

**a handbook on freedom**

**13 THINGS  
THE GOVERNMENT  
DOESN'T WANT YOU  
TO KNOW**

**By  
Robert Arthur Menard**

An  
Elizabeth Anne Elaine Society  
Publication

**Justice is Truth in Action**

Publisher: Elizabeth Anne Elaine Society and POOPIE

Design & Layout: Author

Printing: Yes, on paper.

*The information in this book is complete and true to the best of the authors knowledge and belief. The author and publisher disclaim all liability in connection with the use of this book. Knowledge is power, and this book definately holds a lot of it. What you do with it is entirely up to you. I cannot be responsible for the acts of idiots.*

*Copyright 2001, 2003 by Robert Arthur Menard*

*All rights reserved under International and Pan-American and Inter-Galactic Multi-Species Copyright Conventions. This book, or any part thereof, may not be reproduced in any fashion whatsoever without the express prior written permission of the author. That permission will be readily given to any group acting for a just social cause, or from another Galaxy.* (Just 'cause I always wanted to meet someone from another Galaxy.)

Quotes from 'The Matrix' used without permission under the doctrine and principles or fair use.

**I stand against a Matrix also, and I do not think Neo or Morpheus would mind.**

Robert-Arthur: Menard  
General Delivery,  
Vancouver BC  
or  
mrmitee@hotmail.com

**a handbook on freedom**

**13 THINGS  
THE GOVERNMENT  
DOESN'T WANT YOU  
TO KNOW**

**By  
Robert Arthur Menard**

Elizabeth Anne Elaine Society  
Publication

**Justice is Truth in Action**

# Disclaimer

All content is provided in accordance with the inalienable right to freedom of speech, and is intended for information, education, entertainment and positive social change purposes only.

The information is provided as is, without any guarantee of suitability for any purpose. It is the truth as the author sees it. That does not necessarily mean it *is* the truth. He could be totally and absolutely wrong on all points. Decide for yourself.

You are entirely responsible for your use, or misuse, of this information. Before using any information, you are advised to consult a competent professional who can advise you according to your specific circumstances, which will vary from person to person.

The author of this work and the information provided within it does not challenge or threaten the competent exercise of authority of any *lawful* government or agents thereof.

The information within and the ways of dealing with Bills mentioned is lawful according to The Common Law and The Bills of Exchange Act.

This information is not intended to aid anyone in avoiding lawful debts or duties.

The fundamental purpose of this work and the intent of the author is to help create a freer and more just society. Anyone who doesn't like the goal or means of achieving it is free to move to France.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Society is Not a Prison.....	6
Secret #1 .....	9
Secret #2 .....	10
Secret # 3.....	11
Secret # 4.....	12
Secret # 5.....	13
Secret # 6.....	14
Secret # 7.....	15
Secret # 8.....	15
Secret # 9.....	16
Secret # 10.....	17
Secret # 11.....	18
Secret # 12.....	19
Secret # 13.....	21
Constructive Notice of Denial of Consent.....	22
Conditional Acceptance of Offer .....	24
Many Questions .....	26
Notice of Discharge .....	30
Child of God Status .....	34
Another CNDC.....	36

# Society is not a prison.

On Dec 5<sup>th</sup>, 2000 The Ministry of Children and Family Services 'legally removed' a child that didn't 'legally exist'. They did so without investigation. Because they acted without information, they claimed the infant had only one caregiver. They were wrong. The parents said they would prove in court the infant had two caregivers and they were a family in act and intent. In order to deny the parents recourse to the Law, the ministry worker said that if they tried to speak the truth in court, she would see to it that the infant spent the first five years of her life going from foster home to foster home to foster home. This was an act of extortion. This is a society where the government workers feel they have the right to tear apart a family without investigation and then deny the parents recourse to the law. This is the worst form of tyranny and it is one I will not consent to.

We are told that we live in a free society. There is no greater test of freedom than being able to leave. In order to understand this idea better, we need to know some words and their definitions. First off, a society is a group of people joined together by mutual consent to deliberate, determine and act for a common goal. Notice how there is no mention of geographical area? Being in a certain geographical area might give you're the right to join a society, however it cannot create an obligation to join. See that mutual consent part? Pay attention to it, it will become very important.

Now what is a statute? Is a statute law? The answer is yes and no. It is not the law, but it is a rule, which has the force of law, within a society. Statutes are the laws of a society. Outside of society, they have no effect at all.

I look at society as a house party, not a prison. At this party, there is food and music. We have a system set up which is supposed to determine what music is played and what food is served. This system is supposed to be democratic in nature, where the majority decides. Now if you don't like the food, music, rules of the house, or the system designed to determine those things, you are perfectly free to leave.

Maybe in the house (in society) you can't smoke or own a gun. Does this mean you can't do those things once you leave? Of course not!

If you are no longer in the house, its rules no longer apply to you.

These statutes which governments call laws, are all the laws of the society, or the house. Leave society, and these rules are no longer your laws. Those remaining behind will still have to obey them, you will not. Of course, you won't be able to eat the food or listen to the music (collect benefits), either.

The simple fact is if this is a free society, we have the right to leave. If we do not have that right, it is neither free, nor a society.

If our society was a house party, this is what we would see. At the food table, they are serving scraps and crumbs, while we hear them in the back kitchen whooping it up with their supplier friends (bankers). The music is either a Military March or a Polka. The waiters (government workers) are acting more and more like prison guards. There are mirrors everywhere, not enough seats and more than enough smoke. The door leading out of this party has been well hidden and hasn't been opened for a long time. They might have even welded it shut. If we are to have a free society, then every once in a while, someone must leave. This will ensure that people know they are free to do so; someone must guard that door and ensure it opens easily. This will also allow those remaining in the house, to see what its like outside, without venturing forth themselves. If they decide its better outside, then they too are free to leave.

I intend to leave society. I am not moving physically, either. As a human being born in this country, I have the Common Law right to travel anywhere within it. I also have the right to join or not join societies as I see fit. I cannot be forced to consent. If I refuse to consent, none of the statutes everyone else calls laws will have the force of law with me.

I am leaving this party, not because I reject society, but because I wish to embrace it. I want a good one. One that is as free as can be. I reject the way in which this society deliberates, determines and acts for the common goal. I am not even sure we all have a common goal anymore. Those we elect to provide us with food and music are not doing their jobs. The servants are getting uppity and actually think they are in charge. The stole my family and did so unlawfully. The RCMP refuses to investigate them and the elected representatives are not doing their jobs. I am sick of the rules of this house, the meager portions and the blaring music. I will open this long closed door, stand on the other side and wave at you. I will do things lawfully that you cannot do, for you are still in the house.

When I am outside your society and therefore free of its rules, this does not mean there is no law. I do not claim the right to harm another human being, damage property, engage in fraud or extortion or break contracts. I will follow the Law. I just wont give statutes created by governments the force of law. I will achieve this by constructively denying consent to be governed.

When I see that members of society once again have recourse to the Law and those we elect to 'serve the food' are serving more then they eat, when these statutes are less deceptive and I know that the door outside is wide open at all times instead of being so well hidden, when the servants are acting more like servants, when the portions are bigger and there is less reveling in the kitchen, when the RCMP are abiding by the law and willing to investigate government ministries, then I will consider rejoining.

When you see me traveling down the road in my automobile, exercising my Common Law right to travel, and I do not have a license, know I am not breaking the law. Please don't moan about how we all have to follow the same rules. You are in a society, and I am not. You have consented and I have not. You have benefits that I do not. You are free to give up those benefits for more freedom, just as I will have done. Also, please do not think I am rejecting those staying behind in this society. Like a scout doing recon, I am giving up the security you enjoy, to ensure that you don't lose your freedom. At the risk to myself, I am going outside to see what the weather is like. I am doing it for you. I will come back with a report. My actions will clear much of the smoke, and I might break a mirror or two on the way out.

Do not be angry with me for becoming aware of government deception, or for acting against it. Be angry with those who have hidden this door to freedom from you for so long. Be angry with those who tore apart a family and denied citizens recourse to the law. Be angry with the RCMP for refusing to investigate a government ministry just because it is a government ministry. Be angry with your elected representatives for refusing to address crimes within that same ministry. Be angry with them for using so much deception in their legislation. Be angry with the media for constantly referring to new statutes as laws, instead of telling you they are nothing more then the rules of society and that you are free to leave that society if you don't like the new statute.

The freedom you will achieve by me opening this door and leaving society will cost you nothing and it will empower you over those who claim they are your government. If we are to have a free society, this door must be open at all times. There is not one person among you who



can lawfully force me to consent to being governed, nor is there one among you who can lawfully apply society's statutes to me when I am outside of society.

## **“Pay no attention to that man behind the curtain”**

The Wizard in The Wizard of Oz

### **Secret #1:**

#### **They are Human Beings.**

This is not a big secret and although some act like they are Supreme Beings, they are merely human beings. They breathe, bleed and like all others, eventually die. They are neither invincible nor indestructible. All the people who try to get you to register your children, guns or pay their taxes, each and everyone of them are human beings.

Because they are human beings, they make mistakes and they have concerns that quite likely have nothing to do with their government jobs. They, like you, have debts, children, mortgages and worries. They are concerned about their pensions and careers and when you deal with them, mentioning their humanity will often bring them off their high horses. It's called establishing a common ground.

As long as you remember they are human, you can fight them successfully. Do not give them any more power than they already have. Some might say, "There are so many in that Ministry, I can't fight them all!" Although potentially true, the fact is you do not have to fight them all. Between the agent you are speaking with and the top of the chain, there may well only be 4 or 5 others. You **can** fight each one of them.

No foe is effectively fought by attacking their strengths; to fight successfully, the objective must be to attack their weakness. When fighting any government agent, the best way to fight is to attack not their mandate, but their pensions, assets and ability to feed *their* children. Never attack your opponent when they are strong. Attack instead where they are weak and not expecting it.

Like all relationships, any interaction between you and a government agent will be about power. They likely feel they already have it. Power has a very unique nature. Although easily claimed, taking it actually requires either force or subterfuge. The people who want you to believe that they have power over you need you to believe it as well. The moment you question their authority, they are in a position as human beings where they have to prove it exists lawfully. By making it so difficult to do that as human beings they give up, you have effectively removed any authority they may have had.

These humans that you will be dealing with are often caring, compassionate people whose goal is not to harm you, but to help build a society. By demonstrating your own compassionate caring nature, you force them to look at you not as an adversary, but as a fellow believer. Once you have established the common ground, you then seize the moral high ground.

Power results from knowledge. If you can cause them to question their knowledge of certain words, you can cause them to question their own authority. Suddenly, this single human being who thought they had power is in a position where they have to question the human being who is acting as their principle. Every question you ask that they can't answer weakens them.

**“When I use a word, Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, it means just what I choose it to mean- neither more nor less.**

**The question is, said Alice, whether you can make words, mean so many different things.**

**The question is, said Humpty Dumpty, which is to be master- that's all”**

## **Secret #2**

### **They use words.**

The power that the government agents claim to hold over you is a result of words. The power to remove your children, firearms, income or anything else is a result of words. Words have not just definitions, but meanings. To fully understand a word's meaning, you must know the definition, the assumptions the word creates and the implications of the word. Unless you know what a word means, it can have unlimited power over you. One assumption made with any word is that both parties agree on the definition of the word in question. No word can have any power without meaning and there can be no meaning without a definition.

The agents imposing upon you because of a supposed authority, do they know the full and complete meanings of the words comprising their mandate? If not, they can be attacked using their own weapons against them. Are their definitions the same as yours? What makes theirs better than yours?

Often these words they use have had their definitions changed. They might mean something entirely different from what you believe or expect. By not questioning their definitions and assumptions you are letting

them take power. All you have to do to stop them is ask questions. Endless questions. They can't take power without a fight if you are willing to fight. Do you think these bureaucrats would rather fight you or go find easier pickings?

Some of their words are clearly deceptive. They may even have two senses or meanings. If you look in a Standard English dictionary they will mean one thing, but in a proper Law dictionary will tell you something else entirely different. Although a Statute may have thousands of words in it, there are a few key ones, which once you understand their meanings you will begin to see a deception. It is this deception; pointed out to the human beings you are dealing with within the government, which will destroy their motivation. Every good soldier knows that without motivation, there is no fight.

Ready to learn?

## Secret #3

### Some of their words are **VERY** sneaky.

- **Application:** To beg, plead petition, implore, entreat or request
- § **Submission:** To leave to another's discretion, to bend to the will of another.
- § **Must:** This word is legally synonymous with 'may'. The word must has two senses; the imperative and the directive. An imperative creates an obligation on your part. A directive describes conditions that have to be fulfilled. 'You must breath to live.' 'You must come to my party through the front door.' The first is an imperative, the second a directive.
- § **Statute:** A Legislated rule of society that has the force of Law.
- § **Society:** A number of people joined by mutual consent to deliberate, determine and act for a common goal.
- § **Consent:** See secret #4
- § **Person:** (According to Black's Law Dictionary) "a human being is not a person because he is a human being, but rather because rights and duties have been ascribed to him. The *person* is the legal subject or substance of which rights and duties are attributes.

"

"Apple" means a round red fruit.

Seems rather straight forward, eh? Now ask yourself this: 'Are all round red fruits apples?' Wait there's more. See those quotation marks? Do you know what they mean? They mean "this word". Anytime you see the words in quotation marks, you know they are referring to a round red fruit. At no point are they saying that all round red fruits are apples however.

Know what else you can legally do with words? We can agree to change the definitions. You and I can lawfully enter into a contract where we agree to call a 'dog' a 'pig' and then legally own a 'pig' who fetches. We can expand or narrow definitions and as long as both parties agree, it's all perfectly lawful.

When it comes to the meanings of words, what they do not say is just as important as what they do.

## **Secret # 4**

### **Silence is Consent**

**Consent:** An agreement to something proposed and differs from assent. Consent supposes, 1. a physical power to act; 2. a moral power of acting; 3. a serious and determined and free use of those powers.

Consent is either express or implied. Express when it is given viva voce, or in writing; implied, when it is manifested by signs, actions or facts, or inaction or silence, which raise the presumption that the consent has been given.

Let's suppose that someone comes up to you and says, "I am your government, pay me taxes." And you then pay, have you not accepted their claim that they are your government? If a demand is made, it rests upon a claim. Meeting the demand means you have accepted the claim. The word 'accept' implies ability to 'reject'. When you reject their claim the demand has no foundation. At that point the claim has to be either abandoned or defended. Defending a claim means that they, as human beings, have to use words.

Every time someone is elected, they send out a package and they tell everyone in their riding, that they are the new representative. They do this for a reason. Unless you respond saying "Um, Sorry, no you are not." then they become your representative and thus your government.

Consent is not the same as assent. It doesn't require a positive affirmation from you. It is just as easily achieved through your silence as it is through your words.

***The humblest citizen in all the land, when clad in the armor of a righteous cause is stronger than all the hosts of error.***

***WB Jennings***

## **Secret #5**

### **You do not have to register your infant.**

When you submit an application for registration, you are creating a legal entity for your offspring, associating that entity with your offspring and then either signing over that entity to a larger legal entity called The Province of British Columbia or abandoning it and they are claiming it under the laws of Maritime Salvage. It is this legal entity that has the right to collect benefits and services and is obligated to pay for them in the form of taxes.

When the government defines a 'child' in the Children and Family Services Act, it is this entity that they are describing. When they remove a 'child' they are removing that entity which was created with registration. Ready for something exciting? It is possible for them to remove that entity without removing your offspring. You however have to disassociate that legal entity from your offspring. Any association that exists between a legal entity and a human being is presumed to be for the benefit of the human being.

These legal entities are supposed to be for our protection and benefit. Much like a raincoat protects us in the rain, in a lake water to your neck or conversely on a sunny day, it is something you remove lest it harm or hamper you. When they act against this person or provide it with services, they are acting on the assumption that the benefits of this service are something you are consenting to receiving. After all, they are acting for a legal entity, one that you apparently willfully and voluntarily created and associated with your offspring.

If when they come for a 'child' you hand them the Birth Certificate and a document evidencing that the 'child' they seek is no longer associated with your offspring then they can't touch your baby. They have that which is described as a 'child' in the Act, which empowers them. What they do not have is a living breathing human being however.

Why do they use so much deception? They have to! As human beings they have no right to take another's offspring. How can they? As agents however, they can certainly seize property and these 'persons' are property.

You have two apparent recourses to the Law; do not create one in the first place, or disassociate your offspring from it's 'person' if anyone tries providing services which in your opinion are not in your offspring's best interest. Both actions are entirely lawful and both stop agents from seizing your offspring.

## Secret #6

### You have the Common Law Right to Travel

We all want safe streets, competent travelers and a just society. Do we want to be milked like cows though? Why do we have to renew our licenses once we have proven our competence? Why do we have to travel to defend against tickets? We spend more fighting the tickets than if we just pay them. This is highway robbery! Where is the accountability of our government? Funds paid to ICBC support an unaccountable government. Open your eyes to the deception!

You do not need anything from the government to exercise your existing right to travel. By asking them permission, you give them power. Ask them the difficult questions I am providing and discover the truth. You can save thousands in court costs and fees. More importantly, you will be one the road to being a fully free human being and letting the government know that you will not stand for their deception any longer.

“apple” means a round red fruit.

“motor vehicle” means a vehicle, not run on rails, that is designed to be self propelled or propelled by electric power obtained by overhead trolley wires;

You know how not all round red fruit are automatically an apple? Well not all “a vehicle, not run on rails, that is designed to be self propelled or propelled by electric power obtained by overhead trolley wires;” is a motor vehicle either! Their definitions are neither full nor complete and if they are neither full nor complete than there are other attributes that are needed to further define a ‘motor vehicle’. Care to guess what it is? Look at this section of the same Act.

**3(1) except as otherwise provided in this Act, the owner of a motor vehicle or trailer must, before it is used or operated on the highway,**

- (a) register the motor vehicle or trailer with the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.

This is the missing attribute. In this case, since the act of registration requires that you submit an application and ‘application’ means ‘to beg’ and you can never be obligated to beg, the word ‘must’ is being used in it’s directive sense. It creates no obligation on your part to register; it does however create one on their part to prove that a voluntary act of application took place prior to the status of motor vehicle being conferred.

They do not stop there however. Because you voluntarily applied for registration, your ‘motor vehicle’ doesn’t belong solely to you. It is no longer your private property. To prove ownership of private property, you need the bill of sale and the Manufacturers Certificate of Origin.

They get you to send in the MCO and exchange it for a Certificate of Ownership. This certificate evidences that both you and the Province own that 'motor vehicle'.

All the power ICBC has over you is a direct result of your voluntary actions. Before you sought your Driver's License did you ask them about your Common Law right to travel? If not, then why not? Whose fault is that? It's not too late; ask them now.

**"I say sir, that justice is truth in action"**

**B. Disreali**

## **Secret #7**

### **Only Representative Government is Lawful**

The only form of government recognized as lawful in Canada is a representative one. The agent trying to take your children, guns or money is acting as an agent. They have a principal and in order for them to be acting lawfully, that principal must also be your representative. This is very interesting for no one can be your representative without your consent. If you remove your consent to be represented, that agent can no longer act for or against you. His principle, though still representing others, no longer represents you. He can no longer claim to be acting as your government agent.

By simply removing your portion of the mutual consent, you create a situation where you simply do not have a government.

**"When a well packaged web of lies has been gradually sold to the masses over generations, the truth will seem utterly preposterous and it's speaker a raving lunatic."**

**Unknown**

## **Secret # 8**

### **Statutes are not Law**

A statute is defined as '**a legislated rule of society which has the force of law**'. A society is defined as '**a number of people joined through *mutual consent* to deliberate, determine and act for a common goal.**'

If you are not a member of a society, it's rules or statutes do not have the force of law over you. If you remove your consent to be represented, then you are no longer a member of society and no statute for that society can have the force of law over you.

You can, by serving Constructive Notice of Denial of Consent remove the consent, which is required for you to be deemed a member of society. You will give up all the benefits that membership confers, but you will also be completely free from having to give deceptive statutes the force of law.

Imagine being able to completely ignore The Income Tax Act, The Motor Vehicle Act, Narcotic Control Act or any and all other Acts of parliament or any legislature. Sound good?

**“Much madness is divines sensed, to a discerning eye.”**

*E. Dickinson*

**Secret #9**

**Questions ARE power**

Did you know that if you are asking questions, the assumption is that you are asking them because you wish to know the law with the intent of keeping it? If you do not ask questions then the assumption is that it is because you understand the law already.

By asking questions you are taking power. You put the other human being in a position where they have to protect their claim in order to have their demands met. If they refuse or are unable to answer the questions you pose, then they are ignorant of the truth and in no position to exercise a mandate. These questions, voiced with authority and tempered with compassion, pointing to the weakest points of their claim are your most powerful weapons against their demands.

There is something else about questions to government agents. They are FUN! Are you feeling frustrated with some government official or policy? Call up some of the human beings working within the ministry or ICBC and ask them questions they can't answer. Force them to ask their superiors these questions. If these human beings are busy defending their power by answering questions, then they aren't exercising their power.

All the power in words is reflected back with a question. Questions establish authority and control. Answer EVERY government agent's question with one of your own. Make sure yours point out the weakness of the agents authority.

**“ ‘Necessity’ is the plea for every infringement on human liberty; it is the argument of tyrants; it is the creed of slaves”**

*— William Pitt*



## Secret #10

### A person in The Province of Deception...

Once there was a thing and it was a 'province' and it's name was 'British Columbia'. And thus there was 'The province of British Columbia'. But a 'province' is an area held by right of military power and the monarch decided she didn't want to hold it anymore. She let go and it was no longer a province. The government of the day, not wanting to upset the apple cart too much, got to thinking and they created a 'person' or artificial legal entity and they named that person 'The Province of British Columbia'. On one hand there is a thing, an area, it is a province and it is called 'British Columbia'. On the other, the thing is now a fiction, a product of the mind and it's name is "The Province of British Columbia".

Much in the same way that a character exists within a book, persons exist within 'The Province of British Columbia'. You can't open up a book and have a human being in the flesh jump out at you. You will find characters representing human beings, you will not however find actual human beings.

Like wise within a legal entity, you can only find things there which can exist within it. You simply cannot find a natural human being within it. It is impossible. You will however find 'persons' and these can represent a human being. Now here's a killer question:

**Can a 'person' in a legal entity 'represent' you without your consent?**

When a government agent tries acting against you, he or she is being paid by the legal entity, not the geographical area. They can only act legally within that legal entity. Whatever they are acting on must exist within that entity. Since only your legal person can exist within that entity, it must be that which they are acting against.

“Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the forms of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question.” - [Thomas Jefferson](#)

## **Secret #11**

### **Hello Police Officer.**

**“Are you a Peace Officer?”**

**“Yes, I am”**

**“Have you observed me breach the Peace?”**

**“No...”**

**“I hereby exercise my Common Law right to refuse intercourse with a Peace Office who has not observed me breach the Peace. Have a good day.”**

You have the right to refuse intercourse with a Peace Officer who has not observed you breach the Peace. You have to get them to admit they are a Peace Officer first, but if you ask they are obliged to inform you of the truth, unless they are undercover, of course. Under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, they also have the duty to instruct you of your right to retain and instruct counsel without delay. That right exists even if you haven't been arrested.

Some will try telling you they are 'Law Enforcement' Officers. If they say that, ask to see a Court Order with your name on it that they are enforcing. Without that order, what exactly are they enforcing? If they try saying they are enforcing a statute, ask what evidence they have that you are a member of the society being governed. If you ask enough difficult questions in a respectful and assertive way, they will not want to mess with you.

“People are like stained glass windows: they sparkle and shine when the sun's out, but when the darkness sets in, their true beauty is revealed only if there is light within.” - [Elisabeth Kubler-Ross](#)

## Secret #12

### **You can deny consent to be governed.**

*Do you honestly believe that those who sacrificed during Two World Wars did so in order to give us the oppressive, invasive and unaccountable governments we now have? Are you tired of politicians promising one thing and delivering another? Had enough of heartless ignorant bureaucrats interpreting and enforcing statutes on a whim? Do you feel you have the right to own a firearm? Maybe you think you have the right to ingest whatever substance you wish, provided you do not harm another human being.*

*Care to reclaim your right to plant whatever seed you wish? Are you sick of paying 50% or more in taxes every year? Fed up with mismanagement and doublespeak? Do you really think we need more statutes? If you are sick, tired, fed-up, or had it, then why do you let them continue to do it? Is it perhaps, because you didn't know you had a choice? Or is it because you know it means you would give up some benefits?*

*Many slaves refuse freedom, preferring instead the guaranteed food offered by their masters. Imagine the government is your master, and you its slave. It certainly feels that way sometime, eh? Now imagine you are cuffed at the ankle to the person before and behind you. You are on a chain gang, working half your life to pay your masters and their taxes. Now imagine this: **You have a key in your pocket.***

*If you're a happy little slave, clank your chains and stop reading.*

There is no doubt that the government has power. The question is, do they have power because they are the government, or are they the government because they have power? Ever wished you could choose 'non of the above' on a ballot?

The Supreme Court of Canada ruled that governments' right to govern (their power) comes from the consent of the governed.. What this means is at some point you have consented or agreed to being governed. The power rested in you first; you gave it to someone and they are now using it to control you. It is very much like wearing handcuffs but you are wearing them by choice, and the key is in you pocket.

When you vote you are not just electing a government; you are saying that you as an individual wish to be governed and you accept the system that will give you this government. You have consented to being governed. Lets say you don't vote. If someone stands up and says, "Hi we are your new government, give us money", and you pay saying nothing, you have tacitly accepted them as your government. You can consent silently.

Whether you vote Liberal, NDP, Reform, whatever, you are essentially choosing between Huey, Dewey, and Louie. We vote, they get elected, give themselves a fat raise, pass more restrictive statutes and then break their campaign promises. Nothing ever changes.

**There is another option.** No politician will tell you this. They don't want you to know. It has to do with the underlining assumptions their power rests on, and how to remove it from them.

Yes, we live in a democratic society. Does this mean your neighbours can force you to vote? Can they force you to agree explicitly to being governed? No they cannot. If they can't force you to agree explicitly can they then force you to agree tacitly? No, they cannot. Can they stop you then from exercising your third option and denying consent to be governed? No they cannot. What it means, however, is **if** you do consent, you agree to the system that created the governments. If a certain society is democratic, how can you be forced to join it?

This society is built on the Common Law and it says we can remove ourselves from society. You know what? Removing oneself from society does not involve moving physically! A society is not a group of people in a geographical area all following the same rules because they have to. A society is a number of persons united together by mutual consent, in order to deliberate, determine, and act jointly for some common purpose. Each individual member consented to be there. Once they have agreed to be there they are now obligated to follow the rules of that society. If they don't like the rules, they can leave.

## Secret # 13- The truth WILL set you free

Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

Bible, John 8:32

A great man once said “The truth will set you free.” If this is the case one of the best way of looking at a body of ideas or theories is to look at what effect they have on your own personal level of freedom. The information, if it is ‘**THE TRUTH**’, will have an immediate, positive and powerful effect upon your own freedom. Look carefully at the information presented here. Does it have the potential to set you free? Because if so, it is likely the truth.

There is something else you should know about the truth; it simply does not care one bit if you like it or its affect upon your life. It doesn’t care if you don’t agree with it and there is simply no way to change it. It is the truth.

Chase after truth like hell and you’ll free yourself, even though you never touch its coat-tails.

Clarence Darrow (1857 - 1938)

Because you are in control of your life. Don’t ever forget that. You are what you are because of the conscious and subconscious choices you have made.

Barbara Hall, A Summons to New Orleans, 2000

The name of peace is sweet, and the thing itself is beneficial, but there is a great difference between peace and servitude. Peace is freedom in tranquillity, servitude is the worst of all evils, to be resisted not only by war, but even by death.

Cicero (106 BC - 43 BC)

# Constructive Notice of Denial of Consent

Whereas the Province of British Columbia, through it's agents Celia Huber and Charles Hodgson did unlawfully separate an infant from its family, and

Whereas the Province of British Columbia, through it's agents Celia Huber and Charles Hodgson, committed extortion to generate agreements, and

Whereas The Province of British Columbia, through it's agents Celia Huber and Charles Hodgson denied a human being recourse to the law, and

Whereas The Province of British Columbia uses deception to get people to register their offspring, and

Whereas The Government of The Province of British Columbia was informed of unlawful activities within the Ministry of Children and Family Development and did not bring charges to bear against those agents who abducted an infant under the color of law, committed extortion, perjury and fraud upon a court, and acted to deny a citizen recourse to the law, and

Whereas The Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that the power of governments to govern comes from the consent of the governed, and

Whereas consent must be freely given and can never be forced, but can be gained expressly or tacitly, and

Whereas the RCMP refused to even hear a complaint against the Government of the Province of British Columbia and certain agents within The Ministry of Children and Family Development, and

Whereas Stockwell Day, MP, refused to address the issue of a provincial government breaking the Law preferring instead to send the complainant back to the provincial government, and

Whereas it seems the government of the Province of British Columbia uses deception to gain the consent to govern, and

Whereas most people do not know we can deny our consent to be governed, and

Whereas I cannot in good conscience support any organization which uses unlawful means to generate agreements and manufacture apparent consent, and

Whereas the wording in many statutes is misleading to the point of deception,

Be it known, that I,  
\_\_\_\_\_, as of \_\_\_\_\_, do hereby deny consent to be governed by any and all parties.

No statutes can be deemed to apply to me, for they are the product of a governing body, one that I do not consent to.

I will not pay any taxes, for the collection of taxes is a function of government and with my denial of consent, I free myself of any association with all governing bodies.

I acknowledge I give up certain benefits and legal rights.

I affirm that all my Common Law Rights are still intact and I state my intent to exercise those rights.

These rights include but are not limited to the right to private property and the right to travel on a public roadway without a license.

Dated \_\_\_\_\_

WITNESSED \_\_\_\_\_

WITNESSED \_\_\_\_\_

WITNESSED \_\_\_\_\_

## **Conditional Acceptance of Offer**

Re: Violation Ticket AG57716527

Thursday, November 20, 2003

To: TransLink Security Officer # 6602 who issued the above-mentioned ticket.

I conditionally accept your offer to agree that I am MENARD, ROBERT ARTHUR and that I owe \$46 upon proof of claim of all of the following:

1. Upon proof of claim that I am a 'person'.
2. Upon proof of claim that you know what a 'person' actually is, legally speaking.
3. Upon proof of claim that you know what THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA actually is, legally speaking.
4. Upon proof of claim that I showed you some sort of identification establishing an equity relationship with THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.
5. Upon proof of claim that a human being can exist within THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.
6. Upon proof of claim that I am MENARD, ROBERT ARTHUR and not Robert-Arthur: Menard.
7. Upon proof of claim that the ticket was the result of a lawful and complete investigation unmarred by prejudice.
8. Upon proof of claim that you offered and I refused a Fare Deferral Receipt.
9. Upon proof of claim that I am a member of the society whose statutes and subsisting regulations you were enforcing.
10. Upon proof of claim that I did not hold both hands out flat and invite you to serve, present or offer the ticket or bill.
11. Upon proof of claim that failing to then serve, present or offer the bill and instead claiming that I had refused acceptance and thus dishonoured it is not an unlawful act of fraud and if an oath is made an act of perjury as well.
12. Upon proof of claim that the only three ways to lawfully discharge this ticket is by doing one of the three things on the back of the ticket.
13. Upon proof of claim of your Peace Officer status.
14. Upon proof of claim of your identity.



15. Upon proof of claim that you actually presented, served or offered a bill or ticket and I dishonoured it by non-acceptance or non-payment.
16. Upon proof of claim that I did not expressly state my desire to seize the original bill or ticket and promise to honour it lawfully according to the Bills of Exchange Act.
17. Upon proof of claim that you did not in fact refuse to serve the ticket or bill and instead merely gave me a copy of the ticket or bill, having never given me the original nor serving nor presenting.
18. Upon proof of claim that the Bills of Exchange Act allows a Notice of Protest (copy of the dishonoured or returned bill) to be served without the bill in original form being served first.

Please respond within three days to the address below to avoid dishonoring your own ticket.

Sincerely and without malice aforethought, ill will, vexation or frivolity,  
Robert Arthur Menard

## **Questions, Questions, Questions**

Have fun with these questions. Keep asking them and call back the next day and make sure that the agent you speak with has asked their superiors what the answers are. If they continue to plead ignorance, then let them know that you are considering bringing a claim against them for misleading you and acting in ignorance of the Law.

### **For your MP or MLA:**

1. Are you aware that the Supreme Court of Canada has ruled that the government's power to govern comes from the consent of the governed?
2. Are you aware that I am not obligated to consent or agree?
3. Does the government have forms for those who wish to deny consent to be governed?
4. When I deny consent to be governed, will statutes passed by the government have the force of Laws over me?
5. When I deny consent to be governed, will your agents be able to collect any taxes from me?
6. If our elected officials and their agents cannot be trusted to keep their promises and agreements and then fail to follow the Law why should anyone enter into agreements with them?
7. Are you aware that if you are providing a 'service' that there must be a contractual foundation?
8. Are you aware that contracts must be entered into voluntarily for them to be considered lawful?

### **Questions for Police Officers:**

1. If you are acting as a government agent, who is your principle?
2. Are you aware that the only form of government recognized as lawful is representative one?
3. Are you aware that no one can be my representative without my consent?
4. Are you aware that consent can be achieved through silence or inaction?
5. Are you aware that by serving Constructive Notice of Denial of Consent on those who are your principle, that they are then no longer my representative and therefore you can no longer claim to be acting lawfully as a government agent when dealing with me?

6. Are you aware that the only thing stopping me from walking around lawfully and peacefully is a statute?
7. Are you aware that I have the right to travel on public roads without a license and that if you interfere with the exercise of that right you can be sued for your home, pension and Peace Officer Status?
8. If a statute is defined as a 'legislated rule of society with the force of Law' and a society is defined as " a number of people joined through mutual consent to deliberate, determine and act for a common goal" , do the statutes have the force of Law for those who refuse to consent? If so HOW?

### **Questions for ICBC:**

1. Which section of which Act clearly, specifically and unequivocally removed the Common Law Right to Travel?
2. Is there anyone in your organization, who will state categorically that the above-mentioned right no longer exists?
3. In order to receive a license, do I have to '*submit*' and '*application*'?
4. Am I agreeing to the definitions within the MVA when I submit an application?
5. Am I agreeing through submission and application to abide by the Motor Vehicle Act?
6. Is the definition in the Motor Vehicle Act of 'motor vehicle' a full and complete definition?
7. Is the definition of accident in the MVA a full and complete one?
8. Does ICBC own the highways in British Columbia?
9. Do you as an agent have an obligation to understand the Act, which you claim, gives you authority?
10. Are you aware that the Motor Vehicle Act and Highway Traffic Act are merely statutes and do not have the force of Law over those who refuse to consent to be a member of your society?
11. Are you aware that whatever power you have cannot be greater than the source it was derived from?

## Questions for Vital Statistics:

1. Am I through registration creating a legal entity?
2. Will you benefit from us registering our offspring?
3. Am I as a human being, obligated to submit a registration?
4. Will my offspring be accepting any existing debt?
5. Will you be borrowing money based on this legal entity's future tax payments?
6. Without registration, can agents for the Province of British Columbia lawfully provide services for my offspring?
7. When the Ministry of Children and Family Development takes a child into care, they are providing them with a service. Does refusing to register stop them from providing that service?
8. Can the government 'legally remove' that which does not 'legally exist'?
9. Is there a legal entity properly called 'The Province of British Columbia'?
10. As a human being am I obligated to have a 'person' existing within and representing me within that legal entity?
11. Is the act of registration, a contract? Are lawful contracts voluntary?
12. In order to register, do we have to 'submit' anything?
13. What criminal charges, if any can result from refusing to register?
14. If a legal entity is created with the act of registration, who owns that entity?
15. If the wording of the act states that 'under the act you are required' is that saying we are obligated or is it describing conditions, which have to be fulfilled prior to the government claiming authority?

## Questions for TransLink:

1. What section of what Act or regulation clearly, specifically and unequivocally allows you to remove someone from the train for failure to present proof of payment?
2. Is it TransLink Standard Operating Procedure to detain an entire train if someone who has presented a proof of fare and is ordered from the train anyway refuses to do so?
3. What right do you have to demand I not record our interactions with electronic media?
4. Can you and will you define the word 'tariff' as it applies to the British Columbia Transit Act?
5. Is the tariff a result of an agreement?
6. Do you have proof that I am a party to the agreement that resulted in the tariff?
7. Section 4(2) states 'persons must produce proof of fare'. What exactly is a person?
8. You stated that unless I told you my date of birth I would be arrested and incarcerated. Please provide proof of claim that I can possibly tell you that information without relying upon conjecture and hearsay, neither of which belongs in a proper and lawful investigation.
9. Do you have proof of claim that as a human being I am obliged to have a 'name'? If I do not have a 'name', can I give you one? What is a name? When you were asking for my 'name', were you asking for my 'legal name' or name of a natural person? Do you know the difference?
10. Do you have proof of claim that I own an address? If I do not have one can I be lawfully compelled to provide you with one?
11. Do you agree that I signed your document under duress? Are you aware that agreements entered into under duress are in fact void? Did I ever agree to attend court?
12. You appear to wish to speak with me in court. Court is a place for those with conflict. Why do you wish conflict without benefit of prior discussion, which may avoid that conflict?
13. You stated that unless I gave you a signature you would arrest me. Do you know what a signature is and can you define it? If not how do you know it when you get it?

**Notice of Discharge of Appearance Notice # 067252**  
**Demand for Clarification**  
**Conditional Acceptance of Offer**

Saturday, November 22, 2003

To: The TRANS LINK OFFICER WHO ISSUED APPEARANCE NOTICE #067252  
AND AUTHUR OF Police FILE # 03-12437.

I promised you I would honour your APPEARANCE NOTICE and I hereby do so through this Conditional Acceptance.

You have apparently made allegations of criminal conduct against me.

You have apparently made demands upon me.

I do not understand those apparent demands and therefore cannot lawfully fulfill them.

I seek clarification of your document so that I may act according to the law and maintain my entire body of God given Natural Rights.

Failure to accept this offer to clarify and to do so completely and in good faith will be deemed by all parties to mean you and your principal or other parties abandon all demands upon me.

Who are you? I do not know who you are. You purported to be a 'Peace Officer', wore no identification or number and then went out of your way to create conflict and act against the peace. Please provide identification and proof that you are in fact a 'Peace Officer' and an employee of TransLink.

Your document states **"YOU ARE REQUIRED TO ATTEND COURT ON 2003-10-30 AT 0500 O'CLOCK IN THE FORE NOON IN THE PROVINCIAL COURTROOM NUMBER 1 LOCATED AT 14340 57<sup>th</sup> Ave Surrey AND TO ATTEND THEREAFTER AS REQUIRED BY THE COURT, IN ORDER TO BE DEALT WITH ACCORDING TO LAW."**

What does the word 'attend' mean and from where are you deriving the definition? I simply cannot correctly do what you wish of me unless I know what that is. Please explain. I reason that if I am attending, then I am an 'attendant'. I looked that word up in a law dictionary and it stated

**"ATTENDANT.** One who owes a duty or service to another, or in some sort depends upon him. Termes de la Ley, h. t. As to attendant terms, see Powell on Morts. Index, tit. Attendant term; Park on Dower, c. 1 7."

If I owe you or anyone else a specific duty or service, please tell me when and how such a thing was created and then provide proof of your claim. It seems to me that if I do 'attend', I am agreeing to the supposed debt or duty, merely by my presence. I notice however, that presence is not mentioned in this definition and I wonder if it is possible to be present, and yet not be in 'attendance'. What do you think and what evidence do you have suggesting that what you think is in fact the truth? Would showing up in some way create a debt where none had previously existed? Certainly seems that way to me.

The word 'required' is also causing me some concern. I am certain the word 'required' has two quite dissimilar legal meanings or senses. In one sense it

is active and creates an obligation to act, in the other it is passive and merely defines conditions that need to be voluntarily fulfilled in order for a later action to be lawfully undertaken. I also believe that when one issues a document, such as you did, which contains ambiguous words, as this one certainly does, then the interpretation of the ambiguous words must be to the benefit of the receiver and not the issuer. If that is the case, then it is clearly in my benefit to interpret the word 'required' in the passive sense, do you not agree? Also, if the makers of that document had wanted to state that the receiver of them had an obligation to 'attend', why did they not use the word 'obligation' or 'obliged' and thus avoid any ambiguity? The only logical explanation is that it is in fact being used in its passive sense and creates absolutely no obligation upon my part to attend, but is describing conditions which need fulfilling in order for some later action to be lawful. I therefore looked for any mention of later acts.

This brings me to the last part of the above mention portion. After the comma, it states 'IN ORDER TO BE DEALT WITH ACCORDING TO LAW'. The comma and the words 'IN ORDER TO BE' clearly tie directly to the previous words and 'DEALT WITH' is an action. (And not a very pleasant sounding one at that) Since the word 'required' (with all of its inherent ambiguity) is passive, and if I do not accept the imposition of an unproven debt by 'attending', then whatever the court attempts to do to me after that cannot be according to law, and thus will be unlawful. I interpret it as meaning that if I do not 'attend', then the courts actions against me will not be lawful. I will grant that the second 'required' might be active and create an obligation, as it is the courts acting after an appearance. You however are not a judge and therefore cannot tell me I am obliged to do anything. It seems the courts receive the power to deal with me when I 'attend'. If that is not the case will you please provide proof or at least make a lawful claim under full commercial liability to the contrary?

It is not my intent to be difficult, but I exercise and protect my rights and it seems to me not being hoodwinked into accepting a debt or unwillingly granting authority is a fundamental one. This issue would likely be clarified if you and your principal(s) would re-issue the document, replacing the word 'required' with 'obliged' and doing so under full commercial liability. And then of course be ready to prove such a thing.

Finally, I have questions about the very last portion of the Notice. It asks for a 'SIGNATURE OF DEFENDANT'. A signature is legal evidence of an oath and as such in order to have any validity, must be freely given. If extracted under some unlawful threat of violence or otherwise compelled, it simply is not a lawful signature. I remind you that you threatened to arrest me unless I signed your document and that I clearly did so under duress. I even wrote under duress on that document, did I not? Since the statutes, which deal with the alleged infraction you were investigating, do not inflict a punishment greater than a fine, threatening incarceration or detainment in the course of that investigation cannot be lawful. The investigation cannot be a greater imposition than the punishment for a conviction. Also, the term 'DEFENDANT' implies one engaged in a conflict. If we

are in conflict does not honour and the rule of law both demand we sit down and discuss and negotiate before going to court in an adversarial fashion? Did not Jesus Christ teach us to “run to our adversary and make peace with them quickly, lest you be delivered to the Judge and then given onto the Jailer.”? I certainly feel that is the case and would like to re-issue my previous offers to discuss these matter prior to using up valuable court resources. Any court action will clearly be a result of your desire for conflict and rejection of an offer of peace. Also, if in the exercise of my rights and my lawful quest for a more compassionate society I have harmed anyone, I would like the opportunity to apologize and make amends immediately. Who exactly did I harm? If you can’t point that out, why is there any claim of conflict?

One of my other concerns is the fact that you failed in your duty as a TransLink employee to accept Fare Deferral Receipt # 202606 as a valid proof of fare. If you had accepted there would be no conflict. Since that was a lawful option, why did you not exercise it? Do you as a ‘Peace Officer’ benefit from the unnecessary and avoidable conflict you created? The fact is I did pay the fare, I did present it and you still are trying to drag me into court by using deception.

Hereby consider your original Notice to be hereby lawfully discharged and re-issue it forthwith without any ambiguity if you intend to present it in a court of law. If you fail to do so please do not attempt to claim any obligation upon my part towards you or your principal. Also be aware that you failing to present this discharge to court if this matter is heard without my presence would likely be a fraud upon the court, as you would be withholding information vital to the proper administration of justice.

Also, please ask your principal which section of the regulations empowers you to endanger human life by removing someone from the SkyTrain and stranding them miles from their home because they have failed to produce proof of payment. That section must grant the authority clearly, specifically and unequivocally.

As this appears to be a criminal matter, and what I am asking is very reasonable and is in fact information you should already have unless you are grossly negligent, you have three days to respond to this Notice or it will be dishonored.

As I recorded our transaction and upon the tape you can be heard to clearly say “**If you have any intelligent questions I will answer them**” I hereby accept your offer and will be presenting you with a list of intelligent questions on Attachment A. Please answer all of them within three days. Failure to do so honestly and in good faith will result in a Notice of Dishonour and potential legal action.

In Pure Trust and without malice aforethought, ill will, vexation or frivolity,

Robert-Arthur: Menard

Director,

POOPIE

**Public Ombudsman’s Office of Protective Intervention and Education**

Justice is Truth in Action





# Constructive Notice of Child of God Status

Whereas Canada is a nation founded upon the belief in the principles of the supremacy of God and the rule of law, and, Whereas the above sentewnce dfines a heirarchy, with God at the top, and,

Whereas the number two position in that heirarchy is not claimed by anyone, and,

Whereas the governments of this nation seem to rely on deception to gain the power to govern, and,

Whereas I am desirous of living my life as a 'Child of God, and,

Whereas the only powers able to claim any authority over a 'Child of God' is God, and,

Whereas neither the government, nor it's agents nor it's representatives or employees are God, or above God, and,

Whereas by legally claiming the number two position in the above mentioned heirarchy, I occupy a position above all governments and their agents and employees and representatives,

Be it known to any and all, that on this date,

\_\_\_\_\_'

I, \_\_\_\_\_, a free human being, do hereby lawfully claim the status of a 'Child of God'.

Anyhuman being who wishes to claim any authority over me must first prove they exist above God; they are God; they are between me and God; or they have a document upon the face of which can be found the verifiable signature of God.

Failure to first do one of the above mentioned things means all claims to authority is abandoned or is unlawful. Attempting to exercise any authority over me without first fulfilling one of the four above mentioned requirements is an unlawful act of fraud and/or extortion.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:  
\_\_\_\_\_

Witness: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:  
\_\_\_\_\_

Witness: \_\_\_\_\_ Date:  
\_\_\_\_\_

“Change has considerable psychological impact on the human mind. To the fearful it is threatening because it means that things may get worse. To the hopeful it is encouraging because things may get better. To the confident it is inspiring because the challenge exists to make things better. Obviously, then, one’s character and frame of mind determine how readily he brings about change and how he reacts to change that is imposed on him.” - [King Whitney Jr.](#)

“We come into this world crying while all around us are smiling. May we so live that we go out of this world smiling while everybody around us is weeping.” - Persian proverb

Whereas I understand that Canada is a nation founded upon the principles that recognize the supremacy of God and the rule of law, and,  
Whereas Celia Huber, Charles Hodgson and Beverly Kerr while agents of MCFCD did abduct an infant under the color of law and deny the parents the chance to speak the truth in court by threatening the infant with five years of foster care in three separate homes, thus committing extortion, and,  
Whereas they have never been held accountable for their unlawful actions, and,  
Whereas I understand the only form of government recognized as lawful in Canada is a representative one, and,  
Whereas I understand a representative relationship relies upon a foundation of mutual consent, and,  
Whereas I understand the appearance of consent can be achieved through silence and inaction, and,  
Whereas I understand no one can be my representative without my consent, and,  
Whereas I understand it appears that the governments of this nation rely upon deception to gain the right to govern, and,  
Whereas I understand that public servants must 'provide service to the public within the legislated framework within which public service is provided', and,  
Whereas I understand that if they are unable to define the legislated framework they are also unable to claim to act with respect to it, and,  
Whereas I understand a 'statute' is defined as 'a legislated rule of society which has the force of law', and,  
Whereas I understand a 'society' is defined as 'a number of people joined by mutual consent to deliberate, determine, and act for a common goal', and,  
Whereas I understand statutes do not have the force of law over those who have not consented to be governed, and,  
Whereas I understand that a principal has a duty to ensure that the people acting as their agents understand the source, nature and limits of the authority in their mandates, and,  
Whereas I am desirous of living my life with love, compassion and truth, and,  
Whereas the only people who can possibly expect me to follow them must have more love, compassion and truth than I do, and,  
Whereas due to the deception found in so many statutes I can no longer

believe that any government agent or principal acts with the truth, and,  
Whereas certain government policies adversely and severely affect the most disadvantaged within this society, and,  
Whereas those policies cause me to believe that the present government is not guided by the principles of compassion, and,  
Whereas I could not find the word 'love' in any statute, bylaw or regulation, and,  
Whereas I cannot in good conscience support an organization that uses deception to cause people to register their offspring, property and chattel, and,  
Whereas I am desirous of not being governed by those not guided by love, compassion and truth, and,  
Whereas I understand I give up certain benefits and legal rights by existing outside of society, and,  
Whereas I understand I recapture all Common Law rights by existing outside of society,

**BE IT KNOWN TO ANY AND ALL, THAT ON THIS DAY**

\_\_\_\_\_,  
**I, \_\_\_\_\_, A FREE HUMAN BEING, DO HEREBY DENY CONSENT TO BE GOVERNED BY ANY AND ALL PARTIES.**

ALL CONCERNED PARTIES HAVE TWENTY-ONE (21) DAYS TO DISPUTE, DISPROVE OR DENY ANY OF THE FACTS MENTION HEREIN. FAILURE TO DO SO INDICATES FULL ACCEPTANCE AND AGREEMENT.

No statues, bylaws or regulations will apply to me, for they are the products of governing bodies, ones which I do not consent to.

I will not pay taxes; for the collection of taxes is a function of government and with my denial of consent I will free myself completely from all governing bodies, agencies and institutions.

I reserve the right to rejoin society when it has changed the way in which authority is gained and exercised.

I do not abandon the Rule of Law.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ SIGNED:

\_\_\_\_\_

WITNESS: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE:

\_\_\_\_\_

**Make Notes Here:**



We live in a world where we have to deal with government agents almost everyday.

Would you be surprised if I told you they use deception to govern?

Would you be shocked to learn that some of the words they rely on do not mean what you think?

If they use deception, do they not rely on your ignorance?

Would you like to learn what some of their secrets are? Especially those that they need to claim authority over you?

**Freedom is yours;  
if you imagine it.**

**A FREDDIE FREEPICKLE  
PUBLICATION**