

Why the strawman theory does not work

First uploaded 29th of September 2023 - [last edited 29th of September 2023]

By Aurelsson

For this article I will use the Wikipedia entry of the [strawman theory](#) to show you why it will not work in court and why I think it is a controlled opposition mechanism to have people, who are actively looking to challenge the legal system, fail.

As with all controlled opposition, the theory does get some things right: It states that there are in fact two of you. One is the real living being and the other is the fake, illusory legal fiction, the person. Within this theory, the legal fiction or person is called the 'strawman'.

The [sovereign citizen movement](#), which I outed [here](#), along with the [redemption movement](#) and the [freeman on the land movement](#) are all connected to the strawman theory. They are all systems of controlled opposition, which **mix up** the real world with the illusory world. Keeping those two worlds separate is the key to comprehend the scam that is the legal system.

The fundamental flaw of the strawman theory is that most adherents of this movement try to evade taxes, debts and other responsibilities **while** recognizing certain processes within the legal system and sometimes recognizing the legal system itself. In other words, people try to evade responsibilities **after** they have contractual joinder with the legal system. They fail, because they cannot have it both ways and contracts and agreements do not work that way.

If you read my work, you will know that having your fingers in two pies will 100% guarantee you to fail, because you have established joinder/contract within the legal system to get benefits, but are trying to evade the responsibilities that come with that contract.

That is why the strawman movement is seen as people trying to defraud the system. And rightly so. That is because you **already** have established an **agreement** within the legal system and after, try to game that agreement with tricks. It is a fail-proof guarantee that you will get burned. In gaming your own agreement is an inherent dishonesty, isn't it?

The other flaw is that the theory promotes the belief that the government has set up secret bank accounts at the time of the issue of the birth certificate, i.e. at the time of the person's birth (note I use person, not living individual), which it uses as a corporate shell account to pay expenses on an elite level that nobody has any knowledge of. This is in line with the [redemption movement](#). This might be so or not, but it cannot be proven, and thus is void in court. It is void in any form of agreement between two parties as well. At least one party (most people) would have no knowledge about this scheme and thus could not agree based on that knowledge, i.e. it will not work for contractual joinder between any two parties.

The only thing that can come out of this is a public mockery and thus a perfect way to blow up this opposition by public ridicule. It is a form of an anti. You can read [here](#) and [here](#) what an anti is as a figure, but I propose that this whole theory is an 'anti-project' to be able to blow up the opposition and have people directed back to the main-stream. It is a way to deter anybody trying to oppose the legal system and thus frighten them to even try it.

The other flaw, or deliberate sabotage, of the theory is the distinction between capitalized letters and normal letters. The strawman theory claims that the capitalized name (like JOHN DOE) is the name of the legal fiction and that the uncapitalized name (like john doe) is the real name of the living individual. Both are lies. It **does not matter** how you capitalize the name, because the real distinction is if you **either** act as if you are the legal fiction **or** if you state that you are **not** the legal fiction. How you write it is another distraction to keep you from the obvious. This also applies to using red ink and your fingerprint for real people and black ink and the signature for legal fictions. The problem with this is that you still operate within the legal system. If you do use any of those examples above, it does not matter how you conduct business, rather the most important thing is that you show you **recognize** the legal system.

The key to comprehend all of this is to determine in which system you are working: You are working either in the legal system **or** in the real world. The legal world uses fictions and the real world, well, uses real things: In the real world spoken words, hand-shakes, honor and observable behavior are the fundamental mechanisms to establish **agreements**. When you deal with legal fictions, with the courts, with judges and within the legal system in general, you are operation in an **illusory** construct, whereas in the real world you would operate only through one-on-one agreements with another living beings who would show merit based on **behavior**. If either of the parties in the real world would fail their agreement, a termination of the relationship would be a possible outcome and violence would be another possibility. Interpersonal relationships would be far more tightly knit and people would be far more aware how and with

whom they would establish a contract. The quality of relationships would be far higher than what we experience in our modern times.

There is one aspect that is very important: the legal system does **not** recognize a living being to be able to **separate** him/herself from the legal fiction. This is logical, because the legal system only recognizes legal fictions, i.e. if something is legal or not legal. It would **never** recognize the living individual, because it has no jurisdiction over the living individual. The legal system has only jurisdiction over the legal fiction. The legal system only deals with fictions, so it would not even be possible to interact with living individuals. The big **trick** is that living individuals act as if they are a fiction for the system to work.

The only way to separate yourself from the person/legal fiction is to **not act** on its behalf. This means to **not engage** in anything that has to do with the legal system. This is where the strawman theory goes sideways, because it tries to have it both ways, one foot outside and one foot inside the legal system. It just does not work that way. You are either in or out of the system, there is no middle way.

Wikipedia does go on to state some more falsehoods that for example a living being is also automatically a legal fiction. Do not fall for it, it is a lie. You **have to act as if you are** the person to **join together** the living being and the legal fiction. The two become one for the legal system to work. It is **not** automatic. If it were automatic there would be no need in court to state you name, birth date and home address, would it? The judge would just be able to take your body and convict it, but that is not what is happening: the court **always always always** needs your **consent** to be able to convict you. In **any** court in the world, no matter which country. That is how the illusion can have a grip on reality, through **consent**. In other words it needs you to give the authority/jurisdiction to the **judge** before a ruling can be made. If you do not give them your consent, nothing can happen.

A court is a temple where commercial disputes are being settled. Always think in terms of contracts, agreements and commercial procedure. When you give them your name, birth date and home address then you have established joinder on behalf of the legal fiction and the judge will prosecute you.

When you **do not wish** to enter in any agreement with the state, there cannot be any legal procedure and thus no conviction. But, be careful **how** you enter into contracts with anybody or anything in the future. Additionally, the past can come and hunt you and if you have dealt within the legal system, you better be sure to respect that contract until it is finished. In other words, finish up unfinished business before you start denying the legal system.

Another lie from Wikipedia:

'It is impossible to dodge the law by insisting that an individual is different from his or her person. If a court can establish a person's identity, regardless of consent or cooperation, the court will engage in proceedings and sanctions against the individual.'

Do not fall for this as this is a lie. Why do you think the state is so keen on getting every baby registered? Think about that. Also, when you are denying the legal system, make it absolutely impossible for them to track down your identity. If they can 'identify' you, your chances to defend yourself will be reduced to only one option: you stating that you are not the person.

The truth of the matter is that this whole issue is all about **consent**. Without your consent nothing can happen. Of course you will be threatened, bullied, coerced and pressured, but hold your ground as they cannot do anything without your consent.

Just realize that there are two worlds, one fake, the legal system and one real, the real world where you live in. It is all commerce and it is all a way to screw you over at every turn that you make.