can see it, you will be transformed in the blink of an eye.

56:48

You've heard of the 'stimulus package' giving every family a thousand dollars? Why not give everyone a million dollars? If a thousand dollars is good, give everyone a million dollars. If everyone has too much money and stops working, nobody can redeem anything for anything. You see, it's not the money, it's the labour. It's the material wealth, the inheritance and the labour turning your inheritance into wealth, which is called increase, not money.

You think you want a job because you know no other way of life. You think the government wants a job for you for your welfare. They want a job for you so that they have something to redeem the debt that you are holding. Otherwise it is worthless. Bank notes are good for about 2 minutes heat in the fireplace or wiping your rear end, that's it. It's all paper money is good for.

If you think laws and insurance and all sorts of other things are passed for the public good or safety, you need your head examined. Public safety and sustainable development and it's for your own good. They are all damn lies. They are sold to you. They appear right. You believe them, but they are all designed to prevent you from getting out of your self-imposed slavery.

If you think banking was designed to protect your wealth and give you a convenience in your business, you need your head examined. First, you have no business. You have no private business. You have a franchise and an office. You own nothing. All you can do is run other people's business or here in Canada, the Queen's business. The second, banking is to keep track of her business which you run and have to account for. For everything!

What do you think an audit is? Have you ever been audited? Right down to your socks and the pizza you bought to eat. Right down to every little penny and right down to every asset. The things that you think you own is not property. Everything you think you own is only an asset. It is only an asset with you as a trustee in a fiduciary trustee relationship. You are only an equitable holder of things as a trustee. You are not the owner of anything.

You have not only abandoned your own birthright but you have destroyed your children's birthright too when you registered their birth. You sealed their fate when you applied for a Birth Certificate. But, remember, this is all fraud. There is a way out. There is a better life.

CONFUSION OF "God" Video 8

00:27

You will recall that when I first started figuring out things, I was having a hard time with words. I was finding that words mean this or that and in law it would mean something else. I also kept seeing the word "God" being used in all these legal and constitutional documents and politicians talking about "God" in their speeches.

I see that politicians are making oaths that end with 'so help me "God"'. People in court say 'I will tell the truth, so help me "God"'. Our Queen claims to rule over us by the grace of "God".

I'm thinking what does "God" have to do with the law. Law is made in the legislature or congress... the House of Commons and the House of Representatives. Laws are an act of parliament or an act of congress. I know for certain "God" doesn't live there. That's the people's house. That's not "God"'s house.

Everybody knows "God" lives in church (*or maybe "heaven"*). I was born into a Roman Catholic family and I know exactly where He lives. He lives in the tabernacle. The priest told me he lives in there. He showed it to me. So, it's about this big (*shows with hands that it is about 2' x 2'*). There's a door on the front and there is a key and I never got the key so I never got to open it. So, I don't know what "God" looks like but He's in there, so He can't be very big.

1:52

As I was having a look at the law, here are places I found "God" in the law. Yes, I found "God"! Now, because of what I know today, I can't help making some comments. I know I said I would give no opinions or what I believe to be true or anything like that, but when I see blatant hypocrisies, I have to make a comment here. So, I hope you will indulge me in that.

The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms – 1982 Part of Constitution. Whereas Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of "God" and the rule of law. So, "God" is the highest in Canada. Nothing higher. Supreme. Most high.

Canadian Bill of Rights 1960: The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of "God", the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions; Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;

Well, strange, don't you think, because I read on the Justice of Canada website that courts don't deal with moral laws or morality.

On all Canadian money coins is engraved: Dei Gratia Regina – By the grace of "God", Queen.

I heard people in court say "SO HELP YOU "God"". That is the formula at the end of a common oath as administered to a witness who testifies in chief, so I guess "God" helps the chief.

The divine right of kings or divine-right theory of kingship is a political and religious doctrine of royal and political legitimacy. It asserts that a monarch is subject to no earthly authority, deriving his right to rule directly from the will of "God". Now, I don't know why atheists obey the Queen of Canada, when she is "God"'s representative here on Earth. So, don't believe in "God", don't obey the Queen.

In the U.S., I came across this phrase, "One Nation under "God" with Liberty and Justice for all." That is right after they pledged allegiance to the flag. They didn't pledge allegiance to "God", but they said they are under "God".

I also heard one night on CNN, something about somebody or some place obeying the law of "God", and she said "We don't want to descend into a theocracy". This means we don't want to go down to where "God" is. I thought that was strange.

In the U.S. I saw "In "God" we trust" on the paper money, and engraved on numerous government buildings and on the wall in many courtrooms. It's strange to put "In "God" we trust" on money when "God" says the love of money is the root of all evil.

And, if in "God" we trust, that would make us a trustee of "God". When was the last time that an IRS agent said "'God" sent me and I'm here to examine or audit the trust?

I heard a song ("God Bless America) sung by Americans, even the American lawmakers. There's a line in there that says 'stand beside me to guide me'. Well, that's not 'under "God"', that's your buddy standing beside you, so I guess you're even with "God".

I heard an army Motto that said ""God", Country, Duty".

I saw in the U.S. Declaration of Independence that man was created by a creator and it said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident (*nobody needs to explain this to you, it is self-evident*) that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

What happened to 'property'? We'll take your property, now you can be happy. Pursuit of happiness. The first time I heard that I thought that was stupid. Why don't you just say, Life, Liberty and the right to a haircut or the right to a funeral.

Pursuit of happiness ...what does that mean? And that statement can't be exactly right either because the government-approved education curriculum does not teach these 'self-evident' truths; yet the Constitution says they are self-evident. It should say that all men evolved equally and are endowed as the most-evolved animal with certain unalienable rights. That would be correct, according to the education program.

By article 1, of amendments to the Constitution of the United States, it is provided that "Congress shall make no laws respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

In the United States, therefore, everyone is allowed to worship "God" according to the dictates of his own conscience, provided of course, that the religious organization they wish to associate with, is "licensed" to commit whatever crime it is begging for license to commit!

07:39

So, let's see what **religion** means: it means to re-bind. From ligio to bind, and re, again anew. So, to re-bind to something. In essence, it means to hold or bind or bond yourself to something new; to become something new or to move from one state to another, to be part of something but by binding to it. In other words, you have to hold onto it. When you bind to something, you become part of the thing. It is the bond that holds you in place.

Religion: Strictness of fidelity in conforming to any practice, as if it were an enjoined rule of conduct. [1913 Webster] Well, see, that could be anything ... anything could be your religion.

So, how does the word 'religion' tie in with "God"? Well, it doesn't. Your local golf club could be your religion if you are a member. Religion just means you were enjoined by a rule of conduct.

So, a religion could involve "God" or not involve "God". It all depends on what your religion is.

Now, no matter what I say, for religious people, you will still believe that religion is a belief in "God", but it's not. You could be a member of no religion and still believe or know the truth about "God". Have no religion...do it all just by yourself.

09:19

Where else did I see "God" in law or government? As you walk up the steps to the building which houses the Supreme Court, you can see at the top of the building, a row of the world's lawgivers and each is facing the one in the middle that is facing forward with a frontal view.

It is Moses and he is holding the Ten Commandments. This is not "God", it is only Moses, but pretty close....I think Moses knew "God".

As you sit in the U.S. Supreme Court there is the display of the Ten Commandments. They were originally written by "God" from what I understand.

Every session of Congress begins with a prayer to "God" by a paid preacher whose salary has been paid by taxpayers since 1777.

I saw during the 'Amanda Know' trial in Italy, if you watched that. They had a big crucifix hanging on the wall behind the bench. I know that's not "God". It is only a symbol of His son, but that's still pretty close.

I've seen a Bible in every courtroom...the word of "God".

Every session of the Supreme Court begins with these words ..."God" save the United States and this honourable court."

So, this concept of "God" is found on money, on buildings, on constitutional documents, etc. With all these references to "God", it would appear that "God" has something to do with the law or justice or courts or the government; but I cannot find a connection between religion and

"God". Not based on what religion is and not based on what law is.

11:04

Then you hear about the separation of church and state. People think that means separation of religion and state. But it doesn't say that! It can't be the separation of religion and state because the state decides what your religious freedoms are...and they're not absolute. So, it can't be from "God" because "God" is the highest and that's absolute.

The Supreme Court said that the official religion of the U.S. and Canada is Secular Humanism. If the U.S.A. or Canada got rid of their religion, what would they practice in court?...because this is religion remember what religion is the strict conformity to rules of conduct, which is law. This is what they practice in court - "legal religion".

So, what does the law say about or define "God" as? From various law books, I got this:

"God". From the Saxon "God", the source of all good; the supreme being. 1. Every man is presumed to believe in "God", and he who opposes a witness on the ground of his unbelief is bound to prove it. 3 Bouv. Inst. U. 3180 So, the law says you don't have to prove "God" exists, but he who opposes the existence must prove it. THAT IS THE LAW.

So, don't confuse law with other things, religion, science or whatever.

Blasphemy against the Almighty, by denying his being or providence, was an offence punishable at common law by fine and imprisonment, or other infamous corporal punishment.

Common law is an unwritten law so that law is still in force and effect now. It's Common Law.

"God": According to the best efforts of linguists and researchers, the root of the present word "God" is the Sanskrit word 'hu' which means to call upon, invoke, implore.

"God": Invoked one – Cite as an authority; resort to.

"God": The supernatural being conceived as the perfect and omnipotent and omniscient originator and ruler of the universe; the object of worship.

"God": The supreme being, eternal and infinite spirit, the creator and sovereign of the universe. "God" is a spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

"God": Any supernatural being worshiped as controlling some part of the world or some aspect of life or who is the personification of a force.

So, based on all of the above I'm getting a clearer concept of "God". What is "God"? It is a Supreme Being!!! That is it.

But, to be a "God", you must be a creator, a lawmaker, a Judge, a sovereign. So, in other words, a "God" must create something, make some rules for the thing he created and use those rules to govern the thing he created. That is basically what a "God" is. *(So that would be his resume.)*

14:57

So, with all this in mind now, what can we say "God" is? There are many words for supreme beings. It all depends on what we are referring to as its supreme being. A supreme being can be a master, a king, a chief, president, emperor, monarch, father, chairman, mayor, premier, judge, creator, lord, maker, head, crown, "God". They are all supreme beings of something.

We call the mayor of a city, your worship.

We call a justice of the peace, your worship.

We call judges, your honour or my lord.

We call the man who wrote our constitution our founding father.

On and on it goes. These are all supreme beings of something.

I also learned that law comes from a Sovereign, a "God" power. That would now make sense. So, what is a sovereign? Again from the law books ...

SOVEREIGN, n. *suv'eran*. 1. A supreme lord or ruler; one who possesses the highest authority without control.

SOVEREIGN. A chief ruler with supreme power; one possessing sovereignty.

2. In the United States the sovereignty resides in the body of the people. Vide Rutherf. Inst. 282. In Canada Sovereignty is in the Queen.

SOURCES OF THE LAW. By this expression is understood the authority from which the laws derive their force.

In the U.S. and Canada the power of making all laws is in the people or – their representatives, and none can have any force whatever, which is derived from any other source. There is no other source of law in these countries. So, "God" is not in the country. He's above it, below it, wherever, but He has been replaced.

Now, it's becoming clearer. Now I understand separation of church and state. The "God" of the U.S. and the "God" of Canada, stated in documents, cannot be the "God" religious people think of as "God". It's not possible. Because The Law of the land says "God" cannot be the source of any laws!

Under religious freedom rights, man decides if you can obey the Law of "God". WHAT ??? You decide if someone else can obey the Law of "God". Well, that puts you higher than "God", doesn't it?

Wow, that doesn't only make you a "God", but that puts you higher than "God". What a revelation. So, what's my conclusion: In our legal system "God" can only be man himself acting as "God". THERE IS NOBODY HERE ON EARTH BUT US PEOPLE!

17:41

Now, let's see if anybody who studies "God" and law, agrees with me .

The "God"less Constitution was written by two professors of government and history at Cornell University. Isaac Kramnick and R. Laurence Moore have spent their careers studying religion in American life. Some quotes from their book:

The preamble of the Constitution invokes the people of the United States. It does not invoke any sort of "God".

The Constitution forbids any religious test to hold office. A "God"less person is just as eligible as a "God"ly one! (*Article 6, Paragraph 3*) (*Now, I'm not sure these guys understand the difference between religion and "God".*)

The original motto of the United States was secular. "E Pluribus Unum" is Latin for "One from many" or "One from many parts" or "Out of many we are One". Of course, my little bit of religious training, I learned the opposite. It was 'out of one, we are many'. So, everything is just backwards, upside down, exactly opposite.

These guys also had this letter and this was interesting. It was written by John Adams to Thomas Jefferson. He wrote:

"The United States of America have exhibited, perhaps, the first example of governments erected on the simple principles of nature; and if men are now sufficiently enlightened to disabuse themselves of artifice, imposture, hypocrisy, and superstition, they will consider this event as an era in their history. Although the detail of the formation of the American governments is at present little known or regarded either in Europe or in America, it may hereafter become an object of curiosity. It will never be pretended that any persons employed in that service had interviews with the Gods, or were in any degree under the influence of Heaven, more than those at work upon ships or houses, or laboring in merchandise or agriculture; it will forever be acknowledged that these governments were contrived merely by the use of reason and the senses." (*I thought you said 'in "God" we trust and 'one nation under "God".'*)

"...Thirteen governments [of the original states] thus founded on the natural authority of the people alone, without a pretense of miracle or mystery, and which are destined to spread over the northern part of that whole quarter of the globe, are a great point gained in favor of the rights of mankind." (*What happened to being founded upon the supremacy of "God"?*)

20:55

Let's look now at what Canadian law professors from the University law schools say about the supremacy of "God". These are all quotes. There are so many of them in these articles, I couldn't put them all here. These are all quotes from Chief Justices of the Supreme Court, Federal Courts, Provincial Courts, Courts of Appeal, Constitutional Law Scholars, Law Professors, Politicians, scholars in Constitutional Law. There is no source of thinking or source of thinking on this topic that is any higher.

In this one article called "The Embarrassing Preamble? Understanding the "Supremacy of "God"". Now, I'm going to read this as if there is a "God". Why? Because the Constitution says there is. Do I know if there is a "God"? It doesn't matter what I think. The Constitution says there is, and that's the LAW.

It starts out by saying that at the outset of Canada's most venerated human rights document, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is a short but profound Declaration. Canada is founded upon principles that recognize the supremacy of "God" and the rule of law. This reference to the supremacy of "God" and the rule of law appears in the Preamble....the part of the Constitution that the Supreme Court of Canada has called the "grand entrance hall to the castle of the Constitution" wherein the political theory, which the Act embodies is found.

Accordingly, the rule of law has played a rather remarkable role over the jurisprudence of the Courts, most noticeably, the Supreme Court. It has been called a fundamental postulate of our constitutional structure, a notion that comprises indispensable elements of civilized life in a principle with profound constitutional and political significance.

In stark contrast, the "supremacy of "God"" has suffered a much different fate, as recently noted by Professor Lord Saussen. The reference to the 'supremacy of "God"' in the preamble, hereinafter referred to as 'the supremacy of "God" clause' has been almost entirely ignored by the Supreme Court of Canada. Further, the few times it has received attention from the courts and academics it has been consistently marginalized.

From Professor Peter Hogg (*he's a constitutional law expert*) on the 'supremacy of "God" clause': "provides little assistance in understanding the Constitution".

From Professor Dale Gibson, "its value [is to be]... seriously doubted".

And to others it is a 'contradiction', a dead letter stemming from "inglorious origins".

And to Justice Bertha Wilson, the clause is possibly "in conflict with values of a free and democratic society."

So, saying that "God" is supreme is embarrassing, marginalized, should be ignored. It's in conflict with the rule of law, and in conflict with the values of a free and democratic society!

Peter W. Hogg said "it's difficult to see what aid can be derived from it". No aid to us.

David M. Brown says ""God" and democracy stand opposed to each other". He's saying "God" opposes democracy or democracy opposes "God". They're opposites. He goes on to say "because they were embarrassed about the implications of its proper interpretation (*talking about the supremacy of "God" clause*). If somebody actually took the proper interpretation of this, the implications would be embarrassing. It goes on "an embarrassment to be ignored", ought to be removed.

The supremacy of "God" clause has received the silent treatment both from academics and courts – in particular, the Supreme Court of Canada.

The supremacy of "God" clause has been moved to the sidelines of constitutional adjudication, essentially holding that it was of no legal import as either an independent source of law or an

interpretive aid. No use, not even as a guidance.

It goes on to say "that it conflicted with the values of a "free and democratic society".³² Add this judicial commentary to the views of prominent scholars such as Peter Hogg and Dale Gibson (*who, as already noted, have questioned the value of the supremacy of "God" clause*) and you have a recipe for irrelevance.

So, this very first clause in the Constitution is irrelevant. Why put it there? This doesn't make any sense, does it.

I (*Madam Justice Southin*) ask rhetorically this question: If the preamble creates, because of the words "the rule of law", a constitutional foundation for striking a statue down, do the words "supremacy of "God"" which precede these words, also create such a foundation and how are we to define and apply it? The reason for the 'rhetorical' nature of Madam Southin's question would appear to be the notion, **that the supremacy of "God" could never strike down legislation.** "God" can never strike down what you want to do. Impossible!

References to religion in American law and politics; what the United States Supreme Court has called "ceremonial deism". That's what your religion is. That is what the Supreme Court calls it. A nice little ceremony, but not really important at all.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor found that the reference to "God" in the U.S. Pledge of Allegiance did not violate the Establishment Clause of the U.S. Constitution (*which prevents the State from advocating or establishing any religion*) because the reference constituted a form of ceremonial deism that had, over time, lost all religious significance. Many commentators believe that such judicial treatment has rendered references to ""God"" in law and politics meaningless and irrelevant. She's telling you that your religion means nothing. How do you Evangelical Christians feel about that. Nothing to do with the law. It's not only meaningless (*meaningless means nothing*). If it meant nothing that would be something. But, it means less than nothing.

Furthermore, at the level of Canada's highest court, when the supremacy of "God" clause is not being denigrated, "God", in this context, is simply out of place. These are all quotes from Courts and other places. I told you "God" doesn't live in Canada.

Thus in the courts and scholarly halls and the news media, the prevailing opinion is that the supremacy of "God" clause is of trifling importance. "God" couldn't even make it into Trivial Pursuit.

The Court invoked the foundational constitutional principle of the "rule of law" to prevent the "chaos" that would result if all of the laws were immediately ruled invalid. If the preambles to Canada's constitutional texts have such remarkable significance when the rule of law is at issue, at least some significance cannot, without further justification, be denied when the supremacy of "God" is being construed.

Justice Addy stated that "the common law has always recognized the supremacy of "God" ..."
65 What exactly did Justice Addy mean by this? To what history was he referring? Surely there is some story underlying the supremacy of "God" clause that remains untold. That's right. I think I might tell it.

Chief Justice Laymar wrote "In other words, the constitutional Preamble – including the reference to the supremacy of "God" – is not a source of positive law. Rather, it elucidates other sources of the constitutional provisions and rights." What could these 'other' sources of constitutional law be?

"The most important rights held by individuals are derived not from Parliament, or any other lawmaking branches of the state, but rather from other 'higher', or 'supreme', sources. This terrible story tells us that there must be some higher law, some set of rights that no government, no human authority can take away." 76 So, if there is a higher law, it's a terrible story!

"That a proper understanding of the supremacy of "God" clause is no more denominational (*or even religious*) than modern human rights doctrine itself. 124 There now you have Canada's Supreme Court saying the same.

What they are telling you is that your religion has nothing to do with "God". Why? Because your religion is a 'person'. Your religion is a creature of the State, it is not a creation of "God". You believe it is, but not as a matter of law. It is only a matter of belief, nothing to do with the law, or with the truth. Sorry!

30:27

Here in Canada when those clauses were put in there, it says: "Given this assumption about Trudeau's politics, Egerton resolved the puzzle by concluding that the inclusion of the supremacy of "God" clause was not principled, but rather a "political calculation" by Trudeau to garner support for the Charter." 134

The House of Commons on February 17, 1981 on his amendment to add a reference to the "supremacy of "God"" in the Charter, Epp stated: What does this charter do? Where does it start from? This charter starts from the premise that the government will grant us rights. That is where the charter starts and that is where the charter is wrong. My rights, our rights in this House, the rights of Canadians, are not granted by any government. It is for that reason that we moved an amendment, not only because the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker, the then leader of this party and the prime minister of this country, had entrenched in the Canadian Bill of Rights, but because the philosophy underlying the charter was right. What it did was to say that every human being created in the image of "God" has certain inalienable rights. 146

Now, after I read that, I don't know who this Jake Epp is so I go to the internet 'who is Jake Epp. Now, we know that 90% of all members of parliament are lawyers. I said, this guy can't be a lawyer. This guy who proposed this amendment and wanted it in there, couldn't be a lawyer. So, I looked him up. He's not a lawyer. He was born into a Mennonite family and he was a high school teacher. Then he went into politics. No lawyer would ever want to put that in. They're trying to get rid of it now. It ought to be removed. We're embarrassed.

Now, here's a couple statements just on law in general written by Cicero.

Thus Cicero wrote in De Re Publica: There will be but one law, eternal and unchangeable, binding at all times upon all peoples; and there will be, as it were, one common master and ruler of men, namely "God", who is the author of this law, its interpreter, and its sponsor. 87

If the rights in the Charter purport to represent, in general, universal and inalienable rights derived from greater sources beyond the state, then the state cannot completely abrogate or take those rights away, no matter how pressing or substantial the state objective is. Put most simply, what the state did not bestow, it may never fully take away.

33:10

So, to sum this up, based on the highest authorities:

"God" as supreme in our countries is embarrassing, has inglorious origins.

"God" in our constitution is a contradiction.

"God" as the most high is in conflict with values of a "free and democratic society".

Our democracy and "God" stand opposed to each other.

The implications of "God" and its proper interpretation would be embarrassing. "God" is an embarrassment to be ignored.

THESE ARE STATEMENTS FROM COURTS, LAW SCHOLARS AND CONSTITUTIONAL EXPERTS.

"God" ought to be removed.

"God" as Supreme has received the silent treatment both from academics and courts – in particular, the Supreme Court of Canada.

We should relegate the supremacy of "God" clause to the sidelines of constitutional adjudication.

"God" is of no legal import as either an independent source of law or as an interpretive aid.

"God" could never strike down legislation.

References to ""God"" in law and politics are meaningless and irrelevant.

"God" is being denigrated by Canada's highest court.

"God" is of trifling importance.

WOW! Why is it in the Constitution then? To satisfy this one member of parliament? No. It's always been in there. Not only in it, but the first sentence. Why is "God" in the constitution of almost all countries? If it's not in the written constitution, it's in the verbal constitution.

It's very clear that "God" is irrelevant. No need for it, or is there. Now, I'm just a simple man, but I can tell you that if the preamble said "Canada was founded upon the principle that recognizes the Supremacy of Man and the Rule of Law", there would be no embarrassment, no conflicts, no one would oppose it, it wouldn't be marginalized, it wouldn't be ignored, it wouldn't be irrelevant and it wouldn't be getting these comments from law experts and courts any more.

That statement would make perfect sense in its meaning and application used by the courts. Ask any lawyer if any court will take judicial notice of the laws of "God", like thou shalt not kill or thou shalt not steal. The answer will be 'no'.

The next time you claim 'freedom of religion' or 'free religious exercise', remember it's only to practice ceremonial deism based on your religion, not law. A court cannot rule on any law of "God". Only the law within its jurisdiction. It has nothing to do with "God".

33:51

I think by the time you go through all these 'Unravelling' programs, all religious people are going to be a little upset, maybe angry, but you will feel deceived, tricked and fooled. But don't get mad at your pastors, priests or ministers. They don't know this either, I don't think. They are the same as you, we have to go to something much higher than this to find out who is behind all this.

Now, if you think these contradictions cannot be explained just here in Canada, I only used Canada as an example. This deliberate deception is world wide and has a very good reason. You guessed it. To pull off the Greatest Swindle ever. You own nothing.

Its whole purpose is to steal. It's all its about, not about money. It's about stealing property. Some of you will still not believe it, but who cares what you believe. Only the ones who care what you believe are those who want to deceive you or take advantage of you. And you are letting it happen.

36:53

I'm now at the point in my quest where I'm starting to believe what the experts in law are saying....that the word of "God" is the highest final authority on law, but courts can only deal in the Law of Canada, not the law of "God". But, why then, is there a Bible in every courtroom? Nobody uses that law. Nobody opens it up to quote it as an authority. They have their own books of authority....this Act, that Act and so on. But, they swear on the Bible.

So, I did some more research. It's always best to go back in history to the source of things to find things. I was raised Catholic and I find out that Catholics killed MILLIONS of people if they had the Bible or tried to read it. Yeah, millions...called The Inquisition. Not only killed them, but killed them in the cruelest way possible. Why would anyone kill someone over a book?

So, using my brain again, I'm thinking what's the big deal? It's just a book. "God" is supposed to be good and holy and loves us...makes you wonder. Then I learned that the Roman Catholic Church declared it a sin as late as 1962 to read the Bible. WOW!

Then I had a look at the Queen of Canada and her coronation. I got every word that was said during her coronation. "God" is invoked all through it. Must be, because she claims she has a right from "God". Maybe He sent her a note or something....an apparition, I don't know.

At the end she is given the Bible which is just called 'The Book' and is told "This is the most valuable thing the world affords." Well, Wow again. She has one-third of the whole world. She has control of one-third of the whole world, or a quarter or whatever she has now, and this book she was given is the most valuable thing this world affords. More than all the big yachts, countries and skyscrapers, gold mines, whatever. This is the most valuable thing this world affords. She was given it.

So, using my brain again, I got me the book. They are all over the place now, but nobody ever reads it. I wonder why. I read what is called the Ten Commandments. A lot of people have heard of that. Now, being a Roman Catholic, I sort of knew them (*not really*) but there was one I

never heard of and it was number two. So, I go on the internet and look up the Catholic Ten Commandments. Sure enough, number two is not there. It's in the book but it's not in the Catholic Ten Commandments. So, it says what they did was deleted the second commandment. They took the tenth commandment and divided it into two to make it nine and ten, so "hey look, we have Ten Commandments".

So, using my brain again...could this be a typing error or why was it deleted. I mean, one-third of the world is Catholic or something.

40:14

So, putting this altogether, I have millions of people being killed in the worst way possible, being told for centuries that it is a sin to read it. It is the most valuable thing that the Queen has. And the second commandment is deleted on purpose. So, this second commandment must be really important. Maybe I should find out what it's all about.

Remember, I'm on a quest. I'm not sure where I'm headed. All I do is take what is true and put it in one column and what is belief or opinion and put it in another column. I stopped listening to everyone and started thinking for myself. This is the point where the real blessing in disguise began for me.

Do you remember, in the introduction video I told you that much has been done so that you will not find the answer and I said that if you do find it, much has been done to make sure you will reject it. Well, we're at that point.

Remember when I said 'what does "God" have to do with the law'? I'm over 50 years old. I never read it. Only knew one guy who read it and he was a peculiar man. So, for sure, someone does not want you to know what is in this book. They used to kill you for that.

Then it's translated into Latin and the priest will tell you what is in it. Then the book finally gets printed and distributed. Something has happened that assures nobody even wants to read it. And then something happened that even if you do read it, you won't understand it, evidenced by five hundred different religions reading the same story in the same book. It's like I read a story and I read it to 450 people. Then I say to them, would you please tell me about the story and they all tell me something different. What's going on there. Something strange is going on there.

42:18

So, using my brain again, I read the book. As I'm reading through the book, I start seeing things that are completely contrary to what I believed was in there from my limited religious experience. Then I started finding things that are contrary to our laws and legal system. So, I read the whole book, start to finish, twice. Many of things I thought were stupid or wrong in our legal system, the Bible agreed with me. I actually got some confirmation from a guy who claims to know everything. WOW! I finally found someone who agrees with me, but most importantly He confirmed for me the truth of what I was finding and thinking. It turns out I'm not nuts after all.

As I started carefully analyzing the law, I realized that our whole system of jurisprudence is a complete counterfeit from top to bottom. It also took me some time to understand the effects of this, and believe me, they are not good.

This whole thing about 'oh, you're supposed to obey the law of the country or the state unless it conflicts with the Law of "God"'bullshit. It's a lie. It's what our law says, it's not what His law says.

So, when you stop believing everything you think you know and look at all the proof and evidence lying around, your education will begin. Is it possible that the book is the real constitution and any law that is unconstitutional has no force or effect. Something to think about.

Go back and learn what religion is. Even if the Supreme Court declared that "God" cannot have anything to do with religion. Your religion is a creature of the State....a person. Otherwise, your right to freedom of religion or free religious exercise would trump the rule of law. WAKE UP. You've been deceived.

Then, I thought to myself, it's just a book! Then I thought to myself, what has been done to me subliminally that I would never read it, and nobody does. You're probably having the same reaction. Today, if you quote "God" as an authority on anything, it is contrary to public policy because it stands opposed to a free and democratic society. It is called 'hate speech'. Many people claim to quote something about "God" and the reporters attack them on religious terms. Say, it's not my opinion....take it up with "God". It has nothing to do with me.

44:51

Then when I actually found out that it is **this book** that is used to swindle us, WOW, what a discovery. If you think the swindler is a genius, he is not. He only read about it and he has put it into action. Where did he read about it....in the written constitution....the book. The swindler, the fraudster, the deceiver uses this authority to swindle you because there is NONE HIGHER, and you too can use it and the authority in here to reclaim your birthright. The deceiver uses the law to keep you ensnared in captivity. No man is born enslaved or ensnared more than a man who thinks he is free.

Remember, your Birthright is your greatest possession, the knowledge to reclaiming it is in the Book.

45:44

Now, let me tell you about life. You won't believe this. The life protected in your constitution is not your life. Your state cannot give you life. You gave the state life. Your right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, or here in Canada, security of the person...your right to life is not life (*it's a kind of life but it's not a living life*).

Let me read this to you. This comes from Black's Law Dictionary. The word 'life'....it says, "that state of animals, humans and plants or of an organized being in which natural functions and motions are performed or in which organs are capable of performing their functions". That's

life, that's real life. "Human life begins at conception (*really??*) but the stage of pregnancy of a woman determines the conditions under which she may be entitled to an abortion free of state interference". Roe vs. Wade

Then it says "Life", protected by the Federal Constitution includes all personal rights and their enjoyment of the faculties acquiring useful knowledge, the right to marry, establish a home and bringing up children, freedom of worship it all sounds good, right? The life that is protected is the state-created life...life that came from the State, not your real life.

I'll show you. Turn to 'natural life' in Black's Law Dictionary. Natural Life...the period of a person's existence considered as continuing until terminated by physical dissolution or death occurring in the course of nature. (*That's life. USED.*)

That life is used in contradistinction to that juristic and artificial conception of life as an aggregate of legal rights or the possession of a legal personality which could be terminated by civil death that is the extinction of personality which resulted from being attainted of treason or felony." (*This is the life your constitution protects. You are giving your life to something that is not life.*) "It is a juristic and artificial conception of life as an aggregate of legal rights or the possession of legal personality." That is the only life your State, your Country can guarantee you the right to life, not your real life.

So, people opposed to abortions. I hope you heard that carefully. People on death row should listen to this also. What is your conviction? What are you going to do about it?

The conception of life that you anti-abortionists are trying to protect is not the conception of life your Supreme Court is ruling on. It is not possible. It is not within their jurisdiction. You have been deceived. You are confused.

Your whole legal system is a forgery and counterfeit from top to bottom your being, your voice, your face, your life, your money....everything counterfeit, top to bottom. It is all fraud! But, you're the fraudster. You have been deceived into committing the fraud. Nobody forced it on you. You were deceived by the masters of confusion. They run our societies.

Remember, there is a subtlety to all this. It's hard to grasp.

49:43

Now, I am going to end the 'Confusion' videos with these statements. Just a couple statements here.

You live in the Constitution of all that there is. (*Marcus holds out hands and looks around, indicating that all around us is the Constitution and saying "this is the constitution"*). This book (*the Bible*) is not the Constitution, what you live in is the Constitution. This Book, merely called 'The Book' is the written constitution of all that there is. There is no more creation. That's it. It's finished.

Man is a constituent member of the Constitution, not by choice or by free will, but by conception of life. There is nothing you can do about it, you are a constituent member....except you may be deceived.

You have no hope of understanding the Constitution until you can grasp the conception of life and death. Life is a mystery and I can't explain it. But, the conception of life and death is something that is within your grasp.

Life can never die. It is impossible. Why? Because it exists. Life is life.

Life can only leave or depart from a thing that holds life. Then the thing is dead. The thing has no life left in it.

The Constitution that you believe you are a member of has no life, it is dead.

The constituent members are persons, and the human person is as airy as the fairy ones. It is just make believe, a conception you hold.

It is your thinking, your speaking, and your acting that appears to give life to the dead, and you do not even know you are doing it.

That is the end of the 'Confusion' programs. I hope you will join me in the 'Unraveling' programs. It could change your life.

Unraveled – Next Series

Hi.....My name is Marcus,

We are all born undeniably and incontrovertibly into a government. We are taught and seduced to hate our government, become anti-government and join a self-governing society like Canada or the United States. We are all enticed and suborned into making this choice, but it has an unspeakable hidden cost and price.

I have thoroughly re-examined this fraudulent offer, and have determined that the price is too high. You should re-examine it too.

I will take you methodically, step by step through the FRAUD, the what, where, and how you were deceived into voluntarily alienating your property. I show you how you continue to alienate your property on an ongoing basis through money.

You will learn and be able to see how everything is exactly backwards, opposite and upside down from reality, because you have been leading unawares, a fraudulently forged life.

I will confirm for you the unapproved truth of every aspect of the life you have been leading, and you will be surprised. Using the two concepts that led to my discoveries, I will also confirm for you what millions of people claim to know but fail to see.

Blind fools. Means "tricked by sight".

And of course, I give you the Why? Why you do not know. Why it is hard to see. Why it is done. Why you are letting it happen.

The Unraveled Presentation begins with the word **"The"**, the most important word in the LAW.

From there the Unraveling begins and ends with the solution !

*Till then.....**My name is Marcus***