

OUTLAWS LEGAL SERVICE
Why Some People Need A Driver's License

A Lecture by George Gordon

Note: Who is George Gordon? www.georgegordon.org/WHOIS.HTM
Learn more about George Gordon by visiting his website:
www.georgegordon.org

Let me start off and explain to you why some people need a driver's license. There was a time when we didn't need one. When you didn't have one, and you were able to enjoy just driving along in your old car, your 1910 Peerless or your 1910 Model - T Ford.

You didn't have or even need a driver's license. You were driving as a matter of right, exercising your Liberty under the Constitution to go from point A to point B.

Then somebody came along and said, Gosh, wouldn't it be interesting or nifty or nice to. . .? I call this the insurance scam.

Somebody went to this insurance company . . . let's say he was a salesman for the insurance company. He goes in . . . naturally all corporate business is interested in making money . . . he says, "Wouldn't it be nice to increase profits and cut costs?"

"Let me make a suggestion. I'll tell you what we need. We need to insure all of these new horseless carriages. If we could insure all of these horseless carriages, boy there would be a huge market there. I predict that we're going to move from horses and wagons to automobiles."

And so the man goes out and he starts selling policies on horseless carriages and automobiles. But, the more of these horseless carriages and automobiles that pack the roads, then the more accidents, and more claims, right?

So somewhere around, let's say, 1910 . . . let's start out with them selling insurance policies in 1900 to people that have horseless carriages.

By 1910 you go into the board room of the insurance company, and what do you see? Somebody is in there saying, "How can we increase profits and cut costs?"

"You know?" answers someone else. "I noticed the biggest claims problems that we have are these automobiles that come to intersections and one of

them doesn't stop or doesn't see the other one and he goes into the intersection, and bang!, there's a crash in the intersection. I think what we need is the stop sign law."

"If we had a law that put stop signs at these intersections, I think that we could cut down on those accidents and that would cut down on the claims and losses at the insurance claims window, and that would cut our costs and increase our profits."

"Well, how are we going to effect that?" someone else asked.

"Oh, I know what we'll do. We'll go up to the legislature and we'll lobby these legislators up here and we'll show them a bunch of real pictures of death and carnage. We'll show them pictures of arms that are cut off by people that went through the windshield in these accidents. And we'll lobby and we'll tell them that for the health, safety and welfare of the people, under the police powers, we need these stop signs."

Pretty soon we've got stop sign laws.

Now, that cuts down on accidents there. But, what else do you need?

Well, about 1920, let's say, somebody comes in and they say, "How can we increase profits and cut costs?"

So the insurance industry says, "Gosh, that's interesting. Let's see. What's the biggest single thing that costs us money?"

"Well, these automobiles drive awful fast. So we need some traffic regulation. We've got to have a line down the middle of the road, and we've got to have speed limits, and we've got to have signs that show us curves, and we're going to call these 'traffic regulations.'?"

"Oh, how do we get those passed?"

"Well, we'll go to the legislature and we'll show them a lot of pictures of death and destruction and carnage on the highway. And we'll do it in the name of the people to protect the people's health, safety and welfare under the police powers. Oh, and we're doing it with the noblest of intentions."

So now you go up to the legislature this is the insurance industry they show them the pictures and they have the public hearings and go through all the processes and pass these laws called regulations.

Nobody objects too much to that and so pretty soon, somebody comes along and says, "How can we increase profits and cut costs?"

"Well, we noticed that people between the ages of fifteen and twenty-five have the most accidents. Some of the highest rates of claims. So what we need is a system where we can keep records on these driver's. What we'll do is we'll propose a licensing law. And we'll claim that people that aren't licensed are a menace on the road, and that what we need is the licensing to establish qualifications for competency."

Who's going to argue about that? You don't want incompetent driver's out there on the road, do you? So, we passed the licensing law at some point in time and then we start to keep records.

What we'll do to get people to go down and get these licenses is, we'll lower insurance rates to licensed driver's and raise insurance rates to unlicensed driver's.

Well, ten years goes by and we come up to 1930, let's say, or something like that, and now we've got this uniform licensing law border to border, coast to coast. Now what we need to do is we've got to have stricter enforcement of the traffic regulations. So what we need to do is codify these, and call them misdemeanors, and we've got to dish out some punishment for these traffic offenders who are killing people by speeding and drunk driving and doing these violations of law. So we'll codify those.

Here again is your insurance industry going in to the legislature and they go through the hearings. They never do this in the name of profit to protect the claims window of the insurance industry they always do this in the name of health, safety and welfare of the people under the police powers.

"We're doing this to protect you, Mr. John Q. Public, from those drunk drivers out there. Those wicked evil terrible awful people."

So, somebody in the insurance industry asks, "How do we increase profits and cut costs?"

"The next step is, now that we've got everybody licensed, what we need next is a mandatory insurance law. The reason we need a mandatory insurance law is that there are these irresponsible people out there, and they drive their cars, and they run into people, and then they don't have any insurance, and they can't pay the medical bills, and they can't pay the hospital, and they can't pay for the damages they cause, so what we need is a universal insurance program. So what we're going to do is pass a law, and we'll put this in the traffic code."

Now let's take it a step further, you know, say about 1950 or 1960 somebody says, "Well, how do we increase profits and cut costs?"

"What we need to do is educate our youth. We need to take traffic safety into the public schools and have a driver's education program. We've got to get to these young people and teach them how to get a driver's license, how to register their car, how to get insurance. In other words, we've got to train these young people to be slaves when they are age fourteen."

And so you license the kid when he's fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen. You make the requirement to graduate from high school that they have this driver education, this driver training.

He gets out of school, you've never taught him anything about the Constitution. You never taught him any thing about rights versus privilege. So what we've got now is the perfect slave.

He's created and designed by his government to be a perfect tax-payer.

Now, if he violates or breaks any rules or regulations, what happens?

Oh, you take him into the traffic court and they fine him under a penal statute . . . under a contractual penalty for violating the terms and conditions of the contract.

Now, on our streets and highways today, we have a virtual police-state tyranny. That's a fact.

The police stop you. They can search your car. They don't need any Fourth Amendment warrant whatsoever. They can arrest you and throw you in jail for drunk driving and then you can worry about how you're going to prove that you weren't drunk, whether you are or not . . . and listen, I can categorize and tell you some of the most tear-jerking horror stories about people who've been entrapped, and charged with felonies, and thrown in the penitentiary.

Now, did they hurt anybody?

No. Nobody was damaged. Nobody was hurt?

But here they are in prison for drunk driving, maybe the second or third time, and the guy has never had an accident. And, I'm going to talk to you about that in a moment, and show you how that works.

The traffic court's sole function and purpose is to protect the profitability of the insurance industry. It isn't there for any other purpose.

Now the professed goals are always altruistic and magnanimous, and of course, we don't want people killed on the roads. And so we've got this big kick now that we're going to put all these drunk drivers in prison and I've got to lay this story on you, because when it comes to logic, reason and common sense, sometimes what I hear up here in my legislature just befuddles me.

Here are some statistics I heard up here in the legislature. I went up there, and here in Idaho, they're going to pass this strict drunk-driving law.

The second time you're caught drunk driving . . . I mean, you don't have to kill anybody, get in an accident or anything . . . just go get a few drinks in you and drive down the road, the policeman stops you, gives you a ticket, you plead guilty, pay a \$300 fine, come back . . . Let it happen again and they're going to charge you with a felony. That's what they are proposing.

Here's what some of the testimony was about. This one lady get up and she says, "Now listen, there were 52,000 killed last year, and 26,000 or those deaths were alcohol related. We've just got to do something about these drunk drivers because I'm telling you they are just killing people, there's just carnage on the road, and we've just got to do something about these lethal weapons called automobiles driving down the roads with these drunks in them and these alcoholics, and these mean, wicked and terrible people."

So I listened to all that. I listened to eighteen people testify in two hours and a half, and every one of those people had a financial interest in alcoholism. There were non-profit corporations that did alcohol and drug evaluations. There was the Attorney General, who is part of the law enforcement growth industry he has about fifty prosecutors who prosecute drunk drivers. Then there's the prison out here. They've got to warehouse these criminals and they've got beds to fill so that they've got guards to employ to guard those people out there. There's the insurance industry, of course. And the medical industry is interested in these drunk drivers also. They make money off of alcohol evaluation. Then there are these alcohol clinics where you go in and dry out. Not one drunk came in to testify. Not one!

I am sitting there just watching all this, and I think to myself, 26,000. I sat there for a little bit, and my mind works differently from bureaucrats. It works differently from politicians. And I'm sitting there and I'm saying, "Let me see if I understand this. For some reason we've got to pass legislation and call drunkenness a felony?"

Now, we're going to lock this guy up in prison for five years, that's right. A felony is five years in jail.

Do you know what it costs to put a man in prison for five years? In Idaho?

\$15,000 a year. Let's see how much that is . . . fifteen, thirty, forty-five, sixty, seventy five thousand dollars.

My God! Do you understand how much money that is?

You've got this drunk out here and some of these people are testifying that alcoholism is an illness, it's a disease. And we're going to put these sick people out here in the penitentiary for five years, for seventy-five thousand dollars.

I'm saying, wait a minute. I could send that guy to Harvard twice for that kind of money and turn him into a medical doctor . . . or a lawyer, or something, for that kind of money.

Look, if I've got a guy driving down the road drunk and I wanted to get him off the road, why don't . . . instead of paying seventy-five thousand to lock him in prison, why don't we give him fifty thousand dollars and tell him to go to Brazil? We'd save twenty-five thousand and we'd get rid of the guy! We'd make money, and he'd be happier down there. He'd have fifty thousand to blow. He could practically retire.

OK. We've got to have law and order, and we've got to get these drunks off the roads; so we've got twenty-six thousand of them alcohol related.

I sitting there, and I'm thinking; my father was killed in a head-on traffic crash in 1970. I'll tell you, I was really upset about that.

This fellow crossed the center line of the road, about four thirty in the afternoon, in broad daylight, trying to pass a truck, and he didn't have enough clearance, and he ran right into my father and he killed him. My father went right through the windshield and broke his neck and it killed him. And I'll tell you what really galls me, the guy was stone sober! Didn't even drink!

It didn't help my dad any. It killed him.

So why do I . . . I'm sitting in this meeting and I'm listening to this diatribe, and I'm saying to myself, "Wait a minute. What is it? Twenty-six thousand were alcohol related. Well then twenty-six thousand were not alcohol related, are they?"

"Why don't we fund a study for the twenty-six thousand that are non-alcohol related and find out how many of the twenty-six thousand drivers that were

not drunk had blond hair and blue eyes. And find out if there is a correlation between blond hair and blue eyes and traffic accidents and death on the highway?"

It makes about that much sense to me.

The one thing that was totally absent in all the testimony was, how many of those deaths that were alcohol related were caused by the drunk?

You know, there was a famous Supreme Court case came down in New Mexico about ten years ago. This farmer was driving down the road in his old pick-up, just bombed out of his mind. He was so drunk that he couldn't walk. That's probably why he was driving.

He had a bottle of whiskey about two-thirds empty in the truck bed tool box, and he's driving down the road and there's an accident, a head-on crash.

A doctor, his wife and his two children, from Houston, Texas, who were going on holiday to Los Angeles were killed.

The farmer survived.

That's the way it usually happens. The drunk survives and this wonderful family, this man and his wife and his two children were killed.

The problem here was that the doctor fell asleep, crossed the center line, and hit the farmer head-on.

Now let me ask you: Is that wreck, and are those deaths, alcohol related?

Oh yeah. You bet.

The farmer's drunk.

But is the farmer the cause of the accident, or is the farmer (who was drunk) the victim?

What none of these people tell you is, who has ever funded a study to find out whether or not drunkenness is the cause of the accidents that cost these lives.

They'll cite you a few cases where the guy is drunk, ran the red light, ran into this blond-haired, blue-eyed, twenty year old young woman just out of college, or whatever, and ruined her life, and how "we've gotta do something about this guy because it's the fifth time."

Maybe so.

But, that's one out of twenty six thousand. There's still twenty-five thousand nine hundred ninety nine that we've got to analyze.

But for some reason we want to zero in on this one group over here.

Why do we want to zero in on one group?

To protect the claims window of the insurance industry.

I don't care if you drive down the road drunk.

My father never took a sober breath for the last twenty years of his life, and he never had an accident drunk. He had several wrecks sober and never had a wreck drunk.

Now I'm not sitting here telling you that you should drive drunk. I don't know whether you should or not.

I'm just telling you that I'm suspicious when I see people who testify before the legislature trying to get some kind of legislation passed, and they're sitting there railing against some particular group of people that have this or that particular financial motivation involved.

Listen, if you're running a non-profit organization in Idaho, and it's to rehabilitate alcoholics, these people work for these organizations. While the organization is tax exempt, the people who run them get their salaries and make their livings doing that, don't they?

Well, if they are getting their salaries and making their living doing that, then they have a financial interest involved, don't they?

John Q. Public, the average drunk, he doesn't make any money off of it so he doesn't go up a testify.

Oh. Now I see how that goes.

Let's carry this on a step further.

The purpose for having driver's licenses is to regiment all the people into a little group that can be regulated under the police powers, separate from their Constitutional rights.

Like I said, I'm not really concerned about you driving drunk.

I've only got a fifty percent chance of being killed if you're drunk. I still stand the same fifty percent chance of getting killed if you are sober. And I'm just as dead whether you are drunk or sober. It doesn't make any difference whether a drunk kills me or a sober guy kills me.

What you're going is creating this police-state environment giving the police these broad new powers to set up road blocks. I mean, these people are so off-the-wall when it comes to our constitutional guarantees, they're so emotionally involved in their religious philosophy, or their moral philosophy, whatever it is, that they want to set up road blocks to run all these drunks off the road.

I'll bet you there are more people that drink in this country than don't drink. If all of your people out there that drink don't want to be involved in this massive police-state gestapo-type society where we're just going to create this communist one-world government right here in our own land, for the sole purpose of eradicating drunks.

Well, let's think about that for a minute.

The insurance company probably has figured that if they could get rid of a certain number of drinking drivers, they may save a little money. I don't know who came in, but somebody came into the board room and said, "I'll tell you these drunks over here are costing us a lot of money at the claims window. What we need to do is do something about them." So the President and a few of them get out there and they start beating the tom-toms and then they start going to the legislature, and they start getting these laws passed.

Now, personally, I don't really care. I don't have a driver's license. I don't come under Title 49, so I don't have to be concerned about it. But, let me tell you that you licensed people out there better get real concerned about it.

If I'm concerned about you with your hundred dollar car running into my thirty-thousand dollar Porsche, I don't need any legislation to protect me from you. If I'm real concerned about it, it is up to me to go out and insure my thirty-thousand dollar Porsche against irresponsible people who do not have insurance . . . who are poor and cannot pay for my thirty-thousand dollar Porsche.

And if you are the poor guy, and you've got the hundred dollar car, are you really concerned about my thirty -thousand dollar Porsche crashing into your '62 Buick Skylark and wrecking it? You just go out, pay another hundred dollars and buy another car, right? You're not real concerned about it. Besides that, if I've got a thirty -thousand dollar Porsche, and the wreck's

my fault, I probably have a hundred dollars and I can pay you, right?

I don't where this logic of theirs comes from, but we citizens don't go out buying insurance policies for other people, or compelling them to buy insurance policies, for fear that when they die they might leave their family on welfare, do they?

If the government can compel you to buy an insurance policy, can't they compel you to buy a water bed, or compel you to buy a certain type of carpet, or compel you to buy a TV set . . .

The government cannot compel you into a contract against your will and over your objection, pursuant to Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution.

Well how do that do that by statute under Title 49 in the traffic code?

That's easy.

You volunteered to do that. You've got a driver's license in your pocket.

How can the government come in and tell you that you've got to get a permit, and that you've got to build your house in a certain way by a certain method? That it's going to be inspected, and you're going to be regulated, and that if you don't do that you are a criminal and they're going to put you in jail?

I don't know.

A fellow went to jail for five days for building his own house without a building permit.

Was there ever a time in America when you could go out a build something on your own property, and you didn't need your government's permission?

Yeah, there was. It was when the citizens were responsible for their actions . . . and not someone else.

When you are ready to become responsible for your own actions, then you can be free. Because incompetent people are not responsible for their own actions, are they?

An incompetent person has a guardian, doesn't he?

Don't your children at ten years old have a guardian. Don't you tell your kid that he'll come in at eight or nine o'clock at night, and if he doesn't, there is a penalty here called a belt which will be applied until he can get

straight.

Do you know that in America today, we have a police-state environment that we Americans bought and paid for? The Poles and the Chechs can complain about their slavery being imposed upon them at gun point by the Russians, but not us Americans.

We didn't have anybody come over here with a gun and force us to go get a driver's license or tell you to go get a building permit or compel you into this mercantile equity. We volunteered for it. We bought and paid for it. We went to the insurance company and paid them dollars and cents to take our freedom from us.

Now, let me show you how this words with Garrett Truck Lines. I like to talk about Garrett because they come in and out of Boise, and they are pretty much all over the United States.

Here's how mercantile equity works. Outside here we have what's called a right-of-way. That's the road. That belongs to the people.

Garrett is a paper entity. Garrett is a corporation, and they have no natural inalienable rights.

So, when Garrett wants to use that road out there, remember the sovereign peoples representative is the legislature, the legislature created Garrett as a corporation and Garrett is using that road for profit and gain, aren't they? They are using it in privilege.

If they use it in privilege, they have to pay us, the sovereign citizens, a tax for the privilege of using that road in interstate commerce.

We the citizens own it. We don't have to pay for it. We own the thing. We don't want to pay for something that we already own, do we?

You don't pay to park your car in your garage. You pay to park it in somebody else's garage because that's a privilege. But to park it in your own garage isn't.

When Garrett uses that road, it's a privilege for them and they pay tax on it.

Well, let's go back to about 1900.

When a man owned his house, he owned the land. He owned his car. He didn't have to pay tax on it. He owns it in fee simple or alodial absolute title.

Today, we don't know many people that do that. People live now in equitable interest. They don't own their homes, they own an equitable interest in them. They call themselves home owners, but that's a misnomer.

I don't know of very many actual home owners.

When I was a youngster, nearly ten years old, almost everybody I knew owned their own home. I mean that house was bought and paid for.

In 1940, three thousand dollars would build a nice three-bedroom house. When the man got three thousand dollars, he went out and built the house, and he owned the thing in fee simple.

Now, we don't do that. Today, we put three thousand down, of our inflated Federal Reserve notes, and we mortgage that property for thirty years.

Well, corporations have no rights and corporations can be taxed for the privileges, and those are called excises taxes.

So the bank owns your house, or the mortgage company, or whoever owns it, and by contract they pass that tax on to you.

That's right, when you signed that contract for thirty years, you agreed to pay the property taxes and you agreed to insure the house for the entire time, and if you don't, then the bank just does it for you and they add that on to your payments, don't they?

The same thing on the highways. We don't own our automobiles, so therefore GMAC owns your car, and the legislature that has passed traffic laws, rules and regulations governing the use of automobiles. Well GMAC doesn't have any rights, and so the statute says that the car has to be registered, has to be licensed, and only licensed drivers can drive it.

Go to Hertz and try to rent a car without a driver's license, and see if they'll rent you a car.

Why is it that only a licensed driver can drive a Hertz car? Well, because the statute says so.

Now those statutes attach to each and every one of those corporate entities. Every one of those persons in mercantile equity have to obey the statutes.

You go down and you buy the car from the Ford dealer. The Ford dealer then sells the paper to GMAC. You've agreed in this contractual agreement that you'll obey all the rules and regulations and laws, etc. So you have to be licensed, the car has to be registered, and you also have to carry

insurance. And that's all it attaches to.

They cannot tax a right. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

They can tax Garrett right out of existence, and there is nothing they can do about it.

But you can't tax the individual out of existence because the individual is a sovereign. The individual has natural inalienable rights guaranteed by the common law under the constitution.

So don't you see what happens to you?

You go down and you buy the car. Now, by contractual arrangement, you have given up your constitutional rights for a privilege under mercantile equity. Now you come under the statutes because the corporation, through its contract, has imposed it upon you.

We have our government out here licensing free and natural persons as well as corporate persons. You don't have to be, but nearly everybody has volunteered.

Now the poor policeman's out here trying to enforce the law. Look at his problem from his perspective. He's been to the government school. He doesn't understand the constitution or inalienable rights. All he understands is statutes and law. Police regulations. The guy's been in the army, he was in the Marines for a few years, and maybe he was an M.P., and all he knows is, "Sit down and shut up?" "Do this, do that, jump up, come here" and all that. He doesn't understand freedom. He's been a slave his whole life. That's all the military service is, voluntary servitude. You get in there and you sign the contract, and there you are at the Captain's Mast there on the bridge of the ship. Here's the way that comes down.

You have two crewmen down in the engine room and they have a fight. Do they have any constitutional rights on the high seas? That's Admiralty jurisdiction, you take them up to a Captain's Mast. He just sits there and says, "Well who started this fight?" And he asks questions.

Are there any Fifth Amendment rights? Are there Fourth Amendment rights? No.

He just says, "I'm confining you fellows to quarters and I'm going to fine you so much, and blah, blah, blah." That's the end of the argument.

Well what happens when a passenger on a ship gets into a fight with one of the crewman, and they haul the passenger and the crewman up to the Captain.

Well, if they haul this particular passenger up, I'm going to say, "Excuse me, but you've got a problem here. I'm not one of the crew. I'm not one of the fellows you have jurisdiction over. You don't have jurisdiction over me. I'm challenging your jurisdiction. I'm a paying passenger. I'm a sovereign. You put me off at the next port and we'll talk about common law rights."

And that's where you are on the road.

You see, Garrett has to stop at the port of entry. Garrett trucks, and all these others trucks that are operating in interstate commerce for profit or gain, using our roads, have to pay tax.

Let's try this on to the independent trucker. The independent trucker takes five thousand dollars, he goes down and he puts five thousand down on a truck, and now he owes GMAC, or somebody, a bunch of money, doesn't he?

He doesn't own that truck in fee simple .

Now he needs a load, right? So he goes down here to a broker and he goes out and he gets a job to haul stuff.

He goes over to the, let's call it, Acme Lumber Company, and with a bill of lading, he takes a load of lumber from Idaho, and he's going to take it to Texas. So he's going to act in interstate commerce. He has a letter of privilege for profit or gain to use the roads.

Don't we have to control him? How do we know that he's not going to steal the lumber and run to California and sell it?

Article I, Section 8, gives Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. And here's a fellow that acting in interstate commerce for profit or gain, and he's regulateable. And he'd better stop down here at the port of entry, and he'd better clear, and he'd better pay duties, and he'd better pay his taxes, and he better not be overloaded, and if he is he's going to go into the "Captain's Mast" or summary proceedings. He has to be licensed. His truck has to be licensed. He has to have insurance.

We know how that works. It works that way day in and day out, doesn't it?

How would a man operate, then, if he wanted to PRIVATELY operate in the trucking business from Idaho to New York?

Here's the way it works.

The Constitution hasn't changed. The Constitution is still in force and effect. What we have to do is we have to correct our status to that we're no

longer servants in bondage to free men who are responsible for their actions.

Here's the way that works.

You go down here and you buy a truck, and you pay cash for it, and you own it, and you throw the license plates away.

Now you're claiming to own this thing in alodial fee simple.

Now if you've got a driver's license, turn it back in by affidavit and stop driving as a matter of privilege and start driving as a free man as a matter of right.

Now you've got no driver's license. You don't owe any money on the truck, so you're not affecting any corporate entity in any way.

Don't insure the truck, because if you insure the truck, then the insurance company is the master and they're responsible for your actions. You've got to be responsible for your own actions.

Now you go down and you want to haul a load.

Oh, oh. Are you going to go over here to the lumber company with a bill of lading and haul that lumber? Uh huh. No. You can't do that.

What you do is you go over and you tender or you pay properly in full for the lumber. Now you own it.

You own the lumber. You own the truck. And you own the road.

Can you drive your truck, with your property on it, on your road?

Well certainly you can.

Can you drive it in the several states?

Absolutely. You can drive it in every state in the Union.

Can you do it for private business?

Absolutely. Take that load of lumber over to Los Angeles or Houston and sell it, and convert it to something, and go down and buy another load and come back.

You can do that.

That's what I do.

Do you know of any people who do that?

Well I don't know of any either.

If you're a truck driver out there and you've been complaining about this police-state environment, if you want to operate as a free man you have to be prepared to be responsible for your actions.

If you think about it for a moment -- If the insurance company is responsible for your actions, then you are affecting a public interest, and if you affect a public interest the police powers can come into play, and if the police powers come into play, then you're going to be regulated . . . and you're going to be taxed.

Now I want to tell you about the Toby story.

This is an interesting and a true-to-life characterization of the way our constitution works, the way it has worked in the past, and the way I hope it continues to work in the future.

Remember the story of "Roots"? It was on TV.

Here was a fellow who was a natural person with inalienable rights living in his own land and his name was Kunta Kintay.

He exercised all the rights of sovereign. He owned property. He was accepted within his community. He wasn't a slave. He wasn't obligated to anybody. He got up in the morning, he went out, and he came and went as he pleased.

Then, he got captured.

He became a part of the spoils of war, taken to a new land, his name changed from Kunta Kintay, the sovereign free man, to Toby the slave.

Toby then was sold to the master.

Look up the word slave in Bovier's Law Dictionary and you'll find that a slave is a person.

A corporation's a person.

A natural Citizen is a person.

But there are different statuses. There are different powers, rights, obligations, duties, and capacities for different statuses of persons.

Toby has no rights. He doesn't even have a right to live. He has no property rights. He has no right to expect life, liberty or property.

He tries to escape.

What do you do when you have a horse that keep jumping over the fence?

What do you do when you have a cow that keeps breaking the fence, or a calf that you can't keep in?

I used to have a bull that kept jumping over the fence. What did we do? Bored a hole through his nose, put a ring in it, and tied it to a twenty foot rope. That stopped him.

You have to do something to stop your chattels from running away.

Toby ran away. They cut his foot off. It stopped him from running away, didn't it?

The master had a right to protect his property. Toby was property.

OK. Now what happens?

Toby goes out and he starts picking cotton and he stops running away and he becomes a good slave. The master wants to reward the slave with a privilege. So, What's the privilege? The master says, "Toby? See all those women over there? I'm going to let you take any of those women that you want for a wife."

There's the marriage license. There's the privilege.

Remember, the word "license" means the permission to do something that would be otherwise unlawful.

I ask you, my friend, what's illegal about getting married? Did you go down to your government to get a license to get baptized? Do you go to your government to get a license to go to church? Don't you exercise your religious rights freely under the First Amendment?

Our government puts out marriage licenses. Isn't marriage a religious business? What business has the government got in regulating marriage?

I'll tell you friend, you go out and get a marriage license, and doesn't

health and welfare then come into play? And doesn't compulsory education and compulsory attendance to school? And If you're not good, we're going to take your kid away from you?

Well, what happened to Toby and his wife when his first baby was born. Who owned that child?

Toby and his wife? Unh-Unh.

You got a bull and a cow. A calf is the offspring. Who owns that calf?

That's right, the master owns that calf. Yeah.

Remember, when the Constitution was formed in 1787, those people were all slave owners and most of them were religious guys. They understood law. They understood slavery. They understood chattels. They understood mortgages. They understood indenture.

It was Benjamin Franklin who said it was better to go to bed hungry than in debt. He said you'd be better off to go to bed without your dinner than to borrow money to eat dinner and wake up to be in servitude the following morning.

People understood debt.

What does Scripture have to say about that?

Isn't the debtor servant to the lender?

Does it make you wonder why banks want you to be in debt constantly?

You've got a house that free and clear. "Why, free up that equity, friend. Come on in and get a twenty five thousand dollar cash second mortgage and go to Hawaii and squander the money and become our servant for the next twenty-five years."

Isn't that what they've been telling you?

Now look where Toby is. He has a wife. He's tied to the plantation. He's a family man. He got permission to do something that a free man would do anyway.

Have you ever heard of a common law wife or a common law marriage?

Do you suppose that people always got marriage licenses from the government to get married?

Well, was there ever a time when you could get married without a license? Why don't you ask yourself that one.

Let's carry the story on just a couple of steps: The master came to Toby and said, "Toby you've been good. You've been picking cotton and you've got a wife and you're not running away. Tell you what I'm gonna do. I'm gonna give you another privilege. How would you like to drive the wagon to town to get the supplies?"

Now that's a cushy job. Truck driver's job is like that. Airline pilots job is like that.

So he put Toby on the wagon. He trained him to the rules of the road, and there was the master's permission to do something that would otherwise be unlawful. You see Toby couldn't leave the plantation. He has to have the master's permission. That's the driver's license. There's your privilege.

The master/servant relationship. The state licenses you to drive on the road. The master/servant relationship.

Let me ask you this: Toby is driving the wagon to town, he has an accident, he hits another wagon and causes some damage. Who is responsible for the damages that Toby causes on that road?

It isn't Toby. He's a slave. He doesn't have any property and can't possibly pay for any damage.

The person who licensed him. The person who gave him that permission to go out there on the road. The master is responsible for Toby.

Well then, when you're out on the road in an insured automobile, in an insured truck, who's responsible when you have an accident?

The insurance company is responsible.

Well if the insurance company is responsible, isn't the insurance company going to make rules and regulations for you to follow?

It makes sense to me. It makes sense to government. It makes sense to everybody. Because, you see, when you're insured, you're not responsible for your actions, the insurance company is.

If you're going to be free, you're going to have to be responsible for your actions, and that's where the common law comes in. The common law acts after the fact. The common law does not act in equity prior to the

occurrence.

When the policeman gives you a ticket for driving eighty, he's trying to prevent an accident. That's equity. That's trying to prevent something. That isn't the common law.

The common law acts when the damage has occurred. Then you sue and you get money damages back.

It's when the guy gouges the other guy's eye out that you gouge his eye out, after the fact. That's the common law.

Trying to prevent the eye from being gouged out is in the parameters of the insurance company preventing the loss so that they can protect the claims window.

Now that's how your status works. That's how it works with Garrett. That's why you have a driver's license.

Let's carry this on another step and look at your status when you're talking about building a house.

You go out and you buy a house. You live in it a few years and you say, "Well, I think I'm going to convert the garage over into a family room."

You are?

Wait a minute. Who are you affecting?

Who's house is that? Yours?

Well, that's not your house. You have an equitable interest that house, but you're not a property owner. You are bound by contract to specific performance. You are a servant, a slave. A slave to the bank that lent you the money to buy the house.

Now there is a \$50,000 house. You have a \$10,000 equitable interest in it. The bank has a \$40,000 equitable interest in it. The house is insured for \$50,000 and the insurance company stands to lose \$50,000 if the house burns to the ground because you didn't wire it right when you added the room on.

In addition to that, the bank is sitting over there saying, "We don't want just anybody adding rooms on, creating 'tobacco-road' tar-paper shacks, depreciating the value of our home that we own, that in case this guy dies or defaults we have to repossess and sell to somebody else."

So the banks and the insurance companies and all the lending institutions go to the legislature and get zoning laws. They get building laws to protect their property.

That makes sense.

If I owned a house, and I sold it to you, I certainly want to be protected. I don't want you to add a room on to that house, wire it incorrectly and have it burn down. I stand to lose \$40,000 and you lose \$10,000?

If I'm the insurer of it, I certainly don't want to lose \$50,000 because of your ineptness.

So you see, a debtor is servant to the lender. The debtor is an incompetent. That's right. Now you're begin ning to see why God in the Scripture said, "The servant is debtor to the lender."

You know in ancient times, if you went into debt and didn't pay specific performance they bore a hole in your ear and sold you for seven years until the debt was paid off.

Today, we call that bankruptcy. In ancient times they called that slavery. And boy it could get real severe.

You know if we were at law, and had substance at the common law all, I'll tell you the common law is pretty brutal. The common law doesn't leave any room for bankruptcy. You're gonna pay your debts or you're going to pay them off. Crime doesn't pay at the common law because we're not interested in the law enforcement growth industry, we're only interested in justice.

You know you gouge a man's eye out, the old adage "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" is based in the common law.

Equity is, "We want to prevent that loss."

Now, let's discuss this law enforcement growth industry because the police-state environment we have created around ourselves is really inexplicably bound up in this thing I call the law enforcement growth industry.

This law enforcement growth industry, I don't know how big it is, but let's start with a few parameters and let's take a look at what we're talking about with the subject matter.

You've got a lot of policemen out here, nationwide, don't you? I don't know how many policemen there are, but there are thousands and thousands and

thousands of policemen. There may be two or three million, right?

Now, how do they make their living?

They make it off of crime.

Don't you have to have lawyers to defend those criminals?

And don't we have to have lawyers to become prosecutors to prosecute those criminals?

Don't we have to have prisons to house those criminals?

Don't we have to have jails?

Don't we have to have sheriffs, judges?

I don't know how many people that are involved in law enforcement, but I'll bet there are four or five million.

Let's try it this way. Let's suppose that everybody in America, starting tomorrow morning, refused to disobey any more laws and nobody would drive drunk, and nobody would build a room on their house without a permits, and everybody obeyed all laws. We would have chaos by the middle of the week.

What would we do? Why, we'd have five or six million out of work law enforcement people. I don't know how many there are. I wish somebody would let me know. But, I'm telling you that these law schools are graduating law students all the time. Every time a lawyer comes out, he's got to have a job somewhere. So he has a real interest in law enforcement and law, prevention and crime, and punishment.

So, I've been in jail a couple or three times, and when I go out there people like to ask me: "What are you in here for? What did you do?"

I say, "My government puts me in here every once in a while because I don't have a driver's license, or because my car's not registered, and because they don't understand my status. I'm in here because I'm a real bad fellow, and I'm a criminal, and society needs to be protected from me because I want my rights and I want my freedoms, and for demanding these rights and freedoms my government locks me up every now and again to protect you from me."

And I find that there are other people in there also . . .

I asked a young fellow, "Why are you in here?"

He said, "I'm in here because I've been convicted on a felony."

"A felony?" I asked, "What did you do?"

He said, "Well, I drove drunk."

"You drove drunk? What happened?" I asked.

"Last year, I was out driving drunk and the policeman caught me and took me over in front of the judge, and I plead guilty and that was one. Then six months later I went out and I did the same thing and that was two. Then about two months ago I was having a big party over at my apartment, and we were all drunk and having a good time, and we were making too much noise, and the police came up and recognized me and they said, 'Is that your car down there?'"

I said, "yeah."

They said, "It's parked a little close to a fire hydrant, go down there and move it.?"

So he went down to move it, and as soon as he started the car, they arrested him for drunk driving.

He fell within the statute, didn't he?

He had the driver's license. He was acting in privilege. He went down and started the motor. The statute says, ". . . in control of an automobile under the influence." So they arrested him.

Why did they do that? Did you need to be protected from that fellow?

No, they entrapped him because they need business.

You know, in our county it costs thirteen dollars and sixteen cents a day to keep a man in the county jail.

Now, while you're in this county jail, you're locked up in this room and there are ten other guys in there. Ten times thirteen-sixteen is a hundred and thirty dollars a day for that little tank. They have to feed you every day, and so they have these uniformed bell boys running up and down the halls and they bring you your food.

If they didn't have those beds filled with people, what would you need those jail guards running up and down the halls bringing their meals for, and

guarding them? The jail guards would be unemployed if they did not have people inside those jails go guard. If the prison wasn't full of people, there wouldn't be any need for the guards, now would there?

Now I'm not telling you that there are not some bad people in jail. There's some people, I suppose, that need to be locked up.

But my guesstimate is that about ten or fifteen percent of the people that are in the jails here in Idaho are there because they are entrapped. They are not there because I need to be protected, or you need to be protected from them.

The guy that's driving down the road drunk . . . unless he runs into me and causes a damage, I don't have any beef with him.

Hasn't crime always grown by five percent a year?

Well, I was born in 1939, and all I know like Will Rogers always said, is what I read in the papers. Here's the way this comes down.

From the earliest time that I can remember reading the paper, I can see where crime increases by a certain percentage. About five percent a year.

Isn't pretty much that way wherever you are; in Cleveland or Philadelphia or New York? That's the way it is here.

So, in order to combat that crime, what do the police department and the FBI and the officials that are in charge of crime prevention, and the people that deal in crime, what do they tell you?

"We need more police, more laws, and more money."

Now isn't that about what you hear in Cleveland, Philadelphia or wherever you are? Well, I don't know what they tell you there, but that's what they tell us here.

Here in Boise, Idaho, let's say we have a hundred policemen, and crime is at a level . . . let's call it level fifty, OK?

We want to reduce crime from level fifty to zero. We want no crime. We want every policeman, every sheriff, every lawyer, every judge in the state of Idaho unemployed. That's our goal. I want every single law enforcement officer off the payroll and out doing something that's productive. We want absolutely no crime whatsoever. We want every citizen obeying every law.

To do this, to achieve this goal, to combat and to curb crime, we're going

to educate people in the schools and churches, we're going to educate them on television, and we're going to educate them in our jails, and we are going to convert everybody to one hundred percent obedience to all laws at all times without any exceptions whatsoever, and throw every law enforcement worker out of a job, in a certain period of time.

Alright. That's our goal.

To accomplish that, we've got to increase the police budget by five percent. So let's say we're spending ten million dollars a year, and increase that by five percent. We've got to increase our police force from one hundred to one hundred and five, so that's five percent. We have one thousand laws, so what we're going to do is increase the laws by five percent. That's so the police will have more tools with which to combat crime. And we're going to give them five percent more police cars.

Now, instead of a hundred policemen out there on the road, we've got a hundred and five.

Next we tell the policeman that in order to justify his job, he has to make, in an eight hour shift, four contacts with the public. In order for the guy to justify his job, doesn't he have to write four tickets, or doesn't he have to arrest four criminals, doesn't he have to do something to justify his job?

Now, doesn't that sound like we're creating crime?

Aren't we really, in fact, doing this: Every time we increase the budget by five percent, the police by five percent; aren't we really increasing crime by five percent?

Because if there are some real criminals out there who are bad types then we've got to have other issues like drunks on the road so that the policeman can have something to do.

Don't they have a vested interest in this the sheriffs and the jailers and all these law enforcement people? Don't they have a vested interest in trying to keep crime going?

You know, I don't want to pay seventy five thousand dollars to put somebody in prison for five years because he's drunk. Or because he's an alcoholic, because he's sick.

But for some reason, we've got it in our minds that that's what we've got to do. You know really, all I want to do is to be protected from criminals.

I don't need any policeman to protect me from criminals because I carry a gun.

I know that right away you're going to say, "Oh! He carries a gun."

That's right, our Founding Fathers understood crime. That's why the Second Amendment's in the Constitution.

The police cannot prevent crime. Tell me of one rape that the police ever prevented. Policemen catch rapists after they've committed the crime.

I'll tell you how to solve the rape problem. They did it down in Florida. They did it up in Minneapolis one time. What they did is they went on a campaign and started arming women.

I've said it a thousand times, and I'll say it again: "You put a twenty-five automatic in the purse of every woman in America and there will be no more rape."

That's the end of the argument.

One of two or three things has to happen.

Number one, the women kill all the rapists. If women killed all the rapists there wouldn't be any more rapes, would there? Isn't that logical?

If there's ten thousand rapists in America . . . I don't know how many there are, let's say there's ten thousand. If we killed all then thousand of them, there wouldn't be any more. If we killed five thousand of them, I'll bet the other five thousand would become reformed rapists and we wouldn't have any more rapes.

What we do is we disarm all the citizens. We tell them, "You've got to have a gun permit to carry this gun." We take all the guns away from the citizens.

Now the citizen can't protect himself, and the policemen is not there. How many rapists run out and say, "Officer, come on over. I'm gonna rape this woman and I want you here to catch me." When did that ever hap pen? I never saw that.

So rape goes up every year, and armed robbery goes up every year.

I remember down in Oakland, California, there was a liquor store owner down there. He had a gun and he killed three robbers; bang, bang, bang. He kept getting robbed all the time. He got a gun. He killed three. He's not getting

robbed any more.

You know, there was some blood there for a while. And I'm sure that some of these ladies will shoot their feet off, and shoot their husbands, and have some accidents and there will be some blood and the bleeding hearts will come out and say, "My God, we've got to take all these guns away from people."

Well, the problem with people is that they don't know how to handle guns.

I'm not here on some kick to get you to arm yourself, because I don't really care. What I want to do in this segment is I'm trying to show you what crime is and I'm trying to show you what your status is. I'm trying to show you what the root cause of our problem is. And then as we progress with these lessons, how you go in on that courtroom floor and how you win every time. Because, if you are going to go in there and you are going to lose every time, then there is no advantage in going into the courtroom.

Citizens that go into the courtroom go in there in stark terror. I mean literally. The average guy going in to a traffic court, he says, "Uh, I want to plead guilty, your honor, with explanation. Let me tell you why I'm guilty and why I'm sorry and why this happened so you'll give me a twenty-five dollar fine instead of a thirty-five dollar fine."

Why doesn't he go in there and say, "I haven't committed any crime and I'm not going to plead to this. I am standing mute. If the government wants to spend two thousand dollars convicting me, then so be it."

"My attitude is, sir, that any crime that's important enough for my government to prosecute is important enough for me to defend."

Now, that's my attitude.

I carry a gun because I don't need policemen to protect me. I don't need to spend millions of dollars of tax money out here for people to drive up and down the streets with badges on their chests, and nifty uniforms, carrying guns on their hip, acting as hired guns.

I don't need any of that.

Why would I need it?

I dare you to come rob me.

I'll tell you one thing, robbing me could get real hazardous to your health.

If we had two hundred million red-blooded Americans all carrying a gun under their shirt, there wouldn't be any armed robberies. There wouldn't be any armed robbers!

The only reason you've got armed robbers is because you've got citizens that don't have guns and can't kill 'em. That's why you've got armed robbers.

You know there was a time, about 1900, I think every man in the country carried a gun. I came from a family . . . I can't remember a how many guns my dad had. He must have had ten or fifteen. I can't ever remember living in a house that didn't have a gun in it.

My house has got ten guns in it now.

You know, I talk to people all the time that not only don't have guns, are afraid of them.

I'm sitting there going, "You're afraid of a gun? Don't you know how to use one? Haven't you been in the army. Didn't they teach you in the army how to use a gun?"

People come back from the army and they don't have guns.

Women don't have guns. Women get raped all the time, they get abused all the time.

Well let me tell you . . . you know our Founding Fathers knew how to solve that problem and they wrote that right into your Constitution. Because that's a right, it's inalienable and it can't be taken away from you. You can give it up, you know you can give up a right but it cannot be taken away from you.

Now that's the difference between status at law and privilege under contract.

I would say that starting about 1900 we began to shift away from our natural unalienable rights. I remember falling into that syndrome about 1965, somebody got it in my head that the way to make money and be successful in life was to get into debt. Borrow money, pyramid, buy, sell, trade and become kind of a business man. Boy let me tell you all I had was misery the entire time. I was in debt and I was a slave and I was a servant and I paid taxes.

My government was after me constantly for not paying my taxes. Gosh I couldn't afford to pay my taxes. I could barely afford to keep ends meeting and I think that most of you all have the same problem.

Then one day I began to find out what was the root cause of my problem. Well the root cause of my problem was my status, I was a slave, a servant. I was in the Constitutional sense a subject and a member of society. Not a sovereign and a natural person who is a law maker instead of a law obeyer.

You know law has to be made for people who cannot govern themselves. You have to have rules for Toby when he's driving the horses to town. Don't whip the horses, don't speed, and stop for ladies as their crossing the road. Isn't that the rule for of the master concerning Toby the slave?

So the insurance company does that to us they say, don't you whip the horses in that car and drive over fifty -five because there's a possibility that you might cause an accident which would then make us liable and we'd have to pay these damages. You see where you're at. The master/servant relationship?

You know the root cause of our problem then is whether or not we're willing to be responsible for our actions. I think that's where the bottom line is. Most people want limited liability for debt. They want limited responsibility. And the insurance agents, boy let me tell you, they can't preach a sermon about well you know what'll happen to ya if you get in this accident, well you could lose your house, you could lose this you could lose that or one thing and another.

Well certainly you could.

Why don't you go out and learn how your courtroom works?

What's wrong with learning how to be a responsible person when you cause a damage, you have to pay for it.

But if you don't cause a damage, why should you be paying money into an insurance fund to cover the damages and the irresponsibilities of other people?

That's what the insurance fund is all about.

The insurance company pays out about five percent. So you pay ten million dollars in and they pay what...about five hundred thousand out. I think that's about what the ratio is.

Somebody once told me that the insurance companies pay out about five percent, and take the rest in as profit and commissions, etc.

I say "poppycock"! I can spend that money on myself just as well as they can. I don't need anybody to spend my money.

I was thirty-seven before I learned how to count. Once I learned how to count I fired my accountant. I try to encourage other people to learn how to count also.

In review, when you get in on that courtroom floor, and if you want common law rights, then you have to be responsible at the common law.

We're going to talk about the scene of the crime and we're going to get into the nitty-gritty. I'm going to show you classroom scenes here of arraignments, probable cause hearings, felonies, misdemeanors, traffic tickets. We're going to show you in detail how you go into the courtroom to learn that language. There's some words, terms, phrases; there's rules and regulations that you have to learn.

But, the way I see this, it's about the equivalent of learning how to fly. If you can learn how to fly an airplane, you can learn how to be a free common law man. You can learn courtroom strategy and procedure, you can learn how to get into that courtroom and demand your rights at the common law.

In order to do that, the first thing you have to do is change your status at law.

I'm going to show you how to win if you've got a driver's license. I'm going to show you that even if you're wrong, you can still win.

I don't recommend that. I'm not saying you should get on the wrong side of the issue and then go into the courtroom and win your case. I'm not telling people to go out and get drunk and then drive down the road and, even if you've got a driver's license, I'll show you how to win . . . although I can do that.

I've done it and I've demonstrated it for a long time, for about five years. We don't have any students here that have lost a case. Not a one.

Every graduate from this school knows how to win; because, he knows how to conduct the scene of the crime.

For instance in taxes: Do you know how many people the government's laying away every year on income tax evasion and willful failure to file a return, etc.?

I can teach you how to win those cases, but wouldn't it be better if you corrected your status and didn't even owe the tax.

You know, some years ago I dropped out of the income tax system and I've never even had an audit.

I go to audits all the time. I go with people that have tax problems that just want to make you cry. I mean they are attaching their property. Attaching their homes and leaving them with barely enough money . . . in some cases I don't even think they leave them with enough money to buy food, and they've got wives and children. I don't know how they can do it, how those government agents can do that. It makes you sad.

So, what I want to do, and I've told people this and I'm going to tell you now: You should start in, not with a drunk driving case that's coming to trial next week. Because if you're going to trial next week, and you are a novice, and you don't understand what you're doing, and your status is wrong, and you've got a driver's license and you've already made admissions and confessions, and they are going to use them against you, and you are on the video tape down at the police station, and you've made these confessions; it's going to be tough. It's going to be awful hard for you to win.

What I like to see is a student who comes in and says, "Yeah, I'm a tax payer now but I want to stop paying taxes."

You get the deal set-up for next year. You go ahead and pay your taxes this year. You get rid of your checking accounts and your credit cards and your obligations. You start paying off your debts and you get clean with the world and then you drop out of the system in a logical systematic way and they don't even miss ya. You're just gone.

All of a sudden, from tax payer to non-tax payer, from paying twenty-five percent of your total productivity for your government to squander on Poland guaranteeing the Polish debt that your international bankers made.

Put the money in your sock, or buy gold or silver or do whatever you want with it. You don't have to send your money to Poland.

You don't have to pay your money out in property taxes. You don't have to pay that money unless you want to.

You don't have to have a driver's license. You don't have to be a slave to the traffic cop. You don't have to run down the road in fear and trepidation.

And judges understand law. You know, your Supreme Court understands law. The problem is that I don't believe a lot of the citizens out here understand the Constitution.

And the first building-block to becoming a sovereign is to get your status straight. Once you get that status squared around you're going to find that about seventy-five percent of your legal problems are just going to evaporate and disappear.

Now that doesn't mean that the government isn't going to harass you. That they're not going to charge you falsely, because let me tell you that when you become a competent pro se litigant, and you become a what they call "Constitutionalist."

You go out here and jail and they call after you: "Hey, he's one of those Constitutionlists." I heard them say that the other day when they were booking me, or trying to book me.

"You mean you're not a Constitutionalist?"

The conversation broke right down. The cop didn't want to admit that he wasn't.

But, I'm one of those.

You know, they call me a Constitutionalist like I'm a Communist or a Nazi or a queer or a sex pervert or something. They have to hang a label on me.

Slaves are that way. They have to hang a label so they can identify you. They don't know what a free man looks like. They've never seen one before! And so they don't know what a free man is, and it's a strange and foreign doctrine to them, this thing of driving without a driver's license. Driving a car without license plates. Building a house without your government's permission. Holding something free and clear and absolute alodial free-hold fee simple. How many people do you know like that?

When I was a kid, there was a lot of them. But there's not very many of those any more. I'll bet you there's not but a million or two Americans left in the United States who aren't in debt.

Show me a farmer somewhere who isn't in hock. You know these farmers out here, they owe five hundred to seven hundred thousand to a million dollars.

I used to be in the cattle business. I remember, I used to be in debt back in the fifties and sixties. You know, it used to be, when I was a young man, the objective was: You borrowed thirty thousand for production credit and you tried to bet it paid off within the terms of your first lease and you were free and clear and you were out making money.

Something's happened. You know, our land is mortgaged to the government. I

don't know if there's very much land . . . I'll bet you not only does the government own over a third of all America well they claim to, but that's another subject matter but I'll bet you that the government probably owns ninety percent of all the land in America.

We like to think of ourselves as property owners. Why, we're not a nation of property owners. We're a nation of people who are indentured in feudal serfdom. We've done it to ourselves voluntarily. We have voluntarily taken on this debt and squandered it.

Look at the national debt. Look at our mortgages. Look at our local debt and our government debt. Nobody complains about debt. Why, people have been led to believe that debt is wonderful and good.

Let me tell you, debt is slavery. It's just that simple.

Debt is slavery in Scripture. Debt is slavery in practical every-day application. Debt is slavery in law.

When you walk in on the courtroom floor, that judge assumes that you are a merchant and trader in equitable debt.

He doesn't assume you are a free man walking in there demanding your common law rights. He assumes you are a merchant in trade or in equity that has an equitable interest in some piece of property or some issue, and you're coming into the courtroom to throw yourself on the mercy of the court to have them decide how to divide up your marriage.

Have you ever seen a divorce at common law?

Show me a divorce with a jury. Have you ever seen one of those? Well, you're starting to see one or two, once in a while. They're called "palimony" suits.

You know when this fellow Lee Marvin broke up with his common law wife, you had a common law divorce. That is so strange and bizarre, so foreign, the news media picked that up and said, "Here's a milestone in law in America."

That's nothing new. That's the common law working. The woman had a right to what she claimed . . . absolute alodial free-hold right and claim at law to what his property was.

He's sitting there going, "Well this can't be right. We weren't even married." Right? He said, "I'm not even married to her."

We've got people here that can get married without a marriage license. I

just heard of one the other day. A young fellow went out with this lady and had this nice wedding. They couldn't get a preacher to come over there and marry them because you know preachers are licensed.

Do you want to talk about separation of church and state? Don't believe it for a minute. We don't have separation of church and state.

Government licenses all preachers! You show me a preacher in America that's not licensed by his government. I don't know of any. I'm not saying there aren't any. There's probably some of them out there. But as a general rule the churches are all corporate organizations.

Where do you get corporate privilege?

Well, from the government!

The churches are corporations and they are regulated by then by the government. All the preachers are licensed by the government. They're doing something that would otherwise be illegal.

Since when has it been illegal to be a preacher without the government's permission?

I don't claim to be a preacher, but I'll tell you one thing: I sure as Hell don't need my government's permission to tell me whether or not I can or can't be. I don't need my government's permission to do anything. I'm the sovereign, not the government.

When you learn to be the sovereign, then you can learn to be free.

When you go into a court in your county, you're going to find this to be true. The first time that you walk in there, those judges are going to be shocked out of their gourd when you walk in and demand all of your rights at law.

Watch this: "Your honor, I demand all of my rights at law, and I don't wave any of my rights at any time. I'm not coming in here to grovel before you, or to explain to you that I'm guilty. I'm here to tell you that no crime has been committed and I'm not going to plead to this cause of action. There is no cause of action before this court. Driving eighty miles an hour down the road is not against the law. I haven't broken any law. There's no corpus delicti. There's no loss to anybody involved here. There's no contract. There's no penal clause."

Well the poor judges are sitting back there and wondering what sort of foreign and bizarre behavior is this of this fool coming into this

courtroom, who doesn't plead guilty.

Not one person in a hundred and pleads not guilty.

If you took a hundred people who plead not guilty, there's not one of those in a hundred that could go in and competently argue his position at law. He goes in and argues, "Well, I didn't do the act."

What's he saying? He's saying, "Well, yeah I was driving the car and I've got the driver's license and the government commissioned me to go out there on that road, but I wasn't going eighty, I was only going sixty-five. I wasn't breaking the speed limit by twenty-five miles an hour, I was only breaking it by ten, and it's for that reason that I'm pleading not guilty."

He can't even shut up and keep his mouth shut. He's got to spill the beans and go into the courtroom and show the judge that he's guilty of doing something even if it isn't what he really did.

That's the problem that our citizenry has. In the last eight years we have moved from status to contract. We are all of us operating in equity.

We've got marriage licenses and so we have children that are owned by our government and controlled. Take your ten year old kid out of school and find out what your government does to you.

Start educating, training and teaching your own kids in your own home and find out what your government is going to say to you.

I'll bet you that you haven't got the nerve to go in there to that school and tell the principle, "I'm taking my kid out of school, dummy. I don't think you are doing good job here. I think I'll just take him home and teach him myself." Try that one.

Your government tells you when to come in and it tells you when to go out. It tells you when to get up and it tells you when to go to bed. You know that's true and I know that's true, we've all lived through it. We've all been raised, educated, taught and trained by the educational system. They taught you how to use the legislative and executive branches of government. They taught you that redress of grievance come by writing letters to the editor and picketing up and down at the state house to get redress of grievance, and writing letters to your congressman.

Poppycock! Balderdash! Bon phooey!

You get redress of grievance, if you are a free man, on the courtroom floor, by being a belligerent claimant in person and demanding it. You walk into

that courtroom and you demand your rights. You don't go in there like a groveling slave named Toby to plead and beg and whine and wheedle before the master and say, "Oh please, massa. Don't beat me, don't whip me, massa."

Isn't that what a slave does?

He understands and recognizes the status. He isn't ignorant.

You know, we citizens of the United States think we're free, and we tell each other we're free, and we kid ourselves that we're free, and our government propagandizes and tells us that we're free.

But I'll tell you, the status of a free man is the man that doesn't have to show his driver's license to some officer on the road, to drive.

The status of a free man is a man that can work and earn a living and doesn't need a number or somebody's permission to work.

The free man is the man that educates his children at home or sends them to school, or to any school that he wants to, whether the government likes it or not.

A free man, then, having assumed full responsibility for his actions, acts as a matter of right, not as a matter of privilege.

THE END