As usual, the global elite has also infiltrated the Maritime Admiralty Law system, using it for their own purpose. Any contract can be viewed as a word puzzle, using words with different meanings than normally conceived. A word in one paragraph may confirm, or deny it’s meaning in the next. Tricky business...
The Catholic word “See” conceals the influence of the Holy Roman Church over the corrupt corporate government and legal system.

The term “see” comes from the Latin word “sedes”, meaning “seat”, which refers to the Episcopal throne (cathedra).

The term “Apostolic See” can refer to any see founded by one of the Apostles, but, when used with the definite article, it is used in the Catholic Church to refer specifically to the see of the Bishop of Rome, whom that Church sees as successor of Saint Peter, the Prince of the Apostles.

Sedes Sacrorum

(Latin Sedes for seat/see, Sacrorum for holy) otherwise known as Santa Sede and the “SS” also known in English as “Holy See” refers to the legal apparatus as a whole by which the Roman Catholic Pope and its Curia of Bishops claim historical recognition as a sovereign entity with superior legal rights. (http://one-evil.org/content/entities_organizations_holy_see.html)

The Catholic Church uses two legal personalities with which to conduct its international affairs: the first is as an International state known as the Vatican City State, to which the Pope is the Head of Government. The second is as the supreme legal personality above all other legal personalities by which all property and “creatures” are subjects.

The legal enforcability of its first personality as an International State is constrained by international law. The sovereign status of the Vatican City remains dependent upon the continued recognition of an agreement known as the “Lateran Treaty” signed between Catholic Facist Dictator and . . . Benito Mussolini in 1929 and his political supporter Pope Pius XI. This recognition remains in defiance and contempt to existing international laws prohibiting recognition of rogue states and laws created by mass murdering dictators.

The legal enforcability of the second personality of the Catholic Church as the Holy See is dependent upon the continued adherence to legal statutes, definitions, conventions and covenants as have been accumulated since the Middle Ages concerning the primacy of the Pope over all property and creatures. These statutes, conventions and covenants remain the fabric and foundation of the modern legal system of most states in the world.

To extend its legal strength using its second personality, the Catholic Church considers the region controlled by every bishop a See.

Admiralty Law

Admiralty law was introduced into England by the French Queen Eleanor of Aquitaine while she was acting as regent for her son, King Richard the Lionheart. She had earlier established admiralty law on the island of Oleron (where it was published as the Rolls of Oleron) in her own lands (although she is often referred to in admiralty law books as “Eleanor of Guyenne”), having learned about it in the eastern Mediterranean while on a Crusade with her first husband, King Louis VII of France. In England, special admiralty courts handle all admiralty cases. These courts do not use the common law of England, but are civil law courts largely based upon the Corpus Juris Civilis of Justinian.
Admiralty courts were a prominent feature in the prelude to the American Revolution. For example, the phrase in the Declaration of Independence “For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury” refers to the practice of Parliament giving the Admiralty Courts jurisdiction to enforce The Stamp Act in the American Colonies.[4] Because the Stamp Act was unpopular, a colonial jury was unlikely to convict a colonist of its violation. However, because admiralty courts did not (as is true today) grant trial by jury, a colonist accused of violating the Stamp Act could be more easily convicted by the Crown.

Admiralty law became part of the law of the United States as it was gradually introduced through admiralty cases arising after the adoption of the U.S. Constitution in 1789. Many American lawyers who were prominent in the American Revolution were admiralty and maritime lawyers in their private lives. Those included are Alexander Hamilton in New York and John Adams in Massachusetts.

In 1787 John Adams, who was then ambassador to France, wrote to James Madison proposing that the U.S. Constitution, then under consideration by the States, be amended to include “trial by jury in all matters of fact triable by the laws of the land [as opposed the law of admiralty] and not by the laws of Nations [i.e. not by the law of admiralty]”. The result was the Seventh Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Alexander Hamilton and John Adams were both admiralty lawyers and Adams represented John Hancock in an admiralty case in colonial Boston involving seizure of one of Hancock's ships for violations of Customs regulations. In the more modern era, Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes was an admiralty lawyer before ascending to the federal bench. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Admiralty_law

The Roman Court is very confusing – even for some judges – because it does not operate according to any true set rules of law but rather by presumptions of law. If these presumptions presented by the Private Bar Guild (BAR attorneys) are not rebutted they become fact and thereafter are said to stand as a “Truth in Commerce.” Despite the façade, the world is a playground of commercial business and is secretly owned by private foreign corporations.

Why is the Bar Guild so hell-bent on keeping everything on the private side? Because the public side invokes constitutional issues and nothing they do can withstand a constitutional challenge. The organic Constitution still exists in its original glory and authority and is buried in the US Printing Office.

All amendments since 1871 do not exist. Why? It was the “corporate mission statement” for the District of Columbia that was written in 1871 to resemble the organic Constitution. It is that corporate mission statement that has been amended since 1871 and chopped up as of late.

A Legal Way To Defeat This System
Specifically, there is a defendant living in Florida who discovered the answer to this puzzle and properly embraced his (all caps name / strawman) by registering it as a “Fictitious Name” with the state of Florida.

This process identified him as having a commercial and intellectual proprietary interest in the (all caps name). He, by entering it as such clearly on the Public Record, successfully rebutted all (12) presumptions on the private side of the Admiralty Court and nullified its “jurisdiction.”

What did he do?
The Registration of a Fictitious Name is something you might do if you wanted to open a commercial business and you wanted to reserve a “creative name” to identify that business. The process, however, does not obligate you to ever open a business or to incorporate. It simply reserves the name for your future use and as your commercial and intellectual proprietary property.

For many years patriots have attempted to disassociate their sovereign beings from the legal fiction – the all caps name / strawman - created by the corporate government because this was designed to make you personally vulnerable and convert your living being into a corporation – a thing – and the property of the corporate government.

Certain patriots properly decided to embrace the corporate fiction / strawman as their own personal property by affidavit using a Financing Statement filed under the UCC (Uniform Commercial Code) as a notice to the world. This is because an unrebutted affidavit stands as Truth in Commerce and the government never rebuts these affidavits.

So why didn’t it work?

The patriots bypassed one crucial step. They failed to rebut the presumptions of the private side of the corporate government and courts that imprisoned their sweat equity and labor.

An unrebutted presumption stands as Truth in Commerce. Their presumption nullified the affidavit and placed them on the private side.

There are twelve (12) key presumptions asserted by the Private Bar Guilds, which, if left unchallenged, stand as Truth in Commerce.
I’m only going to discuss (6) of those (12) presumptions. However, Frank O’Collins did a superb job addressing these presumptions in an expose’ titled “A history of today’s slavery” and I encourage you all to read it.

Canon 3228 (i): The Presumption Of Public Record

Any matter brought before a lower Roman Court is a matter for the public record, when in fact it is presumed by the Private Bar Guild as private business. Unless this presumption is openly rebutted by filing or stating clearly on the Public Record that the matter is to be a part of the Public Record, the matter remains on the private side as private Bar Guild business under private Guild rules.

The defendant in this particular case recorded on the Public Record the Registration Certificate issued by the state of Florida, identifying his registered ownership of the fictitious (all caps name), which proved that he was not the alleged defendant on the Courts Docket. I believe I should refer to him as the alleged defendant from here on.

Canon 3228 (ii), (iii) and (iv): The Presumptions Of Public Service; Oath And Immunity.

If the Judge ignores the alleged defendants Fictitious Name Registration entered into the Public Record, which is clearly presented to him in open Court and then decides to move forward with the case, he violates his public service oath and judicial immunity under these sub-sections.
Canon 3228 (v): The Presumption Of Summons
A summons, when unrebutted, stands as Truth in Commerce. Attendance in a Court is usually invoked by invitation and therefore one who attends Court initiated by a summons, warrant, subpoena or replevin bond, is presumed to accept the position of a (defendant, juror, witness or thing) and the (jurisdiction) of the Court.

If these instruments are not rejected and returned, with a copy of the rejection filed clearly on the Public Record (jurisdiction) the presumed position and the presumption of guilt also stands as Truth in Commerce.

In this particular case the alleged defendant rebutted his forced appearance by presenting the Judge with the recorded registration certificate issued by Florida. This certificate stated he is not the defendant on the courts docket. ‘The name is fictitious and I am the registered owner of that name under Florida law.’

Canon 3228 (vi): The Presumption Of Custody
Those who attend a Court initiated pursuant to the command of a summons or warrant, is presumed to be “corporate property or a thing” and therefore is liable to be detained in custody by the Courts appointed or elected “Custodian.”

Custodians may only retain custody over “property and things” and not flesh and blood living beings. Unless this presumption is openly challenged by rejection of the summons or warrant on the Public Record, the presumption stands as Truth in Commerce and you are thereafter treated as a “thing or property.”

In this particular case this presumption was absolutely rebutted when the alleged defendant proved his arrest was a case of mistaken identity and in no way could the Court Custodian detain him after that.

I do not accept this offer to contract and I do not consent to these proceedings.

In addition to the above sections of Canon Law 3228, the defendant has also unknowingly rebutted the balance of the (12) presumptions:
This particular defendant succeeded in accomplishing all of this by “registering” his ALL CAPS name as a “Fictitious Name” in which only he now owns an absolute commercial and intellectual proprietary interest in the state of Florida. By entering it in the (Public Record) he has overcome all (12) presumptions and nullified the “prosecution and jurisdiction” of the private Roman court. His next step would be to record it in the UCC, which is a notice to the world.

Checkmate.

There is no way for the corporate government and private Roman Court to proceed against this living being. If the prosecutor was to disclose the presumptive frauds that the Court has been operating under in the private side, it would also nullify the case and subject the judge to arrest and damages for “prosecutorial fraud” and the “absence of jurisdiction.”

Please note that the judge’s only legal response to the alleged defendant is to Order a “Stay” until the defendant secures counsel (meaning an attorney and BAR Guild member). If it is reported that the alleged defendant has not secured counsel the case remains absolutely deadlocked! If this open “stay” does not cause him any harm (and it shouldn’t) he can choose to

- do nothing or
- he can file a two page “Motion to Dismiss” or
- he can file a “Rule to Show Cause” seeking a summary judgment for damages on behalf of his living being.

What would happen if the individual follows the judge’s advice and hires an attorney? In all probability his attorney would use the alleged defendant’s “signed power of attorney” to withdraw the “Fictitious Name Registration” from the Public Record. The defendant would more than likely be imprisoned, tried on the private side, and convicted!
What other applications can this process be used for?

- licensing
- tax collections
- foreclosures
- debt collections
- the vehicle code, to name a few.

Again, checkmate! (Don’t you just love a good story with a happy ending?)
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Black’s compendium on Maritime Admiralty Law (word book)
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