It's Your Turn!

You have had the right to contract as a private Trustee and not a State-owned entity the whole time. You have had the right to live free of Statutory Corporate fiction jurisdiction the entire time. You have had the right to correct how you operate in the world of commerce the whole time. You have had the right not to be infringed upon the entire time.

You have had the right to operate freely and privately the whole time. You have had the right not to give up your rights or privileges the entire time. You have had the right to research, learn, and overstand how the legal and commercial world has provided you with the truth. You have been given the experience and gift of life to live the life you choose to have.

You have had "In God You Trust" a part of you as a spirit of truth and understanding the entire time. You now have the right to distance yourself from a fictional world that was not created for your life but for other purposes much different than what God has intended for you.

Go forward, move ahead with your discovery, and read the following information below to consider what each word may bring you into a light that has been shining as bright as ever this entire time!

Team ALL Trust was designed to open the door to as many open hearts as possible. To help that discovery process happen, an abundance of research, historical facts, and precedent has been brought into a single-source solution available now. Enjoy the opportunity to live an abundant life ahead without fear or darkness that is hopeless energy. God Speed, Sentient Being!

Why Operate a Private Trust, Why You, Why Now?

Reduce or Eliminate Tax Liability

Your tax burden becomes a choice based on the potential benefits rather than an obligation

Freedom from Reporting Requirements

Any statutory body is a 3rd party and has no claim over the contract establishing the Trust.

Probate Free Estate Inheritance

Set up your heirs as Successor Trustees for seamless, probate-free inheritance

Asset Protection Liens, Seizures, or Claims

Protection from wage garnishment, seizure, or liens against your property

Superior Entity Type

Creating your commercial entity with your own pen-hand comes with distinct advantages.

Quick Start Your Business

The ability to easily create a legitimate business entity extremely quickly to pursue entrepreneurial endeavors

Freedom & Empowerment

Easily administer your affairs without requiring B.A.R. attorneys, accountants, or tax agents and their fees.

It's a new era, and it's time to begin operating like the 1% and free you and your family from the public domain. Privacy, Security, Free of Liability.

Principles of Trusteeship introduces you to the foundational concepts of:

- *The Express Trust and its Unique Existence as a Separate Entity*
- *Defining a Trust & Parties of the Trust Contract*
- *Irrevocability & It's Benefits and Protections*
- *Division of 'Legal' and 'Beneficial/Equitable' Ownership*
- *Role of the Trustee "Own Nothing, Control Everything."*
- *The Importance of a Private Contract in Statutory Vs. Common-Law*
- *Attributes & Protections of Trusts*
- *Separating the Trustee from Personal Liability*
- *Basic Administrative Powers of the Trustee to Uphold, Amend, and Expand Trust Provisions*

Who uses Private Trusts?

Individuals and Organizations within the wealthy community use private trusts, specifically irrevocable trusts, to limit their personal and tax liability to zero, 100% lawfully. This is declassified secret as many know this to be true, but 99.89% don't know why.

Now anyone can operate like the wealthy. Are you ready for a change?

Attributes Defining Equity, no tough conversation about trusts can be had without mentioning equity. Trusts are the most remarkable creation of equity in that they make possible a form of ownership relationship which allows a trustee to manage property for someone else's benefit. In finance, equity is the ownership of assets with debts or other liabilities. Equity is measured for accounting purposes by subtracting liabilities from the value of the assets.

Equity in law is the body of law developed in the English Court of Chancery and is now administered concurrently with the common law. In common law jurisdictions, the word "equity" "is not a synonym for 'general fairness' or 'natural justice'" but refers to "a particular body of rules that originated in a special system of courts." The Function of Equity in International Law. Oxford University Press 2021. pp. 11ff. Notably, equity gives the beneficiary an equitable remedy in proprietary rights that compel the trustees to specific performances in a trust dynamic.

Equity, in this case, provides the beneficiaries, who have an equitable title, a non-monetary remedy as opposed to the common law, which seeks the monetary right for damages. Equity is what ultimately compels the trustee to the specific performances expressed in the trust agreement. The equity administered shall be construed to be fair and just so as long as it is not in conflict with the common law of its jurisdiction.

THE DIVISION of LEGAL & EQUITABLE OWNERSHIP: Now that you have been briefed on equity, let's look at the other distinguishing factor of the irrevocable trust: the division of ownership. Ownership is "The complete dominion; the title, and equitable right in a thing or claim." The difference is that “title” suggests a monetary right versus the “equitable,” a non-monetary right. Equitable ownership is a beneficial interest in real property that gives the titleholder the right to acquire legal title to the property.

Equitable titleholders cannot transfer legal title to real property, but they benefit from its appreciation in value. In the Trustee’s case, having the legal title performs everything a corporation can do in public commerce with that title, but with no personal and tax liabilities attached to the beneficial ownership of that title.

Property placed behind a private contract in an irrevocable express trust completes the full release of harm from the grantee and, in effect, conveys legal title to the Trustee and equitable title to the beneficiary, producing the fair and legal separation needed for the Trust's tax & personal liability protection. This is how trustees can move assets into a trust and appear to have full possession of that title when legally, it merely is custody of identification free of the tax incumbrance associated with the beneficial ownership. Beneficial ownership is the interest in the value of the title that is determined upon the time of its legal distribution.

The Common Law Jurisdiction: The Common Law is a part of English law derived from custom and judicial precedent rather than statutes—often contrasted with statutory law. Once conveyed legally into the trust, the property enters the ordinary law jurisdiction, which is now enforced & protected by the newfound equity and provisions of the faith, where any state or government cannot impair the trustee's performance. The trust's creation results from a mutual and "voluntary association" that contractually first took place without the authority or power from a charter or other 3rd party but from the individual's unalienable right & authority to contract.

Contracting in trust form effectively exercises the right to rent privately & invokes the source of man to lay down a self-governing constitution. The First Amendment of the US Constitution states, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech (Which includes expressive contracts).” In Speiser v. Randall 357, 513, 518, 528-29 (1958), The U.S. Supreme Court held that “to deny a tax exemption to claimants who engage in certain forms of speech is to penalize them for such speech. Its deterrent effect is the same as if the State were to fine them for this speech.”

This private right to contract can nullify statutory implications of the trust, which means because its express derivation is of a constitutional & common law right, it denotes that legislative courts do not have jurisdiction over the trust's affairs and would need a common-law court to judge fact and equity on a private contract with its constitution.

In Berry v. McCourt, 204 N.E. 2nd 235, 240 (1965), the court held that the Express Trust is a "coming contractual relationship based on trust form,"; and in Smith v. Morse, 2 Cal 5524, it was held that any law or procedure in its operation denying, or obstructing contracts rights impairs the contractual and is, therefore, violative of Article I, Section 10 of the Constitution which states, "No State shall enter into any Treaty, Alliance, or Confederation; grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal; coin Money; emit Bills of Credit; make anything but gold and silver Coin a Tender in Payment of Debts; pass any Bill of Attainder, ex post facto Law, or Law impairing* the Obligation of Contracts, or grant any Title of Nobility."

Contracting is universal and, according to our Founding Father's philosophy, is a revolutionary principle that is self-evident under common law. Not only is the trustee a legal placeholder with no interest other than what the trust may work out in a private contract with the trust, the trustee, having gained the privilege of use and the power to convey rights, now holds trust assets in the private realm as a private citizen with no obligation of reporting unless otherwise stated in its constitution. *Trustee may contract with the trust non-monetarily or at the parties' discretion for capital interest.

The principles of "Free Exercise" are guaranteed explicitly in the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution and further codified in 42 U.S.C. § 2000bb, Religious Freedom Restoration Act. See section ion 508-(c)(i)(a) The Free Exercise Clause reserves the right of American citizens to accept any religious belief and engage in religious rituals. Free-exercise clauses of state constitutions that protected religious "[o]pinion, expression of opinion, and practice were all expressly protected" by the Free Exercise Clause.[1] Furthermore, in commercial/merchant law, we find no regulation of Express Trusts exists except in Constitution. See People v. Rose, supra.

Trustees have absolute rights in interstate commerce under the protection of the Federal Constitution. See Bruant v. Richardson, 126 Ind. 145, 25 N.E. 807; Robey v. Smith, Ind. Sup, in other words, the trust instrument must specify "express terms and conditions written, as the indentures of the constitution are law by a natural person's right of private contract." William A. Fletcher, The General Common Law and Section 34 of The Judiciary Act of 1789: The Example of Marine Insurance, 97 Harv. L. Rev. 1512,1514 (1984) "Statutory law does not assume to include the jurisdiction of the courts or to provide an exclusive remedy which the parties must follow, as such, no lawful impairment of the obligation of contracts can thereby be executed."

Common-Law & Equity "Where there is the absence of proof of jurisdiction, all administrative and judicial proceedings are a nullity, and confer no right, offer no protection, and afford no justification, and may be rejected upon direct collateral attack." Thompson v Tolmie, 2 Pet. 157, 7 L. Ed. 381; and Griffith v. Frazier, 8 Cr.

9, 3 L. Ed. 471. "Equity is a jurisdiction in which the individual has no rights. and one to which the individual can be subjected only if he volunteers or gives his informed consent." Howard Fisher

PROTECTION & PERSONALITY Additionally, In Elliot v. Freeman, 220 U.S. 178 (1911), "the court made it clear that the Express Trust is not subject to legislative control: It went further to acknowledge the right-wise stance of the United States Supreme Court that the trust relationship comes under the realm of equity, based upon the common law right of contract, and is not subject to legislative restrictions as are corporations and other organizations created by legislative authority." Weiss' Concise Trustee Handbook 2006 stated the Express Trust does not depend on any statute. The afforded private attributes associated with the Express Trust protect the trust even in commerce. *There is virtually no lawful method to pierce the trust without the express permission or implied consent of the parties or some unlawful activity on the part of the trust giving rise to a bona fide cause of action.*

As a result, virtually no direct evidence of the trust's existence can be found unless it is made to be found-and. A court can only hear it of competent jurisdiction. This is protection at its finest, hiding in plain sight as the elites well understand it. "He lives well who conceals [his assets] well." – Ovid (43 B.C.–A.D. 18.)

Contract Law & the UCC Consensus (facit legem) is a Latin Maxim, which means consent makes the law. See Bouvier's Law Dictionary. pp. 770-790 pp. (1928) "A contract is a legal agreement between the parties, and consent is an inevitable component of contracts' legality.

The consent must be free and fair and should not be induced by fraud, misrepresentation, coercion or mistake." The UCC's purpose is described in UCC 1-103: make uniform the law among the various jurisdictions. (b) Unless displaced by the particular provisions, the principles of law and equity supplement its provisions, including the merchant rule and the law of sensation, duress, coercion, mistake, bankruptcy, and other validating or invalidating causes. UCC 1-308 clarifies that "A party that with explicit reservation of rights performs or promises performance or assents to performance in a manner demanded or offered by the other party does not thereby prejudice the rights reserved.

Such words as "without prejudice, " "under protest, " or the like are sufficient." Legislative powers have created citizens to unknowingly consent through various means of debt instruments regulated by a foreign & independent authority in merchant law known as the Uniform Commercial Code. Another such consent is the creation of the legal fiction, "person." It is evidence of legislation enacting (HR-192) The House Joint Resolution 192 1933, mandating consequential foreign powers to have in rem "property" jurisdiction to monetize debt from the newly created persona.

That legal fiction, now assigned by unknown trustees to benefit "immunities and privileges" without beneficiary consent, is stripped of his constitutional rights. In

1933 rather than gold reserves backing the dollar, people became surety about the debt differently. One way is by a **Birth Certificate** when the baby's footprint is placed thereon before touching the land. The certificate is recorded at a County Recorder, then sent to a Secretary of State who sends it to the Bureau of Census of the Commerce Department.

This process converts an individual's life, labor, and property to an asset of the government when this person/citizen receives a 'benefit' from the government such as a driver's license, food stamps, free mail delivery, etc. The government-issued Birth Certificate is now a Registered Security, by evidence of the Committee on Uniform Securities Identification Procedures (CUSIP) number, which initially had an estimated value of One Million dollars. They have circulated the world as collateral for loans and entered on the asset side of ledgers just like any other security. That is why they are initially filed with the N.Y. Securities Exchange Commission.

THE PERSON in jurisprudence, a natural person, is a person that is an individual human being, as opposed to a legal person, which may be a private or public organization. Legal systems can attach rights and duties to natural persons without their express consent in the form of constructive & resulting trusts. Cornell Law, 22 U.S. Code § 1645a. Congruently, when a natural person creates an express trust via a declaration, that natural person then conveys its status to the trustee holding all the rights & privileges while remaining in commerce privately." No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." Amendment XIV Section 1."Where rights, as secured by the Constitution, are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which will abrogate them." Miranda v. Ariz., 384 U.S. 436 at 491 (1966).

As established, the strata in which the private right of contract operates grants its power from the expressed indentures in a trust as a natural person. Understanding what legal fiction is and its relation to your person is another fundamental factor in comprehending express trust's full power. A small number of people learn this legal jargon, much less how it came to be and the current active role it plays in today's Maritime courtrooms.

"A generally unknown fact is that there are several types of citizens. The trustee(s) of an Express Trust may seek protection under the Constitution as "state citizens" throughout the "union" of states, a jurisdiction outside the scope of the 14th Amendment[.] It should be noted of all citizenship that jurisdiction over natural and artificial persons is distinguished without a fundamental difference. This stems, surprisingly, from the operation of in rem jurisdiction, which underlies all civil law. All courts are familiar with the action in personam (against persons); it is the action in rem (against things) which, though practiced only in Maritime Law, stealthily operates in every civil and criminal court.

This principle is one of the least understood in its entirety. In rem, jurisdiction over a man and woman can only exist if the man or woman is an enslaved person, i.e., property or res (an object), in which case his or her disposition at law is no different than if he or she were a house or other goods." See Zong (Gregson V. Gilbert), 99 E.R. 3:3233 (K.B. 1783.) In nature, their Creator exercised jurisdiction over men and women exclusively. Governments can therefore gain only a fictional in rem jurisdiction over men by creating various legal devices (personas) for those men to assume limited control" (e.g., citizen, taxpayer, etc.) see Weiss Handbook & American L&P Ch. V § 65.

IMMUNITY TO SEIZURE *"To further illustrate how neither creditors nor the IRS can penetrate an Irrevocable Trust that the Grantor established when he was personally solvent, the case of Mr. John M. King is an example.* In 1969, oil entrepreneur and member of the Illinois House of Representatives John M. King was worth $300,000,000. In September 1971, Mr. King testified that he and his wife and four children still lived in an elegant, walled estate in a Denver suburb and had the use of vacation places in Palm Springs and La Jolla, California, as well as property in Vail, Colorado and Maui, Hawaii. Although his personal assets were currently tied up in bankruptcy court, Mr. King utilized these assets because he had placed 80% of his holdings into various Irrevocable Trusts. These were trusts established several years before for the benefit of his children.

Therefore, when creditors with claims of $42,000,000, including $5,300,000 already owed to the IRS, tried to collect, they discovered they could not penetrate the trusts that held the assets he formerly owned. This case proves that an Irrevocable Trust, properly established, is a separate legal entity from the Grantor. Assets that have been placed in a properly created trust are immune to seizure" U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit - 482 F.2d 552 (10th Cir. 1973). The trust property that is subject to the power of revocation is liable for the claims of creditors. (California Probate Code Section 18200, 18201). Similarly, suppose a Grantor is a beneficiary of a trust created by the Grantor.

The trust instrument provides that the trustee shall pay income, principal, or both for the education or support of the beneficiary or gives the Trustee discretion to determine the amount of income or principal or both to be paid or for the benefit of the Grantor. In that case, a creditor may reach the maximum amount that the Trustee could pay to or for the use of the Grantor under the trust instrument not exceeding the amount of the Grantor’s proportionate contribution to the trust. (California Probate Code Section 150304(b).

The Unincorporated Business Organization Trust is an irrevocable trust for the above reasons. An irrevocable trust contains language that precludes the property's original power from maintaining any ownership interest or legal control over the property. No creditor can invade the trust corpus and obtain any ownership interest and trust property with these two essential elements. Two recent cases demonstrate Irrevocable Business Trusts as asset protection devices.

In DeMaria v Bank California National Association, 46 Cal Reporter 924 (1965), to further expand and clarify tax liability not to overgeneralize the concept, liability varies widely via entity type, asset type, and transaction type, and module 1.2 of our course work takes a deeper look into specific scenarios that are most typically seen with modern trustees. This exemplifies dealing with your assets and explores where liabilities are attached in any transaction between your trust and your public organization.

The decision of the United States Supreme Court . . . holding that "the Express Trust are not subject to the Federal Excise tax on corporations, has emphasized this method of conducting business as compared with corporations. The best legal talent was soon impressed into the service of devising a means of affording the usual advantages belonging to a corporation without the authority of any legislative act. A method of placing the property into the hands of trustees, who held the legal title and issued certificates, similar to shares of stock, to the cestui que trust, showing the interest owned by each, possessed nearly all the advantages desired. This excludes the use of limited liability companies, joint-stock associations, and co-partnerships, which are organized under enabling statutes that merely enlarge the privileges possessed at equally burdensome to those imposed on corporations: Mr. Sears – Source work from William C. Dunn, Guy A. Thompson, & Sidney R. Wrightington.

CONCLUSION As proven previously, "in a non-statutory, irrevocable private trust, the trustee is empowered to do and act for himself/herself as an individual "sui juris." It has long been held that trustees of express trusts have greater latitude than ordinary trustees, simply because such trusts, created by individual's sui juris, may do whatever individuals sui juris may do." Harwood v. Tracy, 118 Mo. 631, 24 S.W. 214, 216; see Shaw v. Paine, 12 Mass. 293.

Now with this being said, what does "whatever sui Juri may do" actually mean? This again falls into the ability of the individual to draft & contract; for example: assuming the issuance of bond or note was made enforcing performance when a trustee holds capital interest in the trust, he is, in effect, an "interest-holder" holding a bond, exercising control over the affairs and res of the trust. He derives the sole benefit of his actions and determines the activities that would cause him to derive that benefit.; "a person who creates a trust may mold it into whatever form he pleases."

Perry on Trusts, I, §§ 67, 287 (4th Amer. ed.) *"There are no rules against a trustee or agent exchanging his individual property for a capital interest in the trust.* There is no rule against the trustee (or agent) holding beneficial interest. However, the holding of beneficial interest is generally regarded with great suspicion more than that regarding capital interest. The rule is that either transaction will sustain as non-avoidable if it appears free of fraud, concealment, or undue advantage". See Murry v. King, 153 Mo. App. 710, 135 S.W. 107 & Mills v. Mills, 63 Fed. 511 (C.C. or. 1894)

There is a significant difference between a corporation issuing equity and a trust. "The issue or transfer of a share in a joint-stock company makes the new shareholder a partner, and a party therefore to all contracts made by the company. In the case of a trust, the certificate holder is not a partner or a party to any contract of the trustees." Parsons on Partnership, §449 (4th Ed.) Trust notes or bonds issuing interest in the trust are of no value to the public, as the issuance of said security is only valid to those benefiting from the private contract. It is well known that "a trust may divide its trust property into shares and issue certificates" See Hart v. Seymore, 147I11. 598,35 N.E. 246 and Venner v. Chicago City Ry. Co., 258 I11. 523, 101 N.E. 949. The court in Warner v. Beers 38 clarified this principle most effectively: "Such added powers, however valuable, are merely accessory.

They do not in themselves alone confirm a corporate character and may be enjoyed by unincorporated individuals. Such a power is the transferability of shares. Such, too, is the limited responsibility [liability]. So, the convenience of holding real estate for everyday purposes is exempt from the legal inconvenience of joint tenancy or tenancy. Again: There is the continuance of the joint property for the benefit and preservation of the common fund, indissoluble by death or legal disability of any partner.

Every one of these attributes or powers, though commonly falling within our notions of a moneyed corporation, is quite unessential to the legality of a corporation, may be found where there is no pretense of a body corporate; nor will they make one if all were combined, without the presence of the essential quality of legal individuality[.]

Expanding our understanding of equity, trusts, and the ability to contract is not only a way to exponentially increase the methods one can do business, but even in a court of law, the trustee contract makes possible the invoke to estoppel under UCC 1-308; the gathering brings cause to secure the trust to be judged under the proper equitable jurisdiction that correctly determines the equity that compels the specific contractual performance in question.

The rights and privileges of the trust remain at the disposition of the trustee's capacity, which are but are not limited to: The inherent, unquestionable right to total compensation, including reimbursement of all out-of-pocket and other expenses incurred in the discharge of duties. (And unduly withheld reimbursement results in a lien on the trust for the amount plus interest);

The privilege of residing within the trust estate and allowance of rates and taxes " although he [the trustee] has the benefit of living in the house; The right to employ a solicitor for assistance and guidance in the administration of the trust, and, in the case of any doubt or difficulty, to seek the opinion of competent counsel, and, in the case where the trust's accounts are intricate and complicated, to seek the assistance of an accountant—to the charge of the trust; The right to apply to a court of equity for directions in the execution of the trust, or to obtain a declaratory judgment in order to establish the meaning and intent of the trust instrument; The right to carry on in separate business for the benefit of the trust given certain conditions the right not to be compelled by subpoena or review to produce and show records or books to outside parties; The right to further limit his liability in particular contracts, even beyond the limitation made in the trust instrument; The right to relocate, move trust property, or change the trust's domicile,82 and The inalienable right to disclaim the office at the execution, or resign at a later date.

The right is now, right now is your right to correct how you can live free of burden and stress and depart from a construct of corporations that, under their own devices, are laws made of man to inhibit the right to live free. For those who choose to govern their affairs and act in a humanitarian capacity, this path is one of virtue and deliverance. May you choose whatever way brings you closer to the soulful energy you were created from, and thank you for taking the time to get more purpose into your life and the life of others. ***Now it's your turn!***