

**Cause # 2015-3555; #2015-3556; #2015-3557
Guadalupe County Appraisal Review Board Hearing #2
Evidence submitted in writing by the Owner**

Cause #2015-3555: Property ID number: 50610

Legal Description: ABS: 4 SUR: MOSES BAKER 3.7400 AC.

Cause #2015-3556: Property ID number: 50612

Legal Description: ABS: 4 SUR: MOSES BAKER 1.6000 AC.

Superior Allodial Title Owner: Ronald F Avery

Cause #2015-3557: Property ID number: 59576

Legal Description: ABS: 35 SUR: JOHN SOWELL 2.6580 AC.

Ronald F. & Cynthia G. Avery Revocable Living Trust

**Address of Owner & Trust: 1933 Montclair Dr., Seguin, Texas
78155**

Phone # of Owner & Trust: 830-372-5534

**Place of Hearing: Guadalupe Appraisal District, 3000 N.
Austin Street, Seguin, Texas, 78155**

Time & Date of Hearing: 3:00 PM Wednesday 10/14/2015

On the issues of:

1. Property should not be taxed in TEXAS;
2. Property should not be taxed in this appraisal district or in one or more taxing units.
3. Other: Texas Constitution, including Art. 8 Sec. 1-e; Art. 8 Sec. 1(a); and other laws, including the unlawfulness of ad valorem property tax in America according to the Founders, part of the 9 statements of Fact I provided in the Notice of Protest (Step 4).

Table of Contents:

Table of Contents:..... 2

1. Introduction:..... 4

2. What do we base law upon? Is law based upon on principle? What Principles? 6

3. Principles of law according to Attorney Mr. Wood:..... 6

 3.1. Rely solely upon what is written in the Constitution and Texas Property Tax Code? 6

 3.2. Base it upon Democratic voting of the people? 6

 3.3. Base it upon Democratic voting of the legislature or representatives of the people? 7

4. Other Principles of law: 7

 4.1. Principles of Property: 7

 4.1.1. John Locke: Second Treatise of Government:..... 7

 4.1.1.1. Ownership of Property:..... 7

 4.1.1.2. Definition of Ownership of Property:..... 7

 4.1.1.3. Sole purpose of government: 7

 4.1.1.4. Do men give up or transfer their property to the state when they form the state?..... 7

 4.1.1.5. The Principle of Delegated Authority:..... 8

 4.1.2. Frederick Bastiat: The Law:..... 8

 4.1.2.1. Preeminence of property over the state and the law: 8

 4.1.2.2. Ownership of Possessions required to sustain life and liberty:..... 8

 4.1.2.3. The Law is: 8

 4.1.2.4. A Lawful State is: 8

 4.1.2.5. Complete Perversion of the Law: 8

 4.1.2.6. Rise of Unlawful Government Confiscation of Property or Plunder:.. 9

 4.1.3. Thomas Jefferson:..... 9

 4.1.3.1. The Declaration of Independence:..... 9

 4.1.3.1.1. People Cannot Transfer Their Property to Government Upon its Creation or any other time in its Support:..... 9

 4.1.3.1.2. Unalienable rights: 10

 4.1.3.2. A Summary View of the Rights of British America:..... 10

 4.1.3.2.1. The People own the Property:..... 10

 4.1.3.2.2. No form of government can lawfully own the property of the People:..... 11

 4.1.4. John Adams: A Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law: 11

 4.1.4.1. The two tyrannies the founders of America designed the nation to defend against: 11

 4.1.5. Samuel Adams: 14

 4.1.5.1. Correction of Perverted Law, Plunder and Feudalism:..... 14

 4.1.5.2. Samuel Adams says the People are cheated out of their property: ... 14

 4.1.5.3. But he also gave us the solution..... 14

5. I hereby adopt all that I have submitted earlier as part of this protest. 15

6. Taxable Situs:..... 15

6.1.	Property Should Not Be Taxed in any of the several United States of America: .	15
7.	Property Should Not Be Taxed in Texas:	15
7.1.	Mr. Wood did not show that Texas was not a State of the United States of America:.....	15
8.	Property Should Not Be Taxed in Guadalupe County Texas:	15
9.	It is absurd to study the Texas Property Tax Code:	15
10.	Current Condition of Law today is a farce:	16
11.	I therefore request that my three properties the subject of this hearing be removed from the local feudal land system or the so-called "ad valorem property tax" rolls.	16
12.	I also request that all property of every citizen in Texas be removed from the feudal land and property system.	16

1. Introduction:

Mr. Dylan Wood, attorney for the Guadalupe County Appraisal District, has joined the issue of my protest well. He has not applied all the evidence of my protest nor has he understood the gravity of my protest. But Mr. Wood has organized my protest and has understood that the same is permitted by the State in a protest hearing.

However, Mr. Wood has termed the issues of the second protest hearing granted by the Guadalupe County Appraisal District, as "three discrete matters." This term *discrete* is generally understood as using discernment to distinguish between different issues related to a topic. But it can also imply that something is unrelated to the matter at hand, in our case, "property tax." I will assure you that nothing is more related to the topic of "property tax" than to determine, once and for all, who really owns the property in the State of Texas, the State or the People. And if we find that the State owns all the property in Texas including the life, liberty and possessions of the people then we will continue to rent our liberty and possessions from the State that created them and granted them to us for our limited tenure and pleasure. But if we find that the People in Texas own the property in Texas then the State must stop renting the homes and businesses of the People to the People as if the State had created them and granted them to us.

Now we can all go read the Texas Constitution and the Texas Property Tax Code and come up with what Mr. Wood is telling us here. And he calls my argument that my property is not taxable in Texas "specious." Well, at least, he recognizes that my argument sounds good, even if he thinks it isn't sound, as a specious argument is one that sounds good but is flawed for some reason that is hidden to the one who ponders it. We must presume then that Mr. Wood is going to provide us with the profound principle that proves my argument is false. He has admitted in his first and second letter that my argument sounds good but he insists that there is something wrong with it. However, all he has done is read to us from the Texas Constitution and the Texas Property Tax Code as if that alone is enough to put an end forever to any further consideration of who owns the life, liberty and possessions of the People. We must conclude from Mr. Wood that any one can quickly ascertain the fact that the State owns the People and their lives, liberties and possessions by simply reading the Texas Constitution and the Texas Property Tax Code. I ask you: "Is that the response of a judicious mind?" I say there are errors and contradictions in the Constitutional law and the Texas Property Tax Code is the work of tyrants.

If it be so easy to determine what Article 8 Section 1-e really means, then why are hundreds of school districts across Texas constantly suing the State challenging the constitutionality of ad valorem property tax? Why not just go read the Texas Constitution and the Texas Property Tax Code? That will tell them immediately the answers to all their deep questions about property taxation. Why is it that the Judicial system will not let citizens, who have constitutional rights, challenge the ad valorem property tax system while they will let government fictions like school districts, that don't have constitutional rights, challenge the interpretation of Article 8 Section 1-e?

Mr. Wood, in his first letter, restates really well one of my arguments in support of the unlawfulness of ad valorem property taxes in Texas and then fails to perceive of the very logic of his restatement:

"Mr. Avery makes the circular argument that since the state constitution now forbids "the State" from levying a property tax, and, that since taxing units are political subdivisions of the state, and are therefore considered "the State" for some purposes, that they cannot levy a property tax. This argument takes one sentence of our lengthy Constitution completely out of context in an attempt to avoid paying his fair share of the burden of taxes and completely ignores the other, more relevant sections of the Constitution."

Once again I will point out that the argument that he restates is not a "circular argument" but a linear deductive argument which says If A cannot impose a property tax and B, C and D are considered to be A, by law, then B, C and D cannot impose a property tax. I admit; I did not get that from the Texas Property Tax Code but I did get it from the Texas Constitution and the Texas Civil Practice and Remedy Code and the Texas Education Code. Mr. Wood also seems to fall for the false doctrine that State subdivisions are not the State and that they have some other purpose and authority obtained from outside the State of Texas. I will assure you that he is incorrect and it is rather he who has a "profound misunderstanding of our laws," as many other citizens of Texas and the United States do.

Mr. Wood reminds me of a pastor who reads from the Bible: "But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:"¹ Then boldly declares to the congregation; "What great things Christ will one day perform for us!" The pastor reads the great works accomplished by Christ then boldly and jubilantly declares those works undone.

I quote from Mr. Wood's first letter:

"Tex. Const. art. VIII, § 1-e, (emphasis added). Here the will of the people in 1968 was to abolish a statewide property tax ten years in the future. With that vote, the people decided to remove a statewide property tax from the power of the Legislature. It did not, however, remove the property tax altogether. On the contrary, all property is subject to taxation unless exempt by law:

Sec. 1. (a) Taxation shall be equal and uniform.

(b) *All real property and tangible personal property in this State, unless exempt as required or permitted by this Constitution, whether owned by natural persons or corporations, other than municipal, shall be taxed in proportion to its value, which shall be ascertained as may be provided by law.*"

If Article 8 Section 1(a) says that all "Taxation shall be equal and uniform" how can an ad valorem property tax be imposed on all the property of Texas by State Subdivisions only if they are not uniform and not equal? This is exactly why the school districts are constantly suing the State. The school district tax rates reach the maximum ceiling imposed by the legislature which makes them uniform and the Supreme Court of Texas rules that they then violate Article 8 Section 1-e by becoming a uniform statewide ad valorem property tax. But ALL TAXATION MUST BE EQUAL AND UNIFORM!

Article 8 Section 1-e either Abolishes All State ad valorem property taxes in the State of Texas as it says it does or it overturns Article 8 Section 1(a) and makes non-equal and non-uniform taxes lawful in Texas.

¹ Ephesians 2:4-6.

Also notice that Mr. Wood stated that the legislature gave a new spin on the Abolition of Ad Valorem Property Taxes the People had just passed in 1969. What? The legislature! They aren't the People! The People said one thing and the legislature said another thing without authority of the People. Article 8 Section 1-e is clear and is in harmony with Article 8 Section 1(a). It is the later violations by the legislature that don't fit.

But the question should not be who, what, how, and why the property of the People was confiscated by the State, but rather what it will take for the State to finally recognize that the People do, in fact, own their property and the State cannot continue to act as if they own it and charge the People a rent to occupy or possess their own property.

It is not important for me or anyone else to show how and why the confiscation of the property of the People took place. It is only important that I show that the State cannot actually own the property of the People nor levy and collect a rent on any property of the People and that I and my fellow citizens have a right to expect the State of Texas we created for our benefit to recognize once again that we own our property and that the State cannot impose a rent on any of it, for the very purpose of lawful government is the protection of the property of the People not the confiscation of it and the levy of rents upon it from the true owners. All lawful governments recognize the true purpose of government and will vacate any false doctrine or law that confiscates the property of the People and will cease to hold the People accountable for rents they do not owe the State.

I think we can all understand what Mr. Wood is telling the ARB, namely, don't think about anything just obey the Texas Property Tax Code and that is the law of the land. He has not told us a single principle that justifies the state collection of rent on all stationary and personal property of the People of Texas who actually own all the Property in Texas. Mr. Wood simply tells us to read the particular provision of the Constitution that refers to the State subdivision that is collecting it and pay not attention at all to the contradictions between those provisions of the Texas Constitution.

My response to that great Wood declaration is that we should all consider why these contradictions exist. And what I will show herein is that those contradictions exist because the People of Texas have been deceived by clever bankers, lawyers and legislators into paying the State a rent to possess their own property. Let me say right now that I am happy to pay a reasonable rent to the real owner of any property that I do not own. But even the state says I own the three pieces of property the subject of this hearing and therefore do not owe any rent to the State of Texas that does not own it.

There is no such thing as "property rights" if the person is not recognized as the true superior allodial title holder of their property. No one can say they have property rights if they don't own property. The term "Property rights" is merely a feel-good political slogan used to deceive the People into thinking they have them when the State does not in fact recognize them as owning any property even their life, liberty or possessions.

2. What do we base law upon? Is law based upon on principle? What Principles?
3. Principles of law according to Attorney Mr. Wood:
 - 3.1. Rely solely upon what is written in the Constitution and Texas Property Tax Code?
 - 3.2. Base it upon Democratic voting of the people?

- 3.3. Base it upon Democratic voting of the legislature or representatives of the people?
4. Other Principles of law:
 - 4.1. Principles of Property:
 - 4.1.1. John Locke: Second Treatise of Government:
 - 4.1.1.1.Ownership of Property:

The rise of private property: "Though the earth, and all inferior creatures, be common to all men, yet every man has a property in his own person: this no body has any right to but himself. The labour of his body, and the work of his hands, we may say, are properly his. Whatsoever then he removes out of the state that nature hath provided, and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property. It being by him removed from the common state nature hath placed it in, it hath by this labour something annexed to it, that excludes the common right of other men:"
 - 4.1.1.2.Definition of Ownership of Property:

"To understand political power right, and derive it from its original, we must consider, what state all men are naturally in, and that is, a state of perfect freedom to order their actions, and dispose of their possessions and persons, as they think fit, within the bounds of the law of nature, without asking leave, or depending upon the will of any other man."
 - 4.1.1.3.Sole purpose of government:

"If man in the state of nature be so free, as has been said; if he be absolute lord of his own person and possessions, equal to the greatest, and subject to no body, why will he part with his freedom? why will he give up this empire, and subject himself to the dominion and controul of any other power? To which it is obvious to answer, that though in the state of nature he hath such a right, yet the enjoyment of it is very uncertain, and constantly exposed to the invasion of others: for all being kings as much as he, every man his equal, and the greater part no strict observers of equity and justice, the enjoyment of the property he has in this state is very unsafe, very unsecure. This makes him willing to quit a condition, which, however free, is full of fears and continual dangers: and it is not without reason, that he seeks out, and is willing to join in society with others, who are already united, or have a mind to unite, for the mutual preservation of their lives, liberties and estates, which I call by the general name, property. "The great and chief end, therefore, of men's uniting into commonwealths, and putting themselves under government, is the preservation of their property. To which in the state of nature there are many things wanting."
 - 4.1.1.4.Do men give up or transfer their property to the state when they form the state?

"But though men, when they enter into society, give up the equality, liberty, and executive power they had in the state of nature, into the hands of the society, to be so far disposed of by the legislative, as the good of the society shall require; yet it being only with an intention in every one the better to preserve himself, his liberty and property; (for no rational creature can be

supposed to change his condition with an intention to be worse) the power of the society, or legislative constituted by them, can never be supposed to extend farther, than the common good; but is obliged to secure every one's property, by providing against those three defects above mentioned, that made the state of nature so unsafe and uneasy."

4.1.1.5.The Principle of Delegated Authority:

No one has authority to take my property and make me pay rent on it and therefore they cannot delegate such an authority to the government to take my property and make me pay a rent to the government.

4.1.2. Frederick Bastiat: The Law:

4.1.2.1.Preeminence of property over the state and the law:

"Life, liberty, and property do not exist because men have made laws. On the contrary, it was the fact that life, liberty, and property existed beforehand that caused men to make laws in the first place."

4.1.2.2.Ownership of Possessions required to sustain life and liberty:

"Each of us has a natural right—from God—to defend his person, his liberty, and his property. These are the three basic requirements of life, and the preservation of any one of them is completely dependent upon the preservation of the other two."

4.1.2.3.The Law is:

"collective organization of the individual right to lawful defense [of property]."

4.1.2.4.A Lawful State is:

"If every person has the right to defend—even by force—his person, his liberty, and his property, then it follows that a group of men have the right to organize and support a common force to protect these rights constantly. Thus the principle of collective right—its reason for existing, its lawfulness—is based on individual right. And the common force that protects this collective right cannot logically have any other purpose or any other mission than that for which it acts as a substitute. Thus, since an individual cannot lawfully use force against the person, liberty, or property of another individual, then the common force—for the same reason—cannot lawfully be used to destroy the person, liberty, or property of individuals or groups. Such a perversion of force would be, in both cases, contrary to our premise. Force has been given to us to defend our own individual rights. Who will dare to say that force has been given to us to destroy the equal rights of our brothers? Since no individual acting separately can lawfully use force to destroy the rights of others, does it not logically follow that the same principle also applies to the common force that is nothing more than the organized combination of the individual forces? If this is true, then nothing can be more evident than this: The law is the organization of the natural right of lawful defense. It is the substitution of a common force for individual forces. And this common force is to do only what the individual forces have a natural and lawful right to do: to protect persons, liberties, and properties; to maintain the right of each, and to cause justice to reign over us all."

4.1.2.5.Complete Perversion of the Law:

"But, unfortunately, law by no means confines itself to its proper functions. And when it has exceeded its proper functions, it has not done so merely in some inconsequential and debatable matters. The law has gone further than this; it has acted in direct opposition to its own purpose. The law has been used to destroy its own objective: It has been applied to annihilating the justice that it was supposed to maintain; to limiting and destroying rights which its real purpose was to respect. The law has placed the collective force at the disposal of the unscrupulous who wish, without risk, to exploit the person, liberty, and property of others. It has converted plunder into a right, in order to protect plunder. And it has converted lawful defense into a crime, in order to punish lawful defense."

4.1.2.6. Rise of Unlawful Government Confiscation of Property or Plunder:

"Man can live and satisfy his wants only by ceaseless labor; by the ceaseless application of his faculties to natural resources. This process is the origin of property. But it is also true that a man may live and satisfy his wants by seizing and consuming the products of the labor of others. This process is the origin of plunder. Now since man is naturally inclined to avoid pain—and since labor is pain in itself—it follows that men will resort to plunder whenever plunder is easier than work. History shows this quite clearly. And under these conditions, neither religion nor morality can stop it. When, then, does plunder stop? It stops when it becomes more painful and more dangerous than labor. It is evident, then, that the proper purpose of law is to use the power of its collective force to stop this fatal tendency to plunder instead of to work. All the measures of the law should protect property and punish plunder. But, generally, the law is made by one man or one class of men. And since law cannot operate without the sanction and support of a dominating force, this force must be entrusted to those who make the laws. This fact, combined with the fatal tendency that exists in the heart of man to satisfy his wants with the least possible effort, explains the almost universal perversion of the law. Thus it is easy to understand how law, instead of checking injustice, becomes the invincible weapon of injustice. It is easy to understand why the law is used by the legislator to destroy in varying degrees among the rest of the people, their personal independence by slavery, their liberty by oppression, and their property by plunder. This is done for the benefit of the person who makes the law, and in proportion to the power that he holds."

4.1.3. Thomas Jefferson:

4.1.3.1. The Declaration of Independence:

4.1.3.1.1. People Cannot Transfer Their Property to Government Upon its Creation or any other time in its Support:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its

foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

4.1.3.1.2. Unalienable rights:

Those rights and property that cannot be separated from the person. The right of a person to own their own property with an allodial superior title that cannot be confiscated and rented back to them by the state is an unalienable right. No lawful state can rent the property of a person back to them. If the person does not own the property and the state actually owns it then the person would owe rent if they leased it from the state.

4.1.3.2.A Summary View of the Rights of British America:

4.1.3.2.1. The People own the Property:

Jefferson says people own their property in all states of the union with an unalienable allodial superior title that cannot be confiscated by the state or union and leased back to them:

"That we shall at this time also **take notice of an error in the nature of our land holdings, which crept in at a very early period of our settlement.** The introduction of the feudal tenures into the kingdom of England, though antient, is well enough understood to set this matter in a proper light. In the earlier ages of the Saxon settlement feudal holdings were certainly altogether unknown; and very few, if any, had been introduced at the time of the Norman conquest. **Our Saxon ancestors held their lands, as they did their personal property, in absolute dominion, disencumbered with any superior, answering nearly to the nature of those possessions which the feudalists term allodial.** William, the Norman, first introduced that system generally. The lands which had belonged to those who fell in the battle of Hastings, and in the subsequent insurrections of his reign, formed a considerable proportion of the lands of the whole kingdom. These he granted out, subject to feudal duties, as did he also those of a great number of his new subjects, who, by persuasions or threats, were induced to surrender them for that purpose. **But still much was left in the hands of his Saxon subjects; held of no superior, and not subject to feudal conditions.** These, therefore, by express laws, enacted to render uniform the system of military defense, were made liable to the same military duties as if they had been feuds; and the Norman lawyers soon found means to saddle them also with all the other feudal burthens. But still they had not been surrendered to the king, they were not derived from his grant, and therefore they were not holden of him. A general principle, indeed, was introduced, that "all lands in England were held either mediately or immediately of the crown," but this was borrowed from those holdings, which were truly feudal, and only applied to others for the purposes of illustration. **Feudal holdings were therefore but exceptions out of the Saxon laws of possession, under which all lands were held in absolute right. These, therefore, still form the basis, or ground-work, of the common law, to prevail wheresoever the exceptions have not taken place. America was not conquered by William the Norman, nor its lands surrendered to him, or any of his**

successors. Possessions there are undoubtedly of the allodial nature. Our ancestors, however, who migrated hither, were farmers, not lawyers. **The fictitious principle that all lands belong originally to the king, they were early persuaded to believe real;** and accordingly took grants of their own lands from the crown. And **while the crown continued to grant for small sums, and on reasonable rents; there was no inducement to arrest the error,** and lay it open to public view. **But his majesty has lately taken on him to advance the terms of purchase, and of holding to the double of what they were;** by which means the acquisition of lands being rendered difficult, the population of our country is likely to be checked. **It is time, therefore, for us to lay this matter before his majesty, and to declare that he has no right to grant lands of himself.** From the nature and purpose of civil institutions, all the lands within the limits which any particular society has circumscribed around itself are assumed by that society, and subject to their allotment only. This may be done by themselves, assembled collectively, or by their legislature, to whom they may have delegated sovereign authority; and if they are allotted in neither of these ways, each individual of the society may appropriate to himself such lands as he finds vacant, and occupancy will give him title."² (Emphasis added)

4.1.3.2.2. No form of government can lawfully own the property of the People:

The foregoing by Jefferson does not mean only the king of England could not rent a citizen's land back to them but that no lawful state could do such a thing, regardless of the political structure it had such as a monarchy or democratic republic with three branches of government.

4.1.4. John Adams: A Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law:

4.1.4.1. The two tyrannies the founders of America designed the nation to defend against:

John Adams also agrees with Thomas Jefferson and Samuel Adams regarding the true nature of our allodial titles to all our property which cannot be alienated in order to secure payment of money or "taxes" to any government. All these men agree as to what was won for all the states of the union in 1776-1789. John Adams made it clear that it was not only the thirst for religious liberty that drove people to America and made them secure her independence from the rest of the world but their desire to escape the feudal system as well. These two evils, religious persecution and the feudal land system, were hated by early Americans as that which had enslaved them for centuries in the dark ages. And now we live under the feudal property system once again: "Ignorance and inconsideration are the two great causes of the ruin of mankind. By what causes it was brought to pass, that the people in the middle ages became more intelligent in general, would not, perhaps, be possible in

² Thomas Jefferson, *A Summary View of the Rights of British America* (http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/jeffsumm.asp)

these days to discover. But the fact is certain; and wherever a general knowledge and sensibility have prevailed among the people, arbitrary government and every kind of oppression have lessened and disappeared in proportion. Man has certainly an exalted soul; and the same principle in human nature, — that aspiring, noble principle founded in benevolence, and cherished by knowledge; I mean the love of power, which has been so often the cause of slavery, — has, whenever freedom has existed, been the cause of freedom. If it is this principle that has always prompted the princes and nobles of the earth, by every species of fraud and violence to shake off all the limitations of their power, it is the same that has always stimulated the common people to aspire at independency, and to endeavor at confining the power of the great within the limits of equity and reason. The poor people, it is true, have been much less successful than the great. They have seldom found either leisure or opportunity to form a union and exert their strength; ignorant as they were of arts and letters, they have seldom been able to frame and support a regular opposition. This, however, has been known by the great to be the temper of mankind; and they have accordingly labored, in all ages, to wrest from the populace, as they are contemptuously called, the knowledge of their rights and wrongs, and the power to assert the former or redress the latter. I say RIGHTS, for such they have, undoubtedly, antecedent to all earthly government, — Rights, that cannot be repealed or restrained by human laws — Rights, derived from the great Legislator of the universe. Since the promulgation of Christianity, **the two greatest systems of tyranny that have sprung from this original, are the canon and the feudal law.** The desire of dominion, that great principle by which we have attempted to account for so much good and so much evil, is, when properly restrained, a very useful and noble movement in the human mind. But when such restraints are taken off, it becomes an encroaching, grasping, restless, and ungovernable power. **Numberless have been the systems of iniquity contrived by the great for the gratification of this passion in themselves; but in none of them were they ever more successful than in the invention and establishment of the canon and the feudal law.** By the former of these, the most refined, sublime, extensive, and astonishing constitution of policy that ever was conceived by the mind of man was framed by the Romish clergy for the aggrandizement of their own order. All the epithets I have here given to the Romish policy are just, and will be allowed to be so when it is considered, that they even persuaded mankind to believe, faithfully and undoubtingly, that God Almighty had entrusted them with the keys of heaven, whose gates they might open and close at pleasure; with a power of dispensation over all the rules and obligations of morality; with authority to license all sorts of sins and crimes; with a power of deposing princes and absolving subjects from allegiance; with a power of procuring or withholding the rain of heaven and the beams of the sun; with the management of earthquakes, pestilence, and famine; nay, with the mysterious, awful, incomprehensible power of creating out of bread and wine the flesh and blood of God himself. All these opinions they were enabled to spread and rivet among the people by reducing their minds to a state of

sordid ignorance and staring timidity, and by infusing into them a religious horror of letters and knowledge. Thus was human nature chained fast for ages in a cruel, shameful, and deplorable servitude to him, and his subordinate tyrants, who, it was foretold, would exalt himself above all that was called God, and that was worshipped. In the latter we find another system, similar in many respects to the former; which, **although it was originally formed, perhaps, for the necessary defense of a barbarous people against the inroads and invasions of her neighboring nations, yet for the same purposes of tyranny, cruelty, and lust, which had dictated the canon law, it was soon adopted by almost all the princes of Europe, and wrought into the constitutions of their government.** It was originally a code of laws for a vast army in a perpetual encampment. The general was invested with the sovereign propriety of all the lands within the territory. Of him, as his servants and vassals, the first rank of his great officers held the lands; and in the same manner the other subordinate officers held of them; and all ranks and degrees held their lands by a variety of duties and services, all tending to bind the chains the faster on every order of mankind. In this manner the common people were held together in herds and clans in a state of servile dependence on their lords, bound, even by the tenure of their lands, to follow them, whenever they commanded, to their wars, and in a state of total ignorance of every thing divine and human, excepting the use of arms and the culture of their lands. **"But another event still more calamitous to human liberty, was a wicked confederacy between the two systems of tyranny above described. It seems to have been even stipulated between them, that the temporal grandees should contribute every thing in their power to maintain the ascendancy of the priesthood, and that the spiritual grandees in their turn, should employ their ascendancy over the consciences of the people, in impressing on their minds a blind, implicit obedience to civil magistracy.** Thus, as long as this confederacy lasted, and the people were held in ignorance, liberty, and with her, knowledge and virtue too, seem to have deserted the earth, and one age of darkness succeeded another, till God in his benign providence raised up the champions who began and conducted the Reformation. From the time of the Reformation to the first settlement of America, knowledge gradually spread in Europe, but especially in England; and in proportion as that increased and spread among the people, ecclesiastical and civil tyranny, which I use as synonymous expressions for the canon and feudal laws, seem to have lost their strength and weight. The people grew more and more sensible of the wrong that was done them by these systems, more and more impatient under it, and determined at all hazards to rid themselves of it; till at last, under the execrable race of the Stuarts, the struggle between the people and the confederacy aforesaid of temporal and spiritual tyranny, became formidable, violent, and bloody. **It was this great struggle that peopled America. It was not religion alone, as is commonly supposed; but it was a love of universal liberty, and a hatred, a dread, a horror, of the infernal confederacy before described, that projected, conducted, and accomplished the**

settlement of America. It was a resolution formed by a sensible people, — I mean the Puritans, — almost in despair. They had become intelligent in general, and many of them learned. For this fact, I have the testimony of Archbishop King himself, who observed of that people, that they were more intelligent and better read than even the members of the church, whom he censures warmly for that reason. This people had been so vexed and tortured by the powers of those days, for no other crime than their knowledge and their freedom of inquiry and examination, and they had so much reason to despair of deliverance from those miseries on that side the ocean, that they at last resolved to fly to the wilderness for refuge from the temporal and spiritual principalities and powers, and plagues and scourges of their native country. **After their arrival here, they began their settlement, and formed their plan, both of ecclesiastical and civil government, in direct opposition to the canon and the feudal systems.**³

4.1.5. Samuel Adams:

4.1.5.1. Correction of Perverted Law, Plunder and Feudalism:

How does one correct the present unlawful practice of ad valorem property tax or the feudal system in any state in the union: “In short, it is the greatest absurdity to suppose it in the power of one, or any number of men, at the entering into society, to renounce their essential natural rights, or the means of preserving those rights; when the grand end of civil government, from the very nature of its institution, is for the support, protection, and defense of those very rights; the principal of which, as is before observed, are Life, Liberty, and Property. If men, through fear, fraud, or mistake, should in terms renounce or give up any essential natural right, the eternal law of reason and the grand end of society would absolutely vacate such renunciation. The right to freedom being the gift of God Almighty, it is not in the power of man to alienate this gift and voluntarily become a slave.”⁴

4.1.5.2. Samuel Adams says the People are cheated out of their property:

Samuel Adams, Father of the American Revolution, observed the same thing as Jefferson and John Adams, namely, that people are tricked out of their property by clever lawyers and politicians and the education system and the media. People can even vote themselves out of property in a democracy where public opinion is shaped by those who benefit from plundering the people and their property.

4.1.5.3. But he also gave us the solution.

³ John Adams, A Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law (The passage of the Stamp Act in 1765 provoked a response from Adams and in August of that year he anonymously contributed four articles to the Boston Gazette (republished in The London Chronicle in 1768 as True Sentiments of America, also known as A Dissertation on the Canon and Feudal Law).

<http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/document/a-dissertation-on-the-canon-and-feudal-law/A-Dissertation-on-the-Canon-and-Feudal-Law-Teaching-American-History>

⁴ Samuel Adams, *The Christian History of the Constitution of the United States of America - Christian Self-Government* ed., Verna M. Hall, (The Foundation for American Christian Education Box 27035, San Francisco, California 94127) p. 367.

When any person under such a system complains of the injustice and destruction of their property by confiscation, alienation and plunder, and rental, the state should vacate the renunciation of the unalienable right to life, liberty and allodial ownership of property made by all men as the result of fear, fraud and mistake or even desire, because it is not within the power of a man or group of men to alienate their property and become a slave. We see here that we become slaves when we do not own our property with an allodial superior title.

5. I hereby adopt all that I have submitted earlier as part of this protest.

6. Taxable Situs:

6.1. Property Should Not Be Taxed in any of the several United States of America:

Mr. Wood directed our attention to the "Taxable Situs" of all three of my properties asserting they were located in Guadalupe County, a subdivision of the State of Texas. What he did not mention is that Texas is located in the United States of America which we have seen was constructed to really only do two things for every state in the union, namely, protect the people from religious persecution and the feudal land and property system that makes the people pay to use their own property granted to them by God.

The United States of America exists to protect my right to own my property with an allodial superior title against a king or a democratic republic of our own making.

7. Property Should Not Be Taxed in Texas:

7.1. Mr. Wood did not show that Texas was not a State of the United States of America:

Mr. Wood has not shown that Texas is not a State of the Union, where the property of the People is not alienable by any government a part of the United States of America. Texas, being a state of the union, cannot alien the property of the people and charge them rent to use their own property. The Individual People own their property with a superior allodial title which cannot be aliened.

The State of Texas exists to protect my right to own my property with an allodial unalienable title preventing any government from charging me a rent to use and occupy.

8. Property Should Not Be Taxed in Guadalupe County Texas:

Guadalupe County, a subdivision of Texas, a state of the United States of America wherein no state may confiscate the property of the Individual People and charge them a rent to use their own property consisting of personal and fixed land and buildings.

Guadalupe County, the State of Texas and the United States of America cannot derive a title of ownership that is superior to myself on my three properties the subject of this hearing.

Guadalupe County, Texas, USA, exists to protect my right to own property with an allodial unalienable title in which no one and no government entity, foreign or domestic, may charge me a rent to use.

9. It is absurd to study the Texas Property Tax Code:

The Texas Property Tax Code is a complete perversion of law to plunder the people of Texas as so well shown by authority herein that is superior to any living man or office holder today.

10. Current Condition of Law today is a farce:

I have also shown that the current condition of the constitutional and statutory law of Texas and Supreme Court rulings are ludicrous and contradictory.

11. I therefore request that my three properties the subject of this hearing be removed from the local feudal land system or the so-called "ad valorem property tax" rolls.

12. I also request that all property of every citizen in Texas be removed from the feudal land and property system.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ronald F. Avery