LAW FACTS AND FALLACIES
For the Moorish families seeking the Truth
By
Brother A. Hopkins-Bey, G.S.D.M.

INTRODUCTION -

"Ignorantia juris non excusat"
(Latin for "ignorance of the law does not excuse" or "ignorance of the law excuses no one")

“Ignorance of the Law is no excuse” is a legal principle holding that a person who is unaware of a law may not escape liability for violating that law merely because he or she was unaware of its content. In theory every one knows the law or at least should know, being that “ignorance of the law is no excuse.” In fact, the generality of men does not know very much about it; and upon a subject so vast and vague there must necessarily be much ignorance, misreading and subsequent misapprehension. Mere ignorance may be easily enlightened by supplying the needful information; but mistaken notions can only be dislodged by cogent reasoning.

Cogent arguments have, however, little effect upon the public mind, and, seem somewhat out of place in lieu of a popular treatise. To tilt at popular fallacies with the heavy lance of close reasoning seems, at times, a futile endeavor. Here, as elsewhere, the study of ignorance is the first step to imparting knowledge, which is why we have deemed it necessary and proper to divulge the origin of this pseudo-legal sovereign citizen/tax protestor fallacy. It must be borne out that this is the third treatise which I, Brother A. Hopkins-Bey have hitherto published regarding this motif. It also must be related that analogy and repetition are also useful means of popular instruction, the latter being in many cases the only effective method of attacking popular error. No unaccepted truth, indeed, can be too often repeated (the Hammer). It is said that, "it is only by varied
iteration that alien conceptions can be forced upon reluctant minds,” which clearly elucidates why the sovereign ideology has been changing, altering, modifying, revised, and adjusted to fit the popular anarchist mindset of the day (or moment).

Some legal fallacies are harmless enough; others merely cause inconvenience to the individuals who cherish them; while a few, and these are the most important, affect public opinion, especially on questions regarding the official doctrine espoused in the Moorish Science Temple of America, and give rise to agitations of a more or less mischievous tendency. A man is of course at liberty to knock his head against a stone wall if he pleases, and if he suffers for his folly, we may deplore his ignorance, but we cannot much lament his obstinacy. To avert such imprudent consequences, few of us would feel called upon or even compelled to interfere. But it is shockingly appalling, immoral and depraved when such an individual induces others to share his error, and to break their heads in a similar manner and when, finding the wall too strong for them, they agitate for a more convenient and “fitting” manner to bludgeon themselves.

There is, moreover, at the present time especial need of popular instruction regarding legal principles. The Moorish Diaspora is being daily startled by new doctrines apparently subversive of law, nationality, and society; anarchical and unmistakably foreign in nature. The reason why ignorance of law in the Moorish Diaspora is so prevalent among intelligent and otherwise well-informed Moors is that, in order to acquire even an elementary knowledge of the subject, it is of great necessity to make it (Law) the object of systematic study; in other words learning at the University/Collegiate level. However to the generality, life is short and occupations various; and the general Moorish reader, however strong, his/her intellectual digestion, wants something he/she can rapidly assimilate, some easy means of escaping the grosser forms of ignorance, and clearly opts not to spend any considerable portions of time in floundering through text books and law reports, constructing thesis’s, etc. However, Law has a language of its own; Law's language is called legalese. This language is not realized via osmosis; this takes years of dedicated, devoted and committed research, study, and analysis; learning under the tutelage of a legitimately qualified, capable, competent, skilled and practiced teacher/professor/academic scholar. The claim of being autodidactic is but a trait of the narcissistic supercilious novice. Beware of them…

We, the Grand Sheiks, Divine Ministers, and student of the Holy Prophet, are not claimants to be Doctors or Masters of the Law, however what we do is maintain the integrity of being “Set in the Defense of the Gospel.” Being “Set in the Defense of the Gospel” is demonstrating steadfast resolve in standing with the truth of Almighty God-Allah, as expressed through His Holy Prophet Noble Drew Ali. Being “Set in the Defense of the Gospel” is being fixed, firmly established, and stable in the Divine Instructions from the Holy Prophet. Like Paul, we are “set,” not for the defense of inherited positions, pseudo legal theories, pet projects, or previously espoused doctrines of men, but for the defense of the gospel of Prophet Noble Drew Ali, for the truth that "makes man free." Indeed, our position is to defend the truth, nothing more, nothing less, and nothing else. When this is our position, we are at liberty to accept the truth as we learn it, and are not bound to try to defend or justify any un-Moorish, un-Koranic, un-Islamic or un-lawful
position in which we may find ourselves. Truly there is a difference in defending the truth, and in defending a particular position or practice. To defend the truth is not only easier, but it is the honorable thing to do. By so doing, we can save not only ourselves, but those who hear us.

PART 1- THE “RIGHT TO TRAVEL”

LAW FACT: A Drivers License is required to operate a Motor Vehicle on the roads.
LAW FALLACY: As a sovereign citizen (not a 14th amendment 2nd class/federal citizen) you are exempt from licenses and have the ability to exercise your so-called constitutional “Right To Travel.”

EXPLANATION-
In Defense of the Gospel, the Holy Prophet Noble Drew Ali NEVER advocated a disdain for licenses of any kind. The Holy Prophet in His marriage Laws actually encourages marriage LICENSES. Regarding Licenses to drive, it is known that the Holy Prophet had numerous chauffeurs, and these chauffeurs were equipped with LICENSES to chauffeur the Holy Prophet.

I have noticed that even through a cursory amount of research there is a lot of disinformation and much misunderstanding about pretty much every citation mentioned by so-called sovereign citizens who make radical assertions without the proper training to understand and translate the information in the documents they cite. In regards to the so-called constitutional “Right To Travel,” there exist a GROSS misinterpretation, misreading, and subsequent misapprehension of this doctrinal notion. For the sake of clarity and lucidity: THERE IS NO EXPRESS RIGHT TO TRAVEL FOUND IN THE CONSTITUTION, unlike the Articles of Confederation which provided for "free ingress and regress to and from any other State" (which is indicative of the accurate and veritable discernment of the doctrinal concept of ‘right to travel’). As the Supreme Court notes in Saenz v Roe, 98-97 (1999), Justice Stevens who delivered the opinion of the Court stated, “…The word "travel" is NOT FOUND in the text of the Constitution. Yet the "constitutional right to travel from one State to another" is firmly embedded in our jurisprudence (emphasis mine).” Consequently, the so-called right to travel in reference to operating a motor vehicle without a Drivers License is an erroneous notion. The context of the “right to travel” was explained in the court decision in Saenz v Roe, 98-97. The court explained:

“The right to travel embraces three different components: the right to enter and leave another State; the right to be treated as a welcome visitor while temporarily present in another State; and, for those travelers who elect to become permanent residents, the right to be treated like other citizens of that State.”

The doctrine of the “right to travel” actually encompasses three separate rights:
The first is the right of a citizen to move freely between states, a right venerable for its longevity; The second, expressly addressed by the first sentence of Article IV, provides a
citizen of one State who is temporarily visiting another state the "Privileges and Immunities" of a citizen of the latter state. The third is the right of a new arrival to a state, who establishes citizenship in that state, to enjoy the same rights and benefits as other state citizens.

In the case, State v. Booher (Tenn.Crim.App 1997) 978 SW2d 953, the court concluded the following: “the appellant asserts that the state ... has unduly infringed upon his right to travel by requiring licensing and registration .... However, contrary to his assertions, at no time did the State of Tennessee place constraints upon the appellants exercise of this right. His right to travel ... remains unimpeded.... Rather, based upon the context of his argument, the appellant asserts an infringement upon his right to operate a motor vehicle on the public highways of this state. This notion is wholly separate from the right to travel. The ability to drive a motor vehicle on a public highway is not a fundamental right. Instead, it is a revocable privilege that is granted upon compliance with statutory licensing procedures.”

Also, in the case of, City of Salina v. Wisden (Utah 1987) 737 P2d 981, the court concluded: “Mr. Wisden's assertion that the right to travel encompasses 'the unrestrained use of the highway' is wrong. The right to travel granted by the state and federal constitutions does not include the ability to ignore laws governing the use of public roadways. The motor vehicle code was promulgated to increase the safety and efficiency of our public roads. It enhances rather than infringes on the right to travel. The ability to drive a motor vehicle on a public roadway is not a fundamental right; it is a privilege that is granted upon the compliance with the statutory licensing procedures.”

Also see, State v. Skurdal (1988) 235 Mont 291, 767 P2d 304, whereas the court concluded: “This is obviously a growing school of thought which had been misguided.... The notion of right to travel remains wholly separate from the right or privilege to operate a motor vehicle on the public highways. ” Please note that that the court made a point of discussing many of the arguments against requiring drivers licenses, and also rejected the argument that if the travel is not "commercial" or not connected to government activity that it is not susceptible to regulation.

Berberian v. Petit (RI 1977) 374 A2d 791, “The right to operate a motor vehicle is wholly a creation of state law; it certainly is not explicitly guaranteed by the Constitution, and nothing in that document or in our state constitution has even the slightest appearance or an implicit guarantee of that right. The plaintiff's argument that the right to operate a motor vehicle is fundamental because of its relation to the fundamental right of interstate travel ... is utterly frivolous. The plaintiff is not being prevented from traveling interstate by public transportation, by common carrier, or in a motor vehicle driven by someone with a license to drive it. What is at issue here is not his right to travel interstate, but his right to operate a motor vehicle on the public highways, and we have no hesitation in holding that this is not a fundamental right.”

The erroneous notion that a Drivers License is a contract is utterly misleading; the fact is, a Driver's License is not a contract but an agreement between the issuing state and the
licensee. Reasoning for it not being a contract is that there is no initial advertised offer to which the licensor makes or the licensee is accepting. A license to drive is proof of a privilege bestowed upon the licensee by the issuing state. There are also no mutually enforceable terms for consideration associated with a driver's license. A license is not a contract; it is a unilateral grant by the state of the privilege to operate a properly tagged motor vehicle on the State's roads. You have no right to drive, and there are no contractual elements that you can enforce against the State. It is only a permissive grant of "license" to use the roadways within the restrictive covenants of the traffic laws. For legal cases see: Hendrick v. Maryland (1915) 235 US 610 (a state may restrict the use of its highways to drivers who have complied with the license, insurance and vehicle registration laws of this state or, if the driver is a non-resident, of his home state); Bell v. Burson (1971) 402 US 535 (state statute which denies or suspends drivers license for failure to carry insurance or comparable financial responsibility does not violate constitution); also Aptheker v. Secretary of State, 378 U.S. 500, 526, 84 S.Ct. 1659, 1674, 12 L.Ed.2d 992 (1964) ("The right to travel is not absolute"). It is well established that the Constitution permits a state to regulate the operation of motor vehicles on its roads. See, e.g., Bibb v. Navajo Freight Lines, Inc., 359 U.S. 520, 79 S.Ct. 962, 3 L.Ed.2d 1003 (1959).

**PART 2- THE “14TH AMENDMENT CITIZEN”**

**LAW FACT:** There is no difference between a Citizen of the U.S.A. and a Citizen of the U.S.

**LAW FALLACY:** The 14th Amendment created a 2nd class citizen, a Federal Citizen who is solely subject to Federal Laws under Federal Jurisdiction limited to the 10 by 10 square miles of the District of Columbia. These are citizens of the Corporate US (Federal Corporation) as opposed to being Citizens of the USA.

**EXPLANATION-**
The Holy Prophet actually makes reference to many themes which the so-called sovereign citizen/tax protestors exploit, however their respective approaches to these subjects are dissimilar as well as conflicting. As a student of the Holy and Divine Prophet Noble Drew Ali, and closely studying His life-saving teachings, I have noticed on numerous occasion, the Holy Prophet utilizing U.S. and USA interchangeably, which underscores the reality that there is NO difference between the two, when viewed in context. Regarding the 14th Amendment, the Holy Prophet actually reveals THE purpose and objective of not only the 14th Amendment, but also the 15th Amendment. The Holy Prophet said:

>“The 14th and 15th Amendments BROUGHT the North and South IN UNIT PLACING the Southerners who were at that time without power, WITH the constitutional body of power. And at that time, 1865, the free national constitutional law that was enforced since 1774 declared all men equal and free, and if all men are declared by the free national constitution to be free and equal since that constitution
has never been changed, there is no need for the application of the 14th and 15th amendments FOR THE SALVATION of our people and citizens.”

In the abovementioned, there is no mention of any creation of a 2nd or special class of corporate citizenship; therefore the validity (in relation to Moorish) of that particular argument is in question. If it is such a priority for Moors to avoid “14th amendment “corporate citizenship” status, then I am absolutely certain our Holy Prophet would have instructed us to.

Remember, during the Civil War, there were two separate countries or jurisdictions (per say) at battle; the North consisted of the Union States, and the South comprised the Confederate States who seceded from the Union. Being that they seceded from the Union with their own President, their own army, their own flag, their own currency, etc. They were no longer under the sphere of influence and authority of the Constitution after the close of the Civil War; in fact General Robert E. Lee died without US citizenship. The 14th and 15th Amendments brought the southerner within the constitutional body of power as opposed to creating a corporate citizen. If there were a 14th Amendment citizen, it would be the European Southerner.

**PART 3- THE UNITED STATES IS A FEDERAL CORPORATION**

**LAw FACT:** There is no difference between the United States and the United States of America when utilized in the contextual reference of America.

**LAw FALLACY:** The United States is a Federal Corporation enslaving the 14th Amendment citizens via contracts such as Drivers Licenses, Social Security Cards, Birth Certificates, etc.

**EXPLANATION-**
The United States is NOT a Federal Corporation! Some point to the United States Code (USC) to claim that the United States is a federal corporation, and not a union of states as described in the original Constitution.

From Title 28, Part VI, Chapter 176, Subchapter A, Section 3002 of the USC:
(15) “United States” means—
(A) a Federal corporation;
(B) an agency, department, commission, board, or other entity of the United States; or
(C) an instrumentality of the United States.

Many contend that the above quote, a part of the Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act (FDCPA), means "the United States is a corporation." Again, due to lack of proper schooling and education regarding these subject matters, this truly is an erroneous construction of this particular law. The Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act, 104 Stat. 4933, applies to the entirety of the United States government. Virtually everyone knows that the federal government has lots of agencies. It also has lots of departments, commissions, boards and instrumentalities, including FEDERAL CORPORATIONS. In the last 100 years, Congress has created lots of corporations and some that still exist today are: Tennessee Valley Authority; Commodity Credit Corporation; Export-Import Bank; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; National Railroad Passenger Corporation
Consequently, if you look at the context of that definition, it becomes clear that it’s NOT saying that the United States IS a federal corporation, but rather, it’s referring to federal corporations incorporated by the United States. At the beginning of the section, it says: “As used IN THIS CHAPTER:” Therefore, the reference to the “United States” AS “a federal corporation” is only applicable to Title 28, Part VI, Chapter 176 of the United States Code. Even within that limited context, it’s not referring to the United States BEING a federal corporation. If that was the intent, it would have been defined as “the United States, a Federal corporation.”

The FDCPA (Federal Debt Collection Procedures Act) simply regulates the collection activities of all federal agencies, departments, commissions, boards and instrumentalities, including the above federal corporations. Rather than repeatedly state in this 30+ page act that all "federal agencies, departments, commissions, boards and instrumentalities, including federal corporations" shall do certain things, all these entities are, for purposes of this particular act, encompassed within the words, "United States." Wherever the words "United States" appears in this law regulating these federal collection activities, it means all these various entities, INCLUDING "Federal corporations".

While it is true that Washington DC was created by the Act of 1871 (Feb. 21st), its territory was limited to the District of Columbia and it was defined as a municipal corporation; this also does not imply that the US is a Federal Corporation.

PART 4- JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

LAW FACT: Article 1 section 8, clause 17 states Congress has power to “…exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, AND TO EXERCISE LIKE AUTHORITY OVER ALL PLACES purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;…”

LAW FALLACY: The Federal Government’s authority is limited to the 10 by 10 square miles of the District of Columbia (obviously the entire clause has NOT been properly read or understood).

EXPLANATION: Article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, provides in legal effect that the Federal Government shall have exclusive legislative jurisdiction over such area not exceeding 10 miles square as may become the seat of government of the United States, AND LIKE AUTHORITY OVER ALL PLACES acquired by the Government, with the consent of the State involved, for Federal works. It must be properly understood that the Federal Government has acquired, to the exclusion of the states, jurisdiction such
as it exercises with respect to the District of Columbia over SERVERAL THOUSAND AREAS scattered over the 50 States. Federal acquisition of legislative jurisdiction over such areas has made of them Federal islands within States, which the term "enclaves" is frequently used to describe. While these enclaves, which are used for all the many Federal governmental purposes, such as post offices, arsenals, dams, roads, etc, usually are owned by the Government, the United States in many cases has received similar jurisdictional authority over privately owned properties which it leases, or privately owned and occupied properties which are located within the exterior boundaries of a large area (such as the District of Columbia and various national parks) as to which a State has ceded jurisdiction to the United States.

A state may voluntarily sell some of the land lying within its physical boundaries to the U.S. Federal government. It plainly and clearly says so in the Constitution in Article I, Section 8, Clause 17. According to Article I section 8 clause 17 of the U.S. Constitution, if your state legislature decides to sell land to the Federal government, and the Federal government buys it, Congress gets to have EXCLUSIVE LEGISLATION over it. State laws don't apply within such Federal land. The Federal government usually buys small plots of land in this way to build military bases, cemeteries, or other kinds of things that wouldn't fit under normal zoning ordinances. Unfortunately for the state the land was just purchased from, the state's new lack of jurisdiction over the land means that it can no longer collect taxes for anything that happens on that land. All the stands, clothing stores, etc on Federal areas are immune from sales taxes. All those paychecks being handed out to employees that work on the land are likewise untouched by the state's income tax. The Federal government, on the other hand, does not care if state income taxes are applied to its employee's salaries; but it does care if it has to pay a large price to buy land from the states. Enter the Buck Act… Named after the Congressman who introduced the bill, it was passed by Congress on October 9, 1940. On July 30, 1947, the Buck Act was "re-enacted by codification" (61 Stat. 641) and became sections 105-110 of Title 4 in the United States Code. The Act permits state governments to collect all income and sales taxes that they normally do, even if the transactions being taxed take place on Federal land within their borders. To streamline their verbiage, the code sections coin the term "Federal Area" to describe lands or premises owned by any branch of the U.S. government. This is the origin of the Federal Government conspiracy theory. This conspiracy theory was matured via an article entitled "The Story of the Buck Act", written by two Europeans, Richard McDonald and Mitch Modeleski. The gist of the "Story of the Buck Act" article is this: (1) The Social Security Act established ten districts which cover the entire continental U.S.; (2) The Buck Act established that "Federal Areas" apply to any territory within a state where the Federal Government has jurisdiction, including those Social Security districts; and (3) Since the Buck Act says that "State" includes the District of Columbia, from whence the Social Security Administration operates, everybody who participates in the Social Security program is within a "Federal Area" and thus subject to exclusive, non-Constitutionally-protected, Federal jurisdiction. However, under scrutiny, the arguments made by this article fall apart. The article does offer some good sound advice to the reader, it says “DO SOME RESEARCH," and in following this directive, research has revealed a couple of Federal court cases: Johnson v. IRS (CD Cal 1994) 888 F.Supp 1495, which is a Federal district
court case; and US v. Kolchev (9th Cir unpub 4/5/94) 21 F3d 1117(t), 73 AFTR2d 1817, which is a Federal Circuit court case. Johnson and Kolchev both invoked the Buck Act as part of their fusillade of Sovereign Citizen arguments. And in both cases, the judicial opinion was that the Buck Act only does what it says it does (allows states to apply their income/sales taxes on Federally owned land within their physical borders).

PART 5- THE ORIGIN OF THE SOVEREIGN CITIZEN DOCTRINE

LAW FACT: According the Constitution of the USA, sovereignty is relegated to “The People,” those who comprise the Nation.
LAW FALLACY: Everyone individually is a sovereign unto himself.

EXPLANATION: It is the very “Sovereign Citizen Movement” which finds its origin in the group known as “Posse Comitatus.” During the 1970’s through the early 1980’s the Sovereign Citizen Movement developed as a teaching of Christian Identity by Minister William Potter Gale (Christian patriot movement.) They claim that the U.S. government has enslaved its citizens by using them as collateral against foreign debt. Its ideology is Anti-government, coupled with so-called white supremacist elements, which is referred to as a right-wing anarchist ideology. According to sovereign citizens, as well as many so-called white supremacist groups, the 14th Amendment is unconstitutional. Sovereigns today claim it created a second class citizen, who are unknowingly bound by legal contracts (such as driver’s licenses, taxes, etc.) to the federal government. As ‘naturals’, sovereign, or Freemen, they are citizens of states and, thus, are exempt from federal laws and codes.
William Potter Gale has been described as the founder of the group Posse Comitatus (Posse Comitatus is Latin for “power of the county.”). The Posse can be viewed as the predecessor to the militia/survivalism movement of the 90's. Willaim Gale had formally been member of the 'Silver Shirts', an American fascist group that was founded in 1933. They were known as Neo-Nazi conspiracy theorists. The Silver Legion of America, commonly known as the Silver Shirts, was an American fascist organization founded by William Dudley Pelley on January 30, 1933.

The 10th Amendment states: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Keep in mind the latter portion of the amendment states “…THE PEOPLE,” not “Every Individual Person.” “The People” implies collectivity, instead of individuality. The people have a collective responsibility, which translates into shared responsibility, which ensure the success of the Republic.

PART 6- TAX EXEMPT STATUS OF SOVEREIGN CITIZENS

LAW FACT: According the Constitution of the USA, Taxes are legal via the 16th Amendment.
**LAW FALLACY:** Only 14th Amendment citizens are subject to Income Taxes, sovereign citizens are not taxed.

**EXPLANATION:**
Those erroneously thinking that taxes are unconstitutional are sadly misguided and mistaken; many of those who have accepted this flawed and unethical ideology find themselves in prison or in debt behind fines and exorbitant court fees. Clearly, noticeably and unmistakably, in fact, Article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution states: “The Congress shall have Power to LAY and COLLECT TAXES, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.” Obviously this is taxing power! The only limitations on the Federal government's power to impose taxes are in Article I, section 8, clause 1 farther down: “…but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States,” and in Article I, section 2, clause 3 it states, “Representatives and direct TAXES shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective Numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole Number of free Persons, including those bound to Service for a Term of Years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three fifths of all other Persons.” And in Article I, section 9, clauses 3 and 4 it reads, “No Capitation, or other direct, Tax shall be laid, unless in Proportion to the Census or Enumeration herein before directed to be taken. No Tax or Duty shall be laid on Articles exported from any State.” Those are all the limitations on the Federal government's taxing power. DIRECT TAXES have to be apportioned, INDIRECT TAXES have to be uniform, and state exports can't be taxed at all. But other than that THERE ARE NO LIMITS ON what may be TAXED; nor are there any limits on how high those taxes may be. In addition to the aforementioned, the 16TH amendment (ratified in 1913) even eliminates any apportion requirement that might otherwise apply to income taxes: “The Congress shall have power to LAY AND COLLECT TAXES on incomes, FROM WHATEVER SOURCE DERIVED, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration.” There is nothing anywhere in the Constitution prohibiting the Federal government from taxing an individual Citizen without that person's consent. The Framers of the Constitution felt that having a Congress elected by, and chosen from amongst the citizens of the states themselves would be sufficient to deter excessive taxation or other transgressions of Federal power. Clearly this has not been the case and excessive taxes are in place, however the solution is not anarchism, the solution is to become actively engaged in the Civic/Political process.

**PART 7- GOLD FRINGES ON THE FLAG AND MARITIME LAW**

**LAW FACT:** Gold Fringes on the flag DOES NOT indicate maritime law.

**LAW FALLACY:** Gold fringes on the flag is an indication of admiralty law or maritime law, or Federal Jurisdiction.
EXPLANATION:
It is clear, the Holy Prophet Noble Drew Ali flew the Moorish and the American flag with fringes (see the pic of the Prophet in the office with his secretary). The gold fringe on the American flag absolutely DOES NOT represent a country under admiralty jurisdiction and is quite often not even found on many of our official flags (as it was never mandated by any congressional or presidential authorization). Granted you will see this from time to time, but it doesn’t represent anything and there is no legitimate source to the contrary. In fact, According to a CRS (Congressional Research Service) Report for Congress dated August 23rd. 2004: “The placing of a fringe on the flag is optional with the person or organization, and no Act of Congress or Executive Order either requires or prohibits the practice...It is recognized only as an HONORABLE ENRICHMENT.”
The so-called sovereigns claim that any place flying a gold-fringed U.S. flag is showing that it's under Federal territorial law (instead of the laws of the state it's inside of). Other so-called sovereign groups claim that the gold-fringed flag means Martial Law, while still others claim it means Maritime or Admiralty Law. Their stories contradict each other, while we are taught that Truth doesn’t change nor does it pass away. It is true that, in describing the U.S. flag, 4 USC 1-2 make no mention of any fringe decorations being allowed on the flag, although they don't say that a colored fringe isn't allowed; and it's true that Executive Order No. 10834 (August 21, 1959, 24 F.R. 6865) allows a yellow fringe to be added by the President to indicate military jurisdiction; but a more likely explanation for the gold fringe on courtroom flags is that it just makes them look more formal and impressive. At least one U.S. District Court case, McCann v. Greenway, 952 F.Supp. 647 (W.D.Mo. 1997), supports this latter notion. The quote below concerning gold fringe on the Flag is from the book So Proudly We Hail, The History of the United States Flag Smithsonian Institute Press 1981, by Wiliam R. Furlong and Byron McCandless: “The placing of a fringe on Our Flag is optional with the person of organization, and no Act of Congress or Executive Order either prohibits the practice, according to the Institute of Heraldry. Fringe is used on indoor flags only, as fringe on flags on outdoor flags would deteriorate rapidly. The fringe on a Flag is considered an ‘HONORABLE ENRICHMENT ONLY’, and its official use by the US Army dates from 1895. A 1925 Attorney General's Opinion states: 'the fringe does not appear to be regarded as an integral part of the Flag, and its presence cannot be said to constitute an unauthorized addition to the design prescribed by statute. An external fringe is to be distinguished from letters, words, or emblematic designs printed or superimposed upon the body of the flag itself. Under law, such additions might be open to objection as unauthorized; but the same is not necessarily true of the fringe.”
CONCLUSION

Islam, to all active members of the Moorish Science Temple of America:
We are taught in The Holy Koran of the Moorish Science Temple of America-

“Through sin and disobedience every nation has suffered slavery, due to the fact that
they honored not the creed and principles of their forefathers. That is why the
nationality of the Moors was taken away from them in 1774 and the word negro, black
and colored was given to the Asiatics of America who were of Moorish descent,
because they honored not the principles of their mother and father, and strayed after
the GODS OF EUROPE of whom they knew nothing.”

The abovementioned can be viewed both as a lesson and warning; a lesson of what has
occurred in the past and a warning of what can transpire in the present and future. In the
past our Nationality was taken away because we strayed after the “gods of Europe.” To
put the phrase “gods of Europe” in perspective, we must answer the question: What is a
man’s god? According to The Holy Instructions in the Moorish Holy Koran, “A man’s
ideal is his God…,” hence the Asiatics of America who were of Moorish descent strayed
after the “ideals” of Europe of whom they knew nothing. An “ideal” is something which
exists as a mental image, conception, or an idea. In other words, the Asiatics of America
stayed after the “ideas,” and “concepts” which were based upon doctrines established by
Europeans for “their” earthly salvation. In our contemporary society, there are scores of
those who claim to be Bey’s and El’s, yet they rehash invariably the same mistakes of the
past by forgoing the creed and principles as established by “our” forefathers, in exchange
for a European philosophy and perspective based on Christianity and extremism. The
Holy Prophet Noble Drew Ali stated,

“Our Divine and National Movement stands for the specific grand principles of Love,
Truth, Peace, Freedom, and Justice…”

The Sovereign Citizen Movement and the Tax Protestor Movement stands for something
altogether different from what the Holy Prophet articulated; they are diametrically
opposed to one another. It is the very “Sovereign Citizen Movement” which finds its
origin in the aforementioned group known as Posse Comitatus. During the 1970’s
through the early 1980’s the Sovereign Citizen Movement developed as a teaching of
CHRISTIAN IDENTITY by Minister William Potter Gale. They claim that the U.S.
government has enslaved its citizens by using them as collateral against foreign debt. Its
ideology is Anti-government, coupled with so-called white supremacist elements, which
is referred to as a right-wing anarchist ideology. William Potter Gale has been described
as the founder of the group Posse Comitatus. The Posse can be viewed as the predecessor
to the militia/survivalist movement of the 90's. Willaim Gale had formally been member
of the 'Silver Shirts', an American fascist group that was founded in 1933. They were
known as Neo-Nazi conspiracy theorists. The Silver Legion of America, commonly
known as the Silver Shirts, was an American fascist organization founded by William
Dudley Pelley on January 30, 1933.
None of the above so-called sovereign methods/arguments have ever really worked, and at best have landed people in jail for contempt of court, at worst, landed people in prison. These theories (as shown from recent history) can lead to intense irrational fears, distrust in one's own friends, family, and society and a disturbingly depressing outlook on one's own country. Not to mention, its lies have influenced more domestic terrorism and fundamental extremism than nearly any other group in the United States in the last decade.

A Warning for all Moorish-Americans!
Give this ideology (i.e. sovereign citizen/tax protestor) back to the Europeans as it was prepared by their forefathers as a form of “Redemption”! Return to ISLAM, as it was prepared by YOUR forefathers for your earthly and Divine salvation. OUR Redemption is achieved via carrying out the Divine Instructions palpably outlined in the Moorish Holy Koran. The Holy Prophet reportedly stated that he has brought the Divine Plans of the ages, which cannot be changed, and these are the Plans of Redemption.

There are people who really believe in the tax protestor/sovereign literature, who followed it to the letter, and then was either sent to prison for tax evasion, sanctioned or fined for asserting an illegitimate theory in court, etc. There are numerous cases (below there are a few) which demonstrate conclusively that irrespective of what the scam artists who sell the sovereign/tax protestor materials tell you, the only thing that will happen is that you will get prosecuted in court. In addition to being prosecuted, you will also have lost the money you paid for the bogus materials which landed you in said predicament, your defense attorney's fees, the value of your lost time fighting the IRS, and your reputation as a sensible rational individual.

See:

- **United States v. Steiner**, 963 F.2d 381 (9th Cir. 1992)
  Argued that the district court lacked jurisdiction over "sovereign citizens," that he was not a "taxpayer" under the federal tax laws, and that the word "includes" is a term of restriction, not expansion.

- **United States v. Sloan**, 939 F.2d 499 (7th Cir. 1991)
  Argued that there is no law imposing a tax on income, that "freeborn" state citizens are exempt from income tax, and that an individual is not a "person" under the tax code.

- **Schiff v. United States**, 919 F.2d 830 (2nd Cir. 1990)
  Argued that federal reserve notes are not taxable income, that the Constitution does not authorize an income tax, and that tax assessments are takings.
• United States v. White, No. 89-10533 (9th Cir. 1990)
  Argued that there is no law requiring him, as "a sovereign citizen of the state of
  Nevada," to file income tax returns.
• Miller v. United States, 868 F.2d 236 (7th Cir. 1988)
  Argued that the Sixteenth Amendment was never legally ratified.
  Argued that a state court lacked jurisdiction over him because the flag in the
  courtroom had yellow fringe on it, thus converting it into the "maritime flag of
  war." 
• Valdejuli v. Social Security Admin., No. 94-10051 (N.D. Fla. 1994)
  Argued that he was fraudulently induced into signing a "contract" with the Social
  Security Administration, and that he is a natural sovereign citizen of the United
  States who is not subject to the Social Security system.
  Argued that Congress' power to tax does not extend beyond the District of
  Columbia and other federal areas, and that the Sixteenth Amendment was never
  ratified lawfully.
  Argued that the Sixteenth Amendment was never legally ratified.
• Young v. Internal Revenue Service, 596 F. Supp. 141 (N.D. Ind. 1984)
  Argued that the IRS was not created by "positive law," that the tax code does not
  apply to "sovereign citizens," that the tax code is a bill of attainder, and that the
  district court lacks jurisdiction.
• Snyder v. United States, 596 F. Supp. 240 (N.D. Ind. 1984)
  Argued that the I.R.S. is a private corporation and not part of the government of the
  United States.
• McKinney v. Regan, 599 F. Supp. 126 (M.D. La. 1984)
  Argued that as a "Sovereign Individual," the "Common Law of the United States of
  America, a Republic" protected him from penalties for filing a frivolous tax return.