

Political Jurisdiction

Eric 'WhoRU' Williams

Another change on how to raise the issue of Political Jurisdiction,

"We have here an issue of this fictitious political venue establishing that it has political jurisdiction over me, in my real live flesh and blood physical entity. And let it be clear, I am present here in my physical flesh and blood capacity and I am most certainly NOT appearing here as a fictional natural person as defined in your statutes!"

Here below, is the item I read on the September 4, 2006 conference call:

Technically there is no time that jurisdiction (of any variety), cannot be challenged but earlier is much better!

I am adding an item I wrote to another member, a few days ago in a similar situation.

In another court case when the member raised the issue of subject matter jurisdiction the perp judge stated that he had subject matter jurisdiction and the judge then went on to also say (without the member mentioning it), that the perp judge had political jurisdiction as well. If the perp judge does that or in any way states that he has any kind of jurisdiction you have to KNOW inside yourself that he does NOT and cannot possibly have Political jurisdiction OVER YOU!

This is a refinement to what I have previously stated. The issue is not merely political jurisdiction because the judge does indeed have political jurisdiction, generally, so we need to be even more specific in our "semantics" - The issue to be raised is "**Political jurisdiction over you in your real live flesh and blood physical entity and that you are NOT "appearing" as a political fictional character"**!

You have to fully understand that although the perp judge does indeed have political jurisdiction, generally; that there is no possible way that the perp judge can prove that he has political jurisdiction over you in your flesh and blood physical entity. This is true because the judge is always operating in a fictitious political entity. If you are not 100% convinced of this deep inside yourself you will probably "cave" and loose on the political jurisdiction issue!

That being stated, read the following items, then think about how you are going to react to whatever the judge might say the next time you go in.

Another important critical point is "appearance". It is impossible for a flesh and blood person to "appear" in court. "Appear" means to suddenly materialize from out of nowhere. "Appear" is the opposite of "disappear", "disappear" means to suddenly vanish - poof - gone! Those who "appear" in court are "putting on" a

fictitious political entity, such as does an actor who takes on a fictional role in a stage play.

The foregoing is true because all governments are fictional entities - governments do not exist in nature; governments are political fictional entities and cannot have any dominion over real living flesh and blood physical entities, such as you are! So when the matter is called and you present yourself, you must make it clear that you are presenting yourself in your real live flesh and blood physical entity and that you are NOT appearing as a fictional character, but that you are there in your flesh and blood entity presenting yourself in your flesh and blood reality. Yes, this is semantics, but everything is semantics - when they accuse you of "semantics" they are accusing you of insisting on being precise in the meaning of and use of words; imprecision is what trips us up every time!

If the perp judge throws any of this at you all you need to do is fully understand everything I am including in this message to the extent that you can reply to anything the perp says, all you have to do is keep the perp judge on point - being that it is his responsibility to prove he, as a player in a political fiction, has political jurisdiction over you in your real live flesh and blood physical entity.

The perp judge simply cannot prove any such thing!

By the way, another not insignificant point is the opposition attorney (prosecutor). It is actually the prosecutor's responsibility to prove that the court (government) has Political jurisdiction over you and when the judge steps in the judge is in violation of their separation of powers doctrine.

Even when the facts might be that you were the person who originally brought the matter to court (as plaintiff), would muddy things up somewhat. You might in that situation then open the jurisdictional issue by establishing (getting the perp judge to agree), that if jurisdiction did not lie at the outset, that jurisdiction never attached at any point. Once you get that general agreement, then spring the court's lack of Political jurisdiction over you on them.

Carefully read the item below that I sent to another member - all of it applies to you and if it were me I would use some (or all), of the examples included below to make the point in court.

This is the end of that item, then another related item that I sent to another group member with a similar problem, wherein the member asked me to provide my understanding of the term, "political jurisdiction", which I have provided herein further below for your enlightenment. But before you read that, consider the following three pages in answer to any question you may have as to whether or not it is ever too late to raise the issue of political jurisdiction (over you):

Have you heard my example of the parents who had several children, one boy and several girls, where the parents raised all of their children as girls, telling the boy he was a girl and telling all of his sisters and everyone in the community that the

boy was a girl, dressing him in dresses, growing his hair long and combing and fixing his hair like a girl's hair?

Where the parents never ever allowed any of the children to see the genitals of their siblings nor of their parents, so that none of the children had any idea that boys and girls were physically different?

My question to you is, was the boy ever a girl, no matter that he thought and believed that he was a girl, no matter that all of his sisters thought and believed that he was a girl, no matter that everyone in the community thought and believed that he was a girl - was the boy EVER a girl?

Apply the foregoing and reasoning below to your political status!

Keep in mind, was the boy EVER a girl?

Are persons born with an obligation of fealty [the loyalty sworn to a feudal lord by a vassal or tenant] to those persons previously born? Who gets to decide in the affirmative - those already born or those not yet born? What about those already born - why would they not be subject to the dominion of persons born prior to them? Where would it stop? Who would the original persons be obligated to?

Where would those persons previously born derive any authority to deem those born thereafter to be obligated to those born previously?

Is all of this convoluted enough to indicate there is no proper, reasonable source of authority for any person to deem that they have dominion over any other person or persons?

Is it reasonably possible for any person to claim dominion over another person? NO!

Can any person arbitrarily claim dominion over another person or persons? YES, OF COURSE! Any person can CLAIM anything!

Does that mean that any person can properly claim dominion over other persons? NO, not only NO, BUT HELL NO!

Can any person volunteer into a condition of servitude to another person or entity? Yes; certainly; of course; without any doubt; what could possibly prohibit such?

Would it be reasonably expected that any mature, fully informed person, being born free and sovereign over him/herself, would intentionally and voluntarily enter into an unconditional condition of total abject servitude to a fictitious political entity?

Ask yourself, did you ever knowingly, intentionally, willingly, being fully informed of the consequences, ever freely and voluntarily give up your personal individual sovereignty over yourself to a fictitious political entity?

Were you ever told or taught that being a citizen of the United States was an option? Or were you instead, taught that you were a citizen of the United States because you were born in the United States?

Were you ever told or taught that the United States is a fictitious political entity? Or were you instead taught and/or led to believe that the United States actually exists in the real physical world?

Were you ever told or taught that the United States does not physically exist, but exists only as a conception of the human mind? Or were you instead taught and led to believe that the United States actually does exist and that you are a part of it, by birth, without any ability to opt out?

Were you ever told or taught that it is impossible for a real live flesh and blood person to be born into a fictional entity? Or were you instead taught and led to believe that you were born in the United States and that the United States is a real place that really does physically exist?

Were you ever told or taught that United States citizenship constitutes a condition of total abject political servitude? Or were you instead taught and led to believe that the United States is the freest country on the planet and that citizens of the United States are totally free?

Were you ever lied to by the government of the United States? Or, perhaps, more properly put, did the government of the United States ever tell you the truth - ever - even once? About anything?

Were you ever taught that when you were born that you were born politically free, as a sovereign person, with no political obligations to any fictitious political entity?

Were you ever taught that the Fourth Article of the Fourteenth Amendment clearly provides that citizens of the United States shall not complain about being required to pay the national debt?

Were you ever taught that the Thirteenth Amendment absolutely prohibits involuntary servitude from existing in the United States?

Were you ever taught that because of the provision of the Fourth Article of the Fourteenth Amendment that US citizenship constitutes and is a condition of total abject political servitude to the fictitious political entity known as the United States?

Were you ever taught that because of the foregoing facts, that it was impossible for a person to be deemed to be a citizen of the United States because of a mere accident of birth?

Were you ever taught that because the United States is a fictitious political entity, not existing in nature that it is physically impossible for a flesh and blood woman to give birth to a flesh and blood baby, in such a fictitious political entity as is the United States?

Were you ever taught that as there is no natural authority for any person or other entity to proclaim any other person to owe fealty to another, that therefore no entity can possibly properly acquire and have any proper ability or authority to deem any person to be subservient thereto?

So when did you knowingly, willingly and intentionally, being fully informed of the consequences, freely and willingly relinquish your personal individual political sovereignty over yourself to the fictitious political entity known as the United States?

Keep asking yourself; was the boy ever a GIRL?

Now, my explanation of "political jurisdiction":

Simply put, "political jurisdiction" is the authority attained and exercised by a fictitious political entity (government), over those persons who have knowingly, willingly and intentionally, being fully informed of the consequences thereof, freely volunteered themselves to be subject to the jurisdiction thereof. (14th Amendment, (Sect 1), "All persons born ... in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States...", and, having so volunteered, are (Sect. 4), required to SHUT UP and PAY UP! - slightly paraphrased but intent not misconstrued nor misstated).

In more detail, "political jurisdiction" is similar to personal jurisdiction in regard to a fictitious person (e.g., U.S. citizen), except that in the case of a fictitious person, a personal jurisdictional challenge merely challenges the jurisdiction of the fictitious political entity over the fictitious person in that particular situation, while at the same time recognizing generally, the political jurisdiction of the political fiction over the fictitious person. A fictitious person can only challenge personal jurisdiction of the fictitious political entity based on the rules of the fictitious political entity.

A political jurisdictional challenge is similar to a personal jurisdictional challenge except that political jurisdiction bases the challenge on the issue of the basic origin of the purported jurisdiction of the fictitious political entity over the Sovereign person because of the political status of the Sovereign person (e.g., a flesh and blood entity), while at the same time recognizing the existence of the political fiction but not submitting to the authority of the political fiction.

A Sovereign person challenges jurisdiction of the fictitious political entity based on the political status of the Sovereign person and on the fictitious nature of the political fiction and not on the rules of the fictitious political entity.

A challenge of political jurisdiction over you raises the issue to the very existence of the political fiction in relation to the Sovereign person.

Cheers,

I'm Eric WhoRU?

Listen to Eric's conference calls:

<http://www.hopewoodshome.com/eTmp/fone/ewac.htm>

...from Eric Williams;

As soon as the Judge begins talking to you – Look him/her directly in the eyes and say clearly with authority:

Just a minute, we have here an issue of Political Jurisdiction.

IF the Judge asks: What is the nature of this issue?

ANSWER: You know very well what it is.

IF the Judge asks: Are renouncing your United States Citizenship (or any further question[s] of any nature)?

a. ANSWER: Why are you asking me any questions, I have raised an issue of Political Jurisdiction. So now the only thing that you can do is provide your proof that you have Political Jurisdiction over me and you cannot do that by asking me questions. And as soon as you ask me the first question you have acknowledged that you do not have any proof – so goodbye.

b. ACTION: TURN and immediately LEAVE the courtroom without uttering another word.

Suggested reading:

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America, July 4, 1776

<http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/declaration.html>

The Constitution of the United States, 1787

<http://www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters/constitution.html>

CHISHOLM v. STATE OF GA., 2 U.S. 419 (1793)

<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=case&court=us&vol=2&invol=419>

This principal was espoused by Chief Justice John Jay,

"...at the Revolution the sovereignty devolved on the people: and they are truly the sovereigns of the country, but they are sovereigns without subjects unless [472*] *the African* slaves among us may be so called) and have none to govern but themselves; the citizens of America are equal as fellow citizens and as joint tenants in the sovereignty.

Hi Group -

I received the below inquiry from a new WhoRU group member; my response follows his message:

Hi

I am new in this group and one of my best friends is going to court in about a week. We have challenged jurisdiction via judicial notice and the judge did not pay any attention to the notice even though it was based in the Attorney General decision on what the judge must do. Does any one have any ideas on what happened on this case??

If someone in Texas needs the decision of the Attorney General, Gregg Abbott, where he spells out the duties of the traffic court judge, let me know.

Don

Eric's response:

Hi Don -

I can only inform you of what I would have done or not done and what I would do nor not do - what anyone does is entirely up to them!!

The first thing I have to decide and understand is my political status?? Am I a citizen of the United States or am I a Sovereign flesh and blood human being?? If I am a US citizen than I just bow down and let them have their way with me but if I am a Sovereign flesh and blood human being then I don't bow very well.

As I am a real live flesh and blood human being and as I am politically sovereign over myself I would never ever file anything with any fictional political entity such as a court. It needs to be understood that it is a physical impossibility for a flesh and blood human being to inter-relate with a fiction!! Just try talking to a fictional character on the pages of a book and see if the fictional character responds to you - or stand in front of a TV and talk to the image depicted on the TV screen - what response or acknowledgment do you get??

The foregoing is not offered as just some silly example!! If you do not understand the concept of "fiction" and what fiction is, then you may as well forget ever prevailing in these matters based on political jurisdiction!!

You must understand that governments do not exist in nature?? You must understand that as governments do not exist in nature that governments only exist as a fiction created by humans?

The story "Cinderella" is a fiction but humans have made a movie depicting the fiction that we can watch. While we are watching the movie we can intellectually and emotionally merge into the story and the story can seem very real to us and we can react emotionally to the story but all the while we are watching and reacting we

know that the fiction is not actually real but just our imagination that is in the story, not our actual flesh and blood human body.

This is exactly what happens in a court!! The court is nothing but a fancy stage set; made up to depict a courtroom. This is true because the political entity that appears there is only able to appear and act out the "script" because all of the participants agree to become fictional actors and thereby volunteer to play as fictional characters in the fictional court - the key for us is to know how to avoid volunteering into the fiction.

As it is self evident that it is absolutely physically impossible for real live flesh and blood humans to interact with physically non-existing fictional characters it is therefore also self evident that when you sent a letter to the fiction you thereby voluntarily participated in the political fiction. Did you not address your letter to the judge or to the court?? The court/judge only exist as part of the political fiction, so when you sent the fiction a letter you thereby indicated your willingness to enter into their fiction and abide by the rules of the fiction. How could it reasonably be otherwise?? But you can opt out at any time you choose - but you have to know how to shout, "CUT"!!

The way I do that is by presenting (NOT "appearing" - PRESENTING!!), my real live flesh and blood human body in the set of the fictional court room. The actor who plays the judge really does also exist as a real live flesh and blood human being just as I do. When he comes out dressed in his costume (black robe), he is doing the same thing a movie actor would be doing when the movie actor, dressed in the appropriate costume, takes his position on the stage of a movie set; but the actor remains in his real live flesh and blood human being status until the action starts.

Then, when the "action" starts, the real live man on the bench assumes his fictional role as a judge and the room (set) becomes a court in the political fiction and everyone who participates MUST also don the role of a fictional character in order to "appear" in the fictional court.

My "job" is to know when and how to yell "CUT"!!

When the director of a Hollywood fictional depiction yells "CUT" all of the actors drop out of their fictional roles and resume their flesh and blood entities and turn their attention to the real live director who then gives them real live instructions telling them to do this or that in order to have the fictional presentation to be done as he wants. Then, after the director has given his instructions to the real live flesh and blood actors he then yells, "ACTION!!" and all of the actors immediately put aside their real live flesh and blood persons and don the personalities of the fictional characters; the actors then "appear" as the fictional characters they are depicting in the fictional story they are acting out. Everyone who participates in the fiction can only do so by "appearing" in the role of a fictional character!!

So, in the fictional court, when the judge says, "Next case" that is like the director saying, "Action", and everyone then dons their fictional roles and they all then "appear" on the set and begin acting in their fictional characters. That is when I need to yell, "CUT", in order to get all the actors to drop out of their fictional roles and

revert to their real live human entities so I can talk to them in their flesh and blood human being form and not as an actor in a fictional court; except I do not yell, "CUT", what I do is say, "Just a minute, we have here an issue of political jurisdiction to resolve!!" And, thereupon, the actor playing the judge drops out of his position of authority over me and reverts to his real live flesh and blood human entity and becomes a man with no more authority than any other man.

At that moment the actor playing the role as "judge" is no longer a fictional judge, he is a real live flesh and blood person, by name of Mr. Smith (or whatever his name is), and as Mr. Smith, a flesh and blood human, he has no political jurisdiction over me because no one then present at that point is in an assumed fictional role, because I refused to don the fictional character as a "defendant" when the "judge" said, "Next case" and I said, "Just a minute, we have here an issue of political jurisdiction to resolve."

At this point I will address the judge as Mr. Smith, not as judge Smith or as Your Honor. This is because at this point he is NOT in his role as a fictional court officer, he is in his real live physical human being entity, and I need to make it clear that I am not "appearing" in their political fiction. Until it is established that the political fiction has political jurisdiction over my real live flesh and blood human form, Mr. Smith is not a judge, as far as I am concerned!!

When I refused to "appear" on stage (by raising the issue of political jurisdiction), I effectively told Mr. Smith (not as "judge Smith" but as Mr. Smith), "I have not joined the Screen Actors Guild (I have not volunteered into US citizenship BUT I AM MOST CERTAINLY NEVER EVER GOING TO SAY THAT!!!*), so I cannot assume this fictional role and the "play" cannot go on with me involved until my status as an actor in this fiction is resolved."

* It is not up to me to tell the perps what my political status is or to tell them that I have not volunteered!!! It is up to them to prove that they have political jurisdiction over me and I do not have to give them any clues!!

It is thereupon the responsibility of the actors, in their real live flesh and blood entities, to produce proof that I have, indeed, in the past, voluntarily agreed to participate in their political fiction; which it is totally impossible for them to do without my acquiescence.

In previous instances the perp judge has done one of two things:

(1) Stated that he does have jurisdiction, or state that he does have political jurisdiction. In either event I would say, "FOR THE RECORD, I am not "appearing" in this political fiction, I am present here in my real live flesh and blood human being entity and, FOR THE RECORD I want to know on what basis you are claiming that this fictitious political entity has political jurisdiction over my real live flesh and blood human being entity!! When he does not respond within 30 nano seconds I will then say, "There is no possible way that this fictional political entity can establish political jurisdiction over me so this matter is concluded, is expunged from your fictional records and I am departing", and I would walk out.

Or I might say, "As you have of your own volition stated that you do have political jurisdiction, would you please explain what political jurisdiction is and how it is that you have it over my real live flesh and blood human form."

Every time any variation of the forgoing has occurred the perp judges have said absolutely nothing to the Sovereign who then walked out.

(2) Asked questions. Most often the perp judge will ask some question to try to establish jurisdiction, such as, "What is political jurisdiction?" My response would be, "If you don't know it is quite obvious that you do not have it. Therefore, this matter is concluded, is expunged from your fictional records and I am departing."

Or the perp will say, "There is no such thing as political jurisdiction." I would respond, "As it is self evident that governments do not exist in nature, then it reasonably follows that governments can only exist as political fictions and everything done under the jurisdiction thereof would be done under political jurisdiction, so then what you are saying Mr. Smith, is that the government under which this fictional court purports to be a sub entity does not exist. That being your position it reasonably follows that this court has no authority whatsoever, even as a political fiction, so therefore, you could not possibly have any political jurisdiction over me, good day."

Or I might respond, "As you have stated that political jurisdiction does not exist you must know what political jurisdiction is, so would you please explain, for the record, why it is that you claim that political jurisdiction does not exist."

I could say at any time after the perp judge addresses the issue of political jurisdiction over my real live flesh and blood human form, that as it is my understanding that under the separation of powers doctrine, the judicial branch is deemed to be neutral and not a party to litigation brought before it, so, if that is the case, then how is it that the judicial branch is attempting to establish political jurisdiction over my real live flesh and blood human form, the judicial branch is clearly doing what is clearly the responsibility of the executive branch?? As the purported neutral party has clearly exhibited a strong bias in favor of the complaining party, this matter is deemed terminated, expunged from your fictitious records and I am departing.

Cheers,

I'm Eric WhoRU