

# Why the sovereign citizen movement does not work

First uploaded 5th of September 2023 - [last edited 5th of September 2023]

By Aurelsson

In this article I would like to show you a few example video's of people who have been in court or dealing with police officers using the philosophy of the sovereign citizen movement and its various derivatives. You can read about this movement on Wikipedia, so I am not going to bore you with that here. I am just going to show you why it does **not** work with some example videos.

I recommend that you read my article about the 'person' first and the two articles on strategies in court. Once you have done that, have a look at the below video's and try to determine for yourself **first** why the people who you see have failed in their attempts.

What were their fundamental mistakes? What do you see that makes you conclude they have not fully comprehended the essence of the legal system? What stands out?

I will give you the link of the video and I would recommend you to watch it first and think about it, before you read my comments on it.

## **Video 1:** [Link](#)

First few seconds: How does the magistrate know the name of the defendant? Either he is known by the courts or he identified with the person. It is game over from that point on, because as the name is known, the magistrate/judge has full jurisdiction over the body and the person of Henry T. Elden. With this, the court assumes the defendant to be the person, the legal fiction. A few seconds in the video, the defendant makes himself known in court and the magistrate orders him to take the defendants seat. As you can clearly see, the magistrate behaves as if he owns Henry T. Elden. And he is correct, he now owns both the person Henry T. Elden and the body who has that person.

Mistake number two is that his buddy who is filming, states he is a witness and that 'Henry T. Elden is present'. Game over. What he actually says is that the **person** Henry T. Elden is present, but he means that the body who carries the person of Henry T. Elden is present. His buddy the 'witness' just screwed him over by confusing reality with fiction. By this point, the judge only needs to

steamroll over both these guys as he owns both of them. Additionally, by stating that you are a witness, you give authority to the process of court as an actor in the form of a witness within the theater of court.

Mistake number three: His buddy then says: "He is an American National". That is another label of a person that is not real. If he stated that, then Henry T. Elden automatically identifies as a person, because an 'American National' is not real. His buddy, de facto, also acts in this moment as Henry T. Elden's attorney, because he speaks on behalf of him. What a gigantic mess within just a few minutes.

American National is a concept in the minds of people and does not exist in reality. What I mean by this, nature around you is unaware of 'American Nationals'. Nature is only aware of living bodies walking around in nature. This means that both these guys have confused illusion with reality. The illusion is the 'American National' concept. Reality is the living body that walks around.

When you confuse illusion with reality, you will loose in court. 100% guaranteed. **Always** separate illusion from reality. As you can see, all these sovereign citizen terms, get people in a lot of trouble, because 'sovereign citizens' do not seem to be able to **separate** illusion from reality. People are not sovereign anyway, because only the **owner** is the sovereign. And as most owners are legal fictions as well, technically, only the Creator of the creation in which we live is the real Sovereign. The whole sovereign citizen movement is one giant mess of misinterpretations and mess-ups, because the concept of 'person' is not comprehended by many.

Mistake number four: Henry T. Elden then asks if he may have permission to...and then he is interrupted by the magistrate. Asking permission is recognizing the authority of the court over you. **Never** ever ask permission, plead or act submissive because that will land you in jail. Realize that the whole thing is a theater. It is not real. There is nobody there who is higher than you. There are just people there who are dressed up and put up an act. Nothing more. The magistrate only acts **as if** he is God in court, but don't fall for it. The rest of the video is just a travesty. Moving on to video 2.

**Video 2:** [Link](#)

Did you spot it? Yes, right at the beginning. The magistrate knows the name of the guy and calls him by his name, by saying "You are in contempt, Mr. Tertelgte". He answers, "no I am not [in contempt]". Because he does not correct the magistrate with the fact that he is not the person, he actually **confirms** that he **is** the person. The magistrate caught him focusing on the contempt rather on him being the legal fiction. He should have answered. "I am not Mr. Tertelgte, I am not a legal fiction".

You can only answer 'no I am not' to something that you accept what the other person has said. Here Tertelgte argues the act, while at the same time missing the context. The context is that he is not the person. While he does not comprehend the context, he does not realize that he has consented to the magistrate for being the person. Game over. She has full jurisdiction over him and the magistrate can do whatever she pleases with him, which she does.

The rest is an amusing shitshow that goes nowhere. The other guy then asks permission for something, thus recognizing the court and asks "what did he do wrong"? Well, I just explained the answer above.

But go deeper on this. If you need to ask what he did wrong, it means that you **consult** the authority to **tell** you what the **right** answer is. In other words, the other guy just recognized the court twice! First by asking permission and second by asking for a judgment of the magistrate on what is right or wrong.

You see how easy it is for a court to catch you off guard if you do not comprehend what is actually happening in court? You see how easy it is for people to subjugate themselves in court? That is because we all have been trained that way. We have a natural tendency to obey authority. Whether we want it or not.

It really helps to observe yourself in everyday life and see if you can catch yourself with these little off-guard nuances. It is a subtle art that needs study, practice and observation. Moving on to video 3.

### **Video 3:** [Link](#)

This one is easy to spot. Again, at the beginning. The court knows his name A. Marple. Besides all the rants and emotional anger, he does not correct the fact that he is not A. Marple. Game over. Whatever he says, it does **not** matter. The magistrate has **full** jurisdiction over this guy. Nothing he can do. The contract has been established by the fact that he identifies as A. Marple. Then the guy keeps on ranting and the magistrate remains friendly, which is her choice, but the case is lost. Next on to video 4

### **Video 4:** [Link](#)

The title is not correct as the guy in the car got a few things right, but where did it go wrong? I give you a hint: He wants to play by their rules, so when does he make a mistake?

You see that the cop wants to establish joinder, i.e. a contract. He does that by asking for a name and date of birth. That is the way for them to get jurisdiction over you. If you give them that, it's game over. The guy luckily does not give them that.

Where does it go wrong? The moment the guy asks "By law?", "Cite me that law please". Technically it is an act so not a law, but do you see what is happening here? The guy is playing by the rules of the cop. His argument is that an act is not a law, so it is not mandatory. But this is only true if you **identify** with the **person**. The truth is: Any act, statue or law is not real. It exist only in the legal system. So the guy is dragging himself into the legal system by contesting if it is an act or a law. It is just semantics and it is just content.

What the guy should be focusing on is **syntax**, i.e. the **context**, meaning **how** is he structuring his language in the first place and for what purpose? This means he needs to state he does not want to enter into any contract with the cop for any reason. That is the correct context no matter what the 'transgression' is. Then there is no need to debate acts v.s. laws. The guy in the car is stirring in the legal pot, whereas he should not be near that pot anyway.

He then goes on if he is a man or not, but that discussion goes nowhere. Done correctly, the man vs. person discussion only comes **after** the moment when the guy in the car says he is not the person in order to not establish joinder with any agent of the legal system. Only after such a statement he could debate man vs. person if he wishes to. To be clear, at no-time in the video does he say he is not the person, which makes his case very weak.

The correct way is to **not** identify with the person, to refrain from contracting with the cop, stating that you will not answer any questions and tell them to leave you alone.

Oh yeah, one more thing. It is helpful to practice remaining calm in any of these situations, because that will help the thinking and the execution of the right process. The moment emotions come into play, your chances to see it through correctly, diminishes greatly.

I know there is always the chance of violence of the 'authorities', but speak the truth until the end and they will let you go. The essence of all these stories is the fact that you are in conflict with you own **programming** and indoctrination. This take time, but that is what is really happening.

It also helps to know that the fear you feel inside is not real either. You feel it, but that is always connected to a pattern that you have learned in your days when you were a kid. You can slowly de-program yourself and break out of these patterns which they use against you. Grow up and overcome this. You can do it.

More analysis of videos in the future. For questions, my email is at the bottom of my website.