

A Treatise on the Word "Person" — Williams and WILLIAMS Law Firm

82–105 Minuten

Originally started writing this page on 4/6/25. Official completion of this page was on 4/14/25. Last updated 4/20/25.

I. Introduction

Treatise means: “a written work dealing formally and systematically with a subject.”

Since I started my adventure into the study into law in September 2021, the word “person” has always been the crux of most confusions, difficulties, upsets, etc. There is literally endless confusion as regards to this word and it is the single word that has caused a complete breakdown and destruction of our glorious country of America.

After over 3 years of heavy research into various areas of the law, here in April of 2025... due to some massive recent breakthroughs in research... we now have enough information to map the entire breakdown of and loss of original knowledge of the most important word in all existence... a word that 99.9% of people don't even realize is literally one of the biggest issues in our entire culture and in all other cultures around the world.

As of April 2025, this page is the most important piece that I have ever written on anything in my entire line of research and will completely transform the life of anyone who takes the time to understand it and

realize the implications that it has on their life.

This page will attempt to walk through the entire timeline of the word “person,” the word “persons,” the word “people,” etc. For newcomers this may sound ridiculous or strange but I assure you that it is not.

II. The Current Situation

In today’s world, the term “person” is so far gone and so beyond confusion that it is in a state of complete oblivion. The definition of “oblivion” is **“the state of being unaware or unconscious of what is happening.”**

No one is even aware that this word does not mean anything even REMOTELY close to any assumptions they may have on the subject.

Let’s review some of the current definitions of the word:

In Title 8 of the United States Code, “person” is defined in 8 USC 1101(b)(3) as:

“The term “person” means an individual or an organization.

The term “individual” is not specifically defined and thus defaults to the dictionary definition. Here is the one from Black’s 4th:

As a noun, this term denotes a single person as distinguished from a group or class, and also, very commonly, a private or natural person as distinguished from a partnership, corporation, or association; but it is said that this restrictive signification is not necessarily inherent in the word, and that it may, in proper cases, include artificial persons. *State v. Bell Telephone Co.*, 36 Ohio St. 310, 38 Am.Rep. 583

As you can see, the definition above allows it to also “include artificial persons.”

Then, finally, we have the term “organization” from the Title 8 definition

of “person,” which is defined at 8 USC 1101(a)(28):

The term “organization” means, but is not limited to, an organization, corporation, company, partnership, association, trust, foundation or fund; and includes a group of persons, whether or not incorporated, permanently or temporarily associated together with joint action on any subject or subjects.

(this is pretty wild, by the way. Because “organizations” can get passports. They are “persons” under Title 8, which is all about nationality... it’s the basis of the passport system. You could literally open a company in the District of Columbia, which would make it a US citizen under 8 USC 1401(a), get an EIN/SSN number for it and then go do a DS-11 and get a passport for it. You could also open a business in American Samoa or the Swains Islands, then the business, itself, would be a non-citizen national of the United States under 8 USC 1408. So you could have a whole slew of businesses with all different passports and types of passports. Not even kidding... we currently have some people/teams testing this. Immigration is literally complete bullshit.)

We also should look at the definition of person from other places. A great spot to look would be the Internal Revenue Code (the tax code), which is Title 26. The word is defined at 26 USC 7701(a)(1):

The term “person” shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.

The above definition of “individual” is something we will dive into later on this page... but we already know that the term can include artificial entities such as trusts, estates, corporations, companies, etc.

But the whole point of this page is to create a linear timeline to gain a deep and meaningful understanding of these terms so, at this point, we are going to embark on our historical breakdown to understand

how we arrived at such a confusing and poorly-defined point in our understanding.

III. The original definition of “citizen” and “people”

Section 1 of The Naturalization Act of 1790 is where our journey begins, with a text that reads:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any alien, being a free white person, who shall have resided within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States for the term of two years, may be admitted to become a citizen thereof, on application to any common law court of record, in any one of the states wherein he shall have resided for the term of one year at least, and making proof to the satisfaction of such court, that he is a person of good character, and taking the oath or affirmation prescribed by law, to support the Constitution of the United States...

For those of you that are new to my research, the term “resident” is quite important in the above quote because it is specifically used in reference to aliens prior to their 2 years being complete (“resident” means “foreigner/immigrant,” which is why people are “residents” during their 2 year period while naturalizing).

The term “alien” is defined in 8 USC 1101(a)(3) as:

The term “alien” means any person not a citizen or national of the United States.

So what were the initial points that needed to be met in order to gain citizenship in the United States (if not born in a state of the Union)?

Well let’s break down the above quote by specific point:

1. Was previously an alien (non-citizen/non-national).

2. Meets the criteria of being a "free white person."
3. Has resided (meaning they are not a citizen of a state yet) in the U.S. for two years as an immigrant (with one year in the state of application).
4. Demonstrates "good character" and swears an oath to support the U.S. Constitution.

Now, it's important to keep in mind that there was only "state citizenship" at this time and the term "US citizen" or "United States citizen" was not a specific and separated type of citizenship at this time (and wasn't until 1873). SO THE ABOVE DESCRIPTION IS HOW SOMEONE WOULD BECOME A CITIZEN OF A STATE OF THE UNION. We'll cover more about that later and it might be best to read through this page 2-3 times to make sure you understand the entire timeline.

So what is the definition of a "free white person"? Let's look in Black's Law 4th Edition to figure that out:

- 1. meaning all persons belonging to the European races then commonly counted as white, and their descendants, including such descendants in other countries to which they have emigrated.**
- 2. It includes all European Jews, more or less intermixed with peoples of Celtic, Scandinavian, Teutonic, Iberian, Latin, Greek, and Slavic descent. It includes Magyars, Lapps, and Finns, and the Basques and Albanians. It includes the mixed Latin, Celtic-Iberian, and Moorish inhabitants of Spain and Portugal, the mixed Greek, Latin, Phoenician, and North African inhabitants of Sicily, and the mixed Slav and Tarter inhabitants of South Russia. It does not mean Caucasian race, Aryan race, or Indo-European races, nor the mixed Indo-European, Dravidian, Semitic and Mongolian peoples who inhabit Persia. A Syrian of**

Asiatic birth and descent will not be entitled to become a naturalized citizen of the United States as being a free white person. *Ex parte Shahid, D.C.S.C., 205 F. 812, 813; United States v. Cartozian, D.C.Or., 6 F.2d 919, 921; Ex parte Dow, D.C.S.C., 211 F. 486, 487; In re En Sk Song, D.C.Cal., 271 F. 23. **Nor a native-born Filipino.** *U. S. v. Javier, 22 F.2d 879, 880, 57 App.D.C. 303.* **Nor a native of India who belonged to Hindu race.** *Kharaitf Ram Samras v. United States, C.C.A.Cal., 125 F.2d 879, 881.**

“Shoo-wie, Brandon... that’s quite specific.” Yes, you are correct. It is not just the color of someone’s skin... it was laser-precise.

THIS ABOVE DEFINITION AND THE 4 POINTS ABOVE IT WAS THE EXACT AND LASER-PRECISE DEFINITION AS TO CITIZENSHIP. THAT CITIZENSHIP IS WHAT MADE UP THE DEFINITION OF “WE THE PEOPLE” IN THE CONSTITUTION. A “RESIDENT” OR “IMMIGRANT” WAS NOT CONSIDERED ONE THE “PEOPLE” UNTIL THEIR CITIZENSHIP WAS ESTABLISHED. THIS IS WHY THEY WERE CONSIDERED “RESIDENTS.” I’M NOT SURE IF THE TERM “PERSONS” WAS USED FOR THESE PEOPLE AT THIS TIME BUT YOU CAN SEE WHERE WE ARE GOING ON THIS PAGE... IF THEY WERE NOT PART OF “WE THE PEOPLE” THEN THEY WERE NOT CONSIDERED “PEOPLE.”

IV. The introduction of the term “persons”

I’m sure the term was used prior to 1857, and this entire research of me regarding this word continues even to this day, but the term “persons” is very sharply and explicitly defined and delineated in the case *Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 US 393 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1857)*. In this case, which is regarding a released slave attempting to gain citizenship of a state, we have the following quotes (bold-words

and underlines added to bring attention to specific words):

1. The words "**people** of the United States" and "citizens" are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. They both describe the political body who, according to our republican institutions, form the sovereignty, and who hold the power and conduct the Government through their representatives. They are what we familiarly call the "sovereign **people**," and every citizen is one of this **people**, and a constituent member of this sovereignty
2. The question before us is, whether the class of **persons** described in the plea in abatement compose a portion of this **people**, and are constituent members of this sovereignty? We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word "citizens" in the Constitution, and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings, who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and, whether emancipated or not, yet remained subject to their authority, and had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the Government might choose to grant them.
3. In the opinion of the court, the legislation and histories of the times, and the language used in the Declaration of Independence, show, that neither the class of **persons** who had been imported as slaves, nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were then acknowledged as a part of the **people**, nor intended to be included in the general words used in that memorable instrument.

It is difficult at this day to realize the state of public opinion in relation to that unfortunate race, which prevailed in the civilized and enlightened portions of the world at the time of the Declaration of Independence, and when the Constitution of the United States was framed and

adopted. But the public history of every European nation displays it in a manner too plain to be mistaken.

They had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far inferior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect; and that the negro might justly and lawfully be reduced to slavery for his benefit. He was bought and sold, and treated as an ordinary article of merchandise and traffic, whenever a profit could be made by it. This opinion was at that time fixed and universal in the civilized portion of the white race. It was regarded as an axiom in morals as well as in politics, which no one thought of disputing, or supposed to be open to dispute; and men in every grade and position in society daily and habitually acted upon it in their private pursuits, as well as in matters of public concern, without doubting for a moment the correctness of this opinion.

And in no nation was this opinion more firmly fixed or more uniformly acted upon than by the English Government and English people. They not only seized them on the coast of Africa, and sold them or held them in slavery for their own use; but they took them as ordinary articles of merchandise to every country where they could make a profit on them, and were far more extensively engaged in this commerce than any other nation in the world.

4. But there are two clauses in the Constitution which point directly and specifically to the negro race as a separate class of **persons**, and show clearly that they were not regarded as a portion of the **people** or citizens of the Government then formed.

CAREFULLY READ THE ABOVE QUOTES OVER AND OVER, TAKING TIME TO CLEAR UP ANY WORDS AND TERMS YOU DON'T FULLY UNDERSTAND. JUST TAKE A MOMENT. THESE 4 QUOTES WILL COMPLETELY CHANGE YOUR LIFE WHEN YOU

TAKE THE TIME TO REALIZE THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT ENTIRELY DIFFERENT CLASSES WHEN THEY SAY “PEOPLE” VERSUS WHEN THEY SAY “PERSONS”

As it is made crystal clear in the above quotes, men/women that were not considered “people” as “We the People” were considered “persons” in an effort to delineate them sharply and explicitly from the actual citizenship.

Now let’s pause for a second and talk about racism, classism, etc.

Every group prides itself on strength and inclusivity. Every group prefers members of its own and shuns “outsiders.” This is literally human nature. So anyone saying that our country is nothing more than a Klu Klux Klan circle-jerk session needs to take a deep breath and realize that the world was different.

If you take the time, above and beyond the shocking few quotes above, to actually go and read ***Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 US 393 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1857)***, you will see that the Honorable Justices in that case, including the Honorable Justice Roger B. Taney, who gave the final opinion and judgement in Dred Scott v. Sandford, all did **TREMENDOUS BACKGROUND RESEARCH AND EXTENSIVELY INSPECTED THE LAWS OF EACH STATE AND TERRITORY AND STRETCHED THEIR RESEARCH ALL THE WAY BACK TO THE ENGLISH EMPIRE CIRCA EARLY 1700s.**

I understand that, in today’s world, all this information is shocking and may even morally disgust you... but I assure you that if you take the time to understand this information without emotional intervention and without swan diving into a pool of philosophical morality, you will start to see the big picture and how all this relates to you now in today’s world.

I’m not here to tell you what is right or wrong. I’m not writing this as a dissertation of opinion of morality. I’m writing this for a very

specific and precise reason that will empower you and I need you to do what you can to PREVENT your emotions from running wild at any point of this treatise. I promise you that this document will improve your life dramatically if you simply allow yourself to use all available logic facilities right now and save ethics and morality for a later date! Not now! YOU WILL SEE, BY THE END OF THIS TREATISE, THAT WE CAN ALL FREE EACH OTHER AND ALL RACES BY SIMPLY UNDERSTANDING THIS INFORMATION FIRST AND NOT ALLOWING OUR EMOTIONS TO PREMATURELY TAKE OVER OUR THOUGHTS ON THIS SUBJECT.

V. The birth of the Federal US citizenship category and the birth of the nation of the District of Columbia

After *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, 60 US 393 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1857), our motion towards the civil war accelerated. It wasn't the sole reason why we entered the civil war, but it greatly accelerated the motion towards it.

While coming out of the civil war, there was a specific case that was, in my opinion, THE MOST IMPORTANT CASE EVER DONE IN OUR COUNTRY. This case overturned the Dred Scott v. Sandford decision (it interpreted the 14th Amendment as being what overturned Dred Scott, but without this interpretation that would have never happened). This case is called *The Slaughter-House Cases*, 83 US 36 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1873). In these series of cases, which had a singular finale, we have the creation of the Federal "US citizen" category as an entirely separate category. Please carefully read the following quotes where I will, again, use bold words and underlines to bring your attention to specific aspects of the communication from the Honorable Samuel Freeman Miller:

1. The first section of the fourteenth article, to which our attention is more specially invited, opens with a definition of citizenship — not only citizenship of the United States, but citizenship of the States. No such definition was previously found in the Constitution, nor had any attempt been made to define it by act of Congress. It had been the occasion of much discussion in the courts, by the executive departments, and in the public journals. It had been said by eminent judges that no man was a citizen of the United States, except as he was a citizen of one of the States composing the Union. Those, therefore, who had been born and resided always in the District of Columbia or in the Territories, though within the United States, were not citizens.
2. then all the negro race who had recently been made freemen, were still, not only not citizens, but were incapable of becoming so by anything short of an amendment to the Constitution.

To remove this difficulty primarily, and to establish a clear and comprehensive definition of citizenship which should declare what should constitute citizenship of the United States, and also citizenship of a State, the first clause of the first section was framed.

3. The first observation we have to make on this clause is, that it puts at rest both the questions which we stated to have been the subject of differences of opinion. It declares that **persons** may be citizens of the United States without regard to their citizenship of a particular State, and it overturns the Dred Scott decision by making all **persons** born within the United States and subject to its jurisdiction citizens of the United States. **That its main purpose was to establish the citizenship of the negro can admit of no doubt.** The phrase, "subject to its jurisdiction" was intended to exclude from its operation children of ministers, consuls, and citizens or subjects of foreign States born within the United States.

4. The next observation is more important in view of the arguments of counsel in the present case. It is, that the distinction between citizenship of the United States and citizenship of a State is clearly recognized and established. Not only may a man be a citizen of the United States without being a citizen of a State, but an important element is necessary to convert the former into the latter. He must reside within the State to make him a citizen of it, but it is only necessary that he should be born or naturalized in the United States to be a citizen of the Union.

It is quite clear, then, that there is a citizenship of the United States, and a citizenship of a State, which are distinct from each other, and which depend upon different characteristics or circumstances in the individual.

5. We think this distinction and its explicit recognition in this amendment of great weight in this argument, because the next paragraph of this same section, which is the one mainly relied on by the plaintiffs in error, speaks only of privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, and does not speak of those of citizens of the several States.

6. Of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the United States, and of the privileges and immunities of the citizen of the State, and what they respectively are, we will presently consider; but we wish to state here that it is only the former which are placed by this clause under the protection of the Federal Constitution, and that the latter, whatever they may be, are not intended to have any additional protection by this paragraph of the amendment.

If, then, there is a difference between the privileges and immunities belonging to a citizen of the United States as such, and those belonging to the citizen of the State as such the latter must rest for their security and protection where they have heretofore rested; for they are not embraced by this paragraph of the amendment.

THE ABOVE QUOTES HAVE BEEN TERRIBLY MISUNDERSTOOD AND THIS IS THE EXACT AND SPECIFIC POINT OF THE COMPLETE DOWNFALL OF OUR COUNTRY. PLEASE READ AND RE-READ THE ABOVE QUOTES AS MANY TIMES AS NEEDED TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THE HONORABLE SAMUAL FREEMAN MILLER WAS TRYING TO DO. LOOK UP HIS BACKGROUND. HE FELT VERY STRONGLY ABOUT FREEING THE SLAVES AND WAS TRYING TO BE EXPLICIT IN HOW THE 14TH AMENDMENT ONLY APPLIED TO RELEASED NEGROES AND HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH “FREE WHITE MEN” OF THE VARIOUS STATES OF THE UNION. IF MR. MILLER CAME BACK FROM THE DEAD AND WERE TO SEE WHAT HAPPENED FROM HIS DECISION HE WOULD BE ABSOLUTELY PISSED. THIS IS NOT WHAT HE INTENDED AT ALL AND OUR ENTIRE COUNTRY IS ONE GIANT FUCK UP DUE TO A MISUNDERSTANDING OF THIS CASE. YOU MUST TAKE TIME AND CAREFULLY REVIEW ALL THE ABOVE QUOTES OVER AND OVER TO UNDERSTAND WHAT MR. MILLER WAS TRYING TO DO.

Mr. Miller is an Honorable man. He clearly says that the 13th and 14th Amendments both apply only and specifically to negroes being released from slavery.

The main and primary area of confusion, which essentially destroyed all of America, is the first Clause of the 14th Amendment. I will place the text below with the key word in bold and underlined (I literally cannot stress this word enough):

└ All **persons** born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to

the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

all persons, not people

all persons, not people

all persons, not people

I hope that you can see that Mr. Miller was trying to be quite specific in how himself and the Supreme Court were interpreting the 14th Amendment, MEANING NONE OF THIS HAS ANYTHING TO DO WITH WHITE PEOPLE OR STATE CITIZENS. And, had Mr. Miller's decision ACTUALLY BEEN FOLLOWED AS HE SET FORTH, WE WOULDN'T BE IN THE FUCKING NIGHTMARE THAT WE FIND OURSELVES IN TODAY IN AMERICA.

MR. MILLER SAID, CLEARLY AND WITHOUT REVOCATION, THAT THE 14TH AMENDMENT APPLIES ONLY AND SPECIFICALLY TO RELEASED NEGRO SLAVES. NONE OF THIS APPLIED TO FREE WHITE MEN OR STATE CITIZENS. THIS WAS A SPECIAL CLASS OF CITIZENSHIP CREATED TO ELIMINATE INVOLUNTARY SURVITUDE. MR. MILLER WAS A GOOD MAN WITH A GOOD HEART WHO CARED VERY DEEPLY ABOUT RELEASING THE NEGROES AND IF HE KNEW WHAT HAD BECOME OF HIS JUDGEMENT, HE WOULD EXPLODE INTO A RAGE THE LIKES OF WHICH THIS WORLD HAS NEVER SEEN. MR. MILLER WAS NOT INTENDING THE 14TH AMENDMENT "PERSONS" TO BECOME THE CENTERPIECE OF ALL LAW, NOR WAS HE ATTEMPTING TO REPLACE THE ORIGINAL STATE CITIZENSHIP ENJOYED BY FREE WHITE MEN. HE WAS SIMPLY AND ONLY TRYING TO RELEASE THE ENSLAVED NEGROES. YOU MUST UNDERSTAND THIS. THIS IS SO

FUCKING IMPORTANT.

Another great case that clearly describes this situation (I'm sure you could find more, as well, if you wanted to) is ***ELLEN R. VAN VALKENBURG v. ALBERT BROWN*** **43 Cal. 43 (California Supreme Court - 1872)**. Let's see what the Honorable California Chief Justice William T. Wallace has to say about this situation:

No white person born within the limits of the United States, and subject to their jurisdiction, or born without those limits, and subsequently naturalized under their laws, owes the status of citizenship to the recent amendments to the Federal Constitution. The history and aim of the Fourteenth Amendment is well known, and the purpose had in view in its adoption well understood. That purpose was to confer the status of citizenship upon a numerous class of persons domiciled within the limits of the United States, who could not be brought within the operation of the naturalization laws because native born, and whose birth, though native, had at the same time left them without the status of citizenship. These persons were not white persons, but were, in the main, persons of African descent, who had been held in slavery in this country, or, if having themselves never been held in slavery, were the native-born descendants of slaves. Prior to the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment it was settled that neither slaves, nor those who had been such, nor the descendants of these, though native and free born, were capable of becoming citizens of the United States. (*Dred Scott v. Sanford*, 19 How. 393.) The Thirteenth Amendment, though conferring the boon of freedom upon native-born persons of African blood, had yet left them under an insuperable bar as to citizenship; and it was mainly to remedy this condition that the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted.

THE 14TH AMENDMENT AND “US CITIZENSHIP,” after around 1870-1873, HAD noTHING TO DO WITH THE ACTUAL WHITE STATE CITIZENS WHICH MADE UP “WE THE PEOPLE”

VI. An expansive view into the term “negro”

People use the term “African American” and other terms in an attempt to be “kind,” but what no one realizes is that the term “African American” basically enslaves anyone who accepts it. Mostly white people do this, let’s be honest.

Let’s take some time to carefully break down the exact and specific term of “negro,” as used by the Honorable Justice Miller and others.

Here is the legal definitions of the term “negro” from Black’s Law 4th Edition:

- 1. The word "negro" means a black man, one descended from the African race, and does not commonly include a mulatto. *Felix v. State, 18 Ala. 720*. But the laws of the different states are not uniform in this respect, some including in the description "negro" one who has one-eighth or more of African blood.**
- 2. Term "Negro" means necessarily person of color, but not every person of color is "negro." *Rice v. Gong Lum, 139 Miss. 760, 104 So. 105, 109***

Now let’s, right away, get into the legal definition of a “mulatto” to ensure clarification (from Black’s 4th):

- 1. A person that is the offspring of a negress by a white man, or of a white woman by a negro. *Thurman v. State, 18 Ala. 276*. In a more general sense, a person of mixed Caucasian and negro blood, or**

Indian and negro blood. *Webster, Dict. See, also, Mustizo.*

2. Properly a mulatto is a person one of whose parents is wholly black and the other wholly white ; but the word does not always, though perhaps it does generally, require so exactly even a mixture of blood, nor is its signification alike in all the states. ¹
Bish.Mar. & D. § 308

I WANT TO MAKE IT ABUNDANTLY CLEAR, AT THIS POINT IN THE CONVERSATION, THAT THERE ARE PLENTY OF “BLACK” RACES THAT WOULD NOT LEGALLY FALL UNDER THE “NEGRO” CLASSIFICATION. THESE RACES ARE TYPICALLY (AND IGNORANTLY) CALLED “AFRICAN AMERICANS,” WHICH AUTOMATICALLY CLASSIFY THEM AS “NEGROES” THUS STRIPPING THEM OF THEIR ABILITY TO BE CITIZENS OR “PEOPLE.” I UNDERSTAND THAT YOU NOT AWARE OF THIS STRANGE SITUATION AND GROUPS LIKE THE MOORISH PEOPLE WILL BECOME QUITE UPSET IF YOU CALL THEM “AFRICAN AMERICANS.” THE MOORISH PEOPLE TEACH THAT THEY WERE THE CULTURE THAT WAS HERE IN AMERICA PRIOR TO THE ENGLISH TAKEOVER AND THAT THIS LAND IS ORIGINALLY THEIRS. THEY WERE, TO USE SIMPLE WORDS THAT PEOPLE WHO ARE NEW TO THIS INFORMATION WILL UNDERSTAND, “DARK-SKINNED INDIANS” THAT WERE HERE PRIOR TO THE “SETTLING” (MEANING CONQUERING) FROM THE ENGLISH CULTURE. I AM NOT ATTEMPTING TO SPEAK FOR THE MOORS OR BLACKS HERE AND I RECOMMEND THAT YOU DO YOUR OWN INDEPENDANT RESEARCH ON THIS SUBJECT TO UNDERSTAND IT FOR YOURSELF. I AM SIMPLY A WHITE MAN ATTEMPTING TO SHINE LIGHT ON THE TRUTH AND END THIS FUCKING NIGHTMARE WE HAVE ALL BEEN LIVING IN BECAUSE OF A MASSIVE MISUNDERSTANDING OF THE WORDS OF THE

HONORABLE JUSTICE MILLER.

Keep in mind that everyone has the right against self-incrimination. Everyone has the right to be innocent until proven guilty. So this entire situation is one that you should defend yourself against. If you are a black man, why would you accept the label of “African American”? Why not **MAKE THEM PROVE IT IF THEY ARE PROSECUTING YOU FOR SOMETHING?** Don't just hand them everything they need to strip you of all of your rights... make them work for it... **HARD.** Anything you say can and will be used against you, right? **SO WHY ARE YOU TALKING?**

Do not allow a quick and painless stripping of your rights. Just because you may be of dark complexion means nothing. Are you mulatto? Well that clearly puts you in another classification. **MAKE THEM WORK AND SWEAT TO ESTABLISH YOU IN THIS CLASS AS A “PERSONS.” NEVER MAKE IT EASY.** If they believe you are of African descent and they want to press those claims, don't give them even the slightest word to help them do so. Feed the flames of disgust from the Liberals. Let them bring those claims then bring those claims to the doorsteps of Liberal organizations and allow them to release their ire upon the claimant. Play this game like a musical instrument. You do not need to hand this information to your prosecutor.

PLEASE KEEP IN MIND THAT WHITE PEOPLE BELIEVE IT IS “KIND” TO USE THE TERM “AFRICAN AMERICAN.” PLEASE BE SOFT AND CARING IN OUR IGNORANCE. WE ALL NEED TO LEARN. WHITE PEOPLE DO NOT HAVE TO STRUGGLE AND WRESTLE WITH OUR RIGHTS AND OUR “RIGHT TO EXIST” LIKE THE BLACK RACE NEEDS TO DO. THE STRONGER AND MORE AGGRESSIVE YOU ARE IN AN ATTEMPT TO BE HEARD, THE DEAFER THE EARS WILL BECOME OF THOSE YOU ARE TRYING TO REACH. PLEASE BE SOFT AND HELP EVERYONE UNDERSTAND THIS TERRIBLY IMPORTANT LINE THAT IS

DRAWN BETWEEN THOSE OF AFRICAN BLOOD AND THOSE WITHOUT IT. USE THIS PAGE TO SHARE WITH OTHERS TO HELP THEM UNDERSTAND THE TRUTH OF THIS SITUATION RATHER THAN BEING AGGRESSIVE, MEAN AND ABRASIVE.

VII. The expanding of the word “persons” to include artificial fictions

In 1873, due to the *Slaughter-House Cases, 83 US 36 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1873)*, the delineating point between who was “persons” and who were “people” was simply the distinction between a white man and a negro. It’s that simple (let’s not sugar-coat this).

Then, we have some cases which expand this understanding. One of the most critical being *Santa Clara County v. Southern Pacific Railroad Co., 118 U.S. 394 (US Supreme Court - 1886)*. This case clearly expanded the 14th Amendment’s definition of “persons” (meaning negroes). Here is the exact quote from that case that caused that to occur:

One of the points made and discussed at length in the brief of counsel for defendants in error was that "corporations are persons within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States." Before argument, MR. CHIEF JUSTICE WAITE said:

"The Court does not wish to hear argument on the question whether the provision in the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution which forbids a state to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws applies to these corporations. We are all of opinion that it does."

This is where the Supreme Court began the expansion of the **FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT DEFINITION OF “PERSON”** (WHICH HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH “FREE WHITE PEOPLE” OF

STATE CITIZENSHIP).

This definition and expansion of meaning ONLY applies to the 14th Amendment. Not to state citizenship or “men of the Union” (meaning white people who were actual state citizens). THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT NEVER HAD ANYTHING TO DO WITH WHITE PEOPLE/STATE CITIZENS. THE ORIGINAL TEN AMENDMENTS WERE FOR US... THIS IS THE “BILL OF RIGHTS.” THAT WAS FOR US (WHITE PEOPLE), WHILE THE 14TH AMENDMENT WAS SPECIFICALLY MADE FOR THE NEGROES.

Again, I want to take a moment and diffuse emotional outburst. We are looking at active laws that may be considered “ancient” from our perspective. We need to understand the situation and laws first prior to our ability to change or shape them... that is all I am attempting by this. I am a lowly researcher. The decisions of the American “people” or “persons” must come, first, from a place of understanding then, ultimately, from independent thought and action. I am not a Lord in these discussions... I am simply the messenger attempting to translate the words of the various HONORABLE JUSTICES and the legal terminology. I am simply attempting to be a “legalese translator,” which has never really existed prior to this blip in time... but I attempt to be no Lord over these words. I want to successfully translate these things in order to create change in our culture.

WHEN YOU ACTUALLY TAKE THE TIME TO READ THE WORDS OF THESE HONORABLE JUSTICES YOU QUICKLY REALIZE THAT THEY WERE NOT RACIST PIECES OF SHIT. THEY WERE SIMPLY TRYING TO UNDERSTAND THE SITUATION AND NAVIGATE A DIFFICULT SITUATION THE BEST THEY COULD. IF ANYTHING, THEY WERE PUTTING THEIR LIFE ON THE LINE BY EVEN SPEAKING A WORD TRYING TO PROTECT THE NEGROES OR GIVE THEM ANY KIND OF FREEDOM! THE ISSUE HERE IS NOT THE WORDS OF THESE HONORABLE JUSTICES.

I SAY “HONORABLE” BECAUSE THEY WERE. THE PROBLEM IS THAT THEIR WORDS WERE LOST IN TRANSLATION AND NO ONE READS THEIR ORIGINAL COMMUNICATIONS ANYMORE. STOP USING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, STOP LISTENING TO THE MEDIA, STOP LISTENING TO YOUR FRIENDS... AND TAKE THE TIME TO CAREFULLY READ AND UNDERSTAND WHAT THESE HONORABLE JUSTICES WERE TRYING TO TELL YOU. THEY ARE TELLING YOU EVERYTHING YOU NEED TO ACHIEVE YOUR FREEDOM, I ASSURE YOU. MR. MILLER, MR. TANEY, MR. WALLACE AND A VAST MAJORITY OF ALL THE HONORABLE JUSTICES IN OUR PAST WERE BRILLIANT MEN. IF YOU TAKE THE TIME TO UNDERSTAND THEIR WORDS, YOU WILL SEE THAT.

VIII. The definition of the term “individual”

At this point would be a good point to backtrack to the definition of “individual.”

Let’s look at the various definitions we can find.

1 USC 8 is entitled: “**Person**”, “**human being**”, “**child**”, and “**individual**” as including born-alive infant, and says the following:

(a) In determining the meaning of any Act of Congress, or of any ruling, regulation, or interpretation of the various administrative bureaus and agencies of the United States, the words “person”, “human being”, “child”, and “individual”, shall include every infant member of the species homo sapiens who is born alive at any stage of development.

(b) As used in this section, the term “born alive”, with respect to a member of the species homo sapiens, means the complete expulsion or extraction from his or her mother of that member, at any stage of development, who after such expulsion or

extraction breathes or has a beating heart, pulsation of the umbilical cord, or definite movement of voluntary muscles, regardless of whether the umbilical cord has been cut, and regardless of whether the expulsion or extraction occurs as a result of natural or induced labor, cesarean section, or induced abortion.

Sure does sound like a whole shitload of words for something that should be simple, right? Yeah, well... this is the game. You think "oh well, an individual is so simple... it's me." Yeah... it's not.

Your umbilical cord and placenta, according to the above definition of "live birth," were both independent live births. So let me ask you... **who** is on your birth certificate? Is it your body? Is it your umbilical cord? Is it your placenta? **ARE YOU EVEN YOUR BODY OR ARE YOU JUST A CONSCIOUSNESS THAT CAN BE SEPARATED FROM A PHYSICAL BODY?** Could it be something else entirely? You ASSUME it's you on the birth certificate but that would be unconstitutional in itself. **So the question becomes WHO are they referring to!?**

If these words were really that simple then **THEY WOULD BE THAT SIMPLE IN DEFINITION.** The fact that they are not is evidence there is more here.

Let's look at more definitions of "individual":

In 5 USC 552a(2), "individual" is defined as:

the term "individual" means a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence

We've already established that a "US citizen" is a released slave of African descent ("negro") and that someone with a "residence" is an immigrant. So let's re-write this definition in English:

the term "individual" means a negro and/or a non-citizen/non-

national lawfully admitted to stay here as an immigrant

Bingo! That would be 100% correct! And since all legal fictions are also 14th Amendment US citizens, they would also be included in that definition... so let's expand it even more!

the term "individual" means any 14th Amendment persons, which would include: negroes or other corporate fictions of which would be considered a non-citizen/non-national lawfully admitted to stay here as an immigrant

So let's plug that same idea into the definition of the term "person" from the tax code, which is: **The term "person" shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.**

Let's re-write that now with the above info:

The term "person" shall be construed to mean and include a negro, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.

Bingo, now we got it! I also personally believe that "individual" is typically referring to a sole proprietorship. So personally I would say that the word "individual" leans to mean more of a sole proprietorship whereas a "natural person" would lean more towards a negro... but you get the idea.

If I had to go even a step farther, I would define it as:

The term "person" shall be construed to mean and include a negro, a sole proprietorship, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.

THAT'S EXACTLY WHAT IT IS! PLEASE REVIEW THE ABOVE DEFINITION. I'M TELLING YOU, THIS IS TRULY MY ULTIMATE

VICTORY AFTER 3.5 YEARS OF BEAUTIFUL WORK. THIS IS MY ULTIMATE DISCOVERY AND I DELVER IT TO YOU, HERE, ON A SILVER FUCKING PLATTER.

A negro was never considered part of the "people." They were considered property. This is how we wound up with this crazy situation. Now, everyone is essentially considered property under the Federal government and Congress (BECAUSE WE TELL THEM SO!)... the state citizen category has essentially been quietly wiped away.

EVERYONE HAS BECOME NEGROES WITHOUT ANYONE REALIZING IT. THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED TO OUR COUNTRY.

So let's use Grok on X. On 4/7/25, I typed into Grok: **how many times, in the USC and CFR, is the term "individual" used together with the word "alien"?**

Here is part of the answer it gave me:

Estimation: "Alien" appears hundreds of times in Title 8, and "individual" likely pairs with it in 50–100 instances, based on procedural and definitional sections."

Now, that would make perfect sense in many ways because a business that is created under the United States, which is only and explicitly the District of Columbia, would always be an immigrant, as a person, in each of the 50 states of the Union.

A negro would also always be an immigrant or foreigner in any of the 50 states of the Union. They never had the right to be a state citizen

and can only be “US citizens,” which is under the Federal/National government, which would be the District of Columbia.

So... as far as I'm concerned... **THIS FULLY CLARIFIES THE DEFINITION OF THE WORD PERSON IN A NEW WAY THAT NO ONE HAS EVER DISCOVERED.**

You could almost go so far as to define an “individual” or “person” to be: **a negro or legal fiction that was born/created in the District of Columbia or subjects itself to the District of Columbia and would be an immigrant or foreigner in any of the 50 states of the Union.**

This is exactly why you can never find a definition of “individual.” Everything is carefully and explicitly defined... except this word. Because they don't want you to know and there's no way to define it without giving up the scam!

P.S. - Another important thing to keep in mind is that you become a “ward of the court” whenever you take on an attorney-at-law as a “client.” You can learn more about this on the W&W Questions and Answers page. A “ward of court” is “an infant or person of unsound mind.” This is another way you become an “individual” as a white man!

IX. The beginning of the Administrative State and the replacing of the Constitutional Republic

By the beginning of the 20th century, we see the beginning of everything that we see today... every overcomplicated body of “law” that, supposedly, controls and specifies every area of our existence.

THE ONLY MAJOR ISSUE WITH THIS IS THAT THEY ALWAYS USE THE WORD “PERSONS” AND NEVER “PEOPLE,” WHICH ASSUMES THAT EVERYTHING THEY ARE WRITING IS

UNDER THE 14TH AMENDMENT, WHICH HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH FREE WHITE PEOPLE WHO ARE STATE CITIZENS OF THE UNION.

So what the hell happened? Did they begin to build an entirely new country, essentially, on the heels of the 14th Amendment? Well, my belief is that they did exactly that. Every single mention or definition of a US citizen, after 1873 (Slaughter-House) meant an entirely new classification which were citizens of the District of Columbia. Which, keep in mind, prior to this point, anyone born in the District of Columbia had no right of citizenship of a state unless their parents specifically mentioned that they were citizens of a state of the Union and were not “under the jurisdiction of” the District of Columbia at the point of birth or conception. This was a complex situation and... now we sit here in our high-horse thinking how things are or were but we need to realize that, at this time, they did not have the luxury of evaluating this information the way that we are. Here we are, many years later, saying “oh yes, they understood” while we have our ChatGPT, our Grok, our UberEats, etc. This is something that we need to carefully take into consideration and understand that THIS FUCKING SITUATION IS NOT THAT GODDAMN SIMPLE. WE ARE BEING IGNORANT AND WE ARE NOT TAKING THE TIME REQUIRED TO PUT OURSELVES INTO THESE SHOES OF OUR ANCESTORS. WE ARE NOTHING MORE THAN ATTEMPTING TO MAKE SENSE OF THE CONFUSED PEOPLE/PERSONS THAT CAME BEFORE US.

X. The ultimate presumption

Personally, I believe that we follow a simple line of reasoning: we know everything yet we “dumb ourselves down” and decrease our understanding in an effort to have something to do... something to learn... something to “understand.”

I believe we are all capable of complete understanding... but we are bored. We do not like the idea of understanding everything or having a verbose clarity on things because that ruins it all. It ruins our ability to understand the current scene and to relate that current scene to what gives us excitement and clarity.

I don't typically share my "opinions" on most things because it's essentially irrelevant... but I believe we are simply consciousnesses that are capable of creation and art and we drift from body to body between lifetimes and experience amnesia due to shame and guilt. I realize this may be a bit extreme... but I'm just being transparent. So, if this is true, then we are impossible to truly destroy but we crave the illusion of oblivion because we want a "high-stakes game." This is what we are unconsciously doing, in my OPINION. Please don't attempt to argue with me on this, it's a waste of time. You are also entitled to your opinion and we should, honestly, be more willing to talk about and have friendly debates on our opinions. THIS IS HOW THE COURTS SHOULD BE OPERATING. IT SHOULD BE A VENUE FOR US TO HAVE THESE CONVERSATIONS IN A STRUCTURED MANNER.

We are walking a tightrope: meaning we want the mystery of the unknown without letting things fall into a complete oblivion.

I have no idea how this word "persons" was so grossly lost in terms of its meaning in general (especially in relation to that first line of the 14th Amendment). But here we are and now it appears "unbelievable" that this is the true source of all the issues in America. Well, I believe it clearly is.

The ultimate presumption is that you are a negro. And that presumption is solidified by you answering "yes" to questions like being a US citizen or resident. Negroes released by the 13th Amendment and given a special citizenship through the 14th

Amendment are ALWAYS either a US citizen or a resident when it comes to one of the 50 states of the Union.

Being a US citizen or a “resident” means you are not really an American, within what you think that classification is composed of. It is impossible to be a US citizen/resident and an American at the same time... you must willingly choose one or the other. Since you are not, technically, forced to choose either one, your choice to forego your American roots and decide to classify yourself as a negro (US citizen) is considered voluntary!

People are simply choosing to not be a true American without knowing what they are doing. This is the entire conversation.

XI. The Incorporation Doctrine

The Cornell Law page where I will be pulling most the information for this section can be found at: https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/incorporation_doctrine

Throughout the years later after *Slaughter-House Cases, 83 US 36 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1873)*, we have what is called the “Incorporation Doctrine.” This is essentially where they were trying to build back in all the original rights that were for white state citizens back into the US citizen category. Cornell Law describes it like this:

The incorporation doctrine is a constitutional doctrine through which parts of the first ten amendments of the United States Constitution (known as the Bill of Rights) are made applicable to the states through the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Prior to the doctrine's (and the Fourteenth Amendment's) existence, the Supreme Court found the Bill of Rights to only apply to the Federal government and to federal court cases.

During the signing of the Constitution, every state in the negotiation had different levels of concerns with a too powerful Federal government, and the preamble to the Bill of Rights highlights the importance of the Bill of Rights in limiting overreach by the newly created government. The Supreme Court noted that the Bill of Rights was clearly intended to limit only the federal government (see *Barron v City of Baltimore* (1833)). States and state courts could choose to adopt similar laws, but were under no obligation to do so.

After the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Supreme Court, through a string of cases, found that the Due Process clause of the Fourteenth amendment included applying parts of the Bill of Rights to States (referred to as incorporation). A lot of contention surrounds whether the Fourteenth Amendment should incorporate any substantive rights, with opinions from Supreme Court justices ranging from complete to no incorporation. Rather than find that the Due Process clause incorporates all of the Bill of Rights, the Supreme Court supported selectively incorporating rights that the Court finds as essential to due process. Under selective incorporation, the Supreme Court incorporated certain parts of certain amendments, rather than incorporating an entire amendment at once.

Some argue that the Privileges or Immunities Clause is a more appropriate textual basis than the due process clause for incorporation of the Bill of Rights but because Slaughter-House Cases dealing with this clause are surrounded by controversy this theory is not supported by the majority of the court.

As a note, the Ninth Amendment and the Tenth Amendment have not been incorporated, and it is unlikely that they ever will be. The text of the Tenth Amendment directly interacts with state

law, and the Supreme Court rarely relies upon the Ninth Amendment when deciding cases.

As you can see, the above is a clear and excellent description of what this is.

Here is a copy and paste breakdown of each of the originally ten rights that the white man had, and their corresponding cases which “incorporated” (or deemed them unable to be incorporated) the original state citizen rights into the privileges and immunities available for the negroes in the Fourteenth Amendment. The 9th and 10th Amendments were never “incorporated,” so only eight remain:

First Amendment (fully incorporated)

1. Guarantee against the establishment of religion: *Everson v Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947)
2. Free Exercise of Religion: *Hamilton v. Regents of the University of California*, 293 U.S. 245 (1934), *Cantwell v. Connecticut*, 310 U.S. 296 (1940)
3. Freedom of Speech: *Gitlow v. New York* 268 U.S. 652 (1925)
4. Freedom of the Press: *Near v. Minnesota* 283 U.S. 697 (1931)
5. Right of Assembly and Petition: *DeJonge v. Oregon* 299 U.S. 353 (1937)
6. Freedom of expressive association: Even though not directly mentioned in the Amendment, See *Roberts v. United States Jaycees* 468 U.S. 609 (1984) where the court states that “implicit in the right to engage in activities protected by the First Amendment is a corresponding right to associate with others in pursuit of wide variety of political, social, economic, educational, religious and cultural ends.”

Second Amendment (fully incorporated)

1. Right to keep and bear arms: *McDonald v. Chicago*, 561 U.S. 742

(2010)

Third Amendment (not incorporated)

Fourth Amendment (fully incorporated)

1. Freedom from unreasonable search and seizure: *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961)
2. Requirements in a warrant: *Aguilar v. Texas*, 378 U.S. 108 (1964)

Fifth Amendment (partially incorporated)

1. Right to indictment by a grand jury (not incorporated): *Hurtado v. California*, 110 US 516 (1884)
2. Double Jeopardy: *Benton v. Maryland*, 395 US 784 (1969)
3. Right against Self-Incrimination: *Malloy v. Hogan*, 378 US 1 (1964)
4. Protection against taking property without due compensation: *Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co. v. City of Chicago*, 166 U.S. 226 (1897)

Sixth Amendment (partially incorporated)

1. Right to a Speedy Trial: *Klopfer v. North Carolina*, 386 U.S. 213 (1967)
2. Right to a Public Trial: *In re Oliver*, 333 U.S. 257 (1948)
3. Right to an Impartial Jury: *Parker v. Gladden*, 385 U.S. 363 (1966)
4. Right to notice of accusations: *In re Oliver* 333, U.S. 257 (1948)
5. Right to Confront Hostile Witnesses: *Pointer v. Texas*, 380 U.S. 400 (1965)
6. Right to compulsory process to obtain witness testimony: *Washington v. Texas*, 388 U.S. 14 (1967)
7. Right to Confront Favorable Witnesses: *Washington v. Texas*, 388 U.S. 14 (1967)
8. Right to Counsel: *Gideon v. Wainwright*, 372 U.S. 335 (1963)

9. Right to jury selected from residents of the state and district where the crime occurred (not incorporated)

Seventh Amendment (not incorporated)

Eighth Amendment (fully incorporated)

1. Protection against excessive bail: *Schilb v Kuebel*, 404 U.S. 357 (1971)
2. Protection against excessive fine: *Timbs v. Indiana*, 586 U.S. ____ (2019)
3. Protection against cruel and unusual punishments: *Robinson v California*, 370 U.S. 660 (1962).

There is also another case I wanted to show you that describes many of these rights being converted into privileges and then added in on the US citizen side of the equation, ***Twining v. New Jersey*, 211 US 78 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1908)**. This case was later overturned by ***Malloy v. Hogan*, 378 US 1 - U.S. Supreme Court 1964**, but this case is still wildly important because it breaks down a historical timeline of all the various cases and things that happened up to 1908 involving all this information about the differences between US citizens and state citizens:

[this quote is talking about what rights US citizens have versus state citizens. Some of this information is outdated and should be compared to the above Incorporation Doctrine cases for reference]

Let's hear what the Honorable Justice William Henry Moody has to say in this case:

Thus among the rights and privileges of National citizenship recognized by this court are the right to pass freely from State to State, *Crandall v. Nevada*, 6 Wall. 35; the right to petition Congress

for a redress of grievances, *United States v. Cruikshank, supra*; the right to vote for National officers, *Ex parte Yarbrough, 110 U.S. 651; Wiley v. Sinkler, 179 U.S. 58*; the right to enter the public lands, *United States v. Waddell, 112 U.S. 76*; the right to be protected against violence while in the lawful custody of a United States marshal, *Logan v. United States, 144 U.S. 263*; and the right to inform the United States authorities of violation of its laws, *In re Quarles, 158 U.S. 532* ... The right of trial by jury in civil cases, guaranteed by the Seventh Amendment (*Walker v. Sauvinet, 92 U.S. 90*), and the right to bear arms guaranteed by the Second Amendment (*Presser v. Illinois, 116 U.S. 252*), have been distinctly held not to be privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment against abridgment by the States, and in effect the same decision was made in respect of the guarantee against prosecution, except by indictment of a grand jury, contained in the Fifth Amendment (*Hurtado v. California, 110 U.S. 516*), and in respect of the right to be confronted with witnesses, contained in the Sixth Amendment. *West v. Louisiana, 194 U.S. 258*.

So this is, essentially, the world we have been living in: we are all self-proclaimed “persons” (negroes) under the Fourteenth Amendment and these various rights have been incorporated into the 14th Amendment... but there’s a problem. We all are pretty aware about how the world ACTUALLY works and it is often where these various “incorporated” “rights” don’t work like you would think they should. Well, that’s quite simple and the Honorable Justice Taney already told us why previously in ***Dred Scott v. Sandford, 60 US 393 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1857)***. Again, I will use bold and underlines to bring your attention to specific areas in this quote:

└The question before us is, whether the class of persons described in

the plea in abatement compose a portion of this people, and are constituent members of this sovereignty? We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word "citizens" in the Constitution, and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings, who had been subjugated by the dominant race, and, **whether emancipated or not, yet remained subject to their authority, and had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the Government might choose to grant them.**

So, as you can see above, these "incorporated rights" are not really rights... they are exactly what they say they are: **PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES UNDER THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT.**

PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES CAN BE TAKEN AWAY WHENEVER THEY WANT

Here is the definition of "privilege": **"a special right, advantage, or immunity granted or available only to a particular person or group."**

This was made crystal clear in a case from 1968, *United States v. Valentine, 288 F. Supp. 957 (Dist. Court, D. Puerto Rico - 1968)*, where the Honorable Chief Judge Hiram R. Cancio said:

The only absolute and unqualified right of citizenship is to residence within the territorial boundaries of the United States; a citizen cannot be either deported or denied reentry.

Bingo. That is exactly correct. US citizens, meaning negroes, have **only one RIGHT**. They have many **privileges and immunities**, but **only ONE SINGLE GUARANTEED RIGHT. NO OTHERS!**

So, if you have yourself classified as a “US citizen” or a “resident” or “permanent resident” of a state, the information in this section carefully breaks down your situation. This may shed quite a bit of light as to why this country is the way it is! I imagine now it’s starting to make a lot of sense! The government is essentially asking you all the time is: **are you a negro?** - and you are saying yes! And what’s so shocking is that no one on either side of that question actually understand the question! EVERYONE IS IGNORANT. WE ARE IN AN UNTHINKING NIGHTMARE.

A “permanent resident” is simply someone who “has their citizenship (meaning allegiance and subjugation) elsewhere and has decided to stay here in a foreign land without becoming a state citizen.” As a “resident,” your citizenship is not defined in that term... it is simply known that your citizenship is not in that area. It is simply assumed by the term that your allegiance and subjugation lies elsewhere!

What’s amazing is literally all of this chaos and insanity was caused due to one single misunderstood word... the word “persons” in the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment. Too wild to even be believed!

XII. Using anything derived from the 14th Amendment automatically makes you a negro

So, what makes this so complex is that, in court, the basic fundamental equation for almost anything going on is like this:

Duty-Breach-Damages

In law, this is called a “cause of action.” A cause of action is essentially the basic breakdown of a specific claim on a complaint.

For example, a cause of action for “breach of contract” would be:

1. They had a **duty** to perform based off a contractual obligation (the

contract is then attached to the claim or complaint as evidence as an exhibit)

2. Someone **breached** that claim (ideally with attached evidence proving the alleged breach)
3. **Damage** occurred due to this breach (with attached evidence/ affidavits proving the damages that resulted)

This, in essence, is the composure of a cause of action (and then 1 or more causes of action comprise a complaint). It's really quite simple.

Now here's the issue...

If you use anything as a cause of action which comes from the 14th Amendment, you are, in essence, classifying yourself as a negro by doing so.

I'll give you an excellent example. Let's take a look at 42 U.S. Code Chapter 21, entitled "CIVIL RIGHTS" (which is another way of saying "privileges and immunities")

You can see how obvious this situation is in 42 USC 1981(a) (I will use an underline to show you the key parts):

All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right in every State and Territory to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, give evidence, and to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property as is enjoyed by white citizens, and shall be subject to like punishment, pains, penalties, taxes, licenses, and exactions of every kind, and to no other.

And in 42 USC 1982 we see the following wording (where, again, I will underline to bring your attention to an area):

All citizens of the United States shall have the same right, in every State and Territory, as is enjoyed by white citizens thereof

to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property.

Now all this is HIGHLY important because two of the most common statutes used in civil cases when their rights are violated (for example: against police misbehavior) are 42 USC 1983 and 42 USC 1985, **WHICH ARE RIGHT AFTER THE ABOVE 42 USC 1981 AND 42 USC 1982.**

So everyone bringing claims or causes of actions under 42 USC 1983 or 42 USC 1985 are using the negro's civil rights code. So thus... obviously the presumption will be that you **MUST** be a negro. This is the issue.

Now, keep in mind that the government did give you a sole proprietorship... which is simply just your name in all caps. That is the "persons" that actually is a 14th Amendment US citizen. You can prove that easily because when you look up who can get a Social Security Number in 20 CFR 422.104, you will see that you need to be a US citizen (negro or legal fiction) in order to have one.

So you **HAVE** a US citizen, called a sole proprietorship, which is under the 14th Amendment. And this is exactly how you can bring a claim under 42 USC 1983 or 42 USC 1985. But you as a free white man/state citizen/actual American absolutely may not do so! So how would you navigate something like that? Easy, just make your sole proprietorship, as a person, the plaintiff in the lawsuit and you become the attorney-in-fact or "next friend" on behalf of that person. In this way, you can still bring your claims without committing a felony by saying you are a negro when you are not (which can put you in prison up to 3 years according to 18 USC 911).

If you prefer to actually bring a claim yourself, without some kind of persona or corporate fiction, as a white state citizen, I would recommend that you use your original state's constitution in state

court or use the original Bill of Rights in Federal court. Besides that, with anything else, you would need to check it to see if it is derived from the 14th Amendment.

Newsflash: almost every area of “law” is derived from the 14th Amendment!

IF YOU SEE THE TERM “PERSONS” ANYWHERE (AND IT’S FUCKING EVERYWHERE), THEN YOU IMMEDIATELY KNOW YOU ARE LOOKING AT SOMETHING DERIVED FROM THE 14TH AMENDMENT (SPEAKING ABOUT NEGROES AND CORPORATE FICTIONS, EXCLUSIVELY)

XIII. Qualified Immunity and the True Source of Systemic Racism in America

PREFACE TO THIS SECTION: I TRULY BELIEVE THAT ONLY A SMALL PERCENTAGE OF THE POLICE FORCE ARE INTRINSICALLY PERSONS OF ILL INTENT (LEGALLY, POLICE OFFICERS ARE “PERSONS,” NOT “PEOPLE” BY THE WAY. I’M NOT JUST SAYING THAT... THAT’S AN ACTUAL LEGAL FACT). BUT I DO BELIEVE THAT THE OVERALL POLICING SYSTEM IS CURRENTLY OPERATING IN A WAY THAT NEEDS SOME SERIOUS ADJUSTMENT. WE JUST NEED TO TWEAK THE SYSTEM AND ALL THE POLICE OFFICERS WILL ADJUST TO THE WAY THE SYSTEM IS ADJUSTED. SO THE POLICE ARE NOT THE ENEMY... IT’S SIMPLY THE CALIBRATION OF THE SYSTEM ITSELF. I’M ALSO NOT EXCUSING POLICE BRUTALITY... BUT THERE IS A MIDDLE GROUND HERE THAT NEEDS TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED.

Ok so let’s talk about “qualified immunity.”

First let’s get a definition and start this section off with an article from the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) that I think is a

great starting place (<https://www.ncsl.org/civil-and-criminal-justice/qualified-immunity>):

The doctrine of qualified immunity protects state and local officials, including law enforcement officers, from individual liability unless the official violated a clearly established constitutional right.

The evolution of qualified immunity began in 1871 when Congress adopted 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which makes government employees and officials personally liable for money damages if they violate a person’s federal constitutional rights. State and local police officers may be sued under § 1983. Until the 1960s, few § 1983 lawsuits were successfully brought. In 1967, the Supreme Court recognized qualified immunity as a defense to § 1983 claims. In 1982, the Supreme Court adopted the current test for the doctrine. Qualified immunity is generally available if the law a government official violated isn’t “clearly established.”

Now, at this point in this conversation, you already know where I’m headed with this...

ALL OF THIS APPLIES ONLY AND EXCLUSIVELY TO NEGROES

If you already saw that coming, great. It means you’re learning (thank Christ). Now, this gets more interesting because we can see this even more clearly by actually diving into the cases associated with this situation. Let’s take a peek, shall we?

I’m not much of an AI guy but I’ve recently been using Grok to find cases to dig into on specific subjects. I typed into Grok “what main court cases established qualified immunity for the police?” and this is what it gave me:

Pierson v. Ray (1967): This was the first case to recognize qualified immunity as a defense for public officials, including police officers. The Court held that officers could be shielded from liability for constitutional violations if they acted in good faith and without clear knowledge that their actions were unlawful.

Harlow v. Fitzgerald (1982): This case refined the doctrine by establishing an objective standard for qualified immunity. The Court ruled that officials are immune unless their conduct violates "clearly established" constitutional rights that a reasonable person would have known, removing the subjective "good faith" requirement.

Anderson v. Creighton (1987): This case further clarified that for a right to be "clearly established," prior court decisions must have defined the right with sufficient specificity. It protected officers unless their actions were clearly prohibited by existing precedent.

Saucier v. Katz (2001): The Court formalized a two-step test for qualified immunity: (1) whether the officer's conduct violated a constitutional right, and (2) whether that right was clearly established at the time. (This rigid sequence was later made flexible in *Pearson v. Callahan* (2009).)

Mullenix v. Luna (2015): This case emphasized the high bar for overcoming qualified immunity, reinforcing that a right must be defined with particularity, not at a general level, to be considered "clearly established."

Now, at this point, most of you dumb fucks would start asking Grok more questions and to summarize these cases for you and all other manner of worthless pathetic bullshit. This is how we got into this situation in the first place. OBVIOUSLY NO ONE FUCKING KNOWS

SHIT ABOUT ANY OF THIS OTHERWISE WE WOULDN'T HAVE THE FUCKED UP SITUATION WE HAVE. So don't be a worthless jackoff... use AI to locate cases then ACTUALLY TAKE THE TIME TO GO READ THEM... DON'T ASK AI, WHICH IS AN AMALGAMATION OF OTHER PEOPLE/PERSONS MISUNDERSTANDINGS AND RETARDATIONS, WHAT THESE CASES SAY.

takes deep breath

Let's head over to Google Scholar and look up the case of *Pierson v. Ray, 386 US 547 (U.S. Supreme Court - 1967)*, light up a cigar, and take a look at what quotes we can dig out of this thing:

These cases present issues involving the liability of local police officers and judges under § 1 of the Civil Rights Act of 1871, 17 Stat. 13, now 42 U. S. C. § 1983. Petitioners in No. 79 were members of a group of 15 white and Negro Episcopal clergymen who attempted to use segregated facilities at an interstate bus terminal in Jackson, Mississippi, in 1961.

SO WAIT... STOP RIGHT THERE. STOP THE TRAIN! YOU MEAN TO TELL ME THAT THE MOST BASIC CASE ESTABLISHING QUALIFIED IMMUNITY IS A MOTHER FUCKING CASE INVOLVING THE ARREST OF NEGROES ATTEMPTING TO USE SEGREGATED FACILITIES AT A MOTHER FUCKING BUS TERMINAL? HOW ARE PEOPLE NOT ABSOLUTELY PISSED ABOUT THIS IN 2025?! HOW IS THIS A REALITY?! PLEASE TELL ME. WHERE ARE THE LIBERALS ON THIS ONE? WHERE IS LITERALLY ANYONE WITH 2 FUCKING BRAIN CELLS TO RUB TOGETHER? HOW HAS THIS NOT BEEN OVERTURNED OR CHALLENGED IN ALL THESE YEARS?!

takes deep breath

So, as you can tell, the writing style in this section has changed. Why? Because, by this point in this page you have enough LOGICAL INFORMATION to allow your EMOTIONAL IRE to come out and actually steer you in the correct decision. Do you see this? You can now, if you have understood everything on this page, can allow your rage and disgust over this situation to shine through. It's like this... imagine a 1200 horsepower car. Not many people can drive it, right? My Shelby GT500 is around 800 horsepower and, frankly, most of the people I know would kill themselves in a day behind the wheel. But for me, someone with extensive training and background working on cars, it's perfectly controllable. This is the same situation. We are now far enough along in this discussion to begin to unleash our emotions and allow them to drive our **LOGICAL DESIRES**. This is the whole point here and I truly hope you can see that.

Let's continue...

More "exciting" quotes from this case:

The evidence at the federal trial showed that petitioners and other Negro and white Episcopal clergymen undertook a "prayer pilgrimage" in 1961 from New Orleans to Detroit. The purpose of the pilgrimage was to visit church institutions and other places in the North and South to promote racial equality and integration, and, finally, to report to a church convention in Detroit. Letters from the leader of the group to its members indicate that the clergymen intended from the beginning to go to Jackson and attempt to use segregated facilities at the bus terminal there, and that they fully expected to be arrested for doing so. The group made plans based on the assumption that they would be arrested if they attempted peacefully to exercise their right as interstate travelers to use the waiting rooms and other facilities at the bus terminal, and the letters discussed arrangements for bail and other matters relevant to arrests.

Bro, how can this even be real in 2025? I'm reading this and almost in tears thinking that this fucking dumb bullshit is now the bedrock to the reasoning how police have immunity.

**“QUALIFIED IMMUNITY” IS LITERALLY
LEGALIZED TERRORISM FUELED BY
RACISM. CAN YOU SEE THIS? WE’VE BARELY
EVEN STARTED LOOKING AT THIS CASE AND
WE CAN ALREADY COMFORTABLY MAKE A
DETERMINATION.**

I recently had a very interesting comment on my YouTube channel by the username “@nt75” that I would like to share at this point in the discussion:

“The police is the modern form of the kkk.”

This comment really startled me... got me thinking. While I don't necessarily agree or disagree, intrinsically, the real issue is that the system itself is inherently fucked up and we need to fix the system, not the individual police officers. They obviously just have no clue what is going on. If we attack the individual officers, things will get worse... whereas if we attack the system itself, we can begin to see honest and real long-term change in this situation.

**WE NEED TO FOCUS ON THE TRUE ENEMY, WHICH IS THE
SYSTEM... NOT THE “PERSONS” ADMINISTERING IT. YOU
GUYS MIGHT BE MAD ABOUT THE SITUATION BUT, KNOWING
THAT ALL POLICE ARE LEGALLY “PERSONS” IS ACTUALLY
QUITE A HILARIOUS SITUATION IN ITSELF. THEY DON'T EVEN
REALIZE THAT THEY HAVE FALLEN INTO THEIR OWN TRAP!
THEY ARE, LEGALLY, NEGROES WHO HAVE BEEN GIVEN THE
“PRIVILEGE” TO ASSAULT OTHER NEGORES WITH**

“QUALIFIED IMMUNITY.” THIS IS THE LEGAL REALITY OF THE SITUATION. REMEMBER, IT’S “PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES”!

Let’s keep going on this case. I want you to see how absolutely fucking insane the world you live in really is... look at this next quote:

The ministers stayed one night in Jackson, and went to the bus terminal the next morning to depart for Chattanooga, Tennessee. They entered the waiting room, disobeying a sign at the entrance that announced "White Waiting Room Only—By Order of the Police Department." They then turned to enter the small terminal restaurant but were stopped by two Jackson police officers, respondents Griffith and Nichols, who had been awaiting their arrival and who ordered them to "move on." The ministers replied that they wanted to eat, and refused to move on. Respondent Ray, then a police captain and now the deputy chief of police, arrived a few minutes later. The ministers were placed under arrest and taken to the jail.

Let’s stop again... look... I’m from Indiana. I know racism. And I get that all races sort of stick to themselves and prefer their own people. I get that... I really do. And I think racism is a fairly normal cultural behavior.

But bro... these are white and black ministers who are literally traveling around to preach acceptance in a peaceful way. I’m sorry. I don’t care how “right” or how “left” you are in a situation like this. This is absolutely insane!

IMAGINE OFFICERS DOING SOME SHIT LIKE THIS IN 2025. JUST IMAGINE IT!

I’m not down with it bro. This is fucking insane and stupid and has no right being a basis for qualified immunity.

But let's keep going...

All witnesses including the police officers agreed that the ministers entered the waiting room peacefully and engaged in no boisterous or objectionable conduct while in the "White Only" area. There was conflicting testimony on the number of bystanders present and their behavior. Petitioners testified that there was no crowd at the station, that no one followed them into the waiting room, and that no one uttered threatening words or made threatening gestures. The police testified that some 25 to 30 persons followed the ministers into the terminal, that persons in the crowd were in a very dissatisfied and ugly mood, and that they were mumbling and making unspecified threatening gestures. The police did not describe any specific threatening incidents, and testified that they took no action against any persons in the crowd who were threatening violence because they "had determined that the ministers was the cause of the violence if any might occur," although the ministers were concededly orderly and polite and the police did not claim that it was beyond their power to control the allegedly disorderly crowd. The arrests and convictions were followed by this lawsuit.

Do I even need to say anything? Obviously not... let's continue:

We find no difficulty in agreeing with the Court of Appeals that Judge Spencer is immune from liability for damages for his role in these convictions. The record is barren of any proof or specific allegation that Judge Spencer played any role in these arrests and convictions other than to adjudge petitioners guilty when their cases came before his court. Few doctrines were more solidly established at common law than the immunity of judges from liability for damages for acts committed within their judicial jurisdiction, as this Court recognized when it adopted

the doctrine, in *Bradley v. Fisher*, 13 Wall. 335 (1872). This immunity applies even when the judge is accused of acting maliciously and corruptly, and it "is not for the protection or benefit of a malicious or corrupt judge, but for the benefit of the public, whose interest it is that the judges should be at liberty to exercise their functions with independence and without fear of consequences." (*Scott v. Stansfield*, L. R. 3 Ex. 220, 223 (1868), quoted in *Bradley v. Fisher*, *supra*, 349, note, at 350.) It is a judge's duty to decide all cases within his jurisdiction that are brought before him, including controversial cases that arouse the most intense feelings in the litigants. His errors may be corrected on appeal, but he should not have to fear that unsatisfied litigants may hound him with litigation charging malice or corruption. Imposing such a burden on judges would contribute not to principled and fearless decision-making but to intimidation.

Ok, fine. I could see that point of view. But don't you think there should be a little more of a discussion as regards to what is considered acceptable and what is not rather than just a blanket immunity to treat negroes and "persons" however they want? (again, none of this has anything to do with white state citizens... even if they didn't realize that at the time. Makes no difference).

Let's keep going on this case:

The common law has never granted police officers an absolute and unqualified immunity, and the officers in this case do not claim that they are entitled to one. Their claim is rather that they should not be liable if they acted in good faith and with probable cause in making an arrest under a statute that they believed to be valid. Under the prevailing view in this country a peace officer who arrests someone with probable cause is not liable for false arrest simply because the innocence of the suspect is later proved. *Restatement, Second, Torts* § 121 (1965); 1 *Harper &*

James, The Law of Torts § 3.18, at 277-278 (1956); Ward v. Fidelity & Deposit Co. of Maryland, 179 F. 2d 327 (C. A. 8th Cir. 1950). **A policeman's lot is not so unhappy that he must choose between being charged with dereliction of duty if he does not arrest when he has probable cause, and being mulcted in damages if he does. Although the matter is not entirely free from doubt, the same consideration would seem to require excusing him from liability for acting under a statute that he reasonably believed to be valid but that was later held unconstitutional, on its face or as applied.**

Ok I get this concern, but none of this is applicable in 2025. Totally irrelevant. Do you think all the people in a place would scoff and be upset over white and black ministers using the “whites only” bathroom in 2025? That was a joke because that situation isn’t even possible in 2025.

I’m not going to keep banging this case or the subsequent cases... but you can see that the original cause of action was under the negroes civil rights act (42 USC 1983). So all of this stuff that happened because of that makes perfect sense. They have absolutely no legal obligation to respect the privileges and immunities of negroes.

We’ve gone through a majority of that first case... and now you can kind of see how my mind works and how I build my various cases. You can read these other cases then now build a claim or defense based on that information and file it in. Doing this stuff is actually really interesting and fascinating and I wanted to kind of write this section as a little teaser to kind of show you how this can work and how it can be an interesting discovery. It empowers you because you realize, pretty rapidly, that things like qualified immunity is complete horse shit. But you have to actually attack it in the proper way.

As you can see, this is the true systemic racism in our country. This

whole page could be called “systemic racism in America” and it would be exactly correct!

XIV. America: The World’s Negro Plantation

You need to be a US citizen to be president.

You need to be a US citizen to serve on a jury.

You need to be a US citizen to be governor of a State.

A “US citizen” is someone who has pledged their allegiance to and have subjected themselves to the District of Columbia (which is not one of the states of America). It’s 14th Amendment citizenship for released negroes after the 13th Amendment released them from slavery (I know I’ve said it a million times but I keep saying it so it can have some time to sink in).

Are you seeing the big picture here? This is literal evidence that “State of California” is not a part of the actual state... it is simply a public corporation on behalf of the District of Columbia. State of California has a fucking EIN number: 94-6001347. It’s literally just a business on behalf of the District of Columbia and everyone who works for it, on paper, are blacks of African descent. “The people of State of California” is impossible... it can only be “the **PERSONS** of State of California.”

State of California never replaced the actual California (same for all the other states). This is obvious by the fact that you need to be a US citizen to be governor of State of California. So that means the entire original de jure government is just sitting there... empty. And the 1849 California Constitution is the original Republican center of the original American state.

So America is literally one giant cotton plantation for negroes.

Everyone is black and of African descent on paper. The whole country

operates as though it was released from slavery from the 13th Amendment and given citizenship through the 14th Amendment. This whole country operates as though America began in 1873... not in 1776. This isn't even a joke or something funny or cute... this is literal and not a joke at all. I hope you can see this. It's quite shocking and eye-opening. It's honestly really sad.

XV. The Holy Grail: The Ninth and Tenth Amendments

As a white state citizen (NON US CITIZEN), the ultimate “unlockable” aspect of law is the Ninth and Tenth Amendments (which, as you can see above, were never incorporated back in for the negroes).

Here is the Ninth Amendment:

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Here is the Tenth Amendment:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Now, hopefully you can see, obviously, why these Amendments were ABSOLUTELY never incorporated back into the negro's civil rights. People run around thinking that the Second Amendment is so cool... but it's absolute TRASH compared to The Holy Grail... THE NINTH AND TENTH AMENDMENTS.

These Amendments are ONLY available to free white men who are NOT US citizens, NOT negroes and NOT “residents” of anything. These Amendments are only available for white state citizens who domicile in the state in which their citizenship lies.

What the Ninth and Tenth Amendments say, basically in English, is

“whatever you want your rights to be is totally fine, as long as you aren’t hurting anyone or lowering anyone else’s standard of living.” The Ninth and Tenth Amendments are, essentially, all of common law in a couple of sentences. **AND THEY ARE THE MOST BADASS AMENDMENTS EVER.**

You want your ACTUAL “right to travel”? Well here it is. The Ninth/Tenth Amendment is the ULTIMATE right to travel.

Worried about needing a license to “practice law”? NINTH/TENTH AMENDMENT.

Worried about growing and selling pot? NINTH/TENTH AMENDMENT (just be careful about interstate commerce).

Worried about your rights to your children? NINTH/TENTH AMENDMENT.

I think you get the point.

By having access to these Amendments, you become entirely immune to literally absolutely any aspect of any law in which there is no victim and not clearly provable damages. Things like “possession” crimes, crimes without victims, paperwork-related “crimes” all become legally impossible to prosecute. This is the ultimate in TRUE “immunity.”

If you want TRUE freedom in America, if you want to feel the bald eagles coursing through your veins, the Ninth/Tenth Amendment is what you have been looking for!

XVI. How to shoot bald eagles into your veins

At this point, especially for those who are new to all this information, you may be wondering how to change all this nightmare. It’s honestly pretty easy.

If you were born in one of the 50 states of the Union, just get rid of all your businesses and licenses. Get rid of your driver's license (only negroes and aliens can have those). Shed everything that says US citizen on it or "resident" or any of the other buzzwords. Operate your life through trusts. Do a Federally registered trademark on your name in all caps through the USPTO. Stop saying you are a US citizen or a resident.

Then, when it comes to your passport, you will be getting a passport on behalf of your sole proprietorship. Meaning your passport will have HIS date of birth on it... not yours (which is typically around 2 weeks after you were born... it's the date that the Certificate of Live Birth was received and processed).

The passport will become the only form of identification that you will need. You can live a completely "normal" life in the system with just a passport. You can have bank accounts, credit cards, debit cards, checkbooks, credit card processing, etc. YOU CAN DO EVERYTHING THAT YOU WERE DOING BEFORE WITHOUT LOSING ANY FUNCTIONALITY OR COMFORTS IN LIFE.

And that's it. It's really quite easy. My free Contract Killer Course will have a lot more information on all of this and, if you want to learn more, you should sign up for it. It's free!

Anyone who has naturalized into this country and they were not born here would simply need to follow the instructions in the original Naturalization Act of 1790. "Persons" who do not fit the definition of "free white person" would not be eligible for citizenship. Also, people who are born here of African blood would also not be included (as seen in the definitions by Mr. Taney and Mr. Miller).

If that irritates you then do something about it! Sue and get your case to the US Supreme Court! Make us all proud! Fix and save this country! Be the next Dred Scott (he was one badass mother fucker to

do what he did).

You could get The Slaughter-House Cases overturned or clarified! I know I have been beating the drum for it to be overturned in a lot of my other content... but maybe it just needs some clarification. But if it was simply “clarified” rather than overturned then negroes would not have the ability to become a part of “We the People” and they would be stuck as “persons” forever. This is not a choice for me to make but is up to the PEOPLE and PERSONS in America to decide! I’m a believer in the American spirit but, keep in mind, statistically, white people make up a vast majority of the American population. So if the melanted persons/people want to make a change in how citizenship works then they need to rise up and turn their entire culture into something that the white man can look at and be in agreement that they should be allowed to be included in “We the People.”

That last comment may enrage some people reading it. Well, how has your program been working out for you? **We’re all fucking slaves now.** Obviously whatever anyone has been doing and thinking is **ABOSOLUTE FUCKING ABYSMAL HORSE SHIT**, otherwise we wouldn’t be here. To rise up and help the “black” race grow and become known far and wide as the most helpful, friendly and contributing race would automatically make the black race the primary race and then white people would then actually become the minority. You don’t see white people kicking the Asians out or doing shit to the Asian culture (not at this particular blip in time, anyways). Think about it. Any culture or race can become the “dominant” race by simply being badass and great in the eyes of all the other races in the world. Look at how people emotionally react to various races: look at Samoans... people don’t hate on them. In my opinion, which may offend some people, the “black” race has allowed itself to become infiltrated and destroyed from the inside. I think that’s unacceptable and I think we should all work together to fix this issue. I get that the

situation is pretty fucked but sitting around and bitching about it has **OBVIOUSLY NOT BEEN VERY EFFECTIVE BECAUSE LOOK AT THE FUCKING SEPTIC SHITHOLE WE ARE CURRENTLY LAYING IN.**

Things aren't great. Doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure that out. We don't need more dumbass fucking retard podcasts talking about it. What we need are SOLUTIONS: financial, legal, social, etc. These solutions will be made by thinking men who **IGNORE ALL THE RACISM AND DIFFICULTIES THEY MAY ENCOUNTER AND DECIDE AND MAKE A PACT TO THEMSELVES THAT THEY WILL ACHIEVE THEIR GOALS AT ALL COSTS.** Great historical figures such as Martin Luther King Jr come to mind.

This whole fucking world has become such a fucking pussy. No one is willing to die for anything anymore. What kind of pathetic fucking life is that? I didn't even realize I was alive until I had something I was willing to die for.

Dred Scott is a great example of a man who should, frankly, be a shining star of what the "black" culture should be aspiring to. A fucking released slave **AT ALMOST THE HEIGHT OF THE FUCKING CIVIL WAR, WHO WASN'T EVEN CONSIDERED A FUCKING MAN... HE WAS CONSIDERED AN ARTICLE OF FUCKING PROPERTY... AND HAD AN INTENTION AND HE TOOK THAT INTENTION ALL THE WAY TO THE FUCKING U.S. SUPREME COURT. BRO, THAT'S SO FUCKING BADASS. THAT DUDE DECIDED TO DO SOMETHING AGAINST. EVERY. FUCKING. POSSIBLE. CIRCUMSTANCE. THAT DUDE HAD LITERALLY THE WHOLE WORLD FIGHTING AGAINST HIM. THAT DUDE PLAYED A GAME UNDER THE MOST IMPOSSIBLE ODDS THAT ANY FUCKING MAN OR WOMAN HAS EVER SEEN. ODDS THAT ARE SO LOW... THEY DON'T EVEN EXIST IN TODAY'S WORLD. ODDS LIKE A MAN WITH NO LEGS WINNING A TRACK OLYMPIC MEDAL. AND**

HE FUCKING STOOD UP AND DID IT ANYWAYS.

If we had literally like THREE Dred Scotts in today's world... I promise you, with the way things are now, this whole people/persons bullshit would not be around much longer. But no, everyone is a fucking pussy now and wants to get jerked off like little bitches. I consider myself a Dred Scott (the white version, obviously).

That's why we're in the world we are in. Because we don't have more badassess like Dred Scott. AND I MEAN IN ALL CULTURES, INCLUDING THE "WHITE RACE."

Anyone can press these claims in court and advance through the appellate courts and into the US Supreme Court. Will it be you?

I WANT TO END THIS TREATISE BY BEING ABSOLUTELY AND COMPLETELY TRANSPARENT ABOUT SOMETHING: IF THE COUNTRY DECIDES TO OPERATE THE WAY IT IS SUPPOSED TO OPERATE AND DECIDES, AS A COUNTRY, TO NOT CHANGE OR OVERTURN THE SLAUGHTER-HOUSE CASES OR THE 14TH AMENDMENT, WHAT IS GOING TO HAPPEN IS THE COUNTRY IS GOING TO SPLIT INTO TWO CLEAR CATEGORIES JUST LIKE IT USED TO BE. "WE THE PEOPLE" WILL BE THE WHITE STATE CITIZENS UNDER THE BILL OF RIGHTS AND THE NEGROES WILL BE "PERSONS" UNDER THE 14TH AMENDMENT. ALL POLICE WILL ONLY BE ALLOWED TO INTERACT WITH NEGROES (SHERIFFS ARE FOR WHITE PEOPLE!) AND ALL WHITE STATE CITIZENS WILL HAVE COMPLETE IMMUNITY FROM THE POLICE. WHITE AND BLACK SEGREGATION WILL COME BACK INTO THIS COUNTRY THAT WILL MAKE THE MID-20TH CENTURY LOOK LIKE A DISNEY FILM. IT IS NOT MY JOB TO MAKE THESE DECISIONS FOR OUR GLORIOUS COUNTRY. MY JOB IS TO DIG UP THE TRUTH, ORGANIZE IT AND PRESENT IT IN A WAY THAT IT CAN BE

UNDERSTOOD SO THAT US, AS A PEOPLE AND A PERSONS, MAY MAKE EDUCATED AND KNOWING DECISIONS ABOUT OUR LAWS AND EXISTANCE. WHAT OCCURS FROM THIS POINT FORWARD DEPENDS ENTIRELY UPON WHAT YOU DECIDE TO DO WITH THIS INFORMATION. IF THE BLACK RACE DECIDES TO DO NOTHING AS REGARDS TO THIS INFORMATION, YOU ARE MOVING RAPIDLY TOWARDS SLAVERY COMING BACK... AND JUST LIKE MR. TANEY SAID, IT WILL BE DONE "FOR YOUR BENEFIT." NEGROES WILL NOT BE ALLOWED TO HAVE SILVER/GOLD COINS (GOLD ABROGATION ACT), THEY WILL NEED TO HAVE DRIVER'S LICENSES, THEY WILL NEED PERMITS AND LICENSES FOR EVERYTHING, THEN THE WHITE PEOPLE WILL NOT NEED TO HAVE ANY OF THAT. THIS IS THE WORLD WE ARE STEERING TOWARDS UNLESS WE GET SOME DRED SCOTTS STANDING UP AND DOING SOMETHING ABOUT THE SITUATION. IT'S NOT MY JOB TO HOLD THE DICK OF THE BLACK RACE AND ATTEMPT TO STOP THIS FROM OCCURING. THIS IS ABOUT TRANSPARENCY... IF NO ONE ELSE CARES ABOUT SORTING THIS OUT FOR THE BLACKS, FROM THE BLACK RACE ITSELF, THEN THAT IS A SELF-ESTEEM ISSUE DEEPLY IMBEDDED IN THE BLACK RACE THAT I CANNOT OVERCOME AS A WHITE MAN. DON'T SAY I DIDN'T WARN YOU. YOU WILL BE IN FUCKING CHAINS AGAIN AND THERE IS NOT A GODDAMN THING I CAN DO ABOUT IT. I CANNOT FIGHT YOUR BATTLES FOR YOU, I'M SIMPLY TRYING TO EQUIP YOU AND PREPARE YOU FOR THE BATTLE. IF YOU DECIDE TO NOT SHOW UP FOR THE FIGHT, YOU WILL LOSE AND THE FUTURE IS ALREADY WRITTEN. IF THE BLACK RACE DECIDES THEY ARE NOT GOING TO FIGHT FOR THEIR RIGHT TO BE PEOPLE, I WILL NOT PERSONALLY OWN SLAVES BUT I WILL ALSO DO NOTHING TO PREVENT THIS FROM HAPPENING. I AM NOT

**THE SAVIOR OF THE BLACKS, WHITES, OR ANY OTHER RACE.
YOU PAID ME NOTHING TO BE HERE OR READ THIS. MY JOB
IS COMPLETED BY THE WRITING OF THIS. I HAVE NO
FURTHER OBLIGATIONS. FROM HERE, PEOPLE AND
PERSONS NEED TO DECIDE AND ACT. THE FUTURE OF
AMERICA IS UNDETERMINED AND IT'S NOT MY FUCKING JOB
TO DECIDE.**