

Why the redemption movement does not work

First uploaded 14th of October 2023 - [last edited 14th of October 2023]

By Aurelsson

In this paper I explain why the [redemption movement](#) in relation to the legal system does not work. In short, the redemption movement strives to re-deem or recover something that is lost or rightfully owned, hence the word redemption. The item that is claimed to be recovered is a 'trust fund' that allegedly has been set up at birth, which contains large sums of money and which could be used to pay bills and engage in all sorts of legal matters. I won't write too much about this as the various problems with this are obvious:

1. The general assumption is that people are victims and that they have been robbed out of something that was theirs based on the fact that they were born. The trust fund is seen as a collateral, promised for the labor that any man could do over any lifespan. Although this idea is technically and theoretically possible, it cannot be proven and thus is void in the legal court. Since people using this scheme end up in front of a judge, and since they will undoubtedly have matters to settle concerning contracts within the legal system (taxes, debts, bills etc.), it logically follows that they already have **contracted** with the legal system at some point. At that point it is game over as the judge will act as the owner of these people and dismiss all their claims. The correct behavior is to not recognize the legal system in any way. That means people have to let go of the idea that there is a trust fund, which goes against the whole idea of the redemption movement. As you can see, the redemption movement is void, not real and cannot have any existence, because it is intrinsically connected to another illusion called the legal system. It is another illusion projected on another illusion. Both cannot work in reality, but only exist in the minds of people. For both to work people need to **believe** in **both**. Since they are connected the judge will have the final say, so anybody engaged in this, will loose.
2. Any trust fund or secret bank account assumes the legitimate existence of the legal system. When recognized, the authority of the judge is absolute and no living individual has any chance. That is because the living individual **needs** their legal fiction, their person, to make claims. Game over from that point on. Once anybody needs to identify with the person, the system has you. Also, the redemption adherents correctly use the fact that there are two of you, one real (living individual) and one fake, the

person (the document). The problem with this is that the adherents of the redemption movement have mixed the two: They claim they are separate, but still **use** the legal fiction. When you use the legal fiction you **always act as if** you are the legal fiction. There is no other way. So what they do is mix up the two, failing to keep the separate, giving the judge - de facto - full jurisdiction over them.

3. Many adherents of the redemption philosophy constantly make the mistake to file claiming documents with the court or government, which in essence is another form of begging for something from those institutions. In this way they recognize the court or government (both legal fictions) and this will be subject to the jurisdiction of the judge. A guarantee to lose in court.
4. There are many documented redemption cases in which the legal system always wins. This is because the court can prove an **initial contract**. This means that redemption adherents at some point in the past have made a contract with the system. Either involving taxes, debts or bills in some form. They already have **consented** to the legal system. What they are trying to do is to **break their contract**. Since that is what they actually are doing, they will **always** lose. The system simply will gobble them up, because they already have given the legal system the authority to do so through the contract. The obligations connected to that contract are not settled yet and thus a bond to the legal system still exists.
5. This movement overlaps with the [strawman theory](#) and the [sovereign citizen movement](#) which is already outed in previous papers.

One final note. When you read the wikipedia page on this topic, it has a tone of 'all of this is pseudo-law'. I just want to make it clear that the entire legal system is pseudo-law. It is made up and not real. It is an illusion. What you have to realize is that the wikipedia page is trying to **deter** people from finding the truth about the legal system. The general message is: 'don't involve yourself with this or you get burned'. This is true, but all of the movements I outed in previous papers, are very close, but not close enough. This is because many prominent people of these movements are obvious controlled opposition agents. They are controlling the opposition to the point of imploding the movement from within. They say many good things, but then muddy the waters and send people astray in order that they make mistakes and lose in court. They **deliberately** mix the living being with the person. That will land anybody in jail.

My point is very different: realize that the living being and the person are separate: **always!** Which means that if you operate as a living being, the legal system does not exist and as such can be denied its existence. Nothing is signed and no person is used to act on its behalf. This is the very essence of how you can dismiss the legal system. But, for that, some things need to be sacrificed.