



Is Redemption Enough

Those of us who have been in the freedom or patriot movement for years have experienced many new approaches promising to be the "silver bullet" to make us exempt from or immune to a treacherous government. In the past, many turned in their Social Security cards, returned their Driver's Licenses, closed bank accounts, took the tags off their automobiles, refused to show officers their ID, etc. Many of these heroes of freedom, who paved the way for the rest of us, have paid a heavy price trying to get free of the system. Some have been willing to sit in jail and endured heavy fines and long trials to fight for their God given freedom. What little freedom we enjoy today is owed, in large measure, to the tenacity and "belligerent" spirit of these heroes of freedom.

In the last year or so, we were very excited to learn about the Redemption Process. Excited because it all made sense. We learned about the STRAWMAN (all uppercase rendition of our name) used as collateral by the government for the National Debt. We have put what we learned to use but there is still much to understand about the commercial process, how money actually flows from the public to the private side of the Treasury's Accounting Ledger, etc. We have learned a lot in the last year but it is certain that we have much, much more to learn before we can expect consistent results (collect the money!).

The purpose of this article is to examine some of the fundamental issues relating to the Redemption Process and to determine if it really is the "Silver Bullet" that many had hoped it would be. And if it is not, what can be done to Remedy the situation.

Through the years, freedom fighters have been trying, by trial and error, to discover how the system works. Because we are a close knit community, we tend to share our "victories" with each other in hopes of helping others achieve the same results. It has been troubling over the past several months to see that the Redemption Process and the UCC-1(3) filings do not always work as desired. Yes, there are victories but are these really "victories" or merely the results of Judges or Government Employees deciding to "Punt" rather than risk their jobs/careers on something they don't really understand? This leaves us with a few possible reasons why these "wins" are not more consistent and I wish to explore these possible reasons.

1. The judges are corrupt and are not following the law;
2. Patriots say the wrong things in court and therefore the judge is justified, under contract law, to ignore their claims to be Sovereign Citizens;
3. The Redemption Process is an invalid process; or

4. The Redemption Process is missing a vital piece and Judges are actually playing by the rules.

Let's address each of the above issues.

The judges are corrupt and are not following the law. The easiest thing for a freedom fighter to say is that all Judges are corrupt. We all feel like something is wrong with the system because we don't seem to get justice. We find it very easy to believe that the Judges are ignoring the law and are just doing what they want to do in spite of the law.

Personally, I find it easy to criminalize Judges and Attorneys. Don't you? No matter how we might feel personally about a Judge, Attorney or Government Official, corruption should not be the first conclusion we should jump to when we lose a case. If we jump to this conclusion too quickly, we may miss an opportunity to actually learn some vital information from the players in the system that will open a whole new and vast area of discovery making everything else we have learned though the years actually start to make sense. In other words, let's not write them off too quickly but rather let's try to learn from them.

Are there corrupt Judges in the system? YES! Are there Judges out there who are doing the best they can within the system in which they have found themselves? I'm sure there are. So let's table this possible reason for our losses for now and address it after we first investigate other alternatives.

The patriot said the wrong thing in court. Here is another easy way to explain why one lost their case in court. While some may lose their day in court because of a technical issue, could it be that this too is an easy way for us to dismiss something we don't understand? I have actually read transcripts where Judges have bent over backwards to help the patriot understand what was going on in the court. Many times the Judges are bound by the rules they have been given and we are asking them to change the rules in the middle of the game. I know of many individuals who have spent a lot of hard earned money learning the procedures of the court just to later lose a case on a technicality (or so it was thought). Is this really what the patriots want to do with the rest of their lives; figure out the complex web of administrative procedures so one can win a case now and then? It's possible the technical error losses are a smoke screen hiding what is really going on.

The Redemption Process is an invalid process. We all know that the Redemption (UCC) process does not always work. My personal experience is that some have been put in jail for contempt because they get into arguments with the Judge about their Sovereignty and being the Holder-in-due-course, etc. (Can you imagine a Judge in England talking to the Queen the same way our Judges talk to us as Sovereigns?) If the Redemption Process did, in fact, change our status into a Sovereign American Citizen, then why don't Judges sit up straight and give us the respect we deserve - all the time? Don't just say they are corrupt! Remember we are saving that for the end of this article.

I have been troubled in the last few months by the losses experienced by patriots who have used the UCC and Redemption process. But, you say, the Redemption process makes so much sense and we even "win" now and then. Yes, that's very true. The Redemption process does make sense and we do have some "wins". When we win, it's tempting to believe that the Redemption process really does work after all and it is THE solution we have been looking for. However, did you win on the merits or did you win because the Judge was fearful of some unknown consequences? If Redemption is THE solution, why aren't our wins more consistent?

One problem may be in our conception of what the Redemption process and UCC Filings actually do for us. One should remember that the UCC-1 does not change anything! It is only a

means of giving Public Notice in the Commercial Record. Think about this a bit. When a Judgment of the court is filed with the County Records, when did the Judgment actually become a Judgment? When it was filed or when the Judge gave the order? The recording in the Country Records did not make it a Judgment - the recording was only a means of giving the Public Notice that a Judgment exists.

In the same way, a UCC filing does not cause a change in your status - it only records an existing status in the Public Commercial Record. Are the filings we have done (and I have done a ton of them) missing something vital which would render them consistently more effective? To look at it another way, what are we giving Notice of when we file a UCC-1? In the UCC-1 we are claiming to be Sovereign. We claim to be the holder in due course of the STRAWMAN but does the claim have any teeth? If you were required to do so, could you defend your claim of Sovereign Citizenship by pointing to an action you have taken in the Law besides just giving Notice? Worse yet, are we making false claims in our UCC filings which we cannot substantiate by having exercised a Remedy at Law? Could we be in jeopardy of inadvertently stating a false claim? Maybe we ARE missing something in the Redemption/UCC process.

The Redemption Process is missing a vital piece. It seems that the Redemption Process is valid but are we missing something vital in the process? There is a difference between an invalid and an incomplete process! I cannot accept the fact that some STATES will accept the filings of an invalid process, no matter how much money they make. However, I can understand STATES accepting an incomplete process leaving it up to us to find the errors or missing pieces. Could it be that the STATES that are refusing to accept the UCC Filings are actually doing us a favor?

Before you cut out this article and burn it, hear me out.

A few weeks ago, I read two things that opened up a whole new area of understanding for me with regards to our status as American Citizens.

1. There is a Remedy at law for the diminished U.S. citizenship relative to the 14th Amendment passed by the 40th Congress in 1868; and
2. There is actual case evidence which may show that we have not exercised the Remedy at law which was provided for us by the 40th Congress.

The day before the 14th amendment was passed into law, Congress passed the Remedy to the 14th Amendment. That's right! Every law which compels us to do something must also provide us a Remedy (a way out). You would think that Congress would hide that Remedy in the Record about six months before the passing of the 14th Amendment but they didn't. I wonder why? Could it be that they wanted us to find it? That would certainly be an honorable thing for Congress to do, wouldn't it? Maybe the Congress we often refer to as a bunch of "clowns" actually do understand the law and they make an honest attempt to keep the law every now and then. Hum, I wonder.

So what is the law or Remedy they passed? It's not very long so I have included it here.

FORTIETH CONGRESS. Sess. II Ch. 249,250. 1868.

WHEREAS the right of expatriation is a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and whereas in the recognition of this principle this government has freely received emigrants from all nations, and invested them with the rights of citizenship; and whereas it is claimed that such **American citizens**, with their descendents, are subjects of foreign **states** owing allegiance to the governments thereof; and whereas it is necessary to the maintenance of public peace that this claim of foreign allegiance should be promptly and finally disavowed: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That any declaration, instruction, opinion, order, or decision of any officers of this government which denies, restricts, impairs, or questions the right of expatriation, is hereby declared inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this government.

Sec. 2. *And Is it further enacted*, That all naturalized citizens of the United States, while in foreign states, shall be entitled to, and shall receive from this government, the same protection of persons and property that is accorded to native-born citizens in like situations and circumstances

Sec. 3. *And it Is further enacted*, That whenever it shall be made known to the President that any citizen of the United States has been unjustly deprived of his liberty by or under the authority of any foreign government, it shall be the duty of the President forthwith to demand of that government the reasons for such imprisonment, and if it appears to be wrongful and in violation of the rights of American citizenship, the President shall forthwith demand the release of such citizen, and if the release so demanded is unreasonably delayed or refused, it shall be the duty of the President to use such means, not amounting to acts of war, as he may think necessary and proper to obtain or effectuate such release, and all the facts and proceedings relative thereto shall as soon as practicable be communicated by the President to Congress.

Approved, July 27, 1868. (*Emphasis Added*)

Notice that the law speaks of "foreign states" and not countries. Secondly, the government is prohibited by this law from preventing us from expatriating, and if the government were to pass any laws that would prevent us from expatriating, that law would be "inconsistent with the fundamental principles of this government".

This seemingly insignificant law is what we believe to be THE Remedy at Law for the forced and compelled UNITED STATES citizenship imposed upon us by the 14th Amendment. **This is the only Remedy at Law for the 14th Amendment in the Law** we have found! Try as we might to exercise another Remedy of our own choosing, if we do not exercise this specific Remedy, then we are still citizens or "children" of the STATE (U.S. citizens). As children of the STATE, we have been declared incompetent by our paying into a social welfare program called Social Security. The fact that you paid into the system makes you a U.S. citizen by contract. We have one case where the DA identifies the Social Security and the U.S. Postal System as the reasons for a natural person being a U.S. citizen. As U.S. citizens, we are nothing more than children of the State. As children of the State, we have no rights. Is it any wonder that the Judge considers himself justified to ignore the rantings and ravings of an "incompetent and disorderly child (of the STATE)?" Is this really what is happening in our courts?

We have included a court record of a short dialog between a patriot and a Judge (our many thanks to The Aware Group for providing us with a copy of this case). After reading it, ask yourself, "Was the Judge trying to show the patriot the path to freedom?"

I wonder if the patriot learned anything from this experience or did he just dismiss the Judge as being corrupt? Here is the pertinent part of the dialog:

LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1993

P.M. SESSION

THE COURT: JAMES CLIFFORD BRUNSON, J164842 IS THE
CASE APPARENTLY.

MR. BRUNSON, I HAVE READ THE MOTIONS THAT YOU HAVE BROUGHT AND --
OR ACTUALLY HAVE THE SUBPOENA DUCES TECUM AND I QUITE FRANKLY, I DON'T
UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU ARE ASKING FOR. NONE OF THIS WOULD I FIND RELEVANT
TO ANYTHING IN THIS CASE.

IF YOU WISH TO EXPLAIN WHY YOU THINK IT IS, I WILL BE HAPPY TO LISTEN.

THE DEFENDANT: I WOULD LIKE TO DO THAT SOME, YOUR HONOR. I THINK
IT IS VERY RELEVANT IN THE SENSE THAT -- THAT THERE IS A PERCEIVED NOTION
THAT I AM A XIVTH AMENDMENT U.S. CITIZEN, WHICH I AM NOT.

THE COURT: YOU SAY YOU WERE BORN IN SOUTH DAKOTA?

THE DEFENDANT: THAT'S CORRECT.

THE COURT: DID YOU RENOUNCE YOUR CITIZENSHIP?

THE DEFENDANT: TO THE --

THE COURT: TO THE UNITED STATES?

THE DEFENDANT: I HAVE AFFIRMED MY CITIZENSHIP TO THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA. IT IS ON --

THE COURT: THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DOES NOT HAVE CITIZENSHIP, SIR. IT
ONLY HAS RESIDENCY.

THE DEFENDANT: THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DOES HAVE CITIZENSHIP. I
DID NOT BRING IT WITH ME.

THE COURT: SIR, DO NOT BOTHER GOING FURTHER. YOU ARE NOT A
CITIZEN OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA. YOU ARE A RESIDENT.

THE DEFENDANT: YOU ARE TELLING ME --

THE COURT: YOU ARE A CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES. YOU ALSO
RESIDE IN CALIFORNIA. YOU ARE A RESIDENT OF CALIFORNIA.

CALIFORNIA IS A -- IS NOT A SOVEREIGN NATION.

THE DEFENDANT: CALIFORNIA IS IN FACT, A SOVEREIGN NATION.

THE COURT: OKAY. WELL, SIR, THAT'S WHERE WE DIFFER. I WOULD
REJECT THAT PREMISE. THAT IS NOT A VALID LEGAL PREMISE.

(the original was in all uppercase)

The pivotal question in the above dialog is "DID YOU RENOUNCE YOUR CITIZENSHIP...TO THE UNITED STATES?". Once the Judge determined that Mr. Brunson was not expatriated from the UNITED STATES, he could assume that he was still a citizen of the UNITED STATES AND A RESIDENT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA (a child of the STATE) and not a Sovereign as he claimed.

When one walks into a court, is it JUSTIFIABLE for the Judge to assume that the "Defendant" is a UNITED STATES citizen? Think about the things we often say when we stand before the Judge. Do we give him/her evidence that we are in fact Sovereigns or do we just make the claim? Does anything change when we show the Judge a UCC-1 which is nothing more than a Public Notice? What evidence do we give to the Judge to inform him/her that we have actually exercised THE ONLY legal Remedy at Law for separating ourselves from the UNITED STATES Corporation, 14th Amendment citizenship, and their corporate "color of law" jurisdiction?

Could a slave in pre-northern-aggression America (that's the Civil War for the new patriots) just stand up and declare that he/she was a Sovereign American Citizen or would there be some legal process required whereby he/she could actually become free? Would any court in that day listen to a slave rant and rave about being a Sovereign and free if he/she had not followed the proper Remedy to become free? I doubt he/she would have had any more success in the courts of that day than we do in the administrative courts of our day. We must remember that a child has no rights. Whatever the child/slave owns, belongs to the parent/master. So it is when we are citizens "children" of UNITED STATES Corporate government.

Can a "child" of the STATE give Notice that it owns something when it can't really own anything? If your child filed a UCC-1 against you, would you tend to call it "frivolous?" So the next time a Government Agent call what you do frivolous, remember that when they use the word "frivolous" they are referring to WHO YOU ARE and not to WHAT YOU HAVE DONE.

I believe that as children of the STATE who have been declared incompetent, we cannot even Expatriate! The only way to properly expatriate is to show that the contracts (Social Security and U.S. Postal Service), which make us children of the STATE, are void, *ab initio*, due to the fraudulent statements made to us by Government Agents about the true nature of the Social Security Insurance (which is not an Insurance). Once the contract is voided for fraud, you are no longer a U.S. citizen (incompetent child). With no contract making you a child of the STATE, this natural person can now Expatriate from the U.S. Corporate government. At the same time, you would also Repatriate to the "organic" several states united and the "organic" state in which you were born, as a Sovereign American Citizen, to minimize any doubt or confusion about who you are.

Remember, as children of the STATE, we own nothing. Not our automobiles, homes, or anything. What makes us think we can start owning anything just by giving Notice? The difficulty is that the STATE has fooled us into thinking that we do own our property and the STATE is in a catch 22 - not wanting to confirm that we own nothing. The reason we have not had a clearer understanding of our "child" status is because the STATE has cleverly given us "papers and certificates" which make us feel that we own our stuff when in fact we don't own (have Title to) anything.

If we don't own anything and we can't own anything as a "child" of the STATE, then what can we do as a Remedy to change our status?

The Remedy. Most of the Patriots and Freedom Fighters are aware that every law requires a Remedy. This is not new to the legal system but rather a principle which goes back to the beginning of time.

You will remember the story of Cain and Abel. After Adam and Eve sinned, God provided a Remedy for their sin (the shedding of blood). It is very likely that God showed them how to sacrifice a lamb because one of the first things God did for Adam and Eve after they sinned was to make them clothes out of animal skins. The next thing we read is the story of Cain and Abel each bringing a sacrifice before God. Abel brought God's approved Remedy for sin by bringing an animal sacrifice. Cain, on the other hand, brought his own Remedy of fruit and vegetables.

Cain's Remedy was not THE Remedy approved by God for sin. It was a Remedy of Cain's own choosing and that Remedy was not accepted by God. And few of us would ever suggest that God was unjust in not accepting Cain's sacrifice.

There are other stories in Scripture which demonstrate the Remedy principle. One could certainly call the Passover with the blood on the doorposts a Remedy. If you exercised the Remedy, then your firstborn lived. If you didn't, then your firstborn died. What about the brazen snake on a pole the Israelites looked upon to keep from dying when they were bitten by snakes in the desert? Wouldn't one call that a Remedy? And when Peter said in a sermon that Jesus Christ is "the only name under heaven where we must be saved", was he being restrictive and narrow minded or was he telling his listeners that there is a Remedy for sin and Jesus Christ is that Remedy?

It may be that the story of Cain and Abel is one of the first stories told in the Scriptures because it points out a fundamental problem we have as the children of Adam and Eve. We often come before God with our own Remedy for sin (good works, charitable giving, good looks, intelligence, living a good life, etc.) and fail to just accept and exercise/receive the wonderful and FREE Remedy that God has provided for us?

When a Remedy is provided, it is our problem and our fault if we do not exercise it. If the Judge treats you as an incompetent and delinquent child because you have not exercised the Remedy, is he/she unjust or corrupt? Is God unjust or corrupt for ignoring us when we don't accept the Remedy He has provided for us?

So what about Redemption and the UCC? Is the Redemption/UCC process invalid? I don't think so. It is valid and it is important. However, it is NOT the Remedy at Law provided by the 40th Congress for the 14th Amendment and diminished UNITED STATES citizenship. One can file a hundred UCC1-(3)s and the filings CANNOT change your status. The only thing we can do to change our status and move out of the U.S. Corporate government is to exercise the Remedy provided by the 40th Congress. It is not good enough to just Expatriate because that would leave one without a country. One must also Repatriate, *IN TOTO*, back into the several states united and the Organic State wherein you were born or naturalized. By so doing, you are now a Sovereign American Citizen having exercised the Remedy at Law. It appears that the U.S. Government understands this because it issues a different Passport to American Citizens or American Nationals. That passport does not have the words UNITED STATES in it and it refers only to The United States of America. I had one of these passports once and didn't realize what I had!

Even though our organization has been doing UCC document preparation and filings for some time now, we are now suggesting that our members Expatriate/Repatriate before doing UCC Filings. This is because we believe there may be problems with a UCC claim of Sovereignty when one has not actually exercised the Remedy as provided by the 40th Congress. We are concerned that a false claim made prior to exercising the "Remedy" might be construed as fraud at a later time.

We have learned much about our Freedom in the past 15 or 20 years. We have often thought we were very close to capturing that illusive freedom only to have it slip away and leave us disappointed. It is our conviction that Expatriation/Repatriation is THE proper way to regain the Freedom which was fraudulently taken from us by the *de facto* government. Once Expatriation is completed, the Redemption/UCC process can then be used to give Public Notice that we have exercised the Remedy. The results we are seeing are much more impressive than Redemption has been over the past year or so. Our research has revealed that Expatriated American Citizens, who have used a "Proactive" Expatriation/Repatriation approach, have been

able to stay completely out of the court system 100% of the time. We feel this is the best way to deal with the U.S. corporate government. After all, we really do not want to go into their private administrative courts because we seldom win there.

Using what we have learned about the Administrative Process and Contract Law, we get the "U.S. Corporate Officers" to agree with us that we are American Citizens and that we are "without" the UNITED STATES. We also get them to agree to all the fraud and Treason they have committed against the American Citizens. This puts us in a much more powerful position than the one who tries to win by playing by their rules.

NEWS FLASH! One of our associates just received a letter from President George W. Bush in response to his Expatriation/Repatriation. It is the closest thing to an approval of the Expatriation/Repatriation process that we may ever see. A copy of the letter is shown here. It may seem like just a form letter but Keep in mind that this is the only response our Associate received from President Bush and this is further evidence that the President did not object to our associates Expatriation/Repatriation Notice.

Just a couple of things to ponder. When we are members of the U.S. Corporation, the Officers of that corporation can give themselves immunity from us, right? They make the rules and since we are members (citizens) of their "club", we must follow their rules. When we exit the U.S. Corporation, doesn't that make the U.S. Corporation just another corporation with no immunity for its officers who commit fraud or Treason? Could we sue the Officers of that Corporation? Who do you suppose the Officers of this corporation are? Who are the President/CEO, CFO, COO and the Board of Directors of the U.S. Corporation? Could Sovereign American Citizens file a class action suit against the Board of Directors for Criminal Fraud and Treason and compel them to give us our country back? Maybe we could even "plea bargain" getting our country back for a reduced sentence for them! WOW, the possibilities are endless! This raises some very interesting things to think about as we continue our "Belligerent" pursuit of Freedom and Happiness.

Please note the Ad in this issue regarding the Expatriation/Repatriation Seminar we are conducting in Portland, Oregon on May 14, 2001. This seminar is sponsored by the Freedom & Privacy Committee, Citizen's Rights Task Force, The American's Bulletin and BBC of America. Contact us for details.

Joe Saladino is the Founder of the Freedom & Privacy Committee.