

ANOTHER PATRIOT BETRAYS HIS ABJECT WANT OF LAW KNOWLEDGE

From day one elitist-minded Americans within the nation's Federal, state, and local jurisdictions have abused the powers of American governing authority in order to monopolize the human and economic resources of the nation.

A seriously dedicated reader of the nation's past will discover the above statement to be a simple, repeatedly verifiable historical fact. Thomas Jefferson is quoted "*A certain rottenness begins when a man decides to run for public office.*" There's not a single year of our nation's past which is not replete with episodes in every geographic corner of everyday acts of "rottenness" as a matter of routine customs and habits.

[Take notice, In Jefferson's day, the word "*rotten*" conveyed much stronger connotations than today of reprehensible conduct and/or behavior. Reference to Noah Webster's 1828 first edition of his *American Dictionary of the English Language* includes the following definitions of "*rotten*", to wit: "*Not firm or trusty; unsound; defective in principle; treacherous; deceitful.*"]

In this country, no differently than elsewhere, public office – in practice – has always been viewed as a gateway to special privilege in which the office holder, his patrons, and his sponsors all receive special advantages not available to the citizenry at large. A popular phrase in 19th Century America, even found in court decisions, referred to public offices as "*offices of trust and profit.*" Thoughtful reading of the American record will reveal privileges for the few extended to the "Halls of Justice." It should be obvious that some citizens get full respect for their rights to due process of law -- and even more than justice could possibly allow -- while others get nothing more than lip service -- if the courts choose to be so indulgent.

However, there is no reason why any and every American citizen can't get all his due process of law rights respected any and every time he deals with any government actor, a.k.a. office holder, no matter the level where found. The reason is simple. Official authority extends only so far as any given office holder can prove his/her delegated powers when duly challenged in form and substance in a citizen's instant case of engagement with the office holder. And all such challenges must be answered by verifiable law facts which upon their face rebut the issues raised in the challenge. This harsh reality interposes itself on every public office holder because fundamental principles of American Jurisprudence relating to political authority, hence governing authority, are as immutably valid today as they were in 1776 when Americans declared their independence,

or 1781 when the British were compelled to concede that independence, or 1789 when the new American states ratified their national political trust deed: the Constitution of the United States of America.

But there is a catch. The individual citizen must be genuinely grounded in American Jurisprudence, not merely groping for it, but grounded in it. Neither can he rely on lawyers to do the work for him whenever confronted by presumptive “official authority”. Nor can he rely on the word of any other fellow citizen – as we may shortly discover herein -- who may project an image of authoritative knowledge of law. Former U.S. Chief Supreme Court Justice Warren Burger is often quoted remarking “*Seventy-five to ninety percent of American trial lawyers are incompetent, dishonest, or both.*”

So how competent in essential law facts do you suppose members of America’s self-styled Patriot movement are?

And how many public officials to include all rank and file public bureaucrats know anything of the foundational principles of American law related to governing authority and specifically to the law defining the limitations of their individual offices?

Sadly but not surprisingly, the answer to both questions is: Barely a single one.

If the aforesaid statements indeed are a fair representation of the political and jurial intellect of our Republic, then the reasonable question is:

How can ignoramuses in public offices be challenged regarding their presumptive authorities by ignoramuses who rightfully question the office holders and there be any possibility of predictable or rational outcomes to these processes – in short, how can there be outcomes in such instances which are pursuant to the nation’s much touted and ballyhooed, but patently ignored Rule of Law?”

The answer is simply that it can’t be done. But everyone will try; and, everyone will have his/her theory for what unfolds; and, sooner or later there will be outcomes in all such cases which generate more innocent and foolish theories; and, some will appear to be winners and others will discover they are undoubtedly losers.

And so now we come to yet another example of innocent juristic ignoramuses representing themselves to be politically and jurally literate regarding certain unalterable and key fundamentals of our American Jurisprudence. We find here yet another example of unwitting admissions of incompetence in these political law and related substantive

and procedural law matters by persons holding themselves out to others as torchbearers of truth.

This example came to the author's attention "on or about June 10, 2003." Below you will find text excerpts reprinted from an article captioned "***Beating Traffic Tickets in California***" in the January 15, 2002 edition of ***Tax Truth Newsletter: Exposing the Deceptive Tax Practices of the IRS***. You may access this and all other newsletters from this publisher to include becoming a subscriber by going to www.taxtruthnews.com.

In the disclaimer, the publisher states "***This newsletter exists for informational purposes only. It is authored and published independently from Eddie Kahn and American Rights Litigators....***" When you visit this site it will immediately become self evident that this newsletter is the "house organ" for Eddie Kahn and his American Rights Litigators organization.

If you are epistemologically literate it will occur to you that the statement "***published independently from Eddie Kahn and American Rights Litigators***" may connote and/or denote meaning for the word "***independently***" which at best is highly restrictive in its meaning and surely deceptive in its conveyance. Perhaps it simply means, the author of the newsletter is not Eddie Kahn and that neither does Eddie have anything to do with the act of posting the newsletter on the Internet or otherwise getting it out to paying subscribers. Such would make sense, after all a man can't do everything for himself, thus the need for hirelings. Perish the thought that the newsletter is representing itself to be an objectively independent news source with a penchant for reporting the doings of Eddie Kahn in each issue.

In any case, in the "***Beating Traffic Tickets in California***" section, the following statements are made:

"A man asked Eddie Kahn this week if he had ever heard of a guy by the name of James or Jim Woods who has a website at www.beatalltraffictickets.com. Eddie said he knew of him; he bought his package for \$200 just to see what this guy had, but after he got the material Eddie found out that Mr. Woods had never even used it. So, that was \$200 down the drain. Eddie thought he was buying something from this guy had used (stet) and was successful for him.

"Another man asked Eddie if any of that material he bought instructed a person to ask for a verified complaint. Eddie couldn't remember if Mr. Woods' materials

discussed anything like that since there was a lot of stuff in the package. This other guy wondered about that for he claimed to have beaten at least four tickets in California by asking for a verified complaint. He said he learned of this from Lynn Merideth's book How To Cook a Vulture, which also contains the forms for doing it.

“According to him, the state of California issues traffic ticket citations pursuant to Section 853.9 of the California Penal code. He said that's what it says on the bottom of their tickets. Evidently, that California statute says whenever you receive a notice to appear, you can request a verified complaint when you go for your arraignment. Then the court has twenty days to furnish it and if they can't, then they have to squash the ticket. To challenge the traffic ticket, you must specifically request the verified complaint. The time to do this is when you go into court for the hearing. If you don't request the verified complaint at that time, then the state can proceed with just the notice to appear. In other words, the state presumes to be acting correctly unless you raise the challenge.

“The man explained that the officer who issues the ticket is merely a witness when he comes to court. Thus, any testimony given by him at the hearing is irrelevant if there is no verified complaint. A verified complaint here is the certified statement of a victim, i.e. the testimony of someone you injured. Eddie asked this guy where he got the definition of “verified complaint” as that of the victim. The man said the lack of a verified complaint was like when you have a dispute with someone, but they refuse to sign a sworn statement saying you harmed them. That is what the verified complaint is – a sworn statement saying that a crime has been committed and a party has been injured. Without that the court lacks jurisdiction to proceed.

“This is very similar to what Eddie has talked about in the past few months about how ARL attorney, Milton Baxley, challenged a speeding ticket in Florida. He went and looked up the law and found the speeding statute to be limiting in nature. Often a law's applicability is right there in front of our faces, but we just never go read it and just assume our officials are acting correctly. We should never assume that a government agent is acting

within the bounds of their authority.” Tax Truth
Newsletter, Volume 2, Issue 2, January 15, 2002 available
at www.taxtruthnews.com.

With the above published statements that Eddie “*bought his* (referring to yours truly) *package for \$200 just to see what this guy had, but after he got the material Eddie found out that Mr. Woods had never even used it. So that was \$200 down the drain. Eddie thought he was buying something that this guy had used and was successful for him.*”, Eddie Kahn thereby reveals he harbors a child-like conceptualization of law in all its metaphysical splendor. Further reading his materials confirms the impression.

Eddie further admits to a child’s acceptance of hearsay information as if it were established fact. Namely, the idea that he could reject the subjects of author’s *Win Your Traffic Case:a.k.a. Travel as of Right* out of hand on mere heresy that the author had “*never even used the stuff*” demonstrates an immaturity of intellect so extreme as to question his legal research skills in every regard. Indeed on review of the statements in the instantly reviewed article as well as others posted on the newsletter’s website, it is clear that most of the “tax truths” propagated by Eddie and his organization to include his “house organ” are also hearsay, notwithstanding the usual illusions of law which are found in all statutes, codes, court rulings, *ad nauseum*.

Only the linguistically (a.k.a. epistemologically) literate person can expect to root out the semantic illusions and deceptions – the fallacies-- found in all bodies of law -- this linguistic literacy business being the subject of the author’s second workshop: *Secrets of Argument in the Courtroom and Elsewhere*.

Also, there is commentary in said newsletter article about the issue of verified complaints in the matter of traffic tickets with particular discussion about this specific item of law business in California. Here again there is rampant demonstration of misconceptions about the subject of “verified complaints” not only within the context of California traffic tickets, but traffic tickets generally, and to include the context of criminal law, keeping in mind in no state are traffic law regulations ever a part of a state’s penal code. All of this is over Eddie’s head, yet a decent introduction of this “*stuff*” fell into his hands when he received his own personal copy of the author’s above-referenced workshop in late February of 2000.

Further had Eddie read and understood the author’s workshop it is possible he would have gained new and useful insights regarding how to communicate with the IRS regarding presumptive income tax matters.

The income tax thing, of course, is Eddie's self-promoted field of expertise and thus the object of his enterprise -- ARL. But here also, he shows no conceptual grasp of his subject. Instead, he and his sturdy staff of professionals proceed by "hit and miss" – touchie-feelie grasping for law's metaphysical corpus.

Unwittingly Eddie and his staff of lawyers and accountants are unaware of the prerequisite jurisdictional issues which should be firstly raised by persons who wish to "challenge" IRS presumptions that they are taxpayers having outstanding tax liabilities requiring the filing of income tax returns.

In consequence, Eddie and his organization engage in a subset of the usual Patriot community contortions based upon well propagated myths derived from misinterpretations of fundamental law principles, applicability of tax codes, inadequate grasp of procedural law tools, and all the rest of the epistemologic difficulties with which members of the Patriot community seem to be eternally condemned to wrestle.

Their problems are not made easier because IRS agents, personnel, etc., are equally ignorant of how to handle challenges, etc. When ignorance butts heads with ignorance outcomes are always anyone's guess.

All of this is not say that Eddie and his organization have not, and do not, appear to enjoy successes in many of their endeavors because it is obvious that they do.

But Eddie and his professional staff are decoupled from meaningful comprehension of their actions and thus must live with a needless degree of uncertainty that is compounded by the fact that they really don't have a clue how their arguments should be mounted in order to put tax collectors in an ultimate position of having to acknowledge outright that IRS agents alone must shoulder the burden of proving the individual is a taxpayer pursuant to their presumptions and that they flat out can't do it. If IRS authorities can't demonstrate from their own presumptive records that any person, who is the object of their collection efforts, is not an income taxpayer, then the only presumption left is that the income tax scheme is a monumental fraud.

Unwittingly, Eddie and his organization use methods which leave IRS presumptions that their clients are taxpayers unchallenged. They don't know the jurisdictional prerequisite issues in their cases are never meaningfully raised. Thus they fight the flood miles down stream from its source.

Regarding all this, the author expects to offer his workshop on the income tax subject sometime in the summer of 2003.

Only persons who are willing to commit themselves to becoming linguistically literate and then applying those skills in analyzing fallacies inherent in our human language generally and thus in law language can expect to see through the smoke and mirrors of law generally and the nation's income tax schemes particularly. Again, this is the subject of the author's aforesaid *Secret of Arguments in the Courtroom and Elsewhere* workshop materials.

It should be obvious that individuals must also be literate in the political law upon which our nation's schemes of governance depend, as well as all attendant substantive and procedural law matters which must necessarily follow entrain to the nation's essential political law. This is the subject of the author's aforesaid *Win Your Traffic Case:a.k.a. Travel as of Right*.

Not lastly, one must know how to deal with public servants when they fail to answer the good faith and valid challenges of their presumptions of authority by responding only with silence and evasion. Public officials and all public bureaucrats react to challenges as they mostly do because they are too ignorant to do otherwise. How to deal with this problem is the subject of the author's third workshop *Play Hardball in Traffic Court*. The subjects developed in this workshop apply equally in all regulatory law matters and other laws also.

Not lastly regarding the above-described *Tax Truth Newsletter* dated January 15, 2002, there is a discussion regarding an attorney on ALR's staff, Milton Baxley, who is described as challenging a "speeding ticket" issued in Florida. It is said that "he went (sic) and looked up the law and found the speeding statute to be limiting in nature."

In an earlier newsletter, dated October 23, 2001, the details of Baxley's traffic case are reviewed. From reading the commentary and checking the statutes the author notes that ARL attorney Baxley is not only ignorant of the information provided in the author's workshop which Eddie purchased the preceding year, but further Baxley did not really understand F.S. 316.183 which he was charged with violating, nor did the judge when the attorney brought his specious argument to court.

Then to compound the irony, according to the October 23rd newsletter, the judge and police officer later discussed the case and concluded that in the future speeding violations should be raised by citing F.S. 316.189. If this is true, then the judge demonstrated his ignorance of law language for failure to recognize that F.S. 316.189 was strictly an administrative provision of Chapter 316 and not an enforcement provision which a

person could be cited with allegedly violating, and likewise Eddie Kahn and his professional staff displayed their law ignorance by even repeating this story.

Can a nation of ignoramuses be ruled by ignoramuses?

The answer is a resounding “YES!”

Just look around you. Of course, if you are juristically blind you will see nothing.

Former Chief Justice Warren Burger, above quoted, was probably to generous in his appraisal of the American Bar. Imagine what must be said for the state of incompetence and ignorance in the rest of the populace.

POST SCRIPT AND BY-THE-BY

Notwithstanding justice is unavailable to most Americans, nevertheless, wouldn't you agree that it isn't fair that Eddie Kahn may have thrown away good money for information he can't use?

Therefore, the author, James B. Woods III, is sending him an offer to return his \$200.00 if he will return the workshop materials he received back in March of 2000 along with a sworn affidavit that he has not copied the pages by any mechanical or electronic means and that he found the information contained in his copy of the 3-volume *Win Your Traffic Case:a.k.a. Travel as of Right* to be worthless and of no value at all to him.

Regards,

James B. Woods III