



“Bind down the government with the chains of the Constitution.”
Thomas Jefferson

Inside This Issue:

Who Wants To Take An Oath? Part II	2
Why There Will be No Draft	4
Definitions are the Key to Understanding	5
Did You Know?	5
A Note From The Editor	8
Liberty's Cause	9

Patriot Perspective

Edited by Texas Spitfire and produced by Texas Spitfire Productions. Published once a month or as time permits. T.S.P. is headquartered at Houston, Texas.

The Corporation Sole

by Brent Johnson

In the arenas of liability protection and religious freedom, nothing offers better protections than the corporation sole.

A corporation sole is a scriptural society, whose disciplines and structure are based on Old Testament Law. A corporation sole can therefore do just about anything except that which is prohibited by Scripture (i.e. thou shalt not murder, thou shalt no steal, thou shalt not commit fraud, etc.). So long as you do not engage in any of the above-described “antisocial behavior”, you can live your life in relative freedom and privacy, and enjoy the protections of the corporation sole

The corporation sole has been around for a lot longer than the united States of America. The earliest sole that is believed to have existed was created sometime around 200 B.C.! In modern times, soles have always existed. For example, the Catholic Church is a corporation sole, and the Pope is the current Overseer.

A corporation sole is not a corporation. A corporation is a statutory construct that is obligated to the government that created it. Corporations must file tax statements and returns, pay statutory fees, register professional activities, and they generally exist subject to the controls of their masters, their creator... the government.

Corporations sole are a different breed altogether. There are no reporting or filing requirements, no registration of activities, listing of employees, saving of receipts, etc. associated with the operation of a sole. A sole is a genuine religious institution, so its existence rests outside of the jurisdiction of any level or branch of government.

Unlike non-profit corporations registered under Title 26, Section 501(c)(3), a corporation sole is not subject to the imposition of any restrictions by federal, State or local government, or any instrumentality or pseudo-agency of government (e.g. Internal Revenue Service).

There are currently eighteen states that have enacted statutes authorizing the creation of a corporation sole within their jurisdictions. As a result, all fifty states recognize their validity and a corporation sole can operate in any state in the Union.

A corporation sole has two agents that make up the sole. They hold the respective positions of Overseer/Presiding Patriarch/Matriarch and Scribe. These positions are roughly similar to the corporate positions of President and Secretary. Anyone can hold these positions, though generally the individual who set up the sole is its first Overseer and a spouse or close family member,

continued page 3

Who Wants to Take an Oath Part II

by The Informer

Liberty is the prevention of control by others. This requires self-control and, therefore, religious and spiritual influences; education, knowledge, well-being.

Lord Acton

Perjury. n. The act of crime of willfully making a false oath, when lawfully administered; nor a crime committed when a lawful oath is administered in some judicial proceeding, to a person who swears willfully, absolutely, in a matter material to the issue.

Ok now is the oath legal or lawful? Is the court a judicial or administrative court? Was it lawfully or legally administered? There is a big difference. See no man shall know the truth because you can't truthfully answer even these questions).

When the court says to take an oath before you ever say anything it is -- To forswear one's self, is to swear falsely; to perjure one's self, see above under perjure.

As to the jurat (perjury statement on forms), how can you know whether they are using terms or words on the form? People cannot. And, when they sign the form they automatically perjure themselves because terms are used, which make what appear to be common words actually something entirely different when they are terms. Ergo you must have lied in the fact you said something and they said something entirely different. They now perceive you lied and there is nothing you can do because you signed under penalties of perjury, see perjury above.

The current Internal Revenue Code is about as close to legislated chaos as could ever be envisioned. No two people beginning with identical premises will reach the same conclusion under the IRC. Is not that chaos? Thus, in every instance where the government attempts to use oaths to bind a people, the result has been chaos. So who is telling the truth, you or the government drone? Who wrote the statute in such a way that only they know terms, while the even educated man knows not of terms. So only the ones knowing terms are telling the truth as to terms, BUT in reality the fraud of it all they are telling a lie and swearing an oath to tell a lie. Think about that last sentence real hard and you will see even though they are telling the truth on one hand they are lying on the other hand.

If only 2% of the American people understand what is written here, income taxation will be abolished - that out of a fear that the knowledge will expand. The government will be scared silly. What if no one in the next generation would swear an oath? Then there would be no servants!

This is an excerpt from E. Simmons:

Think of this, Pilate had no quarrel with Jesus. He correctly saw the charge as a political matter, devoid of any real criminal act. Likely, Pilate offered Jesus the "protection of Rome." Roman law extended only to sworn subjects. All Jesus would need do is swear an oath to Caesar, then Pilate could protect him. Otherwise, Jesus was probably going to turn up dead at the hands of "person or persons unknown" which would really be at the hands of the civil government, under the false charge of sedition. Pilate administered that oath to Caesar. Jesus stood mute, again refusing jurisdiction. Pilate "marveled at that." He'd never before met a man who preferred to live free or die. Under Roman law the unsworn were considered to be unclean - the "great unwashed masses." The elite were sworn to Caesar.

"...[W]e insist on the principle that no danger or crisis, foreign or domestic, will be solved by Americans surrendering more of their constitutional liberties, in the foolish hope that a bigger government will provide greater security."

Larry P. Arnn

continued page 3

The Corporation Sole by Brent Johnson

continued from page 1

or possible a trusted business associate or partner takes on the position of Scribe.

The corporation sole is structured as a special trust. The corporation sole is unique, because it is the only artificial entity in which the individual for whom it is created retains legal control of the sole assets while relinquishing personal liability for the same.

A sole provides the best way to maintain privacy in your financial affairs. Corporations sole can have bank accounts, even offshore foreign accounts! Soles can hold property, too, but really smart property owners utilize a sole in conjunction with other non-regulated artificial entities (such as Pure Trust Organizations), to provide maximum asset protection with minimal liability. Remember, even though you are no longer personally liable, liability still exists, and diversification of assets is the simplest way to reduce liability to the bare minimum.

The principle of the sole goes back to scriptural days: that everything belongs to our Creator and we are but shepherds for His property. That is how a corporation sole operates. The Overseer and Scribe are the agents for the sole. As agents, the Law of Principal/Agent rules: that the agent cannot be held liable for actions taken on behalf of the principal. Therefore, everything you do for the rest of your life (except murder, steal, commit fraud, etc.) is as an agent for the sole, and you cannot be held personally liable.

In case after case, statutory courts have correctly construed that the individual cannot be held liable for the acts of the sole; nor can property belonging to a sole be taken to settle a grievance or judgment against an individual (*County of San Luis Obispo v. Ashurst*, 145 Cal.App.3d 382).

A corporation sole is a private incorporation of one person, providing the same type of liability protections that are afforded to associations and aggregations of individuals (18 AmJur 2d Sec. 7; 18 AmJur 2d Sec. 29).

Brent Johnson is Director of Freedom Bound International. For more information on Corporations Sole, Sovereignty Package and Common Law Pure Trusts, visit www.americansovereign.com or call toll free 1-888-385-3733

WHO WANTS TO TAKE AN OATH, PART II by The Informer

continued from page 2

When an official errantly extended the law to an unsworn person that "failure of jurisdiction" required that the official perform a symbolic act. To cleanse himself and the law, he would "wash his hands." Pilate did so. Under Roman law, the law to which he was sworn, he had to do so.

The law, neither Roman law nor the law of Israel, could obtain jurisdiction over Jesus. The law couldn't kill Him, nor could it prevent that murder. Jesus was turned over to a mob, demanding His death. How's that for chaos? Jesus was put to death because He refused to be sworn. But the law couldn't do that. Only a mob could do so, setting free a true felon in the process. Thus, Jesus proved the one failing of the law - at least the law then and there - the law has no ability to touch a truly freeman. A mob can, but the result of that is chaos, not order.

continued page 4

"He that holds his peace is wise but he that speaks, speaks not for his own time."
Rainer Maria Rilke

"Those who won our independence believed that the final end of the State was to make men free to develop their faculties... They valued liberty both as an end and as a means. They believed liberty to be the secret of happiness and courage to be the secret of liberty."

Justice Louis D. Brandeis

OATH *continued from page 3*

In every situation where a government attempts to compel an oath, or fails to protect a man of conscience who refuses it, the result is chaos. That government proves itself incapable of any claimed powers as the result, for the only purpose of any government should be to defend the people establishing it - all of those people - and not because they owe that government any duty or allegiance, but for the opposite reason, because the government owes the people its duty and allegiance under the law. This nation came close to that concept for quite a few decades. Then those in federal office realized that they could fool all of the people, some of the time. That "some of the time" regarded oaths and jurisdiction. We were (and still are) a Christian nation, at least the vast majority of us claim ourselves to be Christian. But we are led by churchmen who still uphold the terms of that European treaty. They still profess that it is Christian to swear an oath, so long as it's a "lawful oath." We are deceived. As deceived as the tenant in 1300, but more so, for we now have the Words of Jesus to read for ourselves.

Ed Note: For a version of this piece by *The Informer*, please visit *Against the Grain Press* online: <http://www.atgpress.com/inform/gov069.htm>

“Sometimes the law defends plunder and participates in it. Thus the beneficiaries are spared the shame and danger that their acts would otherwise involve... But how is this legal plunder to be identified? Quite simply. See if the law takes from some persons what belongs to them and gives it to the other persons to whom it doesn't belong. See if the law benefits one citizen at the expense of another by doing what the citizen himself cannot do without committing a crime. Then abolish that law without delay ... No legal plunder; this is the principle of justice, peace, order, stability, harmony and logic.”

Frederic Bastiat

Why There Will Not be a Draft

by Alfred Adask

The government will only re-institute the draft as a last desperate measure to sustain its military adventures.

The reason is that the draft was the animating force behind the hippie-movement, civil disobedience, riots, Weathermen, etc. of the Viet Nam era. We like to think that those anti-government demonstrations were motivated by some moral outrage against the Viet Nam war--and to some extent that's true. But the primary motivation and energy behind the anti-government activities of the A.D. 1960s was the selfish self-interest of young men who weren't about to forfeit two years of their lives to government slavery and risk getting killed.

It's a little like playing high school football. The whole student body will come out to watch the games and cheer for their football team. They'll even describe football players as local heroes and treat them with great respect..

But if being a member of the football team were mandatory for every boy in the high school, the school would soon be plagued by riots, demonstrations, violence and even bombings instigated by those students who are afraid or unwilling to play football and risk being smacked around on the 50 yard line. The games would quickly degenerate from Friday-night celebrations into anti-school riots. The football players who were previously regarded, as "heroes" would quickly assume a mantle of contempt. Driven by fear of being forced to play football, some kids might even begin to spit on existing football players.

While that football scenario may seem farfetched, it's analogous to what happened during the Viet Nam era. Afraid or unwilling to be drafted in the 1960s,

continued page 6

DEFINITIONS ARE THE KEY TO UNDERSTANDING



When the revolutionary war was fought, one of the ideals being fought for was that each man was sovereign in **his own home**, and on his own property. People knew and understood what they were fighting and dieing for. Today, we do not comprehend with total understanding what being *sovereign* is about. Perhaps if we did, we would be less apathic today and more willing to fight for freedom.

From Webster's 1828 Dictionary

SOVEREIGN, a. suv'eran.

1. *Supreme in power; possessing supreme dominion; as a sovereign ruler of the universe.*
2. *Supreme; superior to all others; chief. God is the sovereign good of all who love and obey him.*
3. *Supremely efficacious; superior to all others; predominant; effectual; as a sovereign remedy.*
4. *Supreme; pertaining to the first magistrate of a nation; as sovereign authority.*

SOVEREIGN, n. suv'eran.

1. *A supreme lord or ruler; one who possesses the highest authority without control. Some earthly princes, kings and emperors are sovereigns in their dominions.*
2. *A supreme magistrate; a king.*

DID YOU KNOW?



The American Civil Flag of Peace, which represents constitutional law and has been all but forgotten since the early part of the 20th century. On June 1, 1799, Secretary of the Treasury Oliver Wolcott submitted his design for the Civil Flag of Peace to President John Adams for approval. Wolcott's proposal featured an ensign of sixteen stripes, alternating red and white, representing the number of states that had joined the Union by 1799. It is significant that Wolcott turned the arrangement of the stripes ninety degrees to vertical to differentiate the new ensign from the U.S. Flag, to denote civilian authority under the Treasury Department, rather than military authority under the War Dept. If you should have to go to court, bringing your own Civil Flag of Peace establishes the jurisdiction of the proceedings in your favor.

The flag is 3' x 5' fine nylon, and is suitable for hanging display. The flag is available from Freedom Bound International.

Call for details. 1-888-385-3733

“Whenever a separation is made between liberty and justice, neither, in my opinion, is safe.”

“All that is necessary for evil to triumph, is for good men to do nothing.”

“When bad men combine, the good must associate; else they will fall one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle.”

“The true danger is when liberty is nibbled away, for expedience, and by parts.”

“Nobody made a greater mistake than he who did nothing because he could only do a little.”

Edmund Burke

Why There Will Not be a Draft by Alfred Adask*continued from page 4***On the 2004 election:**

"As for the election, I've never seen an election that disgusted me so much. I can't wait for it to be over. Bush, the dedicated fascist is running against Kerry, the dedicated communist. What a freakin' mess."

Alfred Adask

"There comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but one must take it because it is right." -

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

college-aged men demonstrated and rioted--presumably against Viet Nam war--but actually against being enslaved and forced to risk their lives.

Some people may wonder why today's youth aren't as "moral" as the kids of the Viet Nam era i.e., why don't today's kids riot against the Iraqi War? However, neither generation was remarkably "moral" or susceptible to being motivated by mere moral values to take direct or violent actions against government. Today, we have little or no demonstrations against the Iraqi War and/or the Bush administration precisely because today, we have no draft.

The simple truth is that very few people really give a damn what countries our government invades, why it invades, or who it kills in the process--so long as these invasions and killings don't directly affect Americans personally and directly. Each invasion is welcomed with the same national enthusiasm as we usually find in our Friday-night high school football games. We glorify our military "heroes" just like we glorified our high school quarterbacks. We sit in the bleachers and cheer "Hoo-RAY for Our Side!" each time an American smart bomb flies directly down a chimney or impacts precisely on the door of an enemy bunker--exactly like we cheer when our team's quarterback completes a pass into the enemy's end-zone.

As long as the military is "all-volunteer," the youth of America, and Americans in general, couldn't care less whether anyone dies in Iraq and will continue to "party-on" here in the USA, and cheer for the Friday-night invasions, and "Hail Mary" smart bombs.

Today, the only people likely to "riot" against government are the parents and widows of men and women killed in Iraq. Only they have been directly and personally affected by this foreign war. And there aren't enough actual deaths to inspire enough parents and widows to make much of a demonstration.

Result? Bush is free to talk like some hero about our glorious Iraqi War. He can give us the same idiotic "pep talks" that characterized our high school homecoming celebrations, and most American will love him for it. He is the Vince Lombardi of "America's Team".

But--if our government were to re-institute the draft, you could expect the youth of America (now, both men AND women) to begin rioting, bombing, setting fires, etc. in pretty short order--just like they did during Viet Nam. Bush wouldn't be able to appear in public without facing angry college kids and precipitating riots. He would quickly become as unpopular as Lyndon Baines Johnson who, after one full term in office wherein he enlarged the Viet Nam war and DRAFT, declined to even run for a second. Driven out of office by the Viet Nam DRAFT (not war), LBJ thereby handed the government over to Richard Nixon and the Republicans. Except for the Clinton administration, the Republicans have generally held national power, ever since.

Thus, it is at least arguable that the Democrats--who dominated national government from the A.D. 1930s though the A.D. 1960s, lost control by virtue of imposing the Viet Nam draft. That lesson is not likely to be lost on the Republicans.

continued page 7

Draft

continued from page 6

If the Republicans were sufficiently foolish or desperate to re-institute a draft, they would instantly alienate a whole generation of American youth and perhaps even tip the political balance back in favor of the Democrats for another 20 to 40 years. How many times have we heard President Bush declare, damn near yell in frustration, "THERE . . . WILL ... BE ... NO ... DRAFT!" Why is he so adamant? Because he knows how dangerous a draft can be to his administration.

We can guess whether Bush is lying like his father did ("Read my lips: No more draft!"), but there's no doubt that Bush understands that re-instituting the draft would probably do more to destroy his political power and destabilize the country than launching a nuclear war against England.

So long as the only American casualties in Iraq are suffered by "volunteers," there will be little or no political repercussions in the USA. The truth is that Americans are largely indifferent to other people's deaths. Our politicians don't really give a damn if American soldiers die in Iraq, and the American people are equally indifferent. (We don't even care if our soldiers are adequately paid or receive adequate medical care after they're discharged.)

After all, the soldiers being killed and underpaid are "volunteers". If they were dumb enough to "volunteer" into the military, we may cheer them on as "Friday-night" heroes, but if they die, screw 'em. Better them than us, right?

The Bush administration is already fighting for its life. As likable as Bush is, despite the fact that he's a wartime President, he'll be lucky to win re-election. If he does win this second election, and given that at least 30% of the American people think he "stole" his first election, Bush won't be an inherently strong president in his second term.

Bush may be a great poster-boy for the Republicans, but the real power will probably be found in the Congress. Even if Bush wins, it's possible that there may be enough Republican Congressmen and Senators defeated by Democrats, that the balance of congressional power may even-out enough to give us the blessing of "grid-lock" and prevent Republican storm troopers from goose-stepping down Pennsylvania Avenue. In other words, even if Bush wins, the Democrats might gain enough power in Congress to make Bush walk on eggs for the next four years.

If so, again, Bush should not dare to re-institute the draft unless he's a lot dumber than his critics ever imagined or is more desperate to avoid losing in Iraq than anyone suspects.

Please visit Alfred's website: <http://www.antishyster.net/>

AntiShyster & Suspicious News Magazines

Original Pledge of Allegiance

I pledge allegiance through this flag, to these united States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, as one nation, indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for all.

"The average man's love of liberty is nine-tenths imaginary. It takes a special sort of man to understand and enjoy liberty -- and he is usually an outlaw in democratic societies."

H.L. Mencken

"Rightful liberty is unobstructed action, according to our will, within limits drawn around us by the equal rights of others."

Thomas Jefferson

"Let me just say: Peace to you, if you're willing to fight for it."

**Fred Hampton,
Chair Illinois Black
Panther Party**

A Note from the Editor

“A right is not what someone gives you; it's what no one can take from you.”

Ramsey Clark

“The price of liberty is, always has been, and always will be blood. The person who is not willing to die for his liberty has already lost it to the first scoundrel who is willing to risk dying to violate that person's liberty. Are you free?”

Andrew Ford

“Never could an increase of comfort or security be a sufficient good to be bought at the price of liberty.”

Hillaire Belloc

In the last issue of the PPN, I included the following quote:

**Government is Foreclosed from Parity with Real People —
Supreme Court of the United States 1795**

“Inasmuch as every government is an artificial person, an abstraction, and a creature of the mind only, a government can interface only with other artificial persons. The imaginary, having neither actuality nor substance, is foreclosed from creating and attaining parity with the angible. The legal manifestation of this is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them.”

S.C.R. 1795, Penhallow v. Doane's Administrators (3 U.S. 54; 1L. Ed.57; 3 Dall.54), Supreme Court of the United States 1795

The Informer was kind enough to send me the Penhallow case (75 pages) and let me know that this was an erroneous citation. I could not find this within the case. I apologize for any inconvenience this may have caused and I use this as a perfect example as why people should research for themselves any case quotes they receive. We all trust our sources but we are fallible and make mistakes. Thank you Informer for bringing this to my attention!

~~~~~

In the wake of Bush's "Universal or Mandatory Mental Health Screening Program", Representative Ron Paul of Texas has put forth a bill to stop this insanity. Please take a moment and research the following:

**H. R. 5236 "Let Parents Raise Their Kids Act of 2004"**

<http://www.theorator.com/bills108/hr5236.html>

This bill states in part:

*Parents are already being coerced to put their children on psychiatric medications and some children are dying because of it.*

*The United States Supreme Court in Pierce versus Society of Sisters (268 U.S. 510 (1925)) held that parents have a right to direct the education and upbringing of their children.*

*Universal or mandatory mental health screening violates the right of parents to direct and control the upbringing of their children.*

*Refusal to Consent as Basis of a Charge of Child Abuse or Education Neglect—No Federal education funds may be paid to any local educational agency or other instrument of government that uses the refusal of a parent or legal guardian to provide express, written, voluntary, informed consent to mental health screening for his or her child as the basis of a charge of child abuse or education neglect until the agency or instrument demonstrates that it is no longer using such refusal as a basis of a child abuse or education neglect charge.*

Texas Spitfire

---

## *Liberty's Cause*

A poem by Richard-Jerry..Dixon

As we gaze upon the Stars and Stripes  
 Old Glory is what we see.  
 It means than many have fought and died  
 For the cause of liberty.

Although our flag is tattered and torn  
 And our freedoms have gone astray,  
 We must remember those who died  
 And the price that each one paid.

Our sovereignty is what was bought  
 With the blood of many brave men.  
 They gave their all for liberty  
 With hope for what might have been.

Each day the hopes of those brave men  
 Seem farther and farther away.  
 And the Stars and Stripes of Old Glory  
 Grows dimmer every day.

The time has come for all good men  
 To rise and make their stand  
 And again bring liberty  
 And freedom to this land.

Do we stand up for liberty  
 As those who gave their all  
 Or do we remain upon our knees  
 Like slaves after the fall?

As for me and all my house  
 Freedom is what will be  
 For we will gladly give our all  
 For the cause of liberty.

---

*“It is proper to take alarm at the first experiment on our liberties. We hold this prudent jealousy to be the first duty of citizens and one of the noblest characteristics of the late Revolution. The freemen of America did not wait till usurped power had strengthened itself by exercise and entangled the question in precedents. They saw all the consequences in the principle, and they avoided the consequences by denying the principle. We revere this lesson too much ... to forget it.”*

**James Madison**

---

*“A man who has nothing which he is willing to fight for, nothing which he cares about more than he does about his personal safety, is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free, unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself.”*

**John Stuart Mill,**  
 writing on the  
 U.S. Civil War in 1862

---

## Our Mission

The Patriot Perspective was created to offer information, education and commentary for those Americans who have recognized that America is not following the original intent of our founders. The “Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness”, enumerated by the Constitution, are “inalienable” rights given by God and have always existed. The definition of “inalienable rights” used in our Declaration of Independence means:

*"Rights which can **never** be abridged because they are so fundamental"*  
 - *Black's Law Dictionary 6th Edition*

Our **Rights** are given to us by a higher authority than the "state" The state can only grant *privileges* (licenses). What the state grants, the state can take away. Are you willing to submit to more state control so you can live with the illusion of safety? It is **YOUR** choice.

---

### All rights reserved.

All copyrighted work within this newsletter is distributed under fair use without profit or payment to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for nonprofit research and educational purposes only.

[Ref: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml> ]

Under Common Law, all rights belong to the creator. The above disclaimer is placed here for those who prefer to deal in statutory, rather than common law venues.

### Readers understand and agree to our Disclaimer:

*All representations of the law and quoted sources are accurate and complete to the best for our ability. We make no claims as to how the courts may interpret the "Rule of Law" or the Constitution of the United States .*

---

## Special Note to Our Readers

The Patriot Perspective newsletter is produced by Texas Spitfire Productions, which has been in existence since 2001. *All rights are reserved.* Authors are responsible for their views and the content of their articles. We do not edit articles except for spelling and grammatical errors where found. All work is presumed copyrighted by the submitting author.

As always, we are seeking contributors. If you would like to submit an article or if you have an idea or suggestion, please send an email to the address below.

If you received this newsletter from a friend or the website and would like to subscribe, send an email with “Subscribe” in the subject line to the email address below. The original subscribers list was lost due to a computer crash.

If you would like to obtain a press pass, please send an email requesting a Press Pass application. Please submit all articles or requests for press passes to:

Texas Spitfire Productions  
 c/o 1431 Wirt Rd, #123  
 Houston, republic of Texas uSA  
 Non-Domestic [77055 TDC]  
**[patriot\\_perspective@myway.com](mailto:patriot_perspective@myway.com)**

<http://www.realtruth.biz/patriotperspective/>