

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

An Analysis of: "The Name Game",
in respect of the Legal System,
by: The Man Gordon Thomas or The Man Thomas Gordon,
6th February 2015.

OBJECTIVE:

This treatise is written in respect of Canada, however the information herein applies directly to all British Commonwealth Countries (Australia, New Zealand, Britain, etc.), but also applies to America with some modifications for their different legal system.

The object of this treatise is to deal with the **names** of things. Understanding what a **name** is, and what it is not, is essential knowledge when dealing with the 'Legal System' (the collection of Statutes in Canada, and subsequent case law derived from same), as well as how we relate to each other and business dealings in commerce.

The NAME Game is a "Game" played in the Legal System to trick us into assuming Statutory liability. The "trick" is to get our agreement that we (the living flesh, blood, and bones human beings) are to be treated and considered to be the same as the legal-identity NAME (the "legal person" in Statutes), then prosecute us as though we were identical to the legal-identity NAME as written on the paper used in the Legal System.

This treatise exposes the "trick" and shows how the "Game" works. Herein, the common term "human being" is to be read as "man" or "woman" as required by context.

THE IDENTITY TRAP:

For this "trick" to work, we need to understand the importance of the meanings of certain words. Law is all about the use of words. To begin with, we need to understand "The Identity Trap", so we start with the word "identification". The word "identification" is related to "identity" which is related to "identical" which basically means "the same as". Thus, any ID cards issued by government (Passport, Citizenship, Drivers Licence, Student ID, etc.) create a government "identity" used to link some human being who applied for said ID card (linked usually *via* a photograph on the ID card) to the legal **person** identified by other information on the ID card. No ID card is issued by the government unless one applies for it, so when we apply for government-issued ID we ostensibly create a contract. Refer to [APPENDIX I](#) (page 9) for clarification.

NAMES ARE DESIGNATORS OF THINGS:

The NAME Game relies heavily upon the concept of a "name". We must understand how names are used in The NAME Game. Here we go:

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Names are designators of things, not the things themselves. To designate means to point out, to show, to mark, or to indicate. A **name** of an item is not the same as the item itself. A designator only points to the item; it is not the same as the item. The **name** of a **person** is handled in the same way. The **name** designates a **person**, but is not the same as a **person**. Refer to [APPENDIX II](#) (page 13) for clarification.

BY WHAT NAME ARE YOU CALLED:

Outside of the Legal System, the **name** of a **person** (a human being in common parlance) is that by which the **person** is “designated, called, known”. So a human being can be called Bob, or known as Bob, or designated as Bob. Therefore, the correct way for Bob to refer to himself is to say “I am called Bob” or “I call myself Bob”. Alternatively, Bob could say “my designation is Bob”. If he says “my name **is** Bob”, he may have unintentionally created a connection between the **name** Bob and his human body, depending upon the meaning of the verb “**is**” in his statement. Unintentionally creating such a connection (referred to as “legal joinder”) may not be a good thing because of unintended consequences. The Legal System has a system-wide prejudice where the verb “**is**” takes on the meaning of “the same as” (a prejudice which is unfounded), and all **names** are presumed to have legal joinder between human beings and legal **persons**. We must rebut these presumptions if we wish to remain free from entrapment within The NAME Game. Refer to [APPENDIX III](#) (page 15) for clarification.

WHO OWNS A NAME:

To add more foundation to the **name** issue, it needs to be stated that there are two similar-looking names associated with any human being. One **name** is that by which we are called, originating from our mother (she has the final word as to what she calls us). This **name** will be referred to as the “called **name**” herein. The other NAME (written herein with capital letters for distinction) is the NAME on the Birth Certificate issued by the ‘State’ (the body politic as organized for civil rule and government) created from a Registration of Live Birth document. This other NAME will be referred to as the “legal NAME” herein, which is strictly the legal-identity NAME. Both the called **name** and the legal NAME may look the same, but they are not identical. The Legal System only has jurisdiction over the legal NAME because it has Legal Title to that legal NAME. Refer to [APPENDIX IV](#) (page 17) for clarification.

LEGAL JOINDER:

The importance of this **name** concept becomes apparent in “The NAME Game”, as played in the Legal System. The Legal System is a game of words, with each party, involved in a dispute, throwing paper at the other party. Whoever has the best paper, the best aim, and the best words should win (if Courts were unbiased). For best effect, the paper, being thrown between the parties, has to be targeted to undermine the

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

foundation of the opposition, and knock them off their feet, so to speak. This is something like children throwing crumpled paper balls at each other in a classroom, similar to the antics which take place in a courtroom throwing words and paper.

However sometimes, even with the best paper in a legal action, we are tricked into agreements and we lose because we inadvertently agree that we are to be considered to be the same as the legal NAME involved in the legal action. Only the legal NAME can be charged with any Statutory offence. Nobody has dominion over your human body, especially if you do not create legal joinder with the legal NAME being charged with an offence. If you don't know the difference between the legal NAME which looks like you, and the designator **name** by which you are called, then you can be easily tricked into creating legal joinder between the legal NAME you use in commerce and your human being. Refer to [APPENDIX V](#) (page 27) for clarification.

THE NAME GAME:

The NAME Game needs a legal NAME to be charged with offences. Without a NAME to be charged, there can be no paperwork because some NAME needs to be written on the paperwork begin thrown about in the Legal System. Furthermore, the legal NAME to be charged cannot be a pointer to something else, since a designator cannot be charged with anything. So, the Legal System creates what is called a "legal fiction" to presume that the legal NAME is not a pointer, but is the object itself.

In reality, the legal NAME is only a designator which points to the Birth Certificate, so in reality, the legal NAME is not the same as the Birth Certificate to which it points. If it were known that the legal NAME were only a pointer, then all charges against the legal NAME would have to be charges against the Birth Certificate, for which the State holds Legal Title. Hence, all charges by the State against the legal NAME are in fact charges by the State against itself, *via* the Birth Certificate. In order to hide this truth, The NAME Game is created *via* a legal fiction pretending to make the legal NAME the same as the object which is being charged with an offence. Many legal NAMES are created as bodies corporate (most likely corporations sole), one for each subject matter.

Therefore, in The NAME Game used by the Legal System, **the System presumes the legal NAME to be the same as the object being charged, so as to hide the true connection between the legal NAME and the Birth Certificate. This is done to hide the fact that the State holds Legal Title to the legal NAME and is ultimately liable to pay for any charges laid against their Legal Title.** The actions of the State are considered to be "legal fictions", a topic which is discussed later. This is referred to as the NAME Game. Refer to [APPENDIX VI](#) (page 28) for clarification.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

LEGAL DICTIONARIES:

Why do legal dictionaries exist? The answer to this question is obvious. Legal dictionaries provide definitions and re-definitions of words which only apply when used in the Legal System. New definitions and re-definitions allow Statutes to target intended objects without trespassing onto un-intended objects, which would otherwise occur if there were no legal dictionaries. By intention, words defined in legal dictionaries supersede the ordinary meanings of said words, otherwise there would be no need for said words to be defined in a legal dictionary. If some people mistakenly believe that both legal definitions and ordinary definitions apply at the same time so that one can choose which definition one prefers to use in a given situation, then all Statutes would be void by way of semantic ambiguity, discrimination, and absurdity. Refer to [APPENDIX VII](#) (page 29) for clarification.

LEGAL FICTIONS:

A legal fiction is a presumption that something is real, when in fact it may not be real, in order to allow the law to work. Examples of legal fictions are **corporations**. **Corporations** do not exist in fact because one cannot touch or feel them as real objects. They are imaginary constructs of mind, identified by paperwork with words written that purport some inferred obligations and rights attributed to them. Another example of a legal fiction, like a **corporation**, is the legal NAME. Refer to [APPENDIX VIII](#) (page 31) for clarification.

CORPORATIONS:

As can be seen from the definitions cited herein, a **corporation** is an **artificial person**. A **corporation** has a legal NAME which points to the Incorporation Date and Registration Number. This is fundamental knowledge when applied to incorporated companies, but it also applies to other corporations. For example, the legal NAME associated with the Birth Certificate points to the Birth Date and Registration Number for the **corporation** created for the legal NAME to conduct commerce within the jurisdiction of the Statutes. Therefore, the legal NAME is not the **corporation per se**, it simply designates the **corporation**. Whether or not a legal NAME points to an incorporated company or a Birth Certificate, they both designate **corporations** in law. Refer to [APPENDIX IX](#) (page 33) for clarification.

OWNERSHIP OF A CORPORATION:

Before proceeding, we need to understand something about the concept of **ownership** of things, especially if we refer to something as mine, his, or yours. Basically, **ownership** may be thought of as a bundle of rights, including legal title, equitable title, and quiet possession. One only has true **ownership** when one has all three rights,

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

otherwise, we need to be clear about who has which right. Often, however, the word **ownership** is used in the more relaxed sense to mean that one has equitable title, but this situation does not grant complete **ownership**. For example, we may create a **corporation** and think we have equitable title to use the corporate legal NAME in commerce, but the legal title and quiet possession of the legal entity remains with the State where the **corporation** was created and registered. However, we may loosely refer to this as our **corporation**, even though we do not have complete **ownership** of the corporation. We must be very careful with this claim of ownership, and it is something which is best avoided by using the correct words. Refer to [APPENDIX X](#) (page 35) for clarification.

STATUTORY JURISDICTION:

Statutes are Acts of Parliament (or the Legislature) which have the force and effect of law. Statutes are not in fact law, but they have been given the designation of Statute Law, which is basically man-made law, as opposed to God's Law, or the common law. The question about Statutes becomes: How can man-made rules (so-called laws) have dominion over other men without consent and without slavery? The simple answer is that they cannot, so we have to figure out the true jurisdiction of Statute Law, and how we can achieve a safe functioning society within the jurisdiction of Statute Law. Refer to [APPENDIX XI](#) (page 36) for clarification.

INTERNATIONAL LAW:

As a result of the atrocities committed against human beings during the Second World War, several International Committees were created to ensure that the rights of human beings were protected by treaty agreement with member nations. Most notably, the United Nations has been involved in promoting several Declarations, Covenants, and Treaties. Many nation-states (called "Member States") around the world signed on to these treaties because they wanted to give the appearance of upholding human rights in their nation-states. Canada is a signatory to most of these International Treaties. Most notably, the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* makes it abundantly clear that human beings are not inherently "persons before the law", contrary to the drivel that we see coming from court decisions. Refer to [APPENDIX XII](#) (page 45) for clarification.

WHAT IS CANADA:

All laws written in Canada, make reference to Canada. However, we need to know the answer to the question "Which Canada?" For business within Canada, clearly the Canada in question must be the Corporate CANADA. Clearly, since all commerce within Canada is conducted with the Corporate CANADA, all Statutes made for Canada are made in respect of the Corporate CANADA. This means that all Statute Law is in fact "pretend" law created by the Corporation of CANADA providing the rules and

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

framework for those working for said Corporation of CANADA. The rules of any corporation do not and cannot go outside the corporate scope, thus all Statutes of Canada only apply to those “performing a function of government”. The legal NAME, as identified by the Birth Certificate, is always performing a function of government in commerce since it is a creation of government. Refer to [APPENDIX XIII](#) (page 51) for clarification.

CANADIAN LAW:

With respect to the laws written for Canada, the questions become: to which Canada and to which persons do the laws apply? We can find the answer from two fundamental *Acts* associated with Canada. The first *Act* is called the *Canadian Bill of Rights* and is one of the few *Acts* which deal with human beings as natural-persons in law. Furthermore, said *Act* received *Royal Assent* on 10th August 1960, and has provisions which natural-persons may use to enforce their rights. So, the *Canadian Bill of Rights* applies to human beings as natural-persons in law. The second *Act* comes from the old British *Canada Act*, which subsequently became the *Constitution Act*, that also includes as Part I, the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms*, followed by the rest of the *Act*, including but not limited to Part VII General Provisions of the *Constitution Act* of Canada. This *Constitution Act* did not receive *Royal Assent* and is therefore a “pretend *Act*” most likely applicable to corporate CANADA. Most notable, the *Charter* of Canada has been ruled every time to apply only to those persons performing a function of government, clearly making it an *Act* applicable only to CANADA the **corporation**. The *Charter* of Canada, and hence the *Constitution* of Canada, does not apply to private individuals and their private dealings. All court decisions have emphatically stated that the *Charter* does not apply to private individuals and their affairs. Thus, all Statutes created by Canada or its Provinces under the *Constitution Act*, do not apply to human beings; they only apply to **legal persons** with the legal NAME - an entity for which the government has Legal Title. This makes perfect sense in respect of The NAME Game. Refer to [APPENDIX XIV](#) (page 53) for clarification.

ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS

See [APPENDIX XVII](#) (page 65) for an alternative explanation of The NAME GAME.

SOLUTION:

We need a solution in order to establish our freedom from The NAME Game. Since the government maintains the presumption that every human being is the same as the legal NAME (the government’s claim), then we have to conditionally accept their claim upon their providing us the proof for their claim. If they cannot provide proof (which they cannot), then their claim is deemed to be false by a legal premise known as Acceptance by Conduct. This solution dismantles their presumption by calling their bluff. It is one

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

mechanism that works. We cannot argue and make our claims (because then we have to provide our proof in respect of their system), so we turn the tables and demand to see their proof to the contrary. Refer to [APPENDIX XV](#) (page 56) for clarification. An alternative solution, under review, is the issuance of a Notice of Mistake wherein we admit that we made the mistake of believing that the legal NAME was ours to use in commerce, and we ask them for permission to continue using their property (the legal NAME) with their acceptance to pay for all the goods and services we purchase for them.

CONCLUSIONS:

From the foundation, it has been shown that the called **name** by which we call ourselves is not the same as we are, it is only a reference to us. However, in order to become ensnared in the Legal System (the world of fiction), those in control of the Legal System must get our agreement that we agree to be treated the same as the legal NAME, by using our called **name** as a trick by association with the apparently-identical legal NAME. With such an agreement, any offences against the legal NAME can be attributed to the human being with a similar-looking called **name**.

Since Legal Title to the legal NAME is held by the government, the legal NAME is always performing a function of government, therefore it (the legal NAME) can be held liable for any consequences relating to its use in business and commerce. As human beings, we can only be liable by our consent and agreement, either explicitly (in writing), or implicitly (by our actions), or by trick (essentially a fraudulent inducement to contract).

In order to rebut the government's presumptions that the flesh and blood man or woman is the same as their NAME, we may use a process such as Conditional Acceptance to ask them for their proof of their presumptions. Such a Conditional Acceptance can only be issued as a counter-offer to something which they start against us. There is little to be gained by launching a Claim of Right, or similar "foisted" document to them because they will just use the *Meads v. Meads* decision to block such a document. However, they cannot use *Meads* to block a counter-offer we make asking for their proof, because a counter-offer is not a "foisted agreement" but instead is a "counter agreement".

Alternatively, we can issue them with a Notice of Mistake, again in response to something they start, and in said Notice we admit that we made a mistake in believing that the legal NAME was ours to use, so we ask for their permission to continue using their legal NAME to purchase property in their NAME, and we ask them to reimburse us for the property we purchase in their NAME.

However, no matter what we do in an attempt to assert our rights and freedoms, we will invariably encounter a "bureaucrat" at the other end, which is where we encounter roadblocks. It is worth quoting the dictionary definition for a bureaucrat as "*an official who works by fixed routine without exercising intelligent judgement*". Unfortunately, dealing with bureaucrats is frustrating because they lack the necessary intelligent

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

judgement to deal with the facts. Furthermore, it is worth remembering that those people who work in government jobs invariable do so because they are not capable of working in a real job which requires elevated levels of skills.

One might think that justice can be obtained through the court systems, however, such justice is very difficult to achieve since the judges in the court system are paid from the same source which pays the bureaucrats and other State agencies. Basically, the courts are biased and corrupt in order to maintain the *status quo* and “slavery” over their subjects, in an attempt to protect the State from becoming liable for anything.

Also, the Department of so-called Justice (herein ‘DOJ’) is a “joke” because its sole purpose is not to provide justice to the people; its purpose is to protect the State and the bureaucrats from attack by the people. If you don’t believe this, write a letter to the so-called DOJ and ask them for clarification of some provision in the *Income Tax Act*, and their reply will be that they cannot discuss the matter because the Canada Revenue Agency is their client, and they are bound by client confidentiality. So, some of a taxpayer’s money is funding the so-called DOJ whose position is to prosecute the taxpayer if he does not conform. Essentially, the so-called DOJ is really acting as the Department of No-Justice, a.k.a. the Department of Injustice. As I said, it is a “joke”.

Essentially the government, and all their departments along with the courts, are running what is best called a “**Legalized Criminal Racket**” which they totally control.

More and more people are waking up to the “fiction” created by the government and its Legalized Criminal Racket. When are you going to wake up?

FEEDBACK:

If anybody finds any information herein, which they can prove to be false, please send the evidence along with an email to Grant <themangrant@gmail.com>.

Since the intent of this treatise is to be educational for all readers, then all feedback would be much appreciated.

[<- HOME](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX I

The Identity Trap:

Many times we are asked to produce “government-issued photo identification”, which is a government-issued and government-certified document which “identifies” us in some way with the legal **person** whose details appear on that document. In other words, the government is telling others (and us) who we are by way of this photo ID document. Have you ever wondered why we need the government to tell others (and us) who we are, when we can tell them directly? The answer is that we do not need anybody else to tell anybody who we are. What the government-issued photo ID document provides is a legal connection (called legal joinder) to connect their legal **person** (the legal-identity name on the ID document) to the human being who applied for said document, *via* a contractual relationship for benefits. The government-issued ID document provides the basis for “The Identity Trap”. By the very name “ID” or “identification” document, by which the document is called, the ID document provides evidence that we have agreed (by application and associated contract) to be recognized and to be treated to be the same as the legal **person** whose NAME appears on the ID document. Associated with the application, there are some terms and conditions of the contract between the parties (the government and the applicant), any we are obliged by those terms and conditions under the Statutes which govern the subject matter in that case.

Let’s see how the word “identification” (as used by an ID document) eventually means “the same as”. For the trick to work, it is essential that the ID document make the applicant agree (by his application for same) to be “the same as” the legal person whose identification is associated with the ID document, in order to impose the Statutory terms and conditions of the contract.

We start with the ordinary meaning of the word “identification” as would be used in government-issued photo identification, as “something that identifies a person”:

identification - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

noun

1. an act or instance of identifying; the state of being identified.
2. something that identifies a person, animal, or thing: He carries identification with him at all times.

Now, let’s check the ordinary meaning of the word “identifies” (as used above) to see it means “to verify the identity of”, as well as meaning “the same as”:

identify - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

verb (used with object)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

1. to recognize or establish as being a particular person or thing; verify the identity of: to identify handwriting; to identify the bearer of a check.
2. to serve as a means of identification for: His gruff voice quickly identified him.
3. to make, represent to be, or regard or treat as the same or identical: They identified Jones with the progress of the company.
4. to associate in name, feeling, interest, action, etc. (usually followed by with): He preferred not to identify himself with that group.
5. Biology . to determine to what group (a given specimen) belongs.

Now, let's check the meaning of the word "identity", as used above, and we see it means "the same as":

identity - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

noun

1. the state or fact of remaining the same one or ones, as under varying aspects or conditions: The identity of the fingerprints on the gun with those on file provided evidence that he was the killer.
2. the condition of being oneself or itself, and not another: He doubted his own identity.
3. condition or character as to who a person or what a thing is: a case of mistaken identity.
4. the state or fact of being the same one as described.
5. the sense of self, providing sameness and continuity in personality over time and sometimes disturbed in mental illnesses, as [schizophrenia](#).

Now, for final confirmation, we check the meaning of the "same" and discover that it leads back to "identical":

same - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

adjective

1. identical with what is about to be or has just been mentioned: This street is the same one we were on yesterday.
2. being one or identical though having different names, aspects, etc.: These are the same rules though differently worded.
3. agreeing in kind, amount, etc.; corresponding: two boxes of the same dimensions.
4. unchanged in character, condition, etc.: It's the same town after all these years.

pronoun

5. the same person or thing.
6. the same kind or category of thing: You're having steak? I'll have the same, but very rare.
7. the very person, thing, or [set](#) just mentioned: Sighted sub sank same.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

8. the same, in the same manner; in an identical or similar way: I see the same through your glasses as I do through mine.

The conclusion is that all government-issued photo identification is a document used to provide evidence that the applicant (the one who applied for the identification document) wishes to be treated the same as the legal **person** whose details appear on that document. The treatment is enforced in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract created by the application for the government ID. This is “The Identity Trap” and we must be fully aware of it at all times if we wish to preserve our individual freedoms, namely those which are not connected to the government-issued photo ID.

Each identity is its own legal **person** (called an **artificial person** in law) with its own benefits and liabilities attached. Some examples of the many legal persons are:

Citizen, Teacher, Student, Voter, Homeowner, Driver, Fisherman, Truck Driver, Housewife, Spouse, Engineer, Doctor, Lawyer, Taxpayer, Mother, Father, etc.

For each of the above-cited legal **persons**, the human being plays the role for that position in society, as would an actor play a role on a stage. The English word **person** is derived from the latin word *persona* which means the mask worn by an actor playing a role on a stage (“all the world’s a stage, and all the men and women merely players” - Shakespeare’s *As You Like It*):

persona - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

noun

1. a person.
2. personae, the characters in a play, novel, etc.
3. the narrator of or a character in a literary work, sometimes identified with the author.
4. (in the psychology of C. G. Jung) the mask or façade presented to satisfy the demands of the situation or the [environment](#) and not representing the inner personality of the individual; the public personality (contrasted with [anima](#)).
5. a person's perceived or evident personality, as that of a well-known official, actor, or celebrity; personal [image](#); public role.

Useful Identities with Limited Risk:

There are situations where it is necessary to “play The Name Game” and go along with pretending to be identified by government-issued ID. A very good example of this is a Passport. Unless one is happy being confined to the borders of his country, one requires a Passport to travel around the world. Fortunately, there is very little negative impact on obtaining a Passport and using it for travel around the world. Another example of playing the Name Game is to obtain the benefits provided by the Health

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Care System, with a provincial medical card. This is a low-impact Game with many benefits of medical care and attention when the body needs it.

Some Identities with Moderate Risk:

A moderate risk identity would be a Driver, which can be subject to fines for disobeying the rules associated with the Driver's Licence. The Driver's Licence has clearly defined rules and Statutes, known by the applicant. Furthermore, the Driver's Licence has a photograph to assist in determining the applicant, making it easy for the police to determine who applied for the Licence.

Precarious Identities with High Risk:

A high risk Identity would be a Taxpayer, which is subject to ultimate forms of slavery and confiscation of money whenever some public servant deems it so, whether or not the public servant's presumptions be true or not. The application for a Social Insurance Number (and associated contract to be treated as a taxpayer), results in the issuance of a S.I.N. Card, which only has the NAME of the legal person who applied for the Card, but the Card does not have any photographic evidence of the applicant. Without any form or photographic evidence, the only way the applicant can be identified as a Taxpayer is by the use of the NAME and S.I.N. on such things as bank accounts, and employment contracts.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX II

Names are Designators of Things:

From an ordinary dictionary (not a law dictionary) we get the ordinary meaning of words. Later on, we deal with law dictionaries, but for now, we stay with “ordinary” meanings.

From the “ordinary” on-line Dictionary Definition (www.dictionary.com), we check the definition of the word “**name**”, and we read that a **name** is used to designate (point to) or call things or refer to known things. From this definition you can see that the **name** of an item is not the same as the item itself, but is a means to designate the item:

name - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

noun

1. a [word](#) or a combination of words by [which](#) a **person**, place, or thing, a body or class, or any [object](#) of thought **is** designated, called, or known.
2. mere designation, as distinguished from fact: He was a king in name only.
3. an appellation, title, or epithet, applied descriptively, in honor, abuse, etc.
4. a reputation of a particular kind given by common opinion: to protect one's good name.
5. a distinguished, famous, or great reputation; fame: to make a name for oneself.

From definition #1 *above*, we see that a **name** is a word (or combination) by which something (an item) is “designated, called, or known”. Thus, the **name** is not the same as the item itself; it is how we refer to the item. Definition number “2” gives an alternative understanding of a **name** as a “mere designation, as distinguished from fact”.

What about the **name** of a **person**? Same things apply.

As an example, lets incorporate the word “**person**” from the definition of **name** (*above*) and see what we get. In this ordinary definition of “**person**” (as used in definition number “1”, *above*), the word “**person**” means “human being”, as is commonly understood outside of Statute re-definitions (where “person” has been intentionally re-defined). Here is the “ordinary” definition of “**person**”, quoted below:

person - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

noun

1. a **human being**, whether man, woman, or child.
2. a human being as distinguished from an animal or a thing.
3. Sociology . an individual human being, especially with reference to his or her social relationships and behavioral patterns as conditioned by the [culture](#).
4. Philosophy . a self-conscious or rational being.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

5. the actual self or individual [personality](#) of a human being: You ought not to generalize, but to consider the person you are dealing with.

Therefore, the **name** of a **person** is the designator of a human being (in common parlance), by which the **person** is called or known. Nowhere in any of these definitions is the claim made that the **name** “identifies” the **person** (or human being), and nowhere is any claim made that the **name** of a **person** is to be regard to be the same as that **person**.

It is patently obvious that the **name** of a **person** is not the same as the **person** himself, otherwise there would be thousands of “Bob Smiths” in the world, each one being the same as each other. It is a logical fallacy to presume that the **name** and the **person** are one and the same as each other, and anybody holding that belief needs to re-examine his false beliefs, perhaps with a psychologist.

The conclusion is that all **names** are designators and only point to an object. The NAME Game is used to trick us into thinking that the **name** of a **person** is the same as that **person**, which is simply not true, unless we agree with the “trick”:

trick - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

noun

1. a crafty or underhanded device, maneuver, stratagem, or the like, intended to deceive or cheat; artifice; ruse; wile.
2. an optical illusion: It must have been some visual trick caused by the flickering candlelight.
3. a roguish or mischievous act; practical joke; prank: She likes to play tricks on her friends.
4. a [mean](#), foolish, or childish action.
5. a clever or ingenious device or expedient; adroit technique: the tricks of the trade.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX III

By What Name Are You Called?

If you call yourself Bob (*je m'appelle Bob - me llamo Bob*) then Bob is your designation. If you say your **name** "is" Bob (*mon nom est Bob - mi nombre es Bob*), then you need to know which version of "is" you mean. As an example, the most popular meanings of "is" are:

1. "the same as", for example: He **is** himself (he is identical to himself)
2. "play the role of", for example: He **is** a lawyer (he plays the role of a lawyer)
3. "occupy the location of", for example: He **is** here (he locates himself here)
4. "have possession of", for example: This **is** mine (I have possession of this)
5. "have the essence of", for example: He **is** alive (he has the essence of life)
6. "to exist", for example: There **is** no money (no money exists)

Do you know which one you intend when you say "is"? Do you think you are the same as the **name**, or are you playing the role of the **name**? For example, if you say: "he **is** a lawyer", are you saying that he is the same as a lawyer or are you saying that he plays the role of a lawyer? If he is the same as a lawyer, then what in fact **is** a lawyer? Can a lawyer be touched, felt, or observed? No, but a human being playing the role can. Similar logic applies to such statements as "she **is** the mother", which means "she plays the role of the mother".

For example, consider the role-playing involved for a living-soul to end up playing the role of a Taxpayer: A living-soul possesses the body of a man, who plays the role of a human being, who plays the role of a natural-person in law, who plays the role of an artificial-person in law known as the Taxpayer.

The ONLY valid interpretation for "is" to mean "the same as" is given by example # 1 above, viz: "he **is** himself" because he can only be the same as himself. He cannot be the same as anything else. Since the Legal System makes the presumption that **names** are the same as **persons**, you must totally rebut and destroy this presumption immediately, otherwise all which follows is based upon a false presumption, and the outcome can be devastating and harmful to you.

From the above-stated six different meanings of the verb "is", the most common meaning presumed to apply (in law) is "the same as", which is a "trick" and a joke because you can only be the same as yourself, nothing else. The Legal System has a prejudice in favour of this interpretation because it supports "The NAME Game". So, anything which applies to the **name** Bob, is now deemed to apply to your human body because you just declared that your human body (your **person** so to speak) is the same as the **name** Bob, unless you rebut the presumed meaning of "is". It is important to know what you mean when you use the verb "is", just in case the NAME Bob is charged with any legal action.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

In the legal world, only a legal NAME can be charged with any statutory violation, so it is important for the legal enforcers to get your agreement that your human body is the same as the legal-identity NAME which is being charged. Their objective is to have you agree that your designation (**name**) is the same as their legal NAME, to support The NAME Game. Only with this agreement, or the lack of your rebuttal to the contrary, can they make you liable for any violations attributed to the legal NAME.

You can easily get tricked into creating legal joinder with the NAME, with your agreement, with the simple question: "What is your name?" There are four tricks in this simple question, one for each word in the question:

- (1) which meaning of "what" applies (there are over 20 meanings)?
- (2) which meaning of "is" applies (there are at least 6 meanings)?
- (3) to which "you" is this question directed (there are at least 3 of "you")?
- (4) who owns the name being requested - is it really yours to begin with?

Here are some ways to respond to this question:

- (i) I would be happy to answer your question if you would be willing to clarify your question further. For example: To which "you" is the question directed? Which meaning of "is" applies in the question? Does the preposition "your" include the property rights in terms of Legal Title, Equitable Title, Possession, or some combination of these, and if so, which ones?
- (ii) Who is asking? Why do you want to know? Why do you ask?
- (iii) I am called Bob. My designation is Bob. What is your name?
- (iv) Why do I have to answer your question? Do you have dominion over me?

This "trick" question is used at the very beginning of all negotiations in order to create a contractual relationship between the parties. If you are not successful with diffusing this question from the very beginning, you will enter into a contract without knowledge.

Since a "trick" is deceitful, it needs to be treated with the same level of disrespect.

Answering a question with another question is the best strategy to deflect a "trick" question such as this is. If you make statements, then you need to prove your statements. If you ask questions, then there is nothing to prove.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX IV

Who Owns a Name?:

There are two similar-looking names associated with every human being, the “called **name**” and the “legal NAME”. The question now becomes, who owns the called **name** and who owns the legal NAME?

Before answering this question, we need to establish what is meant by “owns”. There are three things to consider in respect of ownership, and they are: Legal Title, Equitable Title, and Possession. Legal Title grants one the primary control over property, and gives one the right to transfer the Legal Title to another. Equitable Title gives one the right to use the property for his benefit. Possession gives one the right to hold on to the property until challenged by the one who has Legal Title.

Rights of Ownership:

Ownership of property is a very complex issue in law, however for simplicity, let us presume that one only has complete ownership of something when one has all three things in his grasp (*viz*: Legal Title, Equitable Title, and Quiet Possession). However, a common meaning applied to ownership is when one only has Equitable Title (and perhaps Quiet Possession), but this common meaning does not provide complete ownership and we disregard this definition of ownership because it is intentionally or innocently misleading (another “trick”) and results in false conclusions in analysis and logic.

For example, you may think you own a motor vehicle because you have Equitable Title and Quiet Possession, but in fact you do not truly “own” said vehicle because the State holds Legal Title to said vehicle. If you do not believe this, then try to sell a motor vehicle without involving the State, and you will discover that you cannot legally do so.

Similarly, you may think you own a house, because you have Equitable Title and Quiet Possession, but since you do not have Legal Title, you do not really own the house. This is clearly evident if you try to sell a house without involving the Land Title Office (who holds Legal Title). Furthermore, your “Title” listed on the property in the Land Title Registry is either “Joint Tenants” or “Tenants in Common”. In both cases you are considered to be a “Tenant”, so who is the Landlord? The Landlord would be the State because the legal NAME is what appears on the Property Title, and the State has Legal Title to the legal NAME. The legal NAME is subordinate to the State and function is servitude (slavery) to its master.

How do we determine whether or not we have complete ownership of something? We need a legal test for this purpose:

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Test for Complete Ownership:

So, what is the test for complete ownership? The test for complete ownership of property is when one does not need anybody else's approval or involvement to give away, transfer, sell, modify, change, destroy, or mess with one's property. Keep this test in mind when determining complete ownership of property.

In the case of the "called **name**", one does not need anybody's permission or approval to change one's called **name**. Hence, it would appear that one has complete ownership of one's called **name**, except as we will see later, one cannot really own a called **name** because a **name** is just a designator for a thing. So although the test for complete ownership of one's called **name** works, a called **name** cannot be owned by anybody because it just a designator for something else.

On the other hand, the test for a "legal NAME" fails because one cannot modify or change a "legal NAME" without permission of the State, thus indicating that one does not really have complete ownership of the legal NAME. Let's investigate why this is so:

The Public and Private Trusts associated with the legal NAME:

In order to establish who has which title to what (in The NAME Game) we need to investigate the creation of a Birth Certificate to figure out how the called **name** was used to create the legal NAME. For this analysis, we will need to discuss some fundamentals of Trust Law, since Trust Law is involved in the creation of a Birth Certificate:

A Trust is an arrangement whereby one party (called the Settlor) puts something of value (called the Res or Corpus) in the care of a second party (called the Trustee) for the benefit of a third party (called the Beneficiary). The Settlor gives Legal Title of the Res to the Trustee with the requirement that the Res be conferred upon the Beneficiary in accordance with the Terms and Conditions established between the Settlor and the Trustee at the creation of the Trust. The Beneficiary may or may not have any knowledge of the Trust arrangement. A Trust can be expressed (in written or verbal form) or implied (by action not necessarily having any documentation). An example of an Express Trust is a Last Will and Testament. An example of an Implied Trust is the Birth Certificate.

The responsibilities of the Trustee are many, and cover such requirements as:

- Do not steal from the Res of the Trust or convert to another's use
- Do no harm to the Beneficiary
- Abide by the Terms and Conditions set out by the Settlor
- Manage the finances of the Trust
- Pay all payable amounts from the Trust account

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

- Deposit all receivable amounts to the Trust account
- Release the Res to the Beneficiary in accordance with the Terms and Conditions

A Trust may be common law or otherwise. A Trust may be private or public.

So, how does Trust Law relate to a Birth Certificate? Let's see:

The Statement of Live Birth:

For simplicity, the word 'mother' is used herein to include both mother and father as the case may be.

A Statement of Live Birth document (herein 'SOLB') is a document completed by the mother to contain a written record of a **birth-event** information for a new baby human. Typically, it contains the gender for the baby (M/F), a name for the baby (the called name), a family name, a date of birth, a place of birth, a name (called or legal?) for the mother (and father), and perhaps a weight and time of birth. The SOLB is signed by the mother (as the "informant") and signed by another human being (as the "witness") such as a nurse, doctor, midwife, or other human being present at the time of birth. Traditionally, there is no identifying information such as DNA attached to the SOLB, however, there is modern trend to sometimes a mark such as a footprint or finger print on the document - a potentially dangerous trend.

The SOLB is a document witnessing a **birth-event**; it is not a document of identification. Within 30 days after birth, the SOLB is supposed to be "Registered" with the Office of the Registrar of Births Deaths & Marriages.

A Private Trust is created by the "Registration" of a SOLB: A mother (Settlor) puts her child's birth-event SOLB (Res) into the care of the State (Trustee) for the benefit of the State (Beneficiary - most likely the Treasury Department). This Trust is private because the public does not have access to anything associated with the Trust or the SOLB. In fact, once the mother "Registers" the SOLB with the State (*via* the Registrar of Births, Deaths, and Marriages), she can never take it back. She has given away Legal Title of the Res to the Trustee (State). The best she can obtain is a certified copy of the SOLB.

It would appear that the mother (as Settlor) innocently puts the "given **name**" of her baby on the SOLB without full understanding of how the SOLB is used by the State (Trustee) for commercial purposes (to hypothecate the baby's future value in society for the benefit of the State). There appears to be no other purpose, except for commercial value (Census value or whatever), to require registration of the SOLB. It is difficult to find evidence of how a future value is applied to the SOLB, but clearly it has been.

The process of "Registration" of the SOLB creates a "Record" of the **birth-event** information in the Office of the Registrar, and such a "Record" contains all the

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

information transferred from the SOLB. The act of creating the Record creates a new legal person with a legal NAME written within the Record. The Record is created by the State using the information provided by the mother *via* the SOLB. Thus, the State is the creator of the Record and therefore owns the Record. Evidence that such a “Record” belongs to the State (the Office of the Registrar has complete ownership), as provided by section **45** of British Columbia’s *Vital Statistics Act*:

45 (1) All **records**, books and other documents pertaining to any **office** under this Act are the property of the government.

The process of “Registration” puts the Res into the hands of the State, and by virtue of the Private Trust, the State (as Trustee of the Res) has complete ownership of the Record (Legal Title of the SOLB as Trustee, Equitable Title to use the Res of the Trust for the benefit of the State as Beneficiary, and Possession of the Record in their Office).

The SOLB is signed by two human beings (mother and a witness), both of which are human beings, and by the act of signing the SOLB, they are **certifying** that a **birth-event** took place. Just as human beings are the only ones who can swear an affidavit, only human beings can certify a **birth-event**. The SOLB is a very valuable document because it allows for the addition of new life-energy into the economy, and potential future benefits derived therefrom by a process known as “hypothecation”. As such, the SOLB is an “hypothecated certified security” in accordance with the respective definitions:

hypothecate

verb

1. to pledge to a creditor as security without delivering over; to mortgage.
2. to put in pledge by delivery, as stocks given as security for a loan.

certified

adjective

1. having or proved by a certificate.
2. guaranteed; reliably endorsed.

security

noun

1. an assurance; guarantee.
2. something given or deposited as surety for the fulfillment of a promise or an obligation, the payment of a debt, etc.
3. an evidence of a debt or of property, as a bond or a certificate of stock.

Since human beings are the only ones who can create anything of value in society, human beings are the necessary source a valuable “security” to the State. The

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

evidence for the value of human beings in society is multi-faceted, from the government's "head count" during Census taking, to the taxation of commercial activities performed by human beings. Corporations cannot create value. They are dead entities. Without human beings working for corporations, the corporations just sit there doing nothing. Thus, it is only human activity which creates anything of value in society. Make no mistake about it, human beings are the valuable security for the State.

Some people have asked if it is mandatory to register a live birth, and strictly speaking, the answer is **no**. No one can be forced to do anything against his free will. However, the pressure and deception used to force registration of live births is huge, and in fact, borders on slavery. Furthermore, unless registration of the SOLB is done, the baby may have difficulty functioning in society when it grows up, with such things as schooling, working, banking, buying and selling, etc. Clearly, the original peoples living off the land do not have to "register" birth-events. Their children simply grow up on the land and live off the food provided by the land without government intervention or benefits. It is only when one wishes to receive a benefit from society (such as public schooling, banking, participating in commerce such as getting paid with so-called "money", etc.), that one is required to interface with the State.

The process of "Registering" a live birth may be an act of involuntary servitude in accordance with the British Columbia *Vital Statistics Act*, since the mother, and a witness are apparently forced to register the Statement of Live Birth. Here is an extract from the *Vital Statistics Act* which forces registration:

- 3** (1) Within 30 days after the birth of a child in British Columbia, a statement in the form and containing the information the chief executive officer requires respecting the birth must be completed and delivered to the chief executive officer as follows:
- (a) by the **mother** and the **father** of the child;
 - (b) by the child's **mother**, if the **father** is incapable, deceased or unacknowledged by or unknown to the mother;
 - (c) by the child's **father**, if the **mother** is incapable or deceased;
 - (d) if neither parent is capable or living, or if the **mother** is incapable or deceased and the **father** is unacknowledged by or unknown to her, by the **person** standing in the place of the parents of the child.

From section **3** (1) of British Columbia's *Vital Statistics Act*, quoted above, we see that certain information "must be completed and delivered" implying involuntary servitude. The word "must" is compulsory, not voluntary. Thus, a mother or father has no choice but to comply with this Statute (what is the penalty for non-compliance?), raising the question as to whether or not a "mother" or "father" are merely roles played by a human being and, as such, the roles are those of artificial persons in law, which would be the only way the *Act* could have dominion over them. If not, the *Act* is void by imposing slavery upon human beings in violation of *The International Bill of Human Rights*, or, alternatively the *Act* needs to be declared void because it violates sections 32 and 52 of

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

the *Charter*. Void Statutes are common place in Statute Law (intentionally so) and must be challenged *via* a Constitutional Challenge in the courts if justice is to prevail. There is no inherent justice in The NAME Game. Justice is something for which we must continually strive to obtain, since the so-called “Justice System” is based upon the “tricks” of The NAME Game.

So in summary for the SOLB Private Trust, the mother innocently puts her baby’s “called **name**” on a document which is submitted to the State, thereby giving complete ownership of the SOLB information to the State. Since the State cannot own any living human being, and ostensibly cannot steal the baby’s “called **name**” from the mother, the State has to create a “legal NAME” for use in commerce. It is the legal NAME which is entered into the “Record” for the birth-event, with a slight-of hand transmutation from the called **name** to the legal NAME. Be absolutely clear, the legal NAME belongs to the State since it is written into the Record which belongs to the State *via* the Office of the Registrar. The legal NAME so created is not the same as the child’s called **name** since the State cannot own a human being. Anybody in the legal profession who declares that the State owns men and women, needs to abide by the *International Bill of Human Rights* to be held accountable for the imposition of slavery on men and women, which also includes the Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of British Columbia who holds the belief that men and women are the property of the State. Furthermore, the SOLB identifies a **birth-event**, and not a human being. The baby is created by God *via* the mother; the legal NAME is created by the State *via* the Record in the Office of the Registrar. One is not the same as the other. A human being cannot be owned by any body. Slavery and the slave-trade are prohibited in all their forms in a free society. Correct me if I am wrong, but Canada is a signatory to the *International Bill of Human Rights* and has thereby agreed that slavery in Canada is prohibited.

The Legal NAME Begins With The Birth Certificate:

Once the State has Legal Title (as the Private Trustee) to the Private Trust created by the SOLB’s registration under the *Vital Statistics Act*, the State creates a Public Trust arrangement whereby the State (as Settlor) puts the SOLB’s Res from the “Records” (the hypothecated future earnings of the human being in society, most likely already deposited into the State’s Treasury Department) into the hands of the State (as Trustee) for the benefit of the legal-identity NAME (as the Beneficiary - an artificial person created by the State to conduct commerce in society). The Trust is Public because the Beneficiary functions as a member of the public and the public is aware of the Birth Certificate which is subsequently used to create all derived forms of government-issued identification, even though the Birth Certificate clearly states that it is not to be used as an identification document, the State requires the Birth Certificate to be used for identification - go figure this contradiction. Since the Birth Certificate cannot identify the baby human, how is it possible to create “Identification” documents from it? Clearly, the answer is that it cannot identify the human because the Birth Certificate only identifies a Record in the Office of the Registrar, therefore the Birth Certificate identifies the legal person *via* the legal NAME. *Voila !!!*

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Since the State is the Public Trustee for the legal NAME, the State holds “Legal Title” for the legal NAME. Also, the State has “Quiet Possession” of the legal NAME as written in the “Record” in the Office of the Registrar, and the State holds “Equitable Title” for the legal NAME (the Beneficiary as an artificial person - the creation of the State). So, the State passes the complete ownership test because it has all three elements.

A Birth Certificate is a certified extract of the live-birth **event** held in the “Records” of the Office of the Registrar. A Birth Certificate does not, and cannot, identify any human being; it simply identifies a **birth-event**. On that Birth Certificate, there appears the “legal NAME” along with a “Birth Date” and “Registration Number” for that legal NAME, and the Birth Certificate is an identifier pointing back to the legal NAME written in the “Record” held in the Office of the Registrar. The legal NAME is not the same as the called **name** written on the SOLB. The legal NAME is created by and owned by the State, and therefore the legal NAME is subject to all the laws created by the State to rule over its creations. Since a human being cannot be “Registered” in a free society, the legal NAME and Registration Number on the Birth Certificate are not those of any human being. They simply identify an event. As such, the Birth Certificate and legal NAME are “legal fictions”, a subject which is covered later.

A Birth Certificate is signed by the Office of the Registrar (usually with a rubber stamp) and certifies that the “security” associated with the “Record” in said Office has value. Thus, the Birth Certificate is a valuable financial instrument and identifies the “security” (the hypothecated Res) of the “person” (the legal person’s legal-identity NAME), and said Certificate may be used by the Beneficiary (the artificial person) as evidence for his claim to said “security”. This entitlement (“right”) is enacted in the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* (section 7) as well as the *Canadian Bill of Rights* (section 1), to wit:

7 Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.

1 It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion, or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely: (a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not be be deprived thereof except by due process of law.

The Res of the Public Trust is the security pledged by the State as the hypothecated value over the life of the human being associated with the Private Trust. The State issues a “certificate” for this security (called a Birth Certificate) so that the Beneficiary (the artificial person) may hold evidence to his “security”. Reference to this fact is made in several *Acts* including the *Canadian Bill of Rights* and the *Charter* as an individual’s having rights to the “security of the person”, viz, the pledged value of the legal person associated with the legal NAME. Since the legal NAME is the Beneficiary of the Public

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Trust, it has rights to access the Res of said Trust and may use that Res to settle accounts with the State. Since the State is the Trustee to the Public Trust associated with the legal NAME, the Trustee must use the Res to settle accounts associated with the Trust, which is one of their duties as Trustee, otherwise they are in Breach of Trust and may be held accountable therefor.

The Legal NAME Belongs to the State:

Here is direct evidence that Legal Title for the legal NAME identified by a Birth Certificate belongs to the State:

From section 2 (1) of British Columbia's *Name Act*, a **person** (the legal person) may not change his or her name without permission. Remember that if you truly own something, then you can do what you like with it, and since a **person** needs permission to change "his or her name", then clearly said **person** does not have Legal Title to said name in the first place, otherwise he could do anything with it, including changing it:

2 (1) A **person** in British Columbia must not change his or her name unless authorized so to do by section 4, and then only in the manner provided by this Act.

From section 45 (1) of British Columbia's *Vital Statistics Act*, "all records" (including but not limited to the legal NAME written in those records) "pertaining to any office" (such as the Office of the Registrar) "are the property of the government" (the State). This means that the legal NAME, as identified by the Birth Certificate, is the property of the government. The interpretation of this claim to ownership means that the government holds Legal Title, Equitable Title, and Possession of the legal NAME as written in the Record identified by the Birth Certificate:

45 (1) All **records**, books and other documents pertaining to any **office** under this Act are the property of the government.

Since the government claims to have Equitable Title to the legal NAME, then that would explain why Ontario has been forthright enough to provide entitlement to use the legal NAME in commerce as a matter of Private Necessity. From Ontario's *Change of Name Act*, we have an indication that a **person** may use the legal NAME for recognition (designated, called, or known) in society:

2 (1) For all purposes of Ontario law,
(a) a person whose birth is registered in Ontario is entitled to be recognized by the name appearing on the person's birth certificate or change of name certificate, unless clause (c) applies;

From all the evidence we can obtain from the Statutes, we see that we are entitled to use the legal NAME, but the State has complete ownership of the legal NAME. Although it appears that we have Equitable Title to the legal NAME, in fact we do not.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

All equity in the legal NAME (which we created as human beings - the value of all the work we put into society under the legal NAME) may be claimed by the State at any time. The evidence for this fact is the government's ability to seize the equity for such purposes as taxation, and garnishee of bank accounts.

In the case of the legal-identity NAME, the legal NAME is NOT a designator or pointer to any human being. The legal NAME **is in fact** a legal entity (a legal fiction) unto itself for the purposes of being used as a vehicle for functioning in society under the jurisdiction of Statutes and the enforcement of those Statutes within The NAME Game. In this sense, the legal NAME may not comply with the common ordinary meaning of a **name** as something by which an object can be "designated, called, or known". To the contrary, the legal NAME may be the legal entity itself, just as "McDonald's" is a legal entity. More research is needed to clarify this point.

Since the State has complete ownership of the legal NAME, the State is required to pay all the bills and expenses incurred by the legal NAME unless the State can "trick" us into providing our agreement to assume the liability for their legal NAME. This assumption of liability is the essence of The NAME Game.

Summary of Who has What Title:

With the foundation expounded above, lets try to figure out the who has what title to each name:

- i. Clearly, the legal NAME on the Birth Certificate belongs to the State, since that legal NAME was created by the State and is contained within their records of the State, and all those records belong to the State, and one cannot change that legal NAME without permission of the State or paying money to the State. If one needs permission to change the legal NAME, then clearly the legal NAME is not one's to being with; it belongs to the State. All lawyers and courts know about the legal NAME, but not all understand that the State has Legal Title to the NAME. They want to trick us into paying fines for their legal NAME.
- ii. The called **name** by which we are called does not belong to anybody. It is merely a designator for an item, and not the item itself. Nobody can own a designator - it is simply a pointer to something. We may choose to call ourselves by any other **name** without anybody's approval. For example, you and I may agree that from now on you will call me John, and not Bob. That is our choice and our new private agreement is that you will call me John instead of Bob.
- iii. The designator (the **name**) of an item cannot belong to anybody, however the use of the designator (the **name**) in private commerce may be trademarked by an individual who is using that designator as his called **name**. A trademark will protect his interest in the value designated by that called **name**.
- iv. Similarly, the 'legal NAME' (for which the State holds Legal Title) may be trademarked by an individual if he uses that legal NAME in commerce, since the

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

State may not have trademarked the legal NAME. If the State claims to have a trademark on their legal NAME, then the State must provide evidence for such a claim, then subsequently assume all liability for same.

Private Necessity and Public Necessity:

Two other issues which need to be clarified are those of Private Necessity and Public Necessity:

Private Necessity is the use of another's property for private reasons. It grants us permission to use another's property in order to stay alive. For example, if we are being chased by somebody trying to inflict harm, then we may trespass through another's property in order to get away from the chaser. Any claim by the owner to sue us for trespass will be dismissed because of the Private Necessity to use the escape route through another's private property to save our life. However, while an individual may have a private necessity to use the land or property of another, that individual must compensate the owner for any damages caused to the land or property.

Public Necessity is the use of private property by a public official for a public reason. It grants the State permission to use our private property in order to protect the public. For example, the Fire Department may drive their truck through our so-called private property in order to put out a fire which places public property in jeopardy, without any concern about trespass. The injured, private individual does not always recover for the damage caused by the necessity. The issue of who really owns the so-called "private property" is another matter, and further complicates matters.

In the case of the legal NAME, we have shown that the legal NAME belongs to the State and is therefore the property of another. However, in order to stay alive (get a job, earn money, and eat food) we have to use the State's property to function in commerce in society. A similar situation applies to the use of the Bank of Canada's Notes and the Treasury Department's current coins. We need to use those vehicles to eat and stay alive, therefore our use of those items (the State's legal NAME and other's money) is by Private Necessity. If we use the State's legal NAME, and cause some damage, then we would be liable for any damage caused by the use of their legal NAME.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX V

Legal Joinder - When is Which Name Used and Why?:

Now we have to explore which **name** / NAME is used, and in which situation it is used. If we don't know which **name** or NAME is involved in any situation, we can be easily led to the wrong conclusion by those wishing to hold us liable for something for which we may not be liable. Here are the typical uses of the "called **name**" and the "legal NAME":

1. For everyday common dialog between men and women, the called **name** is used. We call each other by these called **names**, and that is how we direct the conversation to the appropriate individual.
2. For private exchange of items between individuals, including private agreements between people, we use our called **name** on our paperwork. Such an agreement might involve a private loan of cash from one individual to another secured by a private promissory note to repay the loan.
3. Some business agreements might be able to support both a legal NAME, as one party to the agreement, and a called **name**, as the other party to the agreement. Such would be the case of a Private Contract for Hire between a human being (using his called **name**) and the legal NAME of the other party (a corporation) to the Private Contract for Hire.
4. For all other commerce and business transactions, the legal NAME is used.
5. For all court-related actions, the legal NAME is used.
6. For all Statutes and man-made laws, the legal NAME is the object.
7. For the Criminal Code of Canada, the legal NAME is the object.
8. For the *International Bill of Human Rights*, both the legal NAME and human beings (*via* their called **names**) are the objects.
9. In common law, the called **name** is used for the human being, but the legal NAME may also be involved. Be very careful.
10. The State only has dominion over the legal NAME.
11. The State has no dominion over the called **name** without consent, lest slavery be condoned by the State - something which is prohibited under international law.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX VI

The NAME Game:

Of paramount importance to the NAME Game, is how it is used by the Legal System to hold us accountable our non-compliance with Statutes. Since the Statutes are man-made Acts of Parliament or the Provincial Legislature, they do not and cannot have any dominion over men and women without consent. Statutes only have dominion over legal persons (artificial persons) identified by the legal NAME. No man has dominion over any other man, therefore no man-made rule can have dominion over any other man, without his consent. However, since the State has Legal Title to the legal NAME, it can punish the legal NAME for not following the rules. So, if we agree to be identified as (*i.e.* the same as) the legal NAME, then we pay the price. Furthermore, since there are no injured parties in any Statute violation, our human being should never be culpable for same unless he has agreed to be liable. The Legal Title holder of the legal NAME should pay for any amount with which the legal NAME is charged. In reality, the State should be the one who pays all fines for the legal NAME, however, the NAME Game is used to trick human beings into paying said fines for breach of contract.

In contrast to Statute offences, we must consider common-law offences and how they need to be addressed in order to maintain a civilized society. In a common-law offence, there **is** an injured party (unlike Statutory offences where there is no injured party). Such offences include bodily harm to another human being, theft of property from another human being, damage of property belonging to another human being, and other common-law offences (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Common_law_offence). The offender must be held accountable for such offences by way of his designator **name**. Since the designator **name** points to the offender, his human body may be detained to make restitution for his common-law crimes. When the body is certain as the cause of the injury to another body, then accountability under common-law must follow. Such offences date back to “an eye for an eye” in the days of yore.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX VII

Legal Definitions Supersede Ordinary Definitions:

As an example of the absurdity which would arise if words defined in legal dictionaries did not supersede the ordinary definition of words, consider the following: If one could choose the ordinary definition of **person** as a human being instead of the legal definition of **person** as defined by the appropriate Statute, then all Statutes intended to deal with **corporations** as **persons** become ineffective. If one simply declares that one chooses to elect to use the ordinary definition of **person** instead of the legal definition, then any Statute which targets his **corporation** as a **person** becomes null and void, essentially allowing every businessman to evade and avoid any and all corporate liability for wrongdoing. Such a situation is not only absurd, it is simply not true. Legal definitions supersede ordinary definitions, contrary to what you may think. There is no other choice, otherwise we might as well throw away all legal dictionaries.

Some judges, like *Sedgwick J.*, have even gone so far as to make very bad case law by a ruling, in "*Kennedy v. Canada (Customs and Revenue Agency)*, 2000 CanLII 22837 (ON SC)" points 8-19, that ordinary definitions supersede legal definitions, in an attempt to arrive at a conclusion that suited the agenda of the court. Unbelievable! Sometimes there is no accounting for ignorance. Absurd case law is void.

So, if a word is defined in a legal dictionary, its meaning supersedes the same ordinary word, when said word is used in the legal context.

Similar principles apply to "terms" and "phrases" when defined in a legal dictionary. Two examples of this type of "term" definition are: "natural person" and "artificial person", which are defined in *Barron's Canadian Legal Dictionary (5th Edition)*, to wit:

NATURAL PERSON "A natural person is a human being that has the capacity for rights and duties." Compare **artificial person; corporation**.

ARTIFICIAL PERSON A legal entity, not a human being, recognized as a person in law to whom legal rights and duties may attach - e.g. a body corporate. The *Interpretation Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. I. 11, s. 29(1) states that "person" includes a corporation and the heirs, executors, administrators, or other legal representatives of a person to whom the context can apply according to law. See **corporation**.

PERSON In law, a individual or incorporated group having certain legal rights and responsibilities. This has been held to include certain foreign and domestic corporations. Compare **artificial person; natural person**.

CORPORATION An association of shareholders created under law and regarded as an **artificial person** by the courts.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

From the quoted definitions above, we see that there are only two persons in law: the **natural person** (human being) and the **artificial person** (everything else). As you can see, the definition of “**person**” in this law dictionary encompasses both the **natural person** (called an “individual” in the definition) and the **artificial person** (called the “incorporated group” - a legal entity - in the definition). With these two **persons** in law, simply using the word “**person**” may be ambiguous, unless further clarification is made, because such a **person** may be natural or artificial. We must always clarify which **person** we intend to reference when dealing in any legal context. We cannot automatically presume which **person** is intended unless clearly defined as such.

The reason why the word “**person**” has been re-defined in legal dictionaries is to allow corporations to be referred to as **persons** in law. Thus, Statutes may be written using the word **person** as the intended object, and after that, the word **person** may be defined appropriately. Therefore, it is absolutely essential that the meaning of the word **person** be established correctly in any Statute so that there is no un-intended trespass onto others. Statutes never use the words “man” or “woman” because Statutes have no dominion over men and women; they only have dominion over **persons**. If you don't believe this statement, search the Statues for the words “man” or “woman” and see for yourself.

Clarify Which Person is Meant:

Whenever you see the word **person** written or spoken anywhere in a legal context, you must clarify whether it is **natural** or **artificial** before proceeding any further. Since there are two **persons** in law, it is necessary to clarify which one is applicable to the context.

There is clear evidence that the word **person** does not automatically include everyone, individuals, human beings, or anything else in law. The word **person** must be clearly defined if law is to make any sense, otherwise absurdity is the result.

Take a look at section 1(a) of the *Canadian Bill of Rights* where the words **individual** and **person** are both used, meaning there is a difference - otherwise the word **person** would not have been used instead **individual**:

1. (a) the right of the **individual** to life, liberty, security of the **person**

Also, take a look at article 3 of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* where the words **everyone** and **person** are both used, meaning there is a difference otherwise the word **person** would have been used instead of **everyone**:

3. **Everyone** has the right to life, liberty and security of **person**.

As you can see, something tricky is going on in these definitions.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX VIII

Legal Fictions:

Legal fictions play an important role in law. In fact, they provide the foundation of law.

Here is a great quote from <http://www.thebcgroup.org.uk/article/legal-fiction-how-they-control-us> in respect of what is a Legal Fiction:

“If you tried to explain the concept of the ‘legal fiction’ to the average individual in the context of how it applies to them, there is a high degree of probability that they would stare back at you as though you were quite mad... explanation rarely attracts a demand to know more, which it should, generally people find comprehension beyond their scope of understanding and they prefer therefore to dismiss it as an absurdity. The creators of the legal fiction knew this and have used our own ignorance to further their aims to control and dominate us, their ultimate weapon being ‘plausible deniability.’ But suddenly we are waking up to what is really going on and as we do the shackles of control are starting to loosen.”

Here is the definition of Legal Fiction in *Black’s Law Dictionary, Revised Fourth Edition*, page 751:

FICTION OF LAW. Something known to be false is assumed to be true. *Ryan v. Motor Credit Co.*, 130 N.J.Eq. 531, 23 A.2d 607, 621.

Here is the definition of Legal Fiction in *Black’s Law Dictionary, Deluxe Seventh Edition*, page 904:

legal fiction. An assumption that something is true even though it may be untrue, made esp. in judicial reasoning to alter how a legal rule operates. The constructive trust is an example of a legal fiction. - Also termed *fiction of law*; *factio juris*.

Here is the definition of Legal Fiction in *Oxford Dictionary of Law, Sixth Edition*, page 222:

legal fiction. An assumption that something is true irrespective of whether it is really true or not. In English legal history, fictions were used by the courts during the development of forms of court action. They enabled the courts to avoid cumbersome procedures, to make remedies available when they would not be otherwise, and to extend their jurisdiction.

So, a **legal fiction** is a presumption that something is real, when in fact it may not be real, in order to allow the law to work. It is a legal construct to make a fiction appear real. A common example of a **legal fiction** is a legal **corporation**, something which is presumed to exist in reality, but does not. Other examples of **legal fictions** are the presumption that the legal NAME is the same as a human being with a similar “called **name**”, and the presumption that the legal NAME is in fact the object itself instead of a

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

pointer to the object (the Birth Certificate). In fact, the legal NAME itself is a **legal fiction** because it only exists in the world of fiction as a designator to something else. All artificial persons (fictitious persons) are also **legal fictions**.

There appears to be three perceptions in life: real, imaginary, or symbolic:

1. Real things are what we can touch and have substance, such as our human body. Real things are discernible and definable. Real things can be damaged or hurt and we must take care not to hurt them.
2. Imaginary things are what we can hold in our minds, such as beliefs and pictures. The concept of law is held in our minds, and is therefore imaginary. We have certain beliefs about what we can and cannot do, but none of those beliefs are real. Imaginary things cannot be damaged or hurt.
3. Symbolic things are what we can see but they actually symbolize some imaginary thing. An example of a symbolic thing would be a word written on paper (appearing real) but points to an imaginary thing (the term "red car" are words which symbolize a real thing, but the words are not the real thing).

A **legal fiction** is an imaginary or symbolic perception. **Legal fictions** are non-real (imaginary) forms of perceptions in life.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX IX

Corporations are Legal Persons:

Let's look at the similarities between and incorporated company, and the legal NAME as used in The NAME Game:

A **corporation**, as an incorporated company, is created by an individual by:

- (a) choosing a legal NAME for the corporation,
- (b) applying to the State for Registration,
- (c) receiving a Registration (or Incorporation) Number for the legal NAME,
- (d) receiving an Incorporation Date attached to the Registration Number,
- (e) appointing a Director for his **corporation**,
- (f) appointing at least one Shareholder (a kind of beneficiary).
- (g) applying for a Tax Identification Number,
- (h) conducting commerce *via* the legal NAME.

The sole individual may play the roles of both Director and Shareholder. No Officers or Employees are necessary. Nothing more is required for the **corporation** to operate. Only a Director, a Shareholder, a Registered legal NAME, Incorporation Date, and a Tax ID number. The legal NAME points to the **corporation**, which is identified by the Incorporation State, Registration Number, and Incorporation Date. The legal NAME is not actually the **corporation**, but helps to identify the **corporation**. The **corporation** is in fact a **legal fiction** in our minds which is associated with some paperwork filed somewhere within the governing authority who gave power to the paperwork.

Now consider the situation when a mother:

- (a) chooses a **name** for her baby,
- (b) submits that **name** for Registration with the State *via* a Statement of Live Birth,
- (c) the State responds with a Registration Number (a Birth Certificate Number) and a legal NAME for the **corporation** (looking a lot like the name submitted by the mother but now having a Registration Number attached to it),
- (d) an Incorporation Date (Birth Date) is attached to the Registration Number (Birth Certificate),
- (e) temporarily acts as the sole Director and Shareholder for the baby designated by the legal NAME until such time as the baby reaches the age of majority (old enough to play the roles of sole Director and Shareholder), at which time he can take on said roles himself,

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

- (f) some time later on, when the legal NAME is ready to be involved in commerce, the Director applies for a Tax ID Number (Social Insurance Number),
- (g) conducts commerce *via* the legal NAME.

Since human beings cannot be “registered”, lest they become chattel of the State, the legal NAME created by the Birth Certificate is the “registered” entity. The legal NAME is not the same as the human being designated by the **name** chosen by the mother. Men and women are created by God and there is no “number” of any kind attached to the body of the human being designated by the **name**, however, the legal NAME as created by the State, is identified by a Birth Certificate with a Registration Number and Date attached.

The parallel drawn above is direct evidence that the legal NAME is in fact a pointer to a **corporation** in the eyes of the law, with the same creation and operation.

Further evidence is provided by the definition of “ARTIFICIAL PERSON” from the Canadian Law Dictionary quoted above where foundation is put forth that the *Interpretation Act* of Canada defines a **person** as a **corporation**. The conclusion is that when used alone in Statutes, without further re-definition, a **person** is defined as a **corporation**, thus the legal NAME used by a human being is in fact the name of a **corporation** for carrying on his business in commerce.

The default meaning for **person** in all Statutes is **corporation**. Subsequent re-definition of **person** is necessary in a Statute to bring in other entities such as a **natural person**.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX X

Ownership of a Corporation:

So, we all do business with a **corporation** under the legal NAME created by the State, with their holding Legal Title (and Quiet Possession) to the legal NAME, and our using the corporation's legal NAME by Private Necessity for the purposes of commerce. As such, we appear to get the benefits from using the legal NAME **corporation**, and as Director, as we control the actions of the legal NAME **corporation**.

There are several different mechanisms by which we can refer to the same thing:

legal NAME = legal entity = corporation = artificial person = legal person

Since true ownership of a **corporation** is divided between the State and the Director, it is interesting to ask who pays the bills for any expenses incurred by the **corporation**:

- In the case of a Landlord and Tenant, the Landlord pays the bills for annual property taxes and for the repair and maintenance of the property, but the Tenant pays the bills for the day-to-day operation of the property, such as electricity and changing light bulbs by his agreement to do so, otherwise the Landlord would pay these bills as he is the holder of Legal Title.
- In the case of an incorporated company, the company pays the bills for day-to-day operation from the company's assets, and the State gets away with paying nothing, even though the State should be paying all the taxes. The Director does not pay for anything since he is only using the company NAME in commerce.
- In the case of the legal NAME (for the artificial person), the bills are paid from the **corporation's** assets (accounts held in the legal NAME), and the State gets away with paying nothing, even though the State should be paying the taxes. The man's called **name** does not pay for anything since he is only using the legal NAME in commerce.

In the examples given above, the **corporation** becomes liable to pay any bills attributed to the **corporation**, not the called **name** of the man using the **corporation**. Therefore, it needs to be understood that if one allows his called **name** to become joined with the legal NAME for the **corporation**, then the creditors will come after the called **name** to pay the debts for the **corporation** by presumption that they are one and the same. Therefore, it is extremely important that one keeps his called **name** separate from the legal NAME for his **corporation**, and does not create legal joinder between them.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX XI

Statutory Jurisdiction:

As man-made contrivances, Statutes have a limited jurisdiction and usually require consent from the party who agrees to be governed by the applicable Statute Law. The best example is the *Motor Vehicle Act*, which applies to the operation of Motor Vehicles. One voluntarily applies for consent to be governed under said *Act* by application for a Driver's Licence. Another example is the *Income Tax Act* where one voluntarily applies for a Social Insurance Number to work as an employee under the jurisdiction of said *Act*. The *Income Tax Act* has no jurisdiction over men who have not applied for a Social Insurance Number, since there has been no consent to be governed by said *Act*, and no consent to accept any benefits associated therewith.

In general, jurisdiction refers to the power of one entity over another. Since no man can have dominion over another man, jurisdiction is only relevant to entities. In order to have jurisdiction, the entities need to have three things in agreement between them:

1. *Personam* jurisdiction, which means jurisdiction over the legal person
2. Subject-Matter jurisdiction, which means jurisdiction over the subject matter
3. Standing, which means having an interest in the matter and may suffer loss

As an example of *personam* jurisdiction, a Canadian *Motor Vehicle Act* does not have jurisdiction over legal persons operating vehicles in Africa. The legal persons in Africa do not fall under *personam* jurisdiction for the *Motor Vehicle Act* in Canada.

As an example of subject-matter jurisdiction, a Canadian *Motor Vehicle Act* does not have jurisdiction over a Taxpayer's Income Tax matters. The Taxpayer's Income Tax matters fall under the subject-matter jurisdiction of the *Income Tax Act*, not the *Motor Vehicle Act*.

As an example of standing jurisdiction, a Canadian *Motor Vehicle Act* does not have jurisdiction over a person who has no interest (no claim, no ownership, not related to) the vehicle or legal persons involved in the subject-matter of a motor vehicle offence. Thus, if Bob's vehicle is involved in a motor vehicle incident, and Tom is a disinterested observer from a roof-top with no interest in the incident, then Bob has standing, but Tom does not.

The Necessity of Royal Assent:

Statutes fall into two categories: those which have received Royal Assent, and those which have not. Royal Assent is the process which transforms a Bill into an *Act*, giving it the force and effect of law. Since not all *Acts* have received Royal Assent we have to investigate what is going on. For example:

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

- Some noteworthy *Acts* which have received Royal Assent are the *Canadian Bill of Rights* (Assented to 10th August 1960), and the *Health of Animals Act* (Assented to June 19th 1990), both of which apply to living beings. There are many other *Acts* which have received Royal Assent.
- Some examples of so-called *Acts* which have NOT received Royal Assent are the *Citizenship Act*, the *Income Tax Act*, and the *Canada Corporations Act*, all of which apply to legal entities. Legal entities are dead and cannot be hurt. Thus, it appears, at first glance, that *Acts* which have not Received Royal Assent do not apply to living beings (men, animals, etc).

If an *Act* has NOT received Royal Assent, then it does not have the force and effect of law (by the definition for Royal Assent), and therefore must be considered to be a “pretend” *Act*, or pretend law, applicable to **bodies corporate** and not applicable to living beings. *Acts* which have received Royal Assent are considered to be *bona fide Acts*, since they have received the necessary agreement from reigning Monarch *via* the Governor General. *Bona fide Acts* are real and require real respect, as they involve living beings, whereas pretend *Acts* are NOT real and require fictitious respect. In fact, the *Royal Assent Act* has been written in an attempt to make “pretend laws” look more valid in the absence of Royal Assent. These shenanigans become laughable if it were not for the fact that the government is getting away with it without objection from the people.

The Hierarchy of Word Definitions:

As previously discussed, definitions in legal dictionaries supersede definitions in common dictionaries. One cannot presume the common ordinary meaning of words used in law, and especially in Statute Law. In fact, if one does not read the definition section of a Statute, then one has no idea what the Statute means.

The hierarchy of word definitions is further expanded by the definition sections in Statutes, which supersede definitions in legal dictionaries. In fact, there is a very specific hierarchy to be observed when looking for the applicable definition of any word used in any Statute, as follows, from highest source to lowest source, stopping the search when the word is found:

1. Subsection of the Statute in question,
2. Definition section of the Statute in question,
3. Definition section of Statutes having the same "subject" matter,
4. The *Interpretation Act*,
5. Canadian Law Dictionaries (Canadian),
6. Oxford Dictionary of Law (British),
7. Black's Law Dictionary (American),

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

8. Canadian English Dictionary (ordinary meanings).
9. The Oxford English Dictionary (ordinary meanings).

From the above list, one can see that the *Interpretation Act* provides the basic definitions for all words used in all Statutes, where law dictionary definitions need to be superseded by Statute definitions. This hierarchy is evident from provision 3 (1) of the *Act*, as follows:

3. (1) Every provision of this Act applies, unless a contrary intention appears, to every enactment, whether enacted before or after the commencement of this Act
- (2) The provisions of this Act apply to the interpretation of this Act.

which basically states that the *Interpretation Act* “provisions” (*viz*: “a clause in a legal instrument, a law, etc.”) apply to every *Act* unless a contrary (superseding) intention (meaning) appears in another *Act*, allowing other *Acts* to supersede the intention (meaning) provided by the *Interpretation Act*. As such, the *Interpretation Act* provides the base (foundational) provisions for all *Acts*, which may be overridden as required.

Of particular importance are the definitions within the *Interpretation Act*. For example, provision 2 (1) begins with the words “In this *Act*, ...” then provides some definitions which only apply to this *Act*. However, provision 35 (1) begins with the words “In every enactment, ...” then provides some definitions which form the base definitions for all *Acts*, including the *Interpretation Act* itself by way of provision 3 (2) quoted above.

The Words “Means” and “Includes”:

Understanding how words are defined in Statutes is of paramount importance to determining Statutory jurisdiction, however it is unbelievable how much ignorance and obfuscation is evident in court decisions with respect to these matters. Even in such great works as *Sullivan and Driedger on Construction of Statutes* the authors get confused and give contradictory reasoning when it comes to some fundamental issues, namely the two words “means” and “includes”. Mostly *Sullivan and Driedger* are correct, but some places they cave in to pressure from the courts and make some incorrect assertions, mostly in respect of the word “includes”, then contradict their own errors with the correct reasoning, later in the same paragraph.

Normal dictionary definitions do not use the words “means” or “includes” in their definitions. They just provide the word followed by its definition (as may be seen from the two definitions given below, as well as all the other definitions for ordinary meanings quoted herein). Why then, do all Statutes incorporate the words “means” and “includes” in their definitions, when ordinary dictionaries do not? Clearly, this is of fundamental importance to the interpretation of Statutes and needs to be resolved. Most likely these two words are used to confuse and obfuscate the Statutes in such a way that the courts

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

can manipulate outcomes to achieve whatever is their agenda, rather than providing true justice.

For these two words (means and includes), the common and ordinary meanings are:

mean - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

verb

1. to have in mind as one's purpose or intention; intend: I meant to compliment you on your work. Synonyms: contemplate.
2. to intend for a particular purpose, destination, etc.: They were meant for each other. Synonyms: destine, foreordain.
3. to intend to express or indicate: What do you mean by “liberal”?
4. to have as its sense or signification; signify: The word “freedom” means many things to many people. Synonyms: denote, indicate; import, imply, connote.
5. to bring, cause, or produce as a result: This bonus means that we can take a trip to Florida.

include - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

verb

1. to contain, as a whole does parts or any part or element: The package includes the computer, program, disks, and a manual.
2. to place in an aggregate, class, category, or the like.
3. to contain as a subordinate element; involve as a factor.

contain - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

verb

1. to hold or include within its volume or area: This glass contains water. This paddock contains our best horses.
2. to be capable of holding; have capacity for: The room will contain 75 persons safely.
3. to have as contents or constituent parts; comprise; include.
4. to keep under proper control; restrain: He could not contain his amusement.
5. to prevent or limit the expansion, influence, success, or advance of (a hostile nation, competitor, opposing force, natural disaster, etc.): to contain an epidemic.

There is much confusion over the meaning of the words “means” and “includes” when used in statutory interpretation, but by referring to the common and ordinary meaning of these words, we can figure out the truth, independent of any legal fiction to the contrary.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

The courts would have you believe that “means” provides a restrictive context, whereas “includes” provides an expansive context. This belief is simply wrong, as proven herein.

To set the record straight, here is the correct interpretation of these two words:

means = to signify or to indicate (from 4 and 3 above)

includes = to contain as part of a whole (from 1 and 3 above)

contain = to prevent or limit expansion (from 5 above)

Contrary to the machinations of the courts, both “means” and “inclusive” are to be interpreted as restrictive when applied to statutory interpretation. The courts go to great lengths with attempts to disprove the common and ordinary meaning of “includes”, even going so far as to claim brevity as the reason why Parliament saved using the word “also” by not explicitly expanding the word “includes” to be written instead as “also includes”. So, in a 20,000 word Statute, Parliament wanted to save maybe 100 words by omitting “also” when using “includes”. What a joke.

If “includes” were expansive, why do lawyers go to so much trouble to be sure and state “including but not limited to” in their legal documents? It is because they know that “includes” is restrictive and only includes what is stated thereafter. To make “includes” expansive, one must say “also includes” or “and includes” or “includes without limitation” as is done in several Statutes so there is no ambiguity.

The main distinction between the two words (means, includes) is the use of the appropriate conjunctions “or” and “and” with the words. For example “means” requires the conjunction “or”, while “includes” requires the conjunction “and”, as follows:

person **means** man **or** woman; (choose which one to use from the given two)

person **includes** natural person **and** legal entity; (choose from the list of two)

The results become absurd if the wrong conjunction is used. For example if person **means** man **and** woman, then person must be only an hermaphrodite. Also, if person **includes** man **or** woman, then good luck getting the one you want from the list because you never know what is in the box until you open it.

The conclusions are that: “means” defines all that there is, and one may choose any of those items; “includes” provides a list of all that is included, and one may choose any of those items from the list.

The real reason why “means” and “includes” has been used in Statute definitions is to muddy the waters and cloud the issues. The intention appears to be to use “includes” for definitions for those words which need to be made ambiguous, and to use “means” for those definitions where no ambiguity is allowed. This intention gives rise to a new

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

game called The WORD Game, which is similar to The NAME Game, but on an individual word basis.

To further confuse matters, the British Columbia provincial Statutes have used the conjunction “and” in definitions where the conjunction “or” should have been used. This ambiguity makes all those provincial Statutes void for ambiguity. On balance, it appears that the federal Statutes have been better written than the provincial. Either those people who write provincial Statutes are ignorant, or they are being intentionally deceptive.

Bias, Impartiality, and the So-Called Justice System:

The real reasons the courts create bad rulings is most likely because the courts have an obvious apprehension of bias in all their rulings where the State may be in jeopardy. Clearly, the judges get paid by the State, and the Crown prosecutors get paid by the State, so do you really think that the judges (the court) will rule against their employer (their boss) the State, and if so, for how long do you think the judge will remain in good standing with the State? The court is biased to rule in favour of the State and maintain the *status quo* of the current Legal System which requires that all human beings believe they are slaves to the State. Thus, the courts cannot rule with impartiality because by doing so they would expose the fact that Statutes do not apply to human beings except by consent of the parties to which the Statute is being applied. And you thought the courts were impartial? Wishful thinking.

Legal Arguments, Circular Reasoning, and Circular Definitions:

In accordance with all the books written about “legal reasoning”, one thing is clear: circular reasoning is fallacious (false). That is, you cannot argue in circles to prove anything. On analogous grounds, something cannot be defined in terms of itself, a process which is called a circular definition. Thus, a “rope” cannot be defined as “a long piece of fibre made into a rope”. This is circular reasoning at its best. Therefore, words cannot be defined by reference to themselves, meaning, that any attempt to use an existing definition for a word as the basis for defining that word is fallacious reasoning. The *Income Tax Act* defines a **person** in terms of a **person**. Hah, no wonder it never received Royal Assent! That *Act* can only ever be pretend law.

Specific Definitions are Mandatory for a Person:

The courts appear to be ruling that the word **person** always includes a human being, since the ordinary definition of **person** must be presumed, regardless of any Statutory re-definition. This is not only laughable, it is absurd.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

To expose the absurdity of court rulings which claim that any definition of the word **person** must begin with the common and ordinary meaning of the word **person** before adding to the definition by those things which follow the use of the verb “includes” in a Statutory definition, we have the following examples:

Ordinary Meaning: **person** = human being = human **person**

Legal Meaning: **person** = human being or legal entity (such as body corporate)

Interpretation Act: **person** = corporation (body corporate)

Bank Act: **person** = natural person (human being) or legal entity

Criminal Code: **person** = Her Majesty or organization (bodies corporate)

BIG QUESTION: If we presume that the Legal Meaning of **person** always applies (**human being** or **body corporate**) according to the courts, then why is it necessary for any Statute to attempt to define **person** since the Legal Meaning already includes all forms of **person** (both natural and artificial)?

Here is the illogic as to why no Statute needs to re-define **person**:

1. The Legal Meaning of **person** always includes both natural person and artificial person, therefore no statute needs to re-define **person**;
2. Since bodies corporate are legal entities (artificial persons), the *Interpretation Act* definition for **person** is not required;
3. Also, the *Bank Act* definition is not required since it includes all types of **persons**;
4. Furthermore, the *Criminal Code* definition for **person** is not required since it would include all types of persons (Her Majesty is a corporation sole - a body corporate of one).

For anyone with half a brain, it is obvious that we are wasting paper by re-defining **person** in each Statute (so much for brevity).

Clearly, the answer is: **person** is re-defined in each Statute to limit the scope of the Statute to only the intended targets, and not to encompass unintended targets thereby creating human rights violations and trespasses everywhere.

The English version of the *Interpretation Act* provides the basic definition for **person**, to be used in all enactments, as a **corporation**. The French version is different because the French Civil Code recognizes common law and human beings, whereas the English Statute Law does not. Furthermore, French Civil Code does not follow the English “Rule of Law” principles, as done in the English system. Some Judges have even gone

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

so far as to bring French definitions into English Statutes in order to justify their ruling. I wonder why?.

From section 35 (1) of the English *Interpretation Act* we have:

"**person**", or any word or expression descriptive of a person, includes a corporation;

Since "includes" is restrictive, this definition means a **person** signifies (or indicates) a **corporation**. This totally makes sense since all Statutes apply to **corporations** as a minimum. If a Statute needs to apply to other **persons** besides **corporations**, then said Statute may re-define **person** as required to target the intended objects.

The *Interpretation Act* provides the basic interpretation for common **names** (as opposed to Proper Names of people, places, or things) in all enactments, from section 38:

38. The name commonly applied to any country, place, body, corporation, society, officer, functionary, **person**, party or thing means the country, place, body, corporation, society, officer, functionary, **person**, party or thing to which the name is commonly applied, although the name is not the formal or extended designation thereof.

The above quoted provision is most interesting in respect of the **names** as being designators of things. Section 38 may be simplified (for person) as follows:

38. [simplified]. The **name** commonly applied to any **person means** (designates) the **person** to which the name is commonly applied, even though the **name** is not the formal designation thereof.

This section seems to state that the **name** by which a **person** is called still designates that **person** even though said **name** may not be its formal designation, hence the common name may designate the **person** and the formal name is not required for said designation. Even though this analysis is correct, it appears that the intention of this section 38 may have been to create legal joinder by using a different definition for the verb **means**, by presuming that means is supposed to mean the same as:

38. [intended]. The **name** commonly applied to any **person is the same as** the **person** to which the name is commonly applied, even though the **name** is not the formal designation thereof.

Statutes Do NOT Have Dominion Over Men or Women:

Statutes are created by men to have dominion over his creations. Statues do not have dominion over God's creations in a free society, regardless of what the courts may decide. If the courts want Statutes to have dominion over men and women without their consent, then the courts need to state in clear an unambiguous terms that slavery and

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

the slave trade is operating in Canada (whatever that may mean) in violation of all International Law which prohibits “slavery and the slave trade in all their forms”.

One of man’s creations is a **body corporate** (a dead legal entity) which is subject to the jurisdiction of Statute Law. Thus, Statutes can have dominion over corporations as well as legal persons designated by the legal NAME created by the Birth Certificate. Since the legal NAME is governed by a Statute (for example, British Columbia’s *Name Act*), then the legal NAME, as held by the Provincial government, is therefore under the dominion of government. Since human beings cannot be under the dominion of any government (a corporate collection of human beings and other things), the legal NAME is the designator for an artificial-person under the jurisdiction of Statutes. Therefore, Statutes only have jurisdiction over legal NAMEs such as bodies corporate (legal persons).

Here is the evidence why the legal NAME is not your name. See section 2 (1) of the British Columbia *Name Act* which prohibits you from changing something which is purported to be yours, but is not in fact yours at all:

2 (1) A **person** in British Columbia must not change his or her **name** unless authorized so to do by section 4, and then only in the manner provided by this Act.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX XII

International Law:

The starting point to look into International Law is to access the United Nations documents is from their web-site:

<http://www.un.org/en/>

The most significant document from the United Nations is the ***Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)***, which may be found at the following URL link:

<http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml>

From the above-referenced *UDHR*, there are a few very important Articles to be discussed later on, however, we begin with the Preamble which outlines the purpose of the Declaration. There are several significant points for discussion in the Preamble, and some words have been underlined in the quotation as shown below:

“PREAMBLE

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Now, Therefore THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY proclaims THIS UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.”

From the above-quoted PREAMBLE, we see that:

- there are “equal and inalienable rights” for “all members of the human family”
- “human rights should be protected by the rule of law”
- the “human person” is another way of saying the “human being”
- “Member States have pledged themselves to achieve the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms”
- “every individual and every organ of society [schools, courts, justice department, political groups, etc.] shall strive by teaching and educating to promote respect for these rights and freedoms to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance”

From the PREAMBLE the intentions are clear that “Member States” have pledged to observe human rights, so what is wrong with our society with its apparent disregard for human rights? Perhaps the answer lies in the definition of the “Member States” who signed onto the *UDHR*. For example, the Member States are most likely “nation-states” which are defined as a group of people (human beings) as follows:

nation-state - (from www.dictionary.com) - ordinary meaning:

noun

a sovereign state inhabited by a relatively homogeneous group of people who share a feeling of common nationality.

So, if nation-states are the Member States who signed on to the *UDHR*, then who or what is running our country? Clearly with the human rights violations evident at all levels in government, it must be the Corporation of CANADA which is running the country, having hijacked and usurped apparent power from the nation-state of the people with their Statute Laws and “enforcement officers”. Unfortunately for everybody, the human beings who act as the “enforcement officers” have no idea what has happened or what they are doing to themselves, their families, and the rest of us. For an excellent biography on the usurpation of power by Corporate AUSTRALIA, see the following video (the same situation exists in Canada and other commonwealth countries):

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=umVj5XQYAi8>

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

The Corporation of CANADA is discussed later in this treatise, so for now, we focus on the *UDHR* from a human being's point of view by looking at some of the significant Articles within the *UDHR*.

From Article 1, the Declaration states that all human beings are born "free and equal", which means that no human being has dominion over another (since they are all equal), leading to the conclusion that Statute Law (written by men) does not apply to human beings without their consent:

Article 1.

- All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

From Article 3, the Declaration states that everyone (all human beings) has the right to "security of the person", which means that we all have the right to access the "security" (the pledge backed by a certificate) of "the person" (the **legal person** identified by the legal NAME on the Birth Certificate):

Article 3.

- Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

From Article 4, the Declaration states that no one (no human being) shall be held in slavery of any kind. So, as human beings, why are we slaves to the State in respect of such issues as Income Tax? The answer is that human beings are NOT subject to Income Tax unless they agree to be bound by the *Income Tax Act*, either by signing up as taxpayers (artificial persons) for the benefits offered by Social Security, or otherwise contacting into voluntary servitude:

Article 4.

- No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

From Article 6, the Declaration states that everyone (every human being) has the "right" to be recognized as a "person" before the law, clearly indicating that everyone is not considered a "person before the law" unless he exercises his right to be recognized as such. Each of us can "waive the right to be recognized as a person before the law" if we so choose, and we cannot be forced to accept a "right" if we have waived it:

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Article 6.

- Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

From Article 7, the Declaration states that “all” (all human beings) are entitled to equal protection of the law, and against discrimination. If that be the case, then why do the courts routinely fabricate decisions against human beings and in favour of the State? Most likely because those people have failed to “waive their right” to be recognized as a “person” before the law or otherwise contracted to be the same as the legal person before the law, and/or that the courts are operating as corporations themselves ruling for their corporate masters:

Article 7.

- All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

From Article 13, the Declaration states that “everyone” (every human being) has freedom of travel within his country and has the right to leave and return. Although we may have the right to leave our country, this does not mean we have the right to enter another country - according to this Article:

Article 13.

- (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.
- (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

From Article 17, the Declaration states that “everyone” (every human being) has the right to own property (his body, his stuff, etc.):

Article 17.

- (1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.
- (2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

From Article 20, the Declaration states that “everyone” (every human being) has the right to freedom of association and “no one” (no human being) may be compelled to belong to an association. This means that no one may be forced to obtain a Social Insurance Number and work in the association known as “taxpayers”:

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Article 20.

- (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.
- (2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

From Article **25**, the Declaration requires an adequate standard of living for health and well-being, including food, clothing, housing, medical care, etc, (which is why we have the social support programs and welfare support):

Article 25.

- (1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.
- (2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

From Article **26**, the Declaration requires that “education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages” (which is why we have free public schools):

Article 26.

- (1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.
- (2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.
- (3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

From Article **29**, the Declaration does not provide for anybody to use any provisions of the *UDHR* to do harm to others:

Article 29.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

- (1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.
- (2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.
- (3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

From Article **30**, the Declaration does not provide for any member State to violate any of the rights and freedoms in the *UDHR*, so a State's laws cannot be used to violate the *UDHR*:

Article 30.

- Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

The conclusions to be drawn from the *UDHR* are that human beings have all these rights which appear to be violated regularly by their country, which can only lead to the conclusion that their "country" has been hijacked by a corporation. This phenomenon is world wide, not just limited to Australia and Canada.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX XIII

What is CANADA:

There are several possible interpretations of Canada applicable to common use:

- The land mass commonly called Canada
- The nation-state (collection of people) commonly called Canada
- The property belonging to the Name Canada defined in the British North America Act of 1867 (railways, government buildings, border strip, etc. - Schedule C)
- The government and political body commonly called Canada
- The Corporate CANADA used for commerce home and abroad.

Since one cannot conduct commerce with the land mass known as Canada, nor with the property which constitutes Canada, nor with the political body of Canada, it becomes clear that commerce and business can only be conducted with a **corporation**, such as the **corporation** of CANADA. Thus, all Statutes deal in commerce for CANADA.

The evidence for the **corporate** CANADA is found in Washington DC with the Securities and Exchange Commission's "Company Search" for Registration Number 0000230098, to wit:



The screenshot shows the SEC Edgar Search Results page for company 0000230098 (CANADA). The page includes the SEC logo, navigation links, and search filters. The company information is as follows:

| Field | Value |
|------------------|--|
| Business Address | CANADIAN EMBASSY 501 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW WASHINGTON DC 20001 613-947-2353 |
| Mailing Address | DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE 140 O'CONNOR STREET OTTAWA, ONTARIO Z4 K1A 0G5 |

Additional information: SIC: 8880 - UNKNOWN SIC - 8880; State location: DC; Fiscal Year End: 0331; (Assistant Director Office: 99).

Filter Results: Filing Type: [] Prior to: (YYYYMMDD) [] Ownership? include exclude only Limit Results Per Page: 40 Entries [v] Search [] Show All []

Items 1 - 40 [RSS Feed](#) [Next 40](#)

| Filings | Format | Description | Filed/Effective | File/Film Number |
|---------|---------------------------|--|-----------------|------------------------|
| 18-K/A | Documents | [Amend]Annual report for foreign governments and political subdivisions Acc-no: 0001193125-13-132361 (34 Act) Size: 12 MB | 2013-03-28 | 033-05368 13724302 |
| 18-K | Documents | Annual report for foreign governments and political subdivisions Acc-no: 0001193125-12-510255 (34 Act) Size: 2 MB | 2012-12-20 | 033-05368 121277236 |

As with any **corporation**, there are directors, shareholders, employees, officers, etc., exactly the same structure for corporate CANADA. Each year, the budget of CANADA (income and expenses) is pledged as the security to back the corporation of CANADA:

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Form 18-K/A

http://www.sec.gov/Archives/edgar/data/230098/00011931251313...

18-K/A 1 d505543d18ka.htm FORM 18-K/A

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549**

FORM 18-K/A

**AMENDMENT NO. 1
For Foreign Governments and Political Subdivisions Thereof**

ANNUAL REPORT

of

CANADA

(Name of Registrant)

Date of end of last fiscal year: March 31, 2012

**SECURITIES REGISTERED*
(As of the close of the fiscal year)**

| Time of Issue | Amount as to Which Registration is Effective | Name of Exchanges on Which Registered |
|----------------------|---|--|
| N/A | N/A | N/A |

**Name and address of person authorized to receive notices
and communications from the Securities and Exchange Commission:**

**PASCALE DUGRÉ-SASSEVILLE
Counsellor (Finance)
Canadian Embassy
501 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001**

Copies to:

**WAYNE FOSTER
Director
Financial Markets Division
Department of Finance, Canada
11th Floor, East Tower
L'Esplanade Laurier
140 O'Connor Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G5**

**DON WILSON
Consul
Consulate General of Canada
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020**

**ROBERT W. MULLEN, JR.
Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP
1 Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005**

* The Registrant is filing this amendment to its annual report on a voluntary basis.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX XIV

Canadian Law:

There are two significant Acts in respect of rights and freedoms in Canada.

The *Canadian Bill of Rights* provides rights and freedoms for human beings as natural persons in law:

<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-12.3/page-1.html>

Noteworthy in the Canadian Bill of Rights is the Preamble and section **1**, with underlining for emphasis as follows:

Preamble

The Parliament of Canada, affirming that the Canadian Nation is founded upon principles that acknowledge the supremacy of God, the dignity and worth of the human person and the position of the family in a society of free men and free institutions;

Affirming also that men and institutions remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;

And being desirous of enshrining these principles and the human rights and fundamental freedoms derived from them, in a Bill of Rights which shall reflect the respect of Parliament for its constitutional authority and which shall ensure the protection of these rights and freedoms in Canada:

Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:

1. It is hereby recognized and declared that in Canada there have existed and shall continue to exist without discrimination by reason of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex, the following human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely,

(a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person and enjoyment of property, and the right not to be deprived thereof except by due process of law;

(b) the right of the individual to equality before the law and the protection of the law;

From the the above-quoted preamble and section **1**, we see that the *Canadian Bill of Rights* recognizes the human person (the human being), which we later presume to be the “individual” so mentioned as opposed to “the security of the person”.

This words used in section **1** (a) provide evidence that the “individual” is not the same as the “person” within the meaning of the *Canadian Bill of Rights*, to wit:

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

1. (a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the person

If “individual” and “person” were meant to be the same, section 1(a) would read:

1. (a) the right of the individual to life, liberty, security of the individual

or

1. (a) the right of the person to life, liberty, security of the person

There is no mistake that the words “individual” and “person” were meant to carry different meanings. Such an important Statute would have every word correct. If you think otherwise, you are fooling yourself.

Now, what about this word “security”, which is typically used to mean “financial backing”. Some people mistakenly believe that in this case “security” means “safety”, and if that be the case, why would such an important Statute not used the phrase “safety of the individual”? Clearly, because that is not the correct interpretation.

The use of the words “security of the person” mean the financial security which was hypothecated for the legal person identified by the legal NAME on the Birth Certificate. There is no other valid interpretation.

Also from provision 1(b) we see that all individuals are equal before the law, meaning that no individual has dominion over another individual, meaning that those who write Statutes do not have dominion over other individuals without their consent.

The *Constitution Act 1867 - 1982*, complete with the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms* as Part I and General Provisions as Part VII of the *Constitution Act*, provides rights and freedoms for legal **persons** performing a function of government, and restricts the government as to what it can do:

<http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/Const/index.html>

Noteworthy section are **32** and **52** as follows:

Section **32** states that the Charter of Canada applies to the government and all matters within its authority (*viz*, those performing a function of government):

32. (1) This Charter applies

- (a) to the Parliament and government of Canada in respect of all matters within the authority of Parliament including all matters relating to the Yukon Territory and Northwest Territories; and
- (b) to the legislature and government of each province in respect of all matters within the authority of the legislature of each province.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Section **52** states that the Constitution is the supreme law of Canada and any law that is inconsistent with the Constitution is of no force and effect:

52. (1) The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of the inconsistency, of no force or effect.

(2) The Constitution of Canada includes

- (a) the *Canada Act 1982*, including this Act;
- (b) the Acts and orders referred to in the schedule; and
- (c) any amendment to any Act or order referred to in paragraph (a) or (b).

(3) Amendments to the Constitution of Canada shall be made only in accordance with the authority contained in the Constitution of Canada.

The combination of provisions **32** and **52** mean that all laws of Canada which purport to apply to individuals who are not performing a function of government, and who are going about their own private business, are of no force and effect.

The Constitution Act is part of the Canada Act from the UK, as follows:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1982/11/section/2>

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX XV

Solution to The NAME Game:

The solution to The NAME Game relies upon several well-established maxims of law, together with a process known as Conditional Acceptance.

This solution can only be used after you have received some claim from some government department demanding that you do something you know to be bogus. This solution cannot be used as a pre-emptive strike because it relies upon their making the first move. The recent court ruling in *Meads v. Meads* ruled that a foisted claim is of no force and effect, and that is precisely why we let them make the first "claim", then we counter-offer asking for proof. With this technique, they cannot use the *Meads* ruling against us.

First we cover some legal maxims, then discuss the Conditional Acceptance process.

Applicable Legal Maxims:

Firstly, we need to establish some legal maxims. A legal maxim is an established principle or proposition, which has been so well accepted over time that it does not require any proof. Latin words are usually written in *italic* type font for distinction.

From the Encyclopedia Britannica, here is the definition:

"legal maxim, a broad proposition (usually stated in a fixed Latin form), a number of which have been used by lawyers since the 17th century or earlier. Some of them can be traced to early [Roman law](#). Much more general in scope than ordinary rules of law, legal maxims commonly formulate a legal policy or ideal that judges are supposed to consider in deciding cases. Maxims do not normally have the dogmatic authority of statutes and are usually not considered to be law except to the extent of their application in adjudicated cases."

Maxims Apply Because of Established Consent:

The role of Legal Maxims is decreed by a couple of legal maxims themselves:

maxime ita dicta quia maxima est ejus dignitas et certissima auctoritas, atque quod maxime omnibus probetur (a maxim is so called because its dignity is chiefest and its authority is the most certain, and because it is most approved by all).

regula pro lege, si deficit lex (if the law is inadequate, the maxim serves in its place).

Men (and Women) Are Not the Same as Legal Persons, Maxims:

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Here is a “clincher” of a legal maxim, clearly separating men and women from legal persons:

homo vocabulum est naturae; persona juris civilis (“Man” [homo] is a term of nature; “person” [persona], a term of civil law).

Slavery is Prohibited, Maxims:

In support of the prohibition of slavery, several maxims apply:

par in parem imperium non habet (an equal has no power over an equal).

actus me invito factus non est meus actus (an act done [by me] against my will [forced to do something] is not my act).

corpus humanum non recipit aestimationem (the body of a human being can have no price put on it).

derivativa potestas non potest esse major primitiva (power that is derived cannot be greater than that from which it is derived).

quod ad jus naturale attinet, omnes homines aequales sunt (all are equal as far as natural law is concerned).

quod attinet ad just civile, servi pro nullis habentur, non tamen et jure naturali, quia, quod ad just naturale attinet, omnes homines aequali sunt (so far as civil law is concerned, slaves are not reckoned as nonentities [slaves are reckoned as entities], but not so by natural law, for so far as regards natural law, all men are equal).

quotiens dubia interpretatio libertatis est, secundum libertatem respondendum erit (whenever there is an interpretation doubtful as to liberty [or slavery], the decision must be made in favour of liberty).

Nobody Can Be Forced To Accept a Benefit Against His Wishes, Maxims:

At certain times, government agents attempt to force benefits upon people. Such benefits might be the right to be recognized as a person before the law. Nobody can force anybody else to accept a benefit against his will:

actus me invito factus non est meus actus (an act done [by me] against my will [forced to do something] is not my act).

adjuvari quippe nos, non decipi, beneficio oportet (surely we ought to be helped by a benefit, not entrapped by it).

beneficium invito non datur (a privilege or benefit is not granted against one’s will).

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

invito beneficium non datur (no benefit is given to one unwilling. no one is obliged to accept a benefit against his consent).

The One Who Makes a Claim Must Provide The Proof, Maxims:

The process of Conditional Acceptance works because those making false claims are unable to provide proof for their claims. There are many legal maxims which clearly state that the one who makes a claim must provide the proof, otherwise his claim is without foundation:

actore non probante, reus absolvitur (if the plaintiff does not prove the case, the defendant is acquitted).

actori incumbit onus probandi (the burden of proof rests upon the plaintiff).

affirmanti, non neganti, incumbit probatio (the proof is incumbent upon the one who affirms, not the one who denies).

affirmantis est probare (the one who affirms must prove).

ei incumbit probatio qui dicit, non qui negat tacet consentire videtur (the burden of the proof rests upon the one who affirms, not the one who denies).

factum negantis nulla probatio (no proof is incumbent on one who denies a fact).

in genere quicumque aliquid dicit, sive actor sive reus, necesse est ut probat (in general, whoever alleges anything, whether plaintiff or defendant, must prove it).

per rerum naturam factum negantis nulla probatio est (by the nature of things, one who denies a fact is not bound to give proof).

stabit praesumptio donec probetur in contrarium (a presumption will stand until proof is given to the contrary).

The One Who Remains Silent Agrees By Conduct, Maxims:

In further support of the Conditional Acceptance process, if the one who makes a false claim has no proof, then he can only remain silent. If he had proof, then surely he would present his proof. There are many legal maxims which clearly state that the one who remains silent after being challenged for the proof of his claim, agrees with the proposition put forth since he has no proof and his claim is false:

qui non improbat approbat (one who does not disapprove approves).

qui non negat fatetur (one who does not deny admits).

qui non prohibet quod prohibere potest, assentire videtur (one who does not forbid what he can forbid is considered to assent).

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

qui potest et debet detare, tacens jubet (one who can and ought to forbid a thing (as much as) orders it, if he keeps silent).

qui tacet consentire videtur (one who is silent appears to consent).

qui tacet consentire videtur ubi tractatur de ejus commodo (one who is silent is considered assenting, when his advantage is debated).

ejus est non nolle qui potest velle (a person may consent tacitly who can consent expressly).

expressio unius est exclusio alterius (the expression of one thing is the exclusion of another).

expressum facit cessare tacitum (something expressed nullifies what is unexpressed – tacit consent via silence).

non refert an quis assensum suum praefert verbis an rebus ipsis et factis (it is immaterial whether one gives assent by words or by acts themselves and deeds).

non refert verbis an factis fit revocatio (it does not matter whether a revocation is made by words or by acts).

non refert an quis assensum suum praefert verbis an rebus ipsis et factis (it is immaterial whether one gives assent by words or by acts themselves and deeds).

stabit praesumptio donec probetur in contrarium (a presumption will stand until proof is given to the contrary).

Fiction Yields to Truth, Maxims:

Get the maxims where fiction yields to truth, and substitute below:

qui non improbat approbat (one who does not disapprove approves).

qui non negat fatetur (one who does not deny admits).

Responding To An Offer:

When one is presented with any Offer, there are five ways to respond, only two of which maintain your honour in the negotiations:

1. Unconditionally Accept the Offer (maintain your honour)
2. Conditionally Accept the Offer upon Proof (maintain your honour)
3. Argue with the Offer (go into dishonour)
4. Reject and Dismiss the Offer (go into dishonour)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

5. Remain Silent (go into dishonour) creating an Acceptance by Conduct

We always want to remain in honour since it puts us in the highest position in any negotiation. Argument is the worst thing to do. So we use a position of honour to provide a solution to The NAME Game.

The Process of Conditional Acceptance:

Foundation:

The Commercial Default Administrative Process is based upon the Law of Contract and the legal principle that an Offer may be either Unconditionally Accepted, Conditionally Accepted (counter-offer), or Rejected. Where there is an on-going business relationship between the parties, Acceptance may be either Expressed or Implied. The principle of Acceptance by Conduct provides Implied Acceptance to an Offer to Contract, which is also referred to as Tacit Consent, Tacit Acceptance, Tacit Agreement, or Tacit Acquiescence.

Procedure:

The process of Conditional Acceptance uses the Commercial Default Administrative Process, between two parties with an on-going and established commercial business arrangement. This Process DOES NOT apply to parties where there is no established on-going business arrangement, however the Process does apply when Party A attempts to create a business with Part B. The Process may be summarized as follows:

1. The process begins when Party A makes an Offer to Party B, and Party A specifies a time period within which Party B is to respond (the offer).
2. If Party B remains silent and does not respond to said offer within the specified time period, then Party B is in agreement with said offer and Party B accepts said offer *via* the principle of Acceptance by Conduct (tacit acceptance).
3. However, if Party B conditionally accepts the Offer to Contract from Party A with the condition that Party A provide some specified consideration for its Offer to Contract, within a specified time period, then Party B has created a Conditional Acceptance of said Offer to Contract (the counter-offer).
4. If Party A produces the specified consideration (as requested by the counter-offer) for its Offer to Contract within the specified time, then Party B is required to adhere to the Contract now memorialized with Party A (the acceptance of the counter-offer).
5. However, if Party A does not produce the specified consideration for its Offer to Contract, within the specified time period, then Party A's Offer to Contract is effectively withdrawn by Party A's action, and Party A may become liable for any specified consequences which may have been in the counter-offer (like 2 above).

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Example:

A Company, and its agents, *inter alios*, (Party A) makes an Offer to Contract and sends it to an individual (Party B) *via* some documents as part of an on-going relationship between the parties. If the individual accepts the Offer to Contract, then the individual is bound by the terms and conditions of said Offer. However, if the individual conditionally accepts the Offer with the provision that Party A provide specific consideration, then Party A must either provide said consideration, or be bound by the terms and conditions of the counter-offer, should they remain silent and not counter the counter-offer.

Authorities:

Legal Maxims from Black's Law Dictionary Seventh Edition:

"The Contract Gives the Law - *Legem Enim Contractus Dat*" *inter alia*;

"A Party who is Silent, appears to Consent - *Qui Tacet Consentire Videtur*" *inter alia*;

"The proof is incumbent upon the one who affirms, not the one who denies - *Affirmanti, non neganti, incumbit probatio*" *inter alia*.

The Imperative Requirement for Affidavits:

The solution to rebutting the State's presumptions that a human being is the same as the legal NAME, is to use the process of Conditional Acceptance in response to any nonsense they foist upon you, where in they claim that the human being is the same as the legal NAME used on their paperwork. Your Conditional Acceptance carries your claims by way of a sworn Affidavit-of-Truth, giving them the opportunity to rebut your Affidavit and the claims you make therein. Since they will be unable to rebut your Affidavit because you speak the truth, and they only deal in fiction, at the end of the process you have put them into default agreement that the human being is not the same as the legal NAME.

The most critical part of this process, aside from following the necessary and requisite steps in the Commercial Default Process, is to make sure your Affidavit is bullet-proof and above reproach. Be careful in your Affidavit not to identify yourself with the NAME, a trap inherent in traditional Affidavits. If you provide a sworn Affidavit-of-Truth, and the other party cannot rebut your Affidavit with their own sworn Affidavit, then your Affidavit stands as the truth. The other party will never be able to rebut your Affidavit because they would have to lie, since they deal in the world of fiction. Refer to [APPENDIX XVI](#) (Page 63) for a sample Affidavit which does not create legal joinder with the NAME.

The fact that an un rebutted affidavit stands as the truth has been adjudicated in many cases, in respect of the Doctrines of Tacit Consent, Acceptance and Acquiescence, however courts will attempt to dismiss these facts since the Commercial Default Process is so powerful that it totally destroys their NAME Game. So be prepared for a battle with dishonourable courts and the un-just Legal System.

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

Submitting any claims or paperwork without an Affidavit-of-Truth, is just a waste of time because you have no substance to your claims, no swearing of any truths. So, a good Affidavit is imperative.

The Solution Relies Upon Their Silence:

By providing a time-frame within which your Conditional Acceptance must be resolved, and consequences if no response is received, then you get your solution by their silence. Since they cannot reply, you win by their default. It is best if you can arrange for some witness, such as a Notary Public or independent Response Verifier, who can swear that no response was received to your Conditional Acceptance.

The Solution In Commerce:

Since the legal NAME is always performing a function of government, it is necessary to avoid using any Bank Accounts for commerce, since they are always created from some government-issued ID, and are therefore connected to the legal NAME.

If you have to accept a cheque from somebody, then the best solution is to cash the cheque at the issuing bank location (where their signature is kept on file) and only provide sufficient ID to cash the cheque (such as Passport which is not really attached to anything except the Birth Certificate - still a problem but it is the best we have).

The next best solution is to only accept cash in exchange for your time and talent labour. The only problem with this approach is that the cash (bank notes) belongs to somebody else, so you have to use them by Private Necessity, and make sure you make that clear whenever necessary.

The best solution is to use either barter, cyber money, or gold and silver coin in exchange for your labour. The new Valcambi Combibars seem to be a good alternative.

[<- BACK](#)

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX XVI

Sample Affidavit-of-Truth:

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that I am, the living soul and free-will man who is commonly called 'Gordon' of the Thomas-clan associated with the original peoples and herein referred to as the 'Man' who was witnessed by many as being born of a woman my mother and not of any statute and having no occupation and sometime living in the area commonly called 'vancouver' situated within the geographical region commonly called 'british columbia' associated with the land mass commonly called 'canada' **for** the legal-identity name 'GORDON THOMAS' **for** HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN, DO SOLEMNLY DECLARE THAT:

1. In this Affidavit-of-Truth, the facts declared herein are true, correct, and not meant to mislead, and unless successfully rebutted with specificity and particularity point-by-point by any interested party, such truth and facts shall be deemed and decreed to be accepted *nolo contendere* as so written and declared herein, and thereby such facts stand as the truth in commerce therefor;
2. The Man has first hand knowledge and experience of the facts declared herein, except where otherwise clearly stated to be made on opinion, belief, or information, and thereby the Man is competent to declare in honour matters in this Affidavit-of-Truth;
3. The Man has information that the flesh, blood, and bones of which he is made came into mortal existence *via* his mother *circa* the year 1947, and the legal-identity 'NAME' "THOMAS Gordon #1234567" was created as a legal-fiction in Canada by agents of Her Majesty *circa* the year 1966 *via* a Canadian Immigration Document, and the legal-identity NAME "GORDON THOMAS # 123 456 789" was created as a legal-fiction in Canada by agents of Her Majesty *circa* the year 1967 *via* an application for Social Insurance, and the legal-identity NAME "GORDON THOMAS #12345678" was created as a legal-fiction in Canada by agents of Her Majesty *circa* the year 1972 *via* a Canadian Citizenship process, therefore it is obvious that one is not the same as the other since they all have different means of identification and different numbers (*viz.* the flesh, blood, and bones is not the same as any NAME on any piece of paper);
4. The Man was lead to believe, by agents of HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN, that the legal-identity NAME was the same as the Man himself, however the Man now knows that his living sole and mortal body is not the same as said legal-identity NAME;
5. The Man has information that Legal Title to the legal-identity NAME "GORDON THOMAS" belongs to HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN by the registration of a Certificate of Live Birth with the Registrar of Births Deaths & Marriages and the creation of a "Birth Certificate" therefor;
6. The Man has information that Equitable Title for the legal-identity NAME "GORDON THOMAS" belongs to HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN since all property purchased for said NAME becomes the property of the Legal Title holder, namely HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN;
7. The Man has information that Quiet Possession for the legal-identity NAME "GORDON THOMAS" is held by HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN since said NAME resides within the "Records" of the Registrar of Births Deaths & Marriages possessed by HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN;

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

APPENDIX XVII

Alternative Explanation from a Third Party

Here is a copy of "The NAME GAME Explained", which was received from an anonymous third party. It is quite good and covers the same material, presented with different words:

<Quote>

The NAME GAME Explained

Recent research here in Canada shows that the income tax, and all other statutory law, is imposed based upon the 'property right', and that property right is the property right of the corporate Crown in Canada, and corporate State (be it a State or the UNITED STATES) in the USA. The same scheme can be found in any country that is a subject country of the Pontiff of Rome's Holy Roman Empire. Thus, in actuality, the assumed 'property right' is that of the corporate Holy Roman Empire, as the Crown or incorporated State is an agency for the Holy Roman Empire.

The 'Crown' is the administrative corporation of the Pontiff of Rome owned City of London, the financial, legal and professional standards capitol of/for the Vatican, The City of London is a square mile area within Greater London, England, and is an independent city-state. In the USA, the administrative corporation for the Pontiff of Rome is the UNITED STATES, and that corporation administers the Vatican capitol, for, primarily, military purposes, called Columbia, or the District of Columbia. The UNITED STATES also administers the 50 sub-corporate States of the United States of America, identified with the 2 cap letters – CA, OR, WA, etc.

All adult humans are deceived into using the fiction name, as imprinted on the copy of the birth certificate you receive when ordering it from Provincial/State Vital Statistics, or to whatever source you apply. Although the birth certificate is of somewhat recent origin and used to formally offer 'citizens' as chattel in bankruptcy to the Pope's Holy Roman Empire owned Rothschilds' Banking System, the false use of the family name goes back into the Middle Ages in England. Thus, it is with the family name made a primary, or surname, (example - Mister Jones), and the given names of the child (example - Peter) made a reference name to the primary name. This is the reverse or mirror image to reality. A 'family name' is NOT a man's name - it is a name of a clan - a blood relationship. [Replace the example names with your given and family name.]

We are then 'forced' or 'obliged' to use that name in all commercial and Government dealings and communications. So, when we do use it, as 99.99% of the human inhabitants of North America (and most of the world) do, we supposedly 'voluntarily' attach ourselves, the free will adult human, to the Crown/State owned property, called the 'legal identity name' as an accessory attached to property owned by Another party..

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

The Crown/State then invokes the legal maxim, *accessio cedit principali*, [an accessory attached to a principal becomes the property of the owner of the principal], where the principal is the legal identity name as 'intellectual property', the owner is the corporation called the Crown/State or UNITED STATES, and the accessory is the free will human who has supposedly volunteered himself to be 'property by attachment' of the Crown/State. An adult human who is property is, and by any other name, a 'slave', be it citizen, subject or freeman.

I would point out here that all concepts that teach that the relationship between free will man and Government/corporate bodies is contractual are incorrect. All supposed remedies in contract law, American UCC or Canadian PPSA are 'red herring' diversions – some intended, and some in ignorance by the teachers.

As a slave, one's property in possession, including body and labor, belongs to the slave owner 100%. And, the property right is a bundle of rights - own, use, sell, gift, bequeath and hypothecate property.

Thus, ALL 'income' resulting from the owned human slave's mental and/or physical labor belongs to the slave owner. That which is left with or granted to the slave for his own use and maintenance is called a 'benefit'. In Canada, the 'return of income' [the phrase itself tells the story] is called a T1 'tax and benefits package'. The T1 or 1040 is an accounting by the slave of his fruits of labor that belongs to the slave owner, and the prescribed 'benefits' that he may keep or have back from withholding.

Thus, all income tax cases', in reality, result from fraud, illegal concealment and theft by the accused slave of the slave owner's 'property'.

Going back to an above paragraph, we find that the attachment of oneself to the Crown/State owned name is 'assumed to be voluntary', as the Crown/State has no valid right to impose slavery upon adult humans against their will. And, constitutional prohibitions of slavery only encompasses 'involuntary servitude', not 'voluntary servitude'. Anyone working as an employee is in a contract of voluntary servitude - direction and time control by, and obedience and loyalty to the employer. Until we 'assumed to be slaves' get our heads around this key to the lock that holds our chains of slavery around our necks and ankles, we will continue to attempt to swim with that 100 lb ball chained to our leg.

Reports of unsuccessful attempts at paying government imposed debts using the Canadian Bills of Exchange Act or US UCC provisions of settling an account proved that there was no contract issue between a Canadian or American adult human and the Government as is commonly taught by some patriot gurus. Under contract, a 'bill' is a method of equalizing a contract - like value exchanged for like value. However, under the 'property right' of a slave owner in regard to property in the possession of an owned slave, a 'demand' for the property by the slave owner, or the slave owner's agent (such as the IRS, or county tax collector, or for a court imposed fine),

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

is all that is necessary, without regard to due process of law. Remember, ALL that a slave possesses belongs to the slave owner. I am NOT saying you ARE a slave. I just point out to you that Government, and its employees, judges and officers SEE you as a SLAVE.

Further, when any 'officer' of the corporate body, be it 'peace officer or police', all the way to King or President choose to declare someone 'homo sacer' (meaning a man who has been stripped of his status of 'person' - that being an obedient corporate slave member of the corporate body politic) - he is stripped of the rights of due process of law, and can be fined, punished, tortured or killed without repercussion to the officer, or officer involved. This happens all the time in the world of the Holy Roman Empire.

This doctrine of 'homo sacer' is clearly presented in the US Fugitive Slave Act 1850, Section 6:

<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/fugitive.htm>

Quote:

"In no trial or hearing under this act shall the testimony of such alleged fugitive be admitted in evidence; and the certificates in this and the first [fourth] section mentioned, shall be conclusive of the right of the person or persons in whose favor granted, to remove such fugitive to the State or Territory from which he escaped, and shall prevent all molestation of such person or persons by any process issued by any court, judge, magistrate, or other person whomsoever. Unquote

Three major points here: 1. The accused disobedient slave cannot enter evidence in his own defense. Sound familiar? The Canadian Human Rights Tribunal and German 'Holocaust Denial' litigation courts declare that "truth is no defense". Judges constantly ignore offered defenses by Government accused defendants, especially in traffic and income tax issues. And, this may be acceptable if the judge were to explain why he need do that, but almost 100% of the time, no explanation is offered, and that is to hide the 'homo sacer' doctrine, and the fact that a slave is being tried and disciplined for disobedience to the rules within the slave owner's property right. 2. The 'certificate' presented by the officer or agent of the property owner (declaration of property ownership) is sufficient for conviction of disobedience. 3. No molestation (such as criminal or civil complaints) can be made by, or on behalf of the accused or convicted disobedient slave. Anyone know of successful litigation against a police officer or judge who severely abused the unalienable rights of a man? Yes, there may be a few in well publicized cases, where the system has to hide their despotic Roman scheme, but that is rare.

A POSSIBLE REMEDY

However, since we are 'forced to', or 'obliged to' use the Crown/State owned legal identity name in all commercial and government dealings, services and communications, we can make a 'claim

The NAME Game - The Trick Used by the Legal System

of right' under the Rule of Private Necessity – with the necessity being the means to sustain and maintain our life, as all food, shelter, clothing, means of travel and that which answers our need for happiness all has to be obtained or used in the realms of commerce. Briefly, commerce is all communications, contracts, and other interrelations and interactions with other parties, which includes government.

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Necessity_\(tort\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Necessity_(tort))

This should counter the claim that we 'voluntarily' attach ourselves to Crown/State property. Repeating - The Private Necessity is that we cannot do anything in relation to life, liberty, property or due process of law without using the Crown/State owned name, and thus we cannot sustain or maintain our lives without that fiction name.

Also, a Freedom Of Information Demand should be sent to the Minister, or Representative requesting the authority, date, means and methods by which you, a free will man (m or f) became a slave owned by the corporate Crown or State.

A process that has worked recently in Texas is the 'surrender' of the copy of the birth certificate one has in possession to a judge, or the judge assigned to a case where you, in the legal identity name, are the defendant, in an 'in chambers' hearing. Some call this 'surrender' of the defendant (the legal identity name) as being on the 'private side' using the Biblical method of settling disputes privately if possible.

This is preferred to 'surrendering it in court' as that is on the 'public side', and as a human presence in the court room, the assumption that you are an attachment to the legal identity name has already been made. And being attached as an accessory to it, you become surety, guarantor and do 'represent' the legal identity name defendant.

<EndQuote>

[<- BACK](#)