

February 15, A. D. 2012

To my many friends across America:

You'd need a calculator in order to count all the good, well-meaning folks across America who are shouting in court "I'm not a fiction", or "that's not me", or claiming that the all-cap name is a fiction, or a corporation, or a trust, or an estate. Yes, I used to be one of those as well.

As most of you know, I shut-down my website well over a year ago, because I refuse to advocate a process/processes that don't work, or that will cause someone more problems than they already have. That began my path of establishing a critical analysis for why these processes weren't successful. Could it be that we were believing something that isn't true ?

Yes, sometimes these arguments resulted in an occasional win here or there, but could it be that those occasional wins were because the judge had a hangover that morning and didn't feel like dealing with you, or because his mistress was waiting for him at the "we-no-tell motel" and he was running late, so he gave you a win so he could get in the car and go ?

So, ask yourself how many times you have "won" a disagreement with administrators using your paperwork ? I'll bet your answer is "never", or at best, "rarely". My purpose here is to tell you why I think your answer is probably "never".

After much thought, I believe that the all-cap name is not a fiction at all (regardless of what folks dig up in Black's Law Dictionary), but merely, what I'll call, **the federal spelling of a man's name that identifies him as being a man who is in the territory.**

The all-cap name is the man's **public name = territorial venue name = federal venue name = commercial venue name = "this state" venue name**, which is required for conducting congressionally-regulated commerce across the territory, as well as being bonded/insured. This spelling identifies the man as being in the **public venue**.

The upper and lower case name is the man's **private name = birth name = common law venue name = "the State" venue name**, which identifies the sovereign man who is on the soil over a republican form of government. This spelling identifies the man as being in the **private venue**.

I believe the all-cap name vs. the upper-and-lower case name is **a venue issue, not a status issue**.

When we speak about the subject of "our name", we tend to think of our status, i.e., who we are (a man created in the image of God, a sovereign, a man with unalienable rights, etc.), when in fact, governmental officials determine our venue by how our name is spelled on our I.D. card. You're either on the soil or in the territory. **It's a venue issue, not a status issue.**

Follow me on this: "STATE OF TEXAS" is a fictional territory, i.e., "this state", while the "The State of Texas" is a member State of the Perpetual Union, i.e., "the State". **It's a venue issue.**

On an employment application, they ask "Are you able to work in the United States"? They are **not** asking if you have identifying documents to prove you're a fiction, but rather, they are asking you if your identifying documents can prove that you are in the public venue of the territory. **Again, it's a venue issue, and has nothing to do with one's status.**

Further, who needs to be "approved" to work in the United States? Obviously, a man who has voluntarily asked to be designated as being a federal citizen of the territory...because of his being required to make payment for Social Security and Medicare taxes out of his paycheck, and his receiving healthcare benefits and state unemployment benefits, and his receiving a check for his labor, i.e., a negotiable instrument. - **It's a venue issue, and has nothing to do with one's status.**

Most of us have a life insurance policy, and we all know that the policy is issued for the all-cap name person. The benefits specified by the policy are payable to the beneficiary by check, i.e., a negotiable instrument, which is a creation of the "this state" territory. However, benefits are only payable when the man dies, not when some fiction dies. In my opinion, upon the death of the man, **who has identified himself as being a part of the territory by making application for the policy**, the insurance company, which is also identified as being a part of the territory, pays out the benefits specified in the policy. If the policy were issued for a fiction, the insurance policy would never pay out any benefits because fictions don't die. - **It's a venue issue.**

If the all-cap name were a fictitious entity, it could very well fit into the category of being a trust entity...which is what I thought it was for many years. Because of this, it would follow that the correct I.R.S. tax form to use would be Form 1041. I, and many others, learned years later that Form 1041 is only for legitimately-created trust entities, and is ignored by the I.R.S. when used for the all-cap named man, and will result in a frivolous filing penalty for its incorrect use. Why? Because, like the government, the I.R.S. correctly recognizes that you are a man who has previously requested of being recognized with the designation as a federal citizen in the territory, i.e., the public venue. You requested the designation of being recognized as a federal citizen in the territory by your **original application** for a Social Security number, and that approved recognition is in the form of the all-cap name...which can be quickly and easily discerned at a glance. - **It's a venue issue.**

Now, let's look at the Birth Certificate, which is a shortened title for the document: "Certificate of Live Birth". I'm speaking of the "long form" which has the doctor's signature thereon, and has a 10 or 11 digit recording number (6 digits on occasion) placed on it in the upper right hand corner by the State's Department of Health. Mine has my upper and lower case name on there, as was my mother's name and my dad's name. That is because a baby is born into the private venue. Thirty years later, my daughters also had all upper and lower case names on their Birth Certificates, again because they were born into the private venue (and had not yet made application for being a part of the public venue). This is because the Birth Certificate was issued upon the **live birth** of a human being. There is no such thing as a live birth of a fiction, because a fiction is merely a piece of paper. Now, you can only get a certified copy of your "long form" Birth Certificate from your State's Department of Health, but you can get a certified copy of your "short form" Birth Certificate, which has your name in all-caps, from any County Clerk in "this state", which is an office that is solely in the public venue. Why the difference? Because the County Clerk is telling you that her office is operating in "this state", i.e., the territory or public venue. However, "this state" cannot do away with your

obtaining the "long form" Birth Certificate because they know you were physically born in the private venue of "the State", and they cannot do away with the private venue/common law venue. Later on, **when you made an applications to be in the public venue of the territory of "this state"**, by applying for a Social Security number (whose approval for territorial designation was given by "this state"), they then created the secondary/alternate birth certificate with the all-cap name spelling that **designated you as having previously made an application to be known/designated as a federal citizen of the territory.** **By making this application, you asked to be recognized as being in the public venue. - It's a venue issue.**

Who needs a driver license, or any other type of license (food handler's license, real estate license, concealed carry license, plumber's license, electrician's license, etc., etc.)? Obviously, a man who is in the public venue and has been designated as being a federal citizen of the territory...because "this state", among other things, wants to tax you for giving you the privilege of being regulated, i.e., delegating their authority to you. **It's a venue issue.** If you wish to perform any of these types of work without seeking the permission and regulation of "this state", you must do so outside of "this state", **in the private venue/common law venue**, by utilizing a private contract with your client (under your right to contract).

Perhaps the cop who pulls you over could care less if you have a Driver License, because he may just want to see an I.D. with the all-cap name so he knows that you are in the territory, i.e., the public venue of "this state". In his mind, he's wondering if you are "one of us" in the public venue, so he can justify his authority to write you a ticket. - **It's a venue issue.**

When an illegal alien hits your car, the cop will let him go without any charges, fines or requirement to fix your car because the alien has no Driver License, Insurance, Registration or Social Security Number, i.e., he has not volunteered to live in, or be a part of the territory. The illegal alien is still in the **private venue** until he voluntarily makes application for the designation of being recognized in the territory. - **It's a venue issue.**

When the police kick in your door, or confiscate your property, or when you are unlawfully arrested, or when your constitutionally-protected rights are violated, or the cops beat you up at the city jail, they get away with it because there exists a record that you previously made an application for the privilege of being designated as a federal citizen in the public venue of the territory, i.e., "this state", with said application usually being a request for a Social Security number, or a request for a Driver License, or a request to be placed on the Selective Service Eligibility list, etc., etc., all of which are privileges granted to you by "this state". If **any** application for recognition as a public venue citizen has been approved by "this state", then you must live by the codes, rules, regulations and ordinances of "this state", as well as accept any violent actions against you by their agents...**UNLESS** you declare that you are in the **private venue. - It's a venue issue, not a rights issue.**

A judge looks at you standing inside the bar, and when you say you're not a fiction, he thinks to himself: "Duh, I know you're not a fiction. I know you're a man standing in front of me, but I also know, by your documentation, that you volunteered into the public venue". Knowing that you made at least one previous application to be in the public venue, the Judge knows that his court has venue jurisdiction, and the only thing left is for the Judge to try to get you to consent to voluntarily accept the charges that were lodged into his territorial tribunal docket. - **It's a venue issue.**

I've always thought it was a joke for a man, who robs a bank, to come into court and claim that an invisible, undefinable fiction robbed the bank, not him. He bases this claim on the false premise that he is not a "**person**". The fact is, someone threatened the bank teller and stole the currency, and it wasn't some invisible entity or a piece of paper created at the Secretary of State's Office. It was the man standing there in the courtroom. So, let's say that you committed a crime, then you go to court and act as though you're not responsible for your actions by trying to pawn it off on an all-cap name fiction. You know, and the judge knows, that you have to accept responsibility (and punishment) for your crime. Yes, there are some tricks you can use to get the case dismissed or to be able to walk away, but a dismissal will **not** occur simply because you convinced the judge that some invisible fiction committed the crime. You'll have a much better chance of winning because you **raised the issue of venue**. A judge cannot continue the trial if you have adequately convinced him that his court is the wrong venue for hearing the accusations made against you.

Now, you may be saying, "What about the obvious definition of the term '**person**' in Black's Law Dictionary", which states: "(1) In general usage, a human being (i.e. natural person), though by statute term may include labor organizations, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, or receivers. (2) Scope and delineation of term is necessary for determining those to whom Fourteenth Amendment of Constitution affords protection since this Amendment expressly applies to 'person'." Notice that it says that the "scope and delineation of term is necessary for determining" who is subject to the 14th Amendment. They are telling you that your venue determines whether or not you're subject to the 14th Amendment. They know you're a man, so status is not the issue. **You need to challenge the presumption of venue, not status**. Yes, a person can be a corporation or other fiction, but a person can also be a man or woman. So, why do we automatically say the all-cap name is a corporation/fiction? Just because that is what everyone else is saying that it is? Maybe we need to think this out in a logical progression in order to confirm or discredit what we are being told...ask ourselves if what we are being told is disinformation or truth. I believe that we have been getting all upset about the term "person" when we don't need to. **What we need to get upset about is the incorrect presumption of venue**.

Paul DeLand said, in a recent radio interview, that if you [are forced to] go to court and refuse to enter a plea, i.e., voluntarily accept the public venue of the territorial tribunal, then the judge cannot go any further with the case on the docket...which is why he will frequently enter a plea for you. The courts of "this state" will use every trick in the book in order to get you to give your voluntary consent for the **public venue** either by your: making an appearance, crossing the bar, recognizing the Judge, entering a plea, filing paperwork with the court's heading, understanding the charges, employing an attorney, consenting to the sentence/decision, etc., etc. - **It's a venue issue, and they will do everything possible to bring you into their public venue**.

"This state's" only hope of continuing their charade is to always (and in all circumstances) have the man consent to step outside his natural venue (on the soil), and voluntarily accept the territorial venue, whether it involves driving, voting, land ownership, court cases, fiat currency, etc., etc. "This state" want the man to "forget" that he is always in the **private venue**, and coerce him into always thinking that he is in the **public venue** under the thumb of "this state". - **It's a venue issue**.

I think this is why several folks are successful when they cross out the all-cap name on a traffic ticket and write their upper and lower case name above it. Most folks think they're changing their status on that ticket from a fiction to a man, but **I think that such a change is merely clarifying their venue, not their status.**

If I'm not mistaken, I believe it was Jack Smith (in a Dallas seminar back in the 1990's) who said: "**The government is always right**". What a shock it was to sit there, face to face, and hear him say that. Suddenly, every hand in the class went up...demanding that he explain his statement. He explained that government officials know and understand their codes, rules and regulations, and they follow them. He went on to say that if we would do our homework before jumping to conclusions with the presumption that the government is wrong in this or that instance, we would see that we are the ones who are wrong. **I believe that Jack was absolutely right.** Regardless of whether we agree or disagree with what the codes, rules and regulations are, very rarely will you find the government is wrong...with the possible exception of not giving full disclosure to the people, which would lead one to believe that the government is wrong. So, if the government is always right when enforcing their codes, rules and regulations, then it is also right **within the public venue**. The man's obvious remedy should be to declare that he is in the **private venue**, rather than being coerced into the **public venue** of "this state", and not allow "this state" walk all over you.

The attorneys and judges who laugh at the patriot community and say that all of our rhetoric is nothing but "a bunch of hooey", are pretty much correct...except when it comes to giving the people full disclosure. **Now, we can continue to accept the patriot mythology of writing affidavits declaring our status 'til we're blue in the face (and continue having them ignored by the courts), but I'm convinced it's all about venue, not status.** I believe that an affidavit declaring one's venue would be far more powerful.

Therefore, I believe that the all-cap name is **NOT** a fiction, but merely a **designation** that you are in the public venue of the territory of "this state", subject to administrative codes, rules, regulations, ordinances and private court decisions.

Conclusion: Yes, there are a several areas where fraud and judicial injustice are rampant, such as: (1) mortgage/foreclosure fraud, (2) obtaining a fair and impartial trial, (3) utilizing negotiable instruments in discharging a debt, and (4) one's right for timely rejecting an offer of contract, **but I have come to the conclusion that there is no basis whatsoever for all the patriot mythology concerning such things as: "copyrighting the fiction", shouting "I'm not a fiction" in court, the redemption process, the acceptance for value process (as opposed to simply stating you don't wish to contract), the birth certificate bond process, paying bills with your endorsement, the BIC process, the 1099-OID process, etc., etc.** The good folks all across America who know that our current governmental and judicial structure of administrative law doesn't match up with the Constitution have latched onto the legal claims of many researchers who may be well meaning, but are, in reality, acting as agents for disinformation. These same good folks then spread the same disinformation to others who are also looking for answers, and before you know it, the disinformation has spread like wildfire, and taken "as gospel" without anyone thinking outside the box and questioning it. I won't name any names because **I was one of those as well...**until I decided to take the time to think it through...starting at square one and analyzing each piece of the puzzle. Yes, it took awhile...too long in fact, but after trying to fit the pieces together into

this puzzle, then into that puzzle, I finally recognized what I outlined above. It was right there staring me in the face all this time, but I, and most of the good folks all across America, couldn't see the forest for the trees. When I did finally see it, I realized that had I studied God's Word more fervently, I probably would have seen it many years ago.

Alfred Adask, a good friend of mine, discovered the drug statutes that refer to "man or other animals", in which men and women are presumed as being synonymous with animals when it comes to the drug statutes. He is absolutely correct in his research and interpretation. The courts do, in cases involving drugs, look at men as nothing more than animals; however, that claim is based on a presumption being made in the **public venue** of a territorial tribunal, i.e., "this state", which is an **incorrect venue**. According to God's Word, man, who is in the **private venue**, was given dominion over all the earth, including the animals. **Because the court presumes the all-cap named man is in the public venue, and therefore, subject to the territorial statutes, we must challenge the presumption of venue, which will automatically address the presumption of your being an animal.**

The late Rice McLeod was also a good friend of mine, and he always said: "Know who you are", meaning that you're not a fiction. I'll be the first to say that Rice did a lot of good; however, he unknowingly was sending everyone "down a rabbit trail", because there is no evidence that the government claims you to be a fiction. They know you're a man or woman, but by spelling your name in all-caps designates you as being in the public venue of the territory of "this state", and thus, giving them venue over you. **I believe Rice should have said: "Know your venue".**

It's all in the name, but as it applies to venue, not to status. When your name is spelled in all-capital letters, the administrative officials are simply recognizing your having previously expressed the desire of being in the public venue of the territory (operating under its statutes, codes, rules, regulations and ordinances), not in the private venue on soil of "the State" (operating under your State's Constitution). **You unknowingly put yourself in this position by having requested to be a part of their venue with your signature on one or more applications in which you asked for permission to receive a benefit only available to those choosing to be a part of the public venue of the territory.** If you don't challenge their presumption of venue, it is presumed that you're in the public venue of the territory. **Again, it's a venue issue, and has nothing to do with one's status.**

I love America, and even with it's faults, brought on by so many greedy, corrupt and power hungry administrative officials who know not God, it is still the best country on earth...because of its people. I don't have all the answers, and many parts of the puzzle remain unsolved, but I am now confident in my understanding of how **venue** created the difference in the two spellings of my name, **not some government conspiracy.** Yes, there is conclusive evidence of definitive acts of fraud and deception being created everyday by many government officials, judges, lawyers and bankers, but claiming that the all-cap name is some invisible, fictional entity is, in my opinion, not one of them.

May God bless you as you analyze this critical issue for yourself.

Kevin Hines

P. S. - As a side note, I will admit that judges use a few tricks to gain venue and jurisdiction, like considering your use of the codes and statutes of "this state", i.e., the United States Code, etc., as being a benefit. If you are forced into a public venue federal tribunal, all you have to do in order to make your point, without accepting the benefit, is to cite the appropriate Statute-at-Large, which states the same wording as the United States Code, but is not codified. How do I know this? The very first law passed by the First Congress, on June 1, 1789, was the requirements for taking an Oath of Office. This was a law passed by the de jure Congress, and can be cited as "Chapter 1, 1 Stat. 23". This same law was codified in the United States Code by the de facto Congress of "this state". However, the Statute-at-Large cite is in the **private venue** of "the State", while the United States Code cite is in the **public venue** of the territory of "this state". **It's a venue issue, not a jurisdiction, status or benefit issue.** Now you understand why administrative officials NEVER refer to the Statutes-at-Large (private venue), and always refer to the United States Code (public venue). - **It's a venue issue.**

P. P. S. - Now that I have established my position as to the venue of "the State", i.e., "The State of Texas", vs. the venue of "this state", i.e., "STATE OF TEXAS", I'll explain my related thoughts on the automobile registration. We all know that if you don't have current license plates on your automobile, you'll quickly end up in a Municipal/Corporation Court facing a pretty significant fine for "no current registration" of your automobile, i.e., you didn't pay a tax. So, in order to avoid this hassle (and expense) each year, you dutifully pay the annual registration fee, and the County Tax Assessor-Collector issues you a new date sticker that is to be placed on your existing license plate reflecting that your automobile has been duly registered for another year. In Texas, when you receive the piece of paper with that adhesive, date sticker on it, you'll notice that off to the right is another, smaller, adhesive sticker that reads "VOID / DO NOT USE / NO USE". That is true...that the second, smaller sticker has "NO USE" in "this state". So, if you're not to use this second, smaller sticker, why is it given to you, on the same piece of paper with the registration date sticker? Certainly, it costs "this state" more to include this smaller, second sticker than if it weren't included. **In my opinion, this second, smaller sticker represents your declaration - should you choose to use it - that you are in the private venue within "the State", not in the public venue of the territory of "this state".** By placing that second, smaller sticker that says "VOID / DO NOT USE / NO USE" on your license plate, you are essentially telling the cop who pulls you over that "I may be required to identify my automobile with a license number, but I am **not** in the public venue of the territory". When the cop sees this, he understands that you are not in the public venue, so he will generally check you out on his computer for any outstanding warrants, then say something like "I'm not going to issue you a citation today, but please use your turn signals in the future. Have a nice day". See, when the words "DO NOT USE" are printed on the piece of paper above the second, smaller sticker, that is "this state" speaking to a man in the public venue on a piece of paper issued by "this state", so naturally, "this state" is going to print that verbiage on their own piece of paper (smoke and mirrors). Why have I come up with this position? Because (1) **that "VOID" sticker is the venue remedy that "this state" is required to "offer" to the man in the private venue/common law venue, but the use of which is highly discouraged,** and (2) I've had this smaller, second sticker on my license plates for many years, and having been pulled over four times in the past, and all four times the cop just let me go. - **It's a venue issue.**

P. P. P. S. - You cannot reason with a foreign court that wants to get their hands on you (and your money). The fact is, you **will** accidentally submit to "their" venue and jurisdiction if you file anything into the case, or address the court with the court's heading at the top of your paperwork, etc., etc., so don't even think about it. You cannot reason with a foreign court concerning (1) proceeding in special appearance, or (2) challenging a foreign venue. So, now you're probably asking how to get out of a foreign venue court case without being hit with a default judgment for not answering ?

Every civil court case starts with a "Citation", issued by the Clerk of Court, which states that you have 21 days to answer the attached lawsuit against you or you'll be subject to a default judgment. **Hey, it's just an offer of contract.** It either applies to you (your venue) or it doesn't (foreign venue). You either want to contract with the foreign-venue court or you don't. However, because these foreign-venue courts will do anything they can to "get you", you need to have a good reason for rejecting their offer of contract. Notice, I did **not** say "accept their offer of contract for value". I said to **reject their offer of contract**, pursuant of your right to contract under established commercial law.

I believe you should simply reject and return their foreign Citation (offer of contract) because you don't wish to contract with them, as their venue is foreign to yours. Below is the wording I would write across the face of the Citation, if it were me. Also, if it were me, (1) I would always mail my rejection of their offer of contract, using a third-party friend to actually mail it for me, because if you physically take it in, you are making an appearance and agreeing to their public venue; (2) I would place the third-party mailer's name and address in the upper left corner of the envelope as the mailer, i.e., Bill Smith, Third-Party; P. O. Box ___; Dallas, Texas; (3) since the third-party (Bill Smith) is mailing the envelope for you, he can request a return receipt from the Post Office, but I prefer not to; (4) even though the third-party (Bill Smith) is mailing the envelope for you, I prefer to place postage stamps on the envelope rather than using a postage meter sticker; (5) I'd use standard blue ink to write my statement across the Citation (I don't agree with the multi-colored ink theories being spread around); and (6) since I don't agree with hyphenating my name (or using any other special punctuation), I prefer to simply sign my statement just as my Mom and Dad named me...without any punctuation. Now, in the alternative to rejecting and returning their offer of contract, you can always take their offer, mark it up the way you want it to read, and return it (via third-party mailing) as a counter-offer of contract. Either way, they're stuck, and they will try to trick you to get you in their foreign-venue court, so be careful and don't accidentally volunteer with your words. After you have done this, remember that your follow-up is a key component, i.e., default the Clerk ten (10) days later for her receipt, her nihil dicit non-response, and her acceptance of your original notice.

Whatever you choose to do, remember that you need to study and either prove or disprove what I have outlined above. You are responsible for your own decisions, and everything you write above your signature. It's your document, and you can use, or modify, or reject my sample template or procedure any way you see fit, because you are responsible for everything you do. May the Lord, Jesus, the Christ, bless you in your research. Below is the sample template I prefer to use:

Notice for: CLERK OF COURT
Regarding: Your Case No. _____

I received your offer of contract, and I am withholding my voluntary consent and returning your offer to you, without dishonor, by midnight of the third business day after receipt, for the reason that I am in the private venue, and your venue is foreign to me; therefore, I don't wish to contract with you in your public venue. I do not recognize you, and we have no agreement for the purpose(s) you proposed in your said offer of contract.

As my word is my bond;
Actually executed in the private venue on February ____, A. D. 2012;
Return service by third-party via Registered Mail: "____ US";

By: *John William Doe*, a man, non-resident,
Beneficiary of the Constitution of The State of Texas,
Belligerent claimer of my God-given, unalienable rights,
One of the people of The State of Texas,
One of the people of The United States of America

Proper name: John William Doe

Proper mailing location:

non-domestic mail
c/o U. S. P. O. Postmaster General,
c/o The United States of America,
c/o The State of Texas,
c/o The County of Dallas,
c/o The City of Dallas,
c/o Main Post Office,
c/o General Post, for pickup by: John William Doe, non-resident

Notice: Forced enforcement against me, a non-resident of the public venue, of a void contract by a public servant in a foreign venue is treason against the people of The State of Texas.