

No one has ever been a US citizen BY LAW of STATUTE.

But when they register to vote they are, **AND**, by Presumption ONLY on the part of the corporation. All courts are private as stated in my Which One Are you book. published 20 years ago, On page 119. All agencies are Private corporations. All law is based on Presumption. I am giving this to you as I speak. This was not put on atgpress. This is now November 10th 2011. What do I mean by Presumption? The law of contracts is by presumption and the corporations use it all the time .Who are these corporations? The UNITED STATES and all 50 STATES. Why do they all appear in caps? Because artificial corporations have to use all caps in their name. Check out your STATES Secretary of STATE'S UCC Section. When corporations are registered to do business. All have to have their names in capital letters. That is why they have tagged you a US Citizen . By presumption on their part, you are their subject, as you are now deemed by them, to be a **person**. By presumption. Let's look at that word Presumption.. You, reading this, have no clue what it really means. now look that word up in Webster's 1828 dictionary even though I put it here. I could be lying to you just like the corporation UNITED STATES does

1828 Definition

PRESUMP'TION, n. [L. proesumption.]

1. **Supposition** of the truth or real existence of something without direct or positive proof of the fact, but grounded on circumstantial or probable evidence which entitles it to belief. Presumption in law is of three sorts, violent or strong, probable, and light.

WHAT is the very first word defining PRESUMPTION? So look that up. I am teaching you how a professional researcher looks at things. You have to, to get what I got in 1998. So we go back to Webster's

SUPPOSITION, n. The act of laying down, imagining or admitting as true or existing, **what is known not to be true, or what is not proved.** How many times has IRS used this PRESUMPTION AND SUPPOSITION in letters to you or the court used it on you?

1. **The position of something known not to be true or not proved;** hypothesis.

This is only an infallibility upon supposition that if a thing be true, it is impossible to be false.

2. **Imagination; belief without full evidence.**

1913 Definition Supposition (supposition)

n. (?)

Sup`po*si"tion

[F. supposition, L. suppositio a placing under, a substitution, fr. supponere, suppositium, to put under, to substitute. The word has the meaning corresponding to **suppose**. See Sub-, and

Position.]

The act of supposing, laying down, imagining, or **considering as true or existing, what is known not to be true, or what is not proved**. Let's suppose John Doe is a taxpayer when he is not. Let's suppose John Doe is a drug user. DO YOU SEE HOW PRESUMPTION WORKS WITH SUPPOSITION

That which is **supposed**; hypothesis; **conjecture**; **surmise**; **opinion or belief** without sufficient evidence.

This is only an infallibility upon supposition that if a thing be true, it is impossible to be false. Tillotson.

So how can you break the Presumption YOU are NOT a US Citizen turned PERSON, INDIVIDUAL in TAX LAW. The ARTIFICIAL ENTITY? BY doing something constructive for once in your life instead of griping all the time? You want to be Free? Then YOU are the only one able to do it. I can't, an attorney won't if they could. Your best friend can't, only you can. How? By simply going back a couple of hundred years Not 20 50 or 100 years. Back to the time these commercial corporations of STATES and UNITED STATES were formed. So we find a statute at large or a case using the statute at large. FOLKS this is not jumping out and saying HERE I AM. Freedom is never Free, when you have corporate criminals claiming by PRESUMPTION, THEY OWN YOU. YOU ARE A PERSON and the corporation statute says ALL PERSONS LIABLE, AND BY PRESUMPTION YOU ARE A PERSON AS A UNITED STATES citizen.

Well how can you prove you Are not a US citizen? Pretty hard is it not? Has anyone ever beat the PRESUMPTION, as I have in 1998, that you really have evidence of that?

WELL LET'S SEE WHAT WE CAN DO ABOUT THAT The Statute at large to become a US citizen is The act of Congress of April 14, 1802, (2 Stat. 153, c. 28, § 1; Rev. St. § 2165,. YOU MEAN YOU NEVER WENT BACK THAT FAR? WHY? DON'T YOU HAVE TO KNOW WHAT THEY DID to SCREW YOU ROYALLY OUT OF YOUR FREEDOMS FOR LIFE?

THAT ACT SAYS, and **PAY ATTENTION**; provides that "**an alien may be admitted to become a citizen of the United States in the following manner, and not otherwise.**" DO YOU understand what NOT OTHERWISE MEANS? OF COURSE YOU DON'T. 4th grade mentality can't understand. This is what the corporation's education system has done to every PERSON in AMERICA. YOU ARE A PERSON because you pay taxes don't you? You have a DL right? VOTE right? Have a birth certificate? Do everything the corporation tells you right? WRONG, THESE DO NOT MAKE YOU A SUBJECT. Well I found a case that will knock These preconceived ideas for a loop that if not heeded will keep you a subject of the corporation for the rest of your life and your kids' and their kids' lives.

The case is an 1893 called CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS v. REUM. (Circuit Court of Appeals, Eighth Circuit. May 29, 1893.) NOW I SAID **PAY ATTENTION**. TO WHAT? OF COURSE DUMMY THE RED WORDS "**AND NOT OTHERWISE**". JUST because you voted DOES

NOT MEAN YOU ARE A US CITIZEN OR GOT ANY LATCHES, FILING TAX FORMS, GETTING LICENSES, ETC., ETC, BIRTH CERTIFICATES ARE ALL IN THE CATEGORY OF **“AND NOT OTHERWISE.”** See, you have to pay attention. The case where Mr. Reum actually voted was not germane, said the court. Even though he voted, it did NOT make him a citizen. Mr. Reum went back and forth—I am, I ain’t—so many times, the court ruled against him. He had not signed his self away from his king and was not entitled to be a NATURALIZED US citizen. Sure he registered to vote and did vote So the court said the Statute stated you had to do three things to become a US citizen. HAVE YOU DONE ANY after reading what the court said, the statute at large said? I Now quote the court and I know you will **not pay attention** so I will put in red what you will gloss over and never give it a thought.

The process was clearly stated as conclusions of law by the Court. The Court went on to state three factors whereby YOU needed to comply to become a U.S. Citizen and **“NOT OTHERWISE”**. They are, quoting the court; **“FIRST.** He shall, two Years at least prior to his admission, declare before a proper court his intention to become a citizen of the United States, (Mr. Reum did this) and to renounce his allegiance to the potentate or sovereignty of which he may be at the time a citizen or subject. (Mr. Reum did NOT do this) **SECOND.** He shall, at the time of his application to be admitted, declare, on oath, before some one of the courts above specified, that he will support the Constitution of the United States, and that he absolutely and entirely renounces and abjures all allegiance and fidelity to every foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty; and particularly, by name, to the prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of which he was before a citizen or subject, **which proceedings shall be recorded by the clerk of the court.** **THIRD.** It shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of the court admitting such **alien** that he has resided within the United States five years at least, and within the state or territory where such court is at the time held one year at least and that during that time he has behaved as a **MAN** of a good moral character, attached to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, and well disposed to the good order and happiness of the same; but the oath of the applicant shall in no case be allowed to prove his residence." Emphasis mine **Note: They said “MAN” not person as today’s corporate R.I.C.O. statues do not mention MAN.**

This statute was only amended once. By the act of May 26, 1824, (4: star. 69, c. 186, § 1; Rev. St. § 2167,) it removed the two year limit that (2 Stat. 153, c. 28, § 1; Rev. St. § 2165 provided. The **TERM** of their law for **Man is NONRESIDENT ALIEN.** This is correct but they used this term, knowing everyone would say “I ain’t no Alien.” Thereby Negating the very thing that would make them free.

This maxim of law that apply is "expressio unius est exclusio alterius." Are all statutes either comprising man or person? MAN is devoid of Statute. Non resident alien, A.K.A. MAN, is mentioned and excluded in statute because he is the TERM non resident Alien. Meaning Not resident in any contract, therefor Alien to the Constitution, policy regs etc., just as Whiting, The solicitor general stated in 1864 **“An alien owes no allegiance or obedience to our government, or to our constitution, laws, or proclamations.”** **A citizen subject is bound to obey them all. In refusing such obedience, he is guilty of crime against his country, and finds in the law of nations no justification for disobedience.** **An alien, being under no such obligation, is justified in refusing such obedience. Over**

an alien enemy, our government can make no constitution, law, or proclamation of obligatory force, because our laws bind only our own subjects, and have no extra-territorial jurisdiction.

Over citizens who are subjects of this government, even if they have so far repudiated their duties as to become enemies, our constitution, statutes, and proclamations are the supreme law of the land. The fact that their enforcement is resisted does not make them void. It is not in the power of armed subjects of the Union to repeal or legally nullify our constitution, laws, or other governmental acts."

SOURCE: The Legal Classics Library War Powers under The Constitution of the United States 1864 tenth Ed Entered by Act of Congress In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts Special Edition 1997. REMEMBER WE WERE SUBJECTS BEFORE THE 1776 WAR WE LOST and became citizen SUBJECTS AFTER the 1783 peace treaty where the King Dictated to the United States exactly what he wanted, thereby leaving his subjects to become his subjects now known as Citizens of The Vatican's corporations. Do not forget that treaty of April 21, 1214 where the King turned his entire Kingdom and SUBJECTS over to the Pope/Vatican corporation. You are now under Ecclesiastical law of the Vatican since 1787. The books I have showing the Vatican rules every aspect of your movements and daily lives. HE created the IRS in 1861 and you never knew it. How do you think I got free in 1998 from all taxes state or US or any other income tax? AND the SSN is your enemy ID to deal in banking. It was not for social security. The two corporate cases settled by the corporate Supreme court came right out in 1935 and said there never was a Social Security. It was all a fraud and it was admitted in 1953 of which I have that document that I posted two years before ATGPRESS was shut down by powers you never knew existed.

Justice Field dissenting, stated in the Erie Railway case of 1892. I paraphrase to keep this short .**"The government thus lays a tax, through the instrumentality of the company, upon the income of a non-resident alien over whom it cannot justly exercise any control, nor upon whom it can justly lay any burden.** The power of the United States to tax is limited to **PERSONS**, property, and business within their jurisdiction, as much as that of the State is limited to the same subjects within its jurisdiction." . United States v. Erie Railway Company, 106 US 327. This Court you just might be in, has to Produce to YOU, the Three Facts of evidence, stated by the Court above, #1 that YOU absolutely and entirely renounced and abjures all allegiance and fidelity to GOD our creator. #2 And had given YOUR intentions to the court to become a U.S. Citizen / SUBJECT of a **corporate nature in writing**. There are no other provision of the acts of congress under which YOU could have been naturalized. The Court did State**" AND NOT OTHERWISE."** #3 And since the statute at large, Not Code, **says it's recorded in fact two**. Either the court has to provide it or you win hands down when the plaintiff cannot produce this fact evidence to you and the court . The Court is the only one that has it not the R.I.C.O. agent coming after you. Why would he have it if all they work from is PRESUMPTION? The court has the record when you became A US citizen as it was **"recorded"**. That destroys their PRESUMPTION YOU ARE NOT A PERSON, US OR STATE citizen, Taxpayer, or that you are the all cap artificial entity. It then throws the PRESUMPTION BACK AT them . Remember the phrase, See you did not pay attention, to the last sentence in #1 of SUPPOSITION. **This is only an infallibility upon supposition that if a thing be true, it is impossible to be false.** This is what kills them You made them prove YOU are a MAN a NONRESIDENT NOT IN CONTRACT, therefore the Alien. So

being the supposition is false on you being a US citizen by PRESUMPTION, the reverse is true that you are an alien, MAN and NOT a PERSON. Who Madison wrote about in his federalist paper 42 and paper 43 The Free White Inhabitant (Alien) man. I wrote extensively on this in my books and free stuff on atgpress for 10 years at least. One was TERMS not WORDS explaining they make up their own definitions . This last part of the case in Which one are you, says a lot Judge Leavy then went on to quote Assessors v. Osborne, 9 Wall. 76 U.S. 567 at 574, `District Courts are courts of *special jurisdiction*, and therefore, they cannot take jurisdiction of any case, either civil or criminal, where they are not authorized to do so by an Act of Congress',--he said it is-- "a leading case, and has not been distinguished, modified or over-ruled." emphasis his.

In 1988 Congress eliminated the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to review decisions on appeal from State Courts and decisions of the United States court of appeals. Does this sound like a Republican Government under the separation of Powers doctrine, or a commissioner form of corporate government (democracy), operating through corporate administrative agencies and commercial tribunals (corporation) COURTS of “ special jurisdiction.” I Know as I was the first case from a state case on appeal that was denied.

The INFORMER
November 10, 2011