Invisible Contracts Bank Accounts

by **George Mercier** [Pages 131-193]

[Index | Next]

Some years preceding his multiple prosecutions in 1984, Mr. Condo went down to a bank, and initiated an Equity relationship with that corporation and the King. Yes, Commercial contracts in effect with banks are invisible juristic contracts in effect with the King. In the Armen Condo Letter, I mentioned that banks are in a special Status with the King, and likewise so are the individual people who experience profit and gain from any Commercial contract they enter into with a bank. This relational effect of doing business in King's Commerce is pronounced quite clearly in the *Instrumentality Doctrine* the Supreme Court initiated publicly with *Davis vs. Elmira Savings:*

> "National banks are instrumentalities of the Federal Government, created for a public purpose, and as such necessarily subject to the paramount authority of the United States."[1]

This Instrumentality Doctrine is very significant, and the word *Instrumentality* means an Equity Relationship that is quite strong in American Jurisprudence. As nationally chartered banks are the Instrumentality of the Congress, consider the subordinate Party (the banks) as being the "right hand" of the Master (the Congress). This is a very powerful Doctrine indeed, and it needs to be understood for what it really means. In the Armen Condo Letter, I mentioned that, from a Judicial Perspective, any profit or gain experienced from a bank carries with it the same identical full force and effect as if the King himself created the gain. Consider, for a moment, the application of the Instrumentality Rule to corporations:

> "Under this Rule, corporate existence will be disregarded where a corporate subsidiary is so organized and controlled and its affairs so conducted as to make it only an adjunct and instrumentality of another parent

corporation."[2]

Now think what happens if the King is substituted for the parent corporation, and your local bank is substituted for the subsidiary corporation. Under the Instrumentality Doctrine, the local bank as a Person and a legal entity fades away in significance as if it was transparent, and the King and the Secretary of the Treasury then appear as the real contracting Persons you are entering into Commercial agreements with. Are you beginning to see the legal significance of this Doctrine? Are you beginning to appreciate the deeper meanings of the bank account in that it is the King that you are really contracting into Commerce with, and the bank is just the King's local agent? That bank is literally the private personal property of the King. Entrepreneurs who go out and capitalize a new bank from scratch do not own that bank. The bank is owned by the King who created the corporation, and his Comptroller of the Currency later issued out a banking charter to; and the individual shareholders only hold an equitable interest in the bank's operations.[3]

The shareholders are only entitled to a limited withdrawal of some of the bank's net earnings, under some limited circumstances.[4]

Many incarcerated Protestors were unaware of the existence of the Commercial contract that they were into, and so having the strong political views that they do, their political feelings, skewing off on a defiant tangent, retained the upper hand over their better judgment -- an inquisitive judgment that would be searching for answers to questions. So although the Protestors was at one time unaware of the existence of a contract being in effect, the King was very much aware, and so the Protestor's defiant behavior is increasingly improvident when viewed from the perspective that the Commercial contract was written to strongly favor the King, and is interstitially dispersed throughout with penal clauses *in esse* for no more than mere administrative negligence and default, and any outs that exist for persons in default are the unintended default technical errors that the King's *lex*

statutes can correct at the discretion of the Congress.

Today, great Tax Protesting Patriots like Condo, Schiff, and Saussey -- who have established themselves in forward political positions -- have the strong advantage of learning in advance the single most important fundamental starting point in this Life; a starting point that most other folks won't even know of until it is too late; a starting point that bifurcates the Law of Judgment into two great subdivisions; Tort and Contract. Unknown to the world at large, Heavenly Father has invisible Celestial Contracts operating on us all, just like the King had multiple layers of Commercial and invisible political contracts operating on Schiff, Condo, and Saussey (I will discuss those layers later on). Maybe I am missing something somewhere, but I wish someone would explain to me the prudence of Armen Condo's *modus operandi*, as I cannot find any; when presented with such valuable information (that invisible contracts were actually in effect) Armen Condo summarily rebuffed that information without any inquiry being made into its authenticity. I had told Armen something he did not want to hear in his non-teachable state of mind; and in ways similar to those invisible juristic contracts the King has on us that so few people know much about, likewise our previous existence First Estate Contracts with Father cast a regulatory contract jurisdiction over us all, and all contract jurisdictions always call for our being self damaged by our own mere neglectful technical default, nonchalant indifference swirling in carefree insouciance, and miscellaneous compliance deflection Tort Law rationalizations:

> "... yea, I lived with her for a while -- she was *nice*, but there was no damages nowhere and everyone consented -- so Father can't hold that against me."

And just as Schiff, Condo, and Saussey were given unpleasant advance introductions into what a contract Star Chamber is all about, so too will the Last Day be a Contract Star Chamber -- the worst imaginable to those who

have used Tort Law behavioral defense arguments down here, as a well sculptured slice of meat was repetitively bewitched into an elevated state of enchantment ("Gee, I didn't damage anyone").[5]

But the Last Day will also be transparent for those who entered into, and were successfully tried under, Father's *New and Everlasting Covenant*; for these, the Last Day will be a smooth procedural formality, nothing that should be of any impending concern.[6]

To Heathens and agnostics, who spent their time playing with their own salvation down here by fighting and resisting what they will then view as something as simple as giving Father what he wanted, there will be no opportunity then to throw multiple exploratory defense lines at Father by going through multiple judgements, but much to our advantage we can have all the prosecutions thrown at us that we want down here, to repetitively argue our defense lines before Judges over and over again; and it is for this reason that incarcerated Protestors will one day look back and be ever grateful that the consequential significance of being in mere technical default on invisible contracts was driven into them, under such strong circumstances.[7]

Yes, today, Condo, Schiff, and Saussey are either in a cage, or close to being thrown into one, because of their default in juristic contracts; tomorrow - after they have *opened their eyes*, they will go forth and inherit, create, and preside over Thrones, Dominions, and *Worlds Without End*, also by Contract. Having known the bitter Agony, they can cleave to the Celestial Ecstasy; in both cases, contracts were the initiating catalytic instrumentality.

This banking *Instrumentality Doctrine* is a pretty strong relational status for the Judiciary to take cognizance of, so when we probe back down the line to uncover why chartered banks are in such a status, we should not be too surprised to uncover our old friend: A contract.[8]

Originally applicable only to nationally chartered banks, the *Instrumentality Doctrine* has since been expanded under the enlarging regulatory penumbra of the Federal Reserve Act of 1913 to include all state and Federally chartered member banks of the Fed. During the Depression, banks who became members of the FDIC and FSLIC insurance programs were deemed Instrumentalities, and this doctrine is now applied in the United States to include all financial institutions where there is any Federal regulatory interest in them. This now includes stock brokerage houses, credit unions, insurance companies, and pension funds. (For example, people acquiring a Merrill Lynch Cash Management Account, which is a negotiable withdrawal instrument, are in the same Juris tic Personality Status (in King's Commerce) with a Merrill Lynch checking account that they are with a checking account from any conventional depository banking institution, such as Manufacturer's Hanover.) When a person initiates such a bank account relationship with the King, an examination of Fourth Amendment Search and Seizure cases relating to account records that banks send to depositors reveals that the Federal appellate judiciary considers the Fourth Amendment to be non-applicable to Seized bank account records.[9]

In those cases, the Supreme Court will talk about how Courts cannot exclude evidence under the Fourth Amendment unless that Court finds that an unlawful Search or Seizure violated the defendant's own Constitutional rights. But that the Constitutional rights of criminal defendants, who are being hanged with their own bank account statements, are violated only when the Search and Seizure conduct violated the defendant's own legitimate expectation of privacy, rather than that of a third party.[10]

Since the "zone of privacy" inherent in the Papers Clause of the Fourth Amendment does not facially protect information you have deposited into the hands of third parties, like banking institutions,[11] Federal Courts find it unnecessary to probe any deeper and explicitly tell you the real underlying reason why bank accounts fall outside the protective penumbra of the Fourth Amendment;

Because a Commercial contract is in effect, and the Bill of Rights cannot be held to interfere with or obstruct the contemporary execution of Commercial contracts, for either party (and properly so). But wait, as those Supreme Court cases dealt with bank accounts Seized from a bank itself, and banks as regulated Commercial establishments have no Fourth Amendment rights whatever. So there are no privacy rights in any information you deposit with those banks, and this remains true whether or not there was a Commercial contract in effect or not. Hmmm. But what if those bank account records were Seized from a person's home where the Fourth Amendment does apply? Now what? The Fourth Amendment still does not apply, and properly so. [12]

This is what is really meant when the bank account evidence taken from a patently unlawful residential Search and Seizure in a person's home is deemed admissible, even though the Fourth Amendment's Exclusionary Rule would otherwise attach if the property that was seized did not belong to the King (guns, cocaine, etc.). Federal Judges will skew their Seizure of bank accounts annulment justifications off to the side and talk about the "special facts in this case" when annulling Fourth Amendment rights on bank account records unlawfully Seized from a residence. [13]

And now we are finally getting down to the one real reason why the Bill of Rights in general, and the Fourth Amendment, in particular, means absolutely nothing when a bank account is involved with a contested Search and Seizure; this special reason is never talked about by law schools; and this reason is not to be found anywhere in any law book in any library that I am acquainted with: But the reason is, as stated, because a Commercial contract with the King is in effect, and so as a point of beginning, the Bill of Rights is irrelevant from the scratch, and properly so; but you will never hear that explicit explanation from anyone else, other than George Mercier. Never in any Court Opinion is there any blunt discussion of Commercial contracts being in effect; rather, Judges will continue to focus distracting attention and discussions around the Fourth Amendment,

creating the potential image, in some peripheral factual setting cases, that the Fourth Amendment is the center of gravity here, rather than the Commercial contract itself. Yet it is very proper and correct that the Bill of Rights should not be allowed to interfere with, obstruct, intervene, or otherwise restrain the execution or operation of contemporary Commercial contracts --for either party; but getting an official admission like that from a Federal Judge will result in a can of worms being opened up (as they perceive it), a can of worms they don't want to talk about and deal with in the future.[14]

Additionally, but to a lesser extent, those bank account records are the private personal property of the King, and so it is irrational that the King cannot reclaim his own property whenever he feels like it, all pursuant to the terms of the bank account contract.[15]

Those are the real reasons why the Fourth and Fifth Amendments are irrelevant in bank account Administrative Seizures and in judicial prosecutions evidentiarily based on bank accounts. Within the same line of Fourth Amendment cases, those Federal Judges will also refer to bank accounts as being interstate merchant and Commercial instruments, but never is there any discussion to be found anywhere on the special Equity Relationship in effect between Persons entering into such Commercial contracts, and the King.

Some folks have taken the position that if they entered into Equity with the King by signing a bank account card under Objection on the grounds of necessity, that Objection somehow will vitiate future liability; but there is an inherent defect in that reasoning. Unlike signing Driver's License applications under Objection and Notice of Duress to avoid incarceration, the Supreme Court has ruled that the *Right to Travel* is a Substantive and Fundamental Right that cannot be infringed upon, absent very strong and compelling state interests; and there are state statutes which criminalize the act of an unlicensed driver operating a motor vehicle down the road. Taking that Driver's License scenario as a model and applying it

to justify possessing bank accounts just does not cut it. Bank accounts are not entered into to avoid incarceration, and banking is not a Substantive Right, and direct personal financial profit and gain enrichment is experienced when possessing bank accounts that is without parallel with a Driver's License. So, all factors considered, the likelihood of escaping an Excise Tax liability by arguing bank account possession by necessity, is remote. This remains true even though the California Supreme Court ruled once that:

> "For all practical purposes, the disclosure by individuals or business firms of their financial affairs to a bank is not entirely volitional, since it is impossible to participate in the economic life of contemporary society without maintaining a bank account. In the course of such dealings, a depositor reveals many aspects of his personal affairs, opinions, habits and associations. Indeed, the totality of bank records provides a virtual current biography."[16]

The California Supreme Court is not a Federal Tribunal, and statements to the effect that bank accounts are necessary for practical economic survival, and perhaps are not purely volitional [*volitional* means freely choosing or will to do so, as in making a decision], although an interesting perception of the passing scene, will in no wise vitiate your legal liability to the adhesive Federal taxation reciprocity expectations resident in Title 26. Notice how the California Supreme Court did not say that possession of bank accounts under a documented factual setting of economic survival annuls Title 26 liability. So let's not read out of that state court what it does not say; and even if that state court did state inferentially that possession by necessity annuls expectation of reciprocity liability in areas of taxation, then the California Supreme Court is still not a Federal Judicial Forum. Federal Judges are taught and trained certain things in those Seminars of theirs, and that *Bench Book* of theirs makes the Government's position sound more than

reasonable, and so as a result, Federal Judges are collectively sensitive towards certain things [such as the significance of a Commercial contract] that State Judges are indifferent to.

This *Davis vs. Elmira Savings* Instrumentality Doctrine occasionally surfaces in Supreme Court rulings, by sometimes being lightly mentioned in passing in *obiter dictum*, such as in *Anderson National Bank vs. Luckett*,[17] and on other occasions, this Instrumentality Doctrine is bluntly reaffirmed by the Supreme Court, as in *Marquette National Bank vs. First of Omaha*.[18] But if the Law of King's Commerce is correctly understood, there is no need for the Supreme Court to reaffirm anything, as the circulation of paper money, notes, or the circulation of any juristic currency, even carrying intrinsic value, in King's Commerce (as distinguished from privately minted coins and notes), has always been the closed private domain of the King of England. And it has been the exclusive domain of the King ever since paper money was first printed and circulated by King Richard II to finance an offensive war against France that Parliament declined to levy taxes to wage.[19]

So the circulation of paper money by Gremlins through the instrumentality of kings, was born in tortious fraud intended to damage people, and was designed to accomplish in the practical setting (the damages of taxation by Inflation) what was not accomplished legally on the Floor of Parliament by common consent.[20] So paper money has been designed from the outset to damage people, and the unnecessary circulation of paper money today in the United States carries along with it identical underlying enscrewment objectives.[21]

Back in an era when the United States was the American Colonies, the Framers to our Constitution never abated or restricted the King's standing right to issue out his own money or to declare that someone else's money or notes are legal and tender for those debts existing under the King's General Commerce Jurisdiction; and neither did the Framers

ever restrict the King's right to delegate any or all of the circulating process to a third party (as arguments in this area of *Federal Reserve Unconstitutionality Due to Lack of Coinage Delegation Jurisdiction* are in error). The Supreme Court has ruled often that the Constitution of the United States must be applied today in light of English Common Law then in effect at the time the Declaration of Independence was executed, and properly so.[22]

> "... Congress possesses all of the powers which existed in the States before the adoption of the National Constitution, and which have always existed in the Parliament in England."[23]

So let us briefly examine English Common Law and see just what type of monetary powers the King of England had. Consider the following words from a landmark case in 1604: [24]

> "[A]s the king by his prerogative may make money of what matter and form he pleaseth, and establish the standard of it, so may he change his money in substance and impression, and enhance or debase the value of it, or entirely decry and annul it...
>
> "And so it is manifest, that the kings of England have always had and exercised the prerogative of coining and changing the form, and when they found it expedient of enhancing and debasing the value of money within their dominions; and this prerogative is allowed and approved not only by the common law, but also by the rules of the imperial law."[25]

And so if the King of England had the right to invoke Sovereignty Jurisdiction to circulate debased currency, then so also does the Congress of the United States now have similar Sovereignty Jurisdiction, absent an explicit and blunt jurisdictional restraining mandate to the contrary in this charter, the Constitution -- paper currency restrainment language which does not exist.[26]

Nowhere in our Constitution did the Framers state that "no paper currency shall issue out of Congress," or "circulating currency is required to physically contain gold and silver," and Patriot arguments to the effect that Article I, Section 10 constitutes such a restrainment are defective, as I will explain later on. Nor did the Framers state that "monetary matters reside exclusively within the Congress, and cannot be delegated..." Are you beginning to see what happens when some agreement is reduced into writing? With the passage of time, oral expectations in effect at the time the agreement was executed diminish away into nothingness, and only the exact, literal content of the agreement, as written, means anything.[27]

Today when we enter into contracts with one another down here, as unforeseen circumstances surface later on, regrets are always quietly expressed about how this or that should have been originally included into the agreement. It was that way with Moses and the Ten Commandments, it was that way with the United States Constitution of 1787, and this attribute of Nature [of people enlarging their basis of factual knowledge over time, and therefore also changing their desires] remains in full force and effect down to the present day with Commercial contracts. An honest assessment of the Framers would suggest that they were unable to guard against all possible evils, since they simply did not have, then, the exposure to the magnitude of evil that we have had thrown at us today.

But as for currency[28] itself as we now have it, synchronous with King Richard II's unsuccessful conquest against France in the 1300's (and long before the King of England's chartering of the Bank of England in 1694 under Gremlin prompting and intellectual guidance),[29] the special *sub rosa* relationship that was developed between the circulation in King's Commerce of paper money by the King and a grand Tort the King intends to work, still remains in full force and effect down to the present day in the United States.[30]

Anglo-Saxon Kings have a long history of never bothering to stop pulling off whatever they can get away with.[31] For example, in the 1500's, the King of England (actually Queen Elizabeth) ordered a debasement of Britain's national currency for the express purpose of working a Tort on rebels in Ireland. This carefully planned currency debasement was explicitly designed to damage these Irish adversaries of the Crown as an act of war. When these debased coins were issued out all over England to the public at large, they became known as *Mixed Money* due to the novel alloy composition in the coins, meaning a hybrid of part precious and part ordinary metals. This degenerate mixed money was then sent by the King of England to Ireland as a covert war military measure against the rebels there. The rebels were buying supplies abroad, and they were making their purchases by using valuable Britannic gold and silver coins, which always had an international allure to them, and properly so. So the King decided that the best way to stop the rebels from making their arms purchases would be by making their money unattractive to their suppliers, foreign gun runners.

In making their purchases of guns and armaments, the rebels had been obtaining their gold and silver English Crown coins from loyal British subjects in the course of ordinary dealings, and those subjects in turn had received it from Queen Elizabeth's soldiers and others functioning as Crown distribution agents. So the King, knowing what he does about using both devalued coin and soft paper currency to damage adversaries, simply reduced the value of the money the rebels were getting, by clever debasement. Although debasing the currency to damage a rebel out in some remote place carries the secondary consequence of damaging loyal subjects who mean the Crown no harm; so as to not offend the Crown's subjects, the Queen promised to redeem this debased money at face value later on [sound familiar today?][32]

But as for the rebels in Ireland, now the debased Crown coins were being rejected by the foreign gun runners as payment for goods they had been selling to the rebels, and so, as the supplies to the rebels were cut off at the

source in this slick and clever way, the plans for conquest by the rebels was frustrated.[33]

The English Case of 1604 that I had quoted from above called the *Mixed Money Case* was a challenge to the authority of the King of England to pull off what he did against Irish rebels, and as you read above in a quotation from the Case, the Judiciary has declared that it is a Sovereign prerogative of the King to debase his own currency, whenever and however the King feels like it. [And rather than snicker at Judges today for tossing aside your challenges to paper money, the correct remedy lies in writing explicit and blunt restraining language into the King's Charter (the Constitution), but our Framers in 1787 never did that; and the Framers of 1787 did not write in such explicit and blunt restrainments for a very good reason; Because there was strong reservations expressed on the floor of the Convention on whether such proposed restrainments were really provident.[34]

That Mixed Money Case was a sleeper, as our Framers never correctly designed the Constitution to repel this special type of quiet *sub rosa* political aggression; and 250 years later, that Mixed Money Case surfaced in the Supreme Court of the United States, in the context of justifying the Civil War era Legal Tender Acts.[35] Down to the present day, the excitement of war is used as a justification to either initiate or continue one more turn in Gremlin enscrewment objectives.[36]

So now we should have some minimum discernment to see why contemporary representations to the effect that gold is just too unsuitable by its heavy bulk weight to be a modern circulating denomination of currency, as both fraudulent and factually defective. Paper money is characterized by its depreciating nature.[37] Fraudulent because people with sinister intentions use debased currency (and non-redeemable Federal Reserve Notes that quietly lose a little decremental value with each passing year are debased currency) for political conquest and to damage their adversaries.[38]

And such representations are factually defective because the King's new proposed money (which the Treasury Department has already quietly circulated prototypes of) has thin strips of metal imbedded in between layers of paper, and those strips of metal could just as easily have been alloyed with gold and silver if our King wanted it -- but no, our King is not quite through with his *magnum* Tortfeasance, not just yet.[39]

And just as Patriots go right ahead and argue defective reasoning based on the milktoast language in Article I, Section 10, so too do Patriots go right ahead and try to argue the line, that well, since the United States has no express grant of jurisdiction to create corporations, therefore, the Federal Reserve Board is unConstitutional for this reason. I have concluded that if I were on the Supreme Court, I would uphold the inherent jurisdiction of the King to organize corporations (or any other instrumentality that had its own separate treasury, with the King calling that instrument whatever he feels like). [40]

That idea of a separate treasury is important to the Supreme Court, since that is the determining logic behind their rulings making municipalities exempt from the 11th Amendment, which otherwise operates to immunize actions against states.[41] My reasoning comes from a confluence of factors. First, getting a feel for the lack of specificity in the Framer's drafting of the Constitution; for example, no where is the King given permission to hire employees, to excavate sites for office buildings, to sign leases, or to purchase assets or land in foreign lands, etc. In examining those areas where the Supreme Court has ruled on inherent meanings of Clauses, they have ruled, for example, that the "Adversary Nature" of criminal prosecutions is inherent in the Sixth Amendment [*Miranda vs. Arizona* and the counsel cases], and that Courts created by the United States have inherent Contempt jurisdiction, regardless of the absence of the conferment of any such jurisdiction.[42]

And on and on. For these reasons there is very much a

basis for an implied grant of jurisdiction for the King to do something, not otherwise specifically denominated in his Charter. The test to be applied to see if some jurisdiction claimed operative by the King, but not exactly specified anywhere in that Constitutional Charter of his which breathed life into the King his breath of juristic life, lies in another strata: First, is the challenged *lex* even inferentially in conflict with any restraining mandate the Framers wrote into the Constitution? In the limited question of creating corporations, the answer is no, it isn't. Next, we shift into the broader question and ask: Is the creation of corporations even out of harmony with the *leit motif* of the Constitution to restrain the King from functioning as a Tortfeasor?[43]

Does the challenged act of Congress (creating corporations or other political instruments with separate treasuries), have the effect, in the practical setting, of allowing or in any way assisting the King to function as a Tortfeasor against us countryside folks? In other words, does the creation of privately held corporations by the King, such as the Federal Reserve System, provide the King with a mechanism to damage us that he would not otherwise be privileged to do, or able to do in the practical effect with his own direct employees? In the case of creating corporations, or in the creation of separate juristic organizations with their own treasuries, the administrative form of the corporation (the wording on the piece of paper that is its charter) offers no possibility of a Tort on us that could not be otherwise worked by Executive Agencies operating under direct Presidential administrative jurisdiction. This is true even in the case of the Federal Reserve System. The Fed is very much a Tortfeasor in its control over the rate of inflation,[44] and in its proclivities to do so; and from its being such a dominate financial market maker and control of re-discount rates its Open Market Committee can and will fix rates of interest at whatever level it feels like; and the Gremlins running the Fed know very much that they posses considerable power to determine prosperity levels.[45]

By controlling these financial market forces, the Fed single-handedly controls the relative level of economic prosperity or decline in the land.[46] If the Fed were an administrative agency under, perhaps, the Comptroller of the Currency, then all of the regulatory assertions it now makes over member banks would remain in effect, and it would still control prosperity through its regulatory mechanisms. (Incidentally, the mere absence of prosperity, under such highly managed and tightly controlled monetary circumstances, is a Tort against us by the Fed).[47]

If the Federal Reserve were an Article II Executive Agency under Presidential Jurisdiction (which as a privately owned and independently managed business entity, it is not), then every single decision made by the Federal Reserve Board and its Open Market Committee (and its predecessor) down to the present time, would still have been made and carried out.[48] The only existential reason for the Fed's corporate organizational legal structure lies in the fact that the Fed was sponsored, as you know, by a Special Interest Group for their own private enrichment:[49] A network of Gremlins operating under the intellectual aegis of Rothschild nominee Paul Warburg and associates, who prodded and tricked an otherwise reticent and naive Congress into enacting the initiating legislation in 1913.[50]

Designed by Gremlins the way it was,[51] and because of its private corporate ownership and lack of public accountability to the Congress and to the public.[52] The Fed has never been audited by the GAO,[53] the Fed as a privately owned corporation is able to provide its European owners with an exceptionally lush American gold mine they would not otherwise experience if title to Federal Reserve stock were ever to be reclaimed by the Congress under *Eminent Domain Jurisdiction*, or simple repeal, or repurchased under a reservation in its charter.[54]

So the Fed exists as a private independent corporation because it was created to act as a financial enrichment velocity accelerant for its owners [I have a hunch that it

is also the single most profitable wealth institution in the world, outdancing and outdazzling the top Fortune 100, as well as the Vatican and several "for profit" political jurisdictions]. The Status of the Federal Reserve System as a Tortfeasor is not related to its legal charter organization as a corporation, and neither would its Tortfeasance be changed, either negative or positive at all, if it ever were to be absorbed into the Executive Presidential bureaucracy of Article II. As an Executive Article II agency, then it would still control inflation since it would still be controlled by Gremlins; and it would continue to control interest rates and relative levels of prosperity through its regulatory mechanisms. [55]

That this Tortfeasance is transparent to its organized form is true because all Torts originate with people, and at the Fed, there is now a man as chairman who is uniquely qualified to operate as a joint Tortfeasor with the Rothschilds and work magnum opus Torts on us all: Gremlin Paul Volcker.[56]

This is the same Treasury Department staff member Paul Volcker who played a supporting role in the theft of American gold bullion deposits from Fort Knox in the 1960's,[57] and the same Paul Volcker who now holds a controlling executive position in the Fed, a position that when he campaigned for it in 1978, he openly called for the "controlled disintegration" of the United States.[58]

Since the corporate structure of the King's peripheral Commercial interests, of and by themselves, do not provide the King with a mechanism to work Torts on us he would be otherwise restrained from doing through executive agencies, I have no objection to the King creating corporations, and I would suggest that arguments to the contrary will likely be rebuffed by the Supreme Court.[59] If at all you question the legal authenticity of my conclusory statements, then please read *M'Culloch vs. Maryland*,[60] and tell me that the Congress cannot create corporations or nationally chartered banks. In that case, the Supreme Court specifically talks, at length, about the

Constitutionality of creating corporations, and the implied powers of Congress to do so.[61]

Also foolish is the line that I hear that no tax could possibly be due to the King, because the IRS is not an Article II Executive Agency and functions as a private contracting corporation.[62] I see no general impediment to the King hiring private contractors to assist him in tax collections.[63] Private contract bounty hunters have been used to find criminal fugitives for centuries, so why aren't you Protestors objecting to that? Incidentally, in the old days of our Mother England in the 1700's, there was a practice going around Europe called *Privateering*, which is when small privately owned armed navies would roam the High Seas in search of prizes to steal for themselves. A *Privateer*, then, is an armed vessel, owned, fitted out, and manned by private parties with a legal commission from a political jurisdiction authorizing it to capture the vessels and cargo's of the enemy. This legal commission, called a *Letter of Marque*, impressed upon the *Privateer's* banditry an aura of legitimacy in International Law, without which Privateers would be hung as pirates by any nation's ships fast enough to capture one. But back safely at home, the *Letter of Marque* also served as a legal basis for an Admiralty Court to condemn the captured property, the Prize, and assign it over to the Privateers themselves who stole it (this was also called *Prize Jurisdiction*).[64]

[In remarkably similar ways today in the United States, private contracting Privateers are at work in the IRS, acting under a legal commission, which largely precludes the imposition of Civil Rights damages because of their operating under the recourse protective umbrella (color) of Governmental authority; and like the Privateers of old, today's tax loot is also handed over to a private party: To the owners of the Federal Reserve System, for payment on the King's National Debt. And even more astounding in parallel, today's IRS collection of loot and banditry is also governed under a Federal Court acting under the rules of Admiralty Jurisdiction, as I will explain later on.]

That analogy between the *Privateers* of old out on the High Seas, and of today's private contracting termites inside the IRS sounds pretty good, doesn't it? The requisite blend of comparative background elements of thievery are present, an underlying tone of IRS illegitimacy runs throughout the analogy, and that, generally is the kind of talk Tax Protestors like to hear... "looters," "theft," "banditry" and the like. Yes, analogies like that are music to the ears of Tax Protestors *Extraordinaire* like Irwin Schiff,[65] and Representative George Hansen.[66]

But just one tiny little problem surfaces here which makes the *Privateers to IRS Termites* analogy fall apart and collapse, a tiny little problem Irwin Schiff and George Hansen do not want to talk about -- a tiny little problem most folks had better start to talk about, *now*, before getting in front of Father at the Last Day: An invisible Contract. Today, the Protestor has entered into a series of invisible contracts with the King, numerous contracts which are invisible to the Protestors, as I will explain later on, so now all of those termites in the IRS are merely collecting monies rightfully due the King by contract, whereas in contrast the *Privateers* of old had no such contract in effect to grab the property belonging to others. Therefore, if I was a Federal Magistrate, I don't know if I would be as patient as some of the State and Federal Magistrates I have seen in hearings and trials in trying to explain error to a Constitutionalist, so called, but whose words were falling on death ears. One prime example of how the carefully chosen words of a Federal Judge falls on death ears, occurs when a petitioner is being rebuffed when throwing a challenge to the Constitutionality of either the Federal Reserve System or Federal Reserve Notes at the Judge. One of the reasons why Federal Magistrates and the United States Supreme Court are so reluctant to declare the Fed or its Notes as being unConstitutional [aside from the fact that many Federal Judges find the idea to be philosophically uncomfortable and ideologically irritating] is because, as a matter of Law, the use and recirculation of Federal Reserve Notes falls under the governing doctrine applicable to Commercial Contract Law Jurisprudence, so the Constitution

is largely irrelevant right from the beginning, as the entire closed private domain of King's Commerce is a benefit/privilege created by the Congress, and there is nothing in the Constitution to restrain it.[67]

Assuming for a moment, *arguendo*, that the interposition of Contract Law was irrelevant, then aside from that there are a large number of separate and distinct sources of jurisdiction the King can claim as authority to issue out debased paper currency. But before listing those sources, we need to back up a step. An examination of the Federal Reserve's Charter also reveals that, in Warburg's devilishly brilliant cleverness, the Congress never recited any specific sources of Constitutional Jurisdiction when it created the Fed. Nowhere in its Charter does it say something like "... the powers of Article I, Section 10 are hereby invoked..." An examination of numerous other statutory programs reveals that the Congress rarely ever bothers to recite its claimed sources of Constitutional Jurisdiction for those programs either (in those Acts that I have searched through). Since the Congress did not recite any Constitutional sources of authority when it allegedly passed the Federal Reserve Act,[68] this now means that whenever a Protestor comes forward today and throws a Case at a Federal Judge where the Constitutionality of the Federal Reserve is being challenged, the United States Attorney General is thereby free to throw any set of defensive arguments back at the Protestor that the Attorney General feels like, in order to justify the Constitutionality of the challenged Act of Congress. The bottom line is that the Attorney General can and will claim sources of Constitutional Jurisdiction at some future date that the Congress never really contemplated when it originally created the program (if a quorum ever really did exist to create the Fed). However unfair this appears to be, would someone please show me where the Constitution requires the Congress to recite its enabling Jurisdiction on each Act it passes? The Framers were also negligent in this respect, and so there is no such recital requirement, and so now the Attorney General is free to come up with a long list of claimed sources of Constitutional Jurisdiction that the Protestor never ever

dreamed of; a list that the Congress never really considered at the time of possible enactment; a list that Federal Judges are well acquainted with; a list that I will be showing you later on.

But first, we need to cover some background material so the concepts I am about to explain can be understood easily. Remember that correct Principles of Nature operate across all factual settings; if the Principle is correct, what works in one factual setting will work for similar reasons in another setting. So with that in mind, if we had a power boat built for us, and that boat had say, 12 gas tanks built into it (perhaps distributed throughout the hull as ballast to achieve some desired weight and loading balancing effects), or if we were piloting an L-1011 jet aircraft with the numerous bladder, wing, and fuselage fuel tanks that it has located throughout its body, then in order for the boat or jet to be stopped dead cold, all fuel tanks individually need to be empty, first. If so much as one fuel tank has any fuel in it at all, then the boat or jet will continue forward at maximum cruising velocity, without any letup, until all tanks are completely empty. Only the complete exhaustion of all fuel from all of the separate fuel tanks, without any exceptions, will return the jet or boat into that quiescent state of rest that it once came from. The fact that one or several of the fuel tanks may be vacant of fuel will offer no propulsion impairment or reduction in velocity -- *none whatsoever*.

As we turn from a high-powered machine or aviation setting where a manufactured product is under propulsion from multiple and independent sources of fuel, as we turn from that setting to a setting where a legal product was also manufactured by men, like the Federal Reserve Board (Incorporated), we found out that its propulsion also originates from multiple sources of jurisdictional fuel. And so in order to return the Federal Reserve Board to its quiescent *status quo ante* state of non-existence, of pre-December, 1913, then a large number of separate and distinct sources of Constitutional fuel need to be individually voided. If so much as one single source of

Constitutional fuel is left remaining --j ust so much as one single Clause -- by having survived the blows of a Protestor in adversary judicial proceedings, then the Federal Reserve Board will carry on at maximum cruising velocity with the same identical full force and effect as if the Protestor had never thrown anything at the Fed. Mindful of this background information, now we can discuss the multiple sources of jurisdictional fuel that the King has got up his sleeve to retortionally throw back at pesky little Protestors.

While examining the main Legal Tender and National bank related cases in the Supreme Court,[69] we see that the right of the Congress to create a bank and have that bank issue out national currency, as well the right of Congress to designate anything it wants as Legal Tender, is a power directly related to the right of the Congress, by both express and incidental powers:

1. To declare war;[70]
2. To suppress insurrection;
3. To raise and support armies;[71]
4. To provide and maintain a navy (notice the words "maintain" and "support," as they mean financially through taxes and money);
5. To regulate Interstate Commerce;[72]
6. To facilitate the laying and collecting of taxes;[73]
7. Existing as an attribute of Sovereignty;[74]
8. To coin and circulate money pursuant to Article I, Section 8;
9. To pay debts and facilitate the borrowing of money on the credit of the United States (Article I, Section 8);[75]
10. To provide for the common defense and general welfare.

all of which were involved, to a lessor and greater extent, at the time the *Legal Tender Acts* were enacted by the Congress in the Civil War era of the 1800's.[76] And the correlation in effect between the right to enact Legal Tender Statutes and the various War Powers of the Congress

applies both in times of war,[77] and also in times of peace.[78]

So what is important for Tax Protestors to understand is that when they attack either the Federal Reserve in whole or part, or the designation of its *Circulating Evidences of Debt* at Legal Tender --and the Protestor goes through all of the Supreme Court rulings on the *Money Coin Clause* in Article I, Section 8,[79] and all the Constitutional Convention debates on the *Money Coin Clause*, and the material discussed in secret Convention meetings back in 1787, and all of the Legislation enacted pursuant thereto, and all of the quotations from the Founding Fathers, such as in Max Farrand's works[80] or "The Federalist," and numerous other private correspondence, and all the lower court opinions on *Choses in Action* and coins and debasement theories, and of their citations on the monetary disabilities of the United States; after the Tax Protestor goes through all that work and effort, he has only told the Supreme Court about 10% of what the Supreme Court needs to hear in order to invalidate the Status of Federal Reserve Notes as Legal Tender instruments: Because the right to create banks and let that bank circulate Legal Tender is also related to *War Powers* and the *Suppression of Domestic Insurrections*, to Raising Taxes, [81] the *Interstate Commerce Clause*, the Article I, Section 8 *Money Coin Clause*, and the *Raising and Financing Armies and Navies Clauses*, and of course *Sovereignty* itself --and they are independent stand-alone sources of jurisdiction that have to be attacked individually, just like a jet or boat with several fuel tanks needs to have each separate tank vacated before the vehicle will come to a stationary state.[82]

Will someone please tell me how to challenge the Fed based on the *Interstate Commerce Clause*?[83] What grant of intervening and manipulative power is more broad than the Interstate Commerce Clause? With that Clause, anything goes. How are you going to attack Federal Reserve Notes as being a defective use of the *Raising and Financing or*

Armies and Navies Clauses?[84]

The answer is that you are not going to. There are some sharp attorneys like Edwin Vieira (Mr. Solyom's attorney), [85] and on the other hand there are some *intelligentsia* clowns; and any judicial rebuffment experienced by attorneys throwing Protestor caliber arguments at Federal Judges is a *fully earned account*, as any flaky arguments centered singularly around just the *Gold and Silver Coin Clause* of Article I, Section 10 are just plain stupid: You are misleading your readers, delivering naught to your clients for your fees, and as attorneys you should know better.[86]

Other rulings also affirm the broad application of monetary powers. Later on in *Veazie Bank vs. Fenno*,[87] the Chief Justice, speaking for the Supreme Court, ruled that it is the Constitutional right of the Congress to provide a currency for the whole country; and that this might be done with coin, or by United States Notes, or by notes of banks chartered by the Congress. Other cases replicate the same line. For example:

> "In *Veazie Bank vs. Fenno* [75 U.S. 533 (1869)], decided at the present term, this court held, after full consideration, that it was the privilege of Congress to furnish this country with the currency to be used by it in the transaction of business, whether this was done by means of coin, of notes of the United States, or of banks created by Congress."[88]

So asking a Federal Judge to declare the Federal Reserve System or its Notes as being unConstitutional based on the *Monetary Clause* of Article I, Section 8 is facially only a small slice of the larger total argument pie that Judges need to hear.[89] One of the reasons lies in the right of Congress to regulate Interstate Commerce through its *Commerce Clause* (and arguing deficiencies in that jurisdiction is foolishness). So any Constitutional

infirmity or tension in effect between the Federal Reserve System and Article I, Section 8 offers no reason whatever for dissolving the Fed; as the *Commerce Clause* neatly picks up all the loose ends where the restrictive coinage jurisdiction conferred by Article I, Section 8 might possibly be imperfect, and renders Judicial dissolution of the Fed inappropriate.[90]

Yes, Virginia, Paul Warburg knew what he was doing. But even that is not the full story.

> *Question*: How are you Protestors going to attack Federal Reserve Notes on the floor of the United States Supreme Court? How are you going to attack Sovereignty itself? Are you going to try and attack the essence of Sovereignty itself by quoting from the devil himself? If you can't find a quotation from Lucifer slicing down Sovereignty, then maybe a quotation from one of his hard working Gremlin assistants might be a point of beginning.[91]

Well, an attack on Sovereignty like that, although a majestic goal for Gremlins as they tear down our existing Constitution and the Juristic Institution it created, and try and replace it with their own, is not much. So now just how does an inherent prerogative of the Sovereign, of this right to issue out money any way he feels like it, violate the King's Charter?

> *Answer:* There is no violation -- there is no express Clause restraining the Congress to circulate only that currency that physically contains gold and silver -- and you are not going to get the chance before the Supreme Court to attack it.[92]

Our Founding Fathers did not tie the King's giblets down tight enough with that level of explicit and blunt language that all Kings need to be restrained by.[93] And so any attack on Federal Reserve Notes will require such an explicit and bluntly worded Constitutional Amendment,

and that is a political operation for the Legislatures to handle, not something lending itself well in nature to a Judicial remedy. At best the Judiciary can rule on cases with the outcome carefully designed to give the Congress an incentive to get going. An honest assessment of the total factual setting of monetary history in the United States will emphasize general naivete among the members of the American legislatures in 1787: They didn't know what they were doing, collectively speaking, although there were a few who did raise their voices in opposition to paper money, like Roger Sherman.[94]

Remember that the Britannic Crown was still quite popular then, and the American Revolution was a minority rights operation, with many bleeding heart native Americans opposing severance from the Crown. And there were also just too few George Masons to go around. The experientially wise know that you never, ever deal with a King with negative restraining clauses in contracts except under the most explicit and blunt words that the English Language offers, because the King will always figure out ways to claim some implicit permission to work his way around a restraining clause that is sounding in milktoast; but our Fathers didn't do that. And compounding the problem drafting such specific language, sprinkled in between the floor debates and political comprises, were a few traitors of strong influence (like Alexander Hamilton, who married indirectly into the House of Rothschild),[95] who knew exactly what they were doing, for and on behalf of their sponsors.[96]

One might think that with the passage of time, an increase in political *savoir faire* might just develop nationally. But no. If a Constitutional Convention were held over again today, as is quite close to happening, I am afraid of the consequences. We need a Constitutional Convention today in the 1980's like we need the Ortega Brothers in the United States Senate representing the State of New Hampshire. Conservatives believing a new Constitutional Convention, called for the purpose of a *Balanced Budget Amendment*, are playing into the hands of Gremlins, who fully intend to use that Constitutional Convention to

replace our Father's Constitution with their own; in fact that is how the Constitution of 1787 was proposed to the States, as a replacement for the *Articles of Confederation*. And if you don't think Gremlins are smart enough to use parliamentary devices to work their way around wording in some State Resolutions calling for such a Convention (attempting to limit the subject matter discussed in the Convention to just the content of the *Balanced budget amendment*), then you have no knowledge whatsoever of Gremlins, and you are not even qualified to exercise such political judgment today when in fact Gremlins now hold the upper hand in the United States.[97] And Gremlins are not about to let a Constitutional Convention come and go in the United States without putting up a good fight.[98]

If you want to get a good preview and feel for the class of new Constitution that such a convention would produce, just examine the caliber of Presidents elected in recent history.[99]

Footnotes:

[1] *Davis vs. Elmira Savings*, 161 U.S. 275, at 283 (1896).

The factual setting giving rise to *Davis* was a Bankruptcy proceeding. In the many quotations from the United States Supreme Court and other judicial forums in this Letter, sentences were rearranged and then quoted out of original order for enhanced logical continuity; and in other places I made nominal punctuation and capitalization changes. Therefore, please refer to the original citations before requoting. [return]

[2] *Black's Law Dictionary*, under the "Instrumentality Rule" [case cites deleted]. [return]

[3] The corporation is the legal owner of all of the

property of the bank, real and personal; and within the powers conferred upon it by the charter, and for the purposes for which it was created, can deal with the corporate property as absolutely as a private individual can deal with his own. This is familiar law, and will be found in every work that may be opened in the subject of corporations. A striking exemplification may be seen in the case of *The Queen vs. Armound*, 9 Ad. & Ell. N.S. 806. The question related to the registry of a ship owned by a corporation. Lord Denman observed:

> "It appears to me that the British corporation is, as such, the sole owner of the ship. The individual members to the corporation are no doubt interested in one sense in the property of the corporation, as they may derive individual benefits from its increase, or loss from its decrease; but in no legal sense are the individual members the owners." - *The Bank Tax Cases*, 70 U.S. 573, at 584 (1865). [return]

[4] "The interest of the shareholder entitles him to participate in the net profits earned by the bank in the employment of its capital, during the existence of its charter, in proportion to the number of his shares; and, upon its dissolution or termination, to his proportion of the property that may remain of the corporation after the payment of its debts." - *The Bank Tax Cases*, id., at 584. [return]

[5] Not that Father is throwing us all into a *lake of fire and brimstone* to scorch us thoroughly (Heathens really get a good kick out of that foolish idea of being roasted in a scorcher by a revengeful god for a few little impish smatterings); but the Last Day Judgement will actually be the *worse imaginable* because of knowledge we will then possess of the magnitude of the lost benefits involved, and how stupid it was to lose it down here over some interesting feminine musculature, and other inappropriate adventurism into peripheral areas that are defined as being illicit by First Estate Covenants, but are not

really illicit practically due to the omission of damages. The *Lake of Fire and Brimstone* analogy that the Prophets of old were referring to is their characterization of this state of mental anguish. [return]

[6] The *New and Everlasting Covenant* has been of particular interest with all of our Patriarchs and Prophets of old, right back down the line, clear back to Adam:

> Question: What is this *New and Everlasting Covenant*?
>
> Answer: Without referring to anyone's commentary or explanation, the name of this particular Celestial Covenant reveals a slice of history by itself, as the words *new and everlasting* possibly imply that other Covenants exist that might be just the opposite: *old and temporary*. Are there in fact such Covenants floating around? Yes, there are, but they are invisible; Father extracted them out of us in the First Estate before we came down here, and by their nature those temporary First Estate Covenants were designed to be replaced with *New and Everlasting Covenants*, Covenants that would never again be replaced, Covenants that are *everlasting*. The anonymous author who once wrote a Letter now known as *Hebrews* in the New Testament, once had a few words to say about *old* Covenants and *new* Covenants, average Covenants and better Covenants, *First* Covenants and *Second* Covenants:
>
> > "... now he hath obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better Covenant, which was established upon better promises. For if that *First covenant had been faultless, then should no*

> *place have been sought for the Second* [Covenant]. For finding fault with them, he saith, `Behold, the days come,' saith the Lord, `when I will make a *new* Covenant with the House of Israel, and with the House of Judah.' ... In that he saith, `A *New* Covenant,' he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to varnish away." -*Hebrews* 8:6, et seq.

The next chapter in *Hebrews* talks about the *Holy of Holies*, Temples, the *Ark of the Covenant*, and First and Second Covenants, which is advanced material I will talk about in another Letter. I do not know who wrote this *Letter to the Hebrews*; within its content the text contains little information about either its author, its original readers and their circumstances, its date, its overt purpose, or its theological background. *Hebrews* commences immediately by laying on the heavy stuff, while the greetings appear at the end. Even its literary form is somewhat mysterious in the sense that by probing into dimensionally deep Christian doctrines, the left the other Commentators behind him biting the dust; words and phrases appearing in *Hebrews* appear nowhere else [for example, the phrase *Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant* -- (see 12:24, 9:15, and 8:6) -- does not appear anywhere else in either the Old or New Testaments]. Martin Luther once made the suggestion that Apollos of Alexandria was the writer [*Apollos* is described in *Acts* 18:24-28 as being a caliber of a fellow who would and could write *Hebrews*]. Suffice it to say that the doctrinal ideas and ecclesiastical commentary presented in *Hebrews* will feel very comfortable to folks today after they have first been steeped in the *Doctrines of the New Covenant* for a while, as both originated from the same Source (the significance of *Hebrews* will be appreciated once you have an enlarged basis of factual knowledge on the successive organic nature of Covenants serving their purpose and then replacing previous Covenants, and in turn being replaced

by still other Covenants). While calling itself a *Word of Exhortation* [13:22], the *Letter to the Hebrews* contains some of the most eloquent writings and sermons in the New Testament, and whoever its author was, had to be a gifted Christian thinker who probed into the deeper doctrines of Christianity where few others did. I will have more to say about *Hebrews* in some other Letter.

-- I said that this *New and Everlasting Covenant* has been a source of interest to all of the great Patriarchs back down the line -- and I meant what I said -- so here are the citations:

- "... and I will look upon it, that I may remember the *Everlasting Covenant* between God and every living creature..." - *Genesis* 6:18
- "... I will establish my Covenant between me and thee and thy Seed [*seed* meaning offspring] after thee in their generation for an *Everlasting Covenant*, to be a God upon thee, and to thy Seed after thee." - *Genesis* 17:7
- "... my Covenant shall be in your flesh for an *Everlasting Covenant*." - *Genesis* 17:13
- "And God said `Sarah, thy wife, shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: And I will establish my Covenant with him for an *Everlasting Covenant*, and with his Seed after him." - *Genesis* 17:19
- "Every Sabbath he shall set it in order before the Lord continually, being taken from the children of Israel by an *Everlasting Covenant*." - *Leviticus* 24:8
- "And he shall have it, and his Seed after him, even the Covenant of an *Everlasting Priesthood*..." - *Numbers* 25:13
- "Although my house be not so with God, yet he hath made with me an *Everlasting Covenant*, ordered in all things, and sure: For this is all my Salvation, and all my desire..." - *II Samuel* 23:5
- "He is the Lord our God; His Judgements are in all the Earth; be mindful always of His Covenant; the

word which He commanded to a thousand generations; even of the Covenant He made with Abraham, and of his Oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a Law, and to Israel for an *Everlasting Covenant...*" - *I Chronicles* 16:14 et seq.

- "He is the Lord our God; His Judgments are in all the Earth; He hath remembered His Covenant for ever; the word which He commanded to a thousand generations; which Covenant He made with Abraham, and his Oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same to Jacob for a Law, and to Israel for an *Everlasting Covenant...*" - *Psalm* 105:7 et seq.
- "... the Earth is also defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the Laws, changed the Ordinance, broken the *Everlasting Covenant*." - *Isaiah* 55:3
- "... everlasting joy shall be unto them.. and I will direct their work in Truth, and I will make an *Everlasting Covenant* with them." - *Isaiah* 61:8 et seq.
- "... and I will make an *Everlasting Covenant* with them..." - *Jeremiah* 32:40
- "... nevertheless, I will remember my Covenant with thee in the days of thy youth, and I will establish unto thee an *Everlasting Covenant*." - *Ezekiel* 16:60
- "Moreover, I will make a Covenant of peace with them; it shall be an *Everlasting Covenant* with them; and I will place them, and multiply them..." - *Ezekiel* 37:26
- "... now the God of peace... that great shepard of the sheep, through the blood of the *Everlasting Covenant*." - *Hebrews* 13:20
- "For they have strayed from mine ordinances, and have broken mine *Everlasting Covenant*..." - *Doctrine and Covenants* 1:15
- "Wherefore, I, the Lord... gave commandments to others, that they should proclaim these things unto the world... that mine *Everlasting Covenant* might be established." - *Doctrine and Covenants* 1:17 et seq.
- "Behold, I say unto you that all old Covenants have I

caused to be done away with in this things; and this is a *New and Everlasting Covenant*, even that which was from the beginning." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 22:1

- "Wherefore I say unto you that I have sent unto you mine *Everlasting Covenant*, even that which was from the beginning." - *Everlasting Covenant* 49:9
- "Verily I say unto you, blessed are you for receiving mine *Everlasting Covenant*... sent forth unto the children of men, that they might have life and be made partakers of the glories which are to be revealed in the last days, as it was written by the Prophets and Apostles in days of old." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 66:2
- "... in the telestial world... [there will be goofs;]... these are they who say they are some of one and some of another -- some of Christ and some of John, and some of Moses, and some of Elias, and some of Esaisis, and some of Isaiah, and some of Enoch [by being of Moses, of John, of Jack, of Pete, of Harry, of Bob, of Ted -- they are spiritually disorganized in that they are *of* anyone except the right One]; but received not the Gospel, neither the testimony of Jesus, neither the Prophets ["... it's all the same God --I just don't need me none of that Contract stuff"], neither the *Everlasting Covenant*." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 76:98 et seq.
- "Wherefore, a commandment I give unto you, to prepare and organize yourselves by a bond or *Everlasting Covenant* that cannot be broken." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 78:11
- "He that is appointed to be president, or teacher,... let him offer himself in prayer upon his knees before God, in token or remembrance of the *Everlasting Covenant*." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 88:128 et seq.
- "I salute you in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, in token or remembrance of the *Everlasting Covenant*, in which Covenant I receive you to fellowship, in a determination that is fixed, immovable, and unchangeable, to be your friend and brother through the grace of God in the bonds of love, to wait in all the commandments of God blameless, in thanksgiving,

forever and ever." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 88:133

- "When men are called unto mine Everlasting Gospel, and Covenant with an *Everlasting Covenant*, they are accounted as the salt of the Earth and the savor of men..." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 101:39
- "For behold, I reveal unto you a *New and Everlasting Covenant*, it was instituted for the fullness of my Glory, and he that receiveth a fullness thereof must and shall abide the Law, or he shall be damned, saith the Lord God. [Yes, those are pretty strong consequences; but where there are high powered benefits, there will always be found correlative high powered consequences]." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 132:6
- "... verily I say unto you, if a man marry a wife by my word, which is my Law, and by the *New and Everlasting Covenant*... ye shall inherit thrones, kingdoms, principalities, and powers dominions, all heights and depths... they shall pass by the angels, and the gods, which are set there, to the exaltation and Glory in all things... and the angels are subject unto them." - *Doctrine & Covenants* 132:19 [return]

[7] "The object of our earthly existence is that we may have a fullness of joy, and that we may become the sons and daughters of God, in the fullest sense of the word, being heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ, to be kings and priests unto God, to inherit glory, dominion, exaltation, thrones, and every power and attribute developed and possessed by our Heavenly Father. This is the object of our being on this Earth. In order to obtain unto this exalted position, it is necessary that we go through this mortal experience, or probation, by which we may prove ourselves worthy, through the aid of our elder brother Jesus." - Joseph F. Smith, in a Funeral Service delivered over the daughter of Daniel H. Wells, on April 11, 1878; 19 *Journal of Discourses* 258, at 259 [London (1878)]. [return]

[8] "A charter is certainly in form and substance a contract; it is a grant of powers, rights, and privileges; ... A charter to a bank... is certainly a

contract, founded on valuable consideration." - Joseph Story, in III *Commentaries on the Constitution*, at page 258 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1833).

This Joseph Story, who I will be quoting from throughout this Letter, was born in Marblehead, Massachusetts in September of 1779. He entered Harvard College and graduated in 1798. When leaving Cambridge, he immediately entered into the study of Law in the office of Mr. Samuel Sewall, then an advocate at the Essex bar. In 1801, Joseph Story was admitted to the Massachusetts bar. He was elected to the Massachusetts Commonwealth Legislature in 1805, and was then elected to the Congress in 1808, and was soon Speaker of the House of Representatives. In 1810 he argued the great Georgia case *Fletcher vs. Peck*, which involved contracts, before the Supreme Court. He edited a book called *Chitty on Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes*, and others. On November 18, 1811, Joseph Story was commissioned to be an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court to fill the vacancy left by Mr. Justice Cushing. He was then 32 years of age, the youngest man ever to be called to such a position in either England or America, except for Justice Buller. While on the Supreme Court, Joseph Story wrestled down questions on Admiralty and Maritime regarding the rights and duties of ship owners, insurance companies, and mariners. He was a major architect of, and wrote extensively about, Patents and their role in English history [see *the Influence of Mr. Justice Story on American Patent Law* by Frank Prager in 5 American Journal of Legal History, at 254 (January, 1961)]. He created a doctrine to settle frictional disputes between the Federal-State layers of Government, called the *Comity Doctrine*, which is still quoted by the Supreme Court down to the present day [see *Joseph Story's Contribution to American Conflicts Law: a Comment* by Kurt Naddleman in 5 American Journal of Legal History, at 230 (January, 1961)]. And he also dealt with the banditry of *Prize Jurisdiction*, which was still in vogue. Back at a time when banking in the United States was operating under a *laissez-faire* relational status to Government, Joseph Story wrote that banking affects a public interest [very

significant words], and that banking involves that most ancient prerogative of national Sovereignty, *the Money Power*, which our Framers never restrained or abated in the Charter they created for our King. [See *Justice Story and the American Law of Banking* by Gerald Dunne, in 5 American Journal of Legal History, at 205 (January, 1961)]; and this is a dominant theme in American Jurisprudence remaining in effect down to the present day with George Mercier enlarging on what Joseph Story started. While studying his *Commentaries on the Constitution*, I have been able to uncover only a few of Justice Story's opinions and legal statements that were later reversed or otherwise toned down in subsequent Federal rulings, and none of the reversals were really on-point factual settings. Down to the present day in 1985, many of Joseph Story's statements of Law that he applied to the hypothetical factual scenarios which he created in 1833 for His *Commentaries* were actually made with great foresight, as they would later be coming to pass long after he returned Home in 1845. [For detailed biographies on all of the early Supreme Court Justices, See the *Supreme Court of the United States* by Hampton Carson [John Huber Company, Philadelphia (1891)]; and also worthwhile is Morgan David's *Justice Joseph Story: a Study of the Legal Philosophy of a Jeffersonian Judge* in 18 Vanderbuilt Law Review, at 643 (March, 1965). [return]

[9] Exemplary perhaps would be two *Exclusionary Rule* based cases from the Supreme Court: - *United States vs. Miller*, 425 U.S. 435 (1976). A criminally accused person made a pre-Trial Motion to Suppress of copies of checks and other bank records which federal agents had gotten a hold of. *HELD*: That the Motion to Suppress was properly denied since the accused person possessed no Fourth Amendment interest that could be vindicated by a challenge to the bank accounts; and any infirmities or deficiencies in the bank account record acquisition process, by way of a defective Subpoena or Search Warrant, were irrelevant arguments since Subpoenas and Search Warrants were unnecessary document acquisition tools to begin with; those bank account records are the property of the

Government, and they are available to the Government under administrative devices (meaning an investigator's phone call or letter inquiry); and - *United States vs. Payner*, 447 U.S. 727 (1979). A criminal defendant had been charged with falsifying his income tax return by denying that he held a foreign bank account. Federal agents in Florida had broken into an apartment and then surreptitiously copied bank records that a bank manager from the Bahamas had brought with him on a trip, under circumstances that you or I would be incarcerated for. Later on, detective work back at the office uncovered the fact that the poor defendant did indeed maintain foreign bank accounts, so the Government then threw a criminal prosecution at the fellow caught in the act of defilement. Since the Government had violated the Constitutional rights of a third party [the bank manager from the Bahamas], and not the criminally accused, the Fourth Amendment offered no protection to the Defendant, since the Defendant had no rights violated.

State in other words, perhaps more explicitly, emphasizing the consequences of maintaining bank account records: When Government obtains your bank account records, regardless of how, through whom, when, or under any circumstances, then arguing Fourth Amendment rights defensively will likely not produce any sympathy from Federal Appellate Forums. [return]

[10] Paraphrased from *United States vs. Payner*, id., at 731. [return]

[11] "... no interest legitimately protected by the Fourth Amendment is implicated by governmental investigative activities unless there is an intrusion into a zone of privacy, into `the security a man relies upon when he places himself or his property within a constitutionally protected area.'" - *Hoffa vs. United States*, 385 U.S. 293, at 301 (1966). [return]

[12] "Respondent [bank account holder] urges that he has a Fourth Amendment interest in the records kept by banks

because they are merely copies of personal records that were made available to the banks for a limited purpose and in which he has a reasonable expectation of privacy... Even if we direct our attention to the original checks and deposit slips [that the bank account holder kept in his home], rather than to the microfilm copies actually viewed and obtained by means of a subpoena, we perceive no legitimate `expectation of privacy' in their contents. The checks are not confidential communications but negotiable instruments to be used in commercial transactions. The lack of *any* legitimate expectation of privacy concerning the information kept in bank records was assumed by Congress in enacting the *Bank Secrecy Act*, the express purpose of which is to require records to be maintained because they *`have a high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax, and regulatory investigations and proceedings'* [12 U.S.C. 1829b(a)(1)]." - *United States vs. Miller*, 425 U.S. 435, at 442 (1976)

The *italics* were added here to underscore the extreme significance of those statements; the Law in this *Fourth Amendment/bank account* area is well settled: *Commercial* contracts are in effect, and challenging it is improvident. Notice how the Congress is playing cutesy by calling a sequential family of statutes the *Bank Secrecy Act*, freely conveying the initially impressive image that these statutes protect or otherwise enhance the public's secrecy in banking accounts and related records -- but in reality the *Bank Secrecy Act* is a high-powered statutory device, as the Supreme Court here exemplifies, to promote the usefulness of those bank records in criminal prosecutions that the Government will one day be throwing at you. Among other things, this Act empowers the Secretary of the Treasury to adopt broad regulations compelling banks to record their customer's transactions and requiring that the banks, as well as private persons using banking services, also report a broad range of financial transactions *to the government* [now where is the "Secrecy"?] Pursuant to this grant of statutory jurisdiction, the Treasury Secretary then turned around and created his own multiplying slice of *lex* by

administrative promulgations directing that each bank report each and every single deposit, withdrawal, and transfer that took place in domestic transactions of $10,000 or more [see 31 *Code of Federal Regulations* Section 103.22]. [return]

[13] Banking records seized from residences merely contain the same information that other documents located in public places contain; and so although those seized records are "private papers," all the Government has to do is go down to the bank [now that they know which bank to go to, and which account to sift through], obtain duplicate copies of banking records, and then throw those copies that were obtained directly from banks at Defendants:

> "On their face, the documents [bank accounts] subpoenaed here are not respondent's `private papers.' Unlike claimant in *Boyd vs. United States* [116 U.S. 616 (1886)], respondent [bank account holder] can assert neither ownership nor possession. Instead, these are the business records of banks." - *United States vs. Miller*, 425 U.S. 435, at 440 (1976). [return]

[14] As I mentioned in the Armen Condo Letter, Federal Judges have been asked not to let the "cat out of the bag" by discussion the special and very quiet relationship between bank accounts and Income Tax statute liability (although bank accounts are not exclusive Equity Jurisdiction attachment instruments, they are air-tight instruments of *Conclusive Evidence* whenever the King has a burden of proving the defendant's entrance into Interstate Commerce). [return]

[15] "The depositor takes the risk, in revealing his affairs to another, that the information will be conveyed by that person to the Government... This Court has held repeatedly that the Fourth Amendment does not prohibit the obtaining of information revealed to a third party and conveyed by [the third party] to Government authorities,

even if the information is revealed on the assumption that it will be used only for a limited purpose and the confidence placed in the third party will not be betrayed." - *United States vs. Miller*, 425 U.S. 435, at 443 (1976).

If you don't know what contract I am referring to that gives the King the right to simply reclaim his own property, then ask a bank for a copy of their bank rules that all depositors and borrowers have agreed to be bound by. Under normal circumstances, banks are reluctant to give depositors copies of Bank Rules those depositors have agreed to be bound by. Sounds irrational, doesn't it? Withholding the terms of contracts those depositors have just taken upon themselves criminal compliance liability for? Yet, numerous attempts by people associated with me have attempted to obtain a copy of these Bank Rules, and all attempts resulted in the banking officer clamming up tight, deflecting attention over to the "irregular and unusual" nature of the request, and then telling the requesting person to go See *Mr. so and so* at the Federal Reserve Board, who in turn also clammed up tight. So much for domestic American bank accounts. [return]

[16] *Burrows vs. Superior Court*, 13 Cal 3rd 238, at 247 (1974). [return]

[17] 321 U.S. 233, at 252 (1943). [return]

[18] 439 U.S. 308 (1978). [return]

[19] Gremlins have had a few words to say about the utterly heinous issuance of paper currency:

> "Of all the contrivances for cheating the laboring classes of mankind, none is so effectual as that which deludes them with paper money. It is the most perfect expedient ever invented for fertilizing the rich man's fields by the sweat of the poor man's brow. Ordinary tyranny, oppression, excessive taxation, these

> bear lightly on the happiness of the community compared with fraudulent currencies and the robberies committed by depreciated paper. Our own history has recorded enough, and more than enough, of the demoralizing tendency, the injustice and intolerable oppression on the virtuous and well disposed, of a degraded paper currency, authorized by law, or in any way countenanced by Government."

-Gremlin Nelson W. Aldrich, United States Senator, at a New York City dinner speech on October 15, 1913 (two months before his pet Federal Reserve System was passed by the Congress to create the very conditions he fraudulently represented to oppose, in *IV Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science #1*, at 38 [Columbia University, New York (1914)]. [return]

[20] When the United States Congress removed the last remaining attachment of paper Federal Reserve notes to gold reserve requirements in 1968 --the Gremlins were there. From out of his nest on the 17th Floor of the Chase Manhattan Bank descended one David Rockefeller on Congress, taking his jet and making his attack sortie on Washington with Gremlin enscrewment in mind --whose very appearance itself at a Committee Hearing was designed to make an important Statement: That we Gremlins now hold the upper hand in the United States, and our grand plans for monetary enscrewment will no longer be restrained on account of some lingering silly little anachronistic gold ratio requirements left over from another era. This is the modern age with computers, Congress, and you just don't need to concern yourself none with that old medieval stuff. See the "Statement of David Rockefeller" in the *Gold Cover Hearings* ["Hearings Before the Committee on Banking and Commerce of the United States Senate"], at page 141, 90th Congress, Second Session ["Repeal of Gold Reserve Requirement"] (January, 1968)]. [return]

[21] The Legal Tender Acts, enacted during the Civil War, were billed as a war measure:

"... to handle the vast amount of means necessary for the prosecution of this war, to enable the people to pay in and the Government to pay out, we must have a larger and more abundant currency that we have heretofore found to be necessary. The accustomed currency is wholly inadequate. The Government has for many years used only gold and silver for this purpose... The business of the Government and the business of the country require some substitute for coin. We must therefore create a new [paper]... currency. We must therefore create a public debt, establish a currency, and impose new taxes." - Speech by Representative John Crisfield of Maryland, favoring enactment of the Legal Tender Statutes [*Congressional Globe*, 37th Congress, 2nd Session, Appendix, page 43 et seq. (February 5, 1862)]. [return]

[22]

- *United States vs. Wong Kim Ark*, 169 U.S. 649, at 645 (1897);
- *Veazie Bank vs. Fenno*, 75 U.S. 533 (1869);
- *Locke vs. New Orleans*, 71 U.S. 172 (1866); etc. [return]

[23] *Gilman vs. Philadelphia*, 70 U.S. 713, at 725 (1865). [return]

[24] I call this a "landmark" case because it was later cited by the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Legal Tender Cases*, 79 U.S. 457, at 548 (1871). [return]

[25] *Case of Mixed Money*, Sir John Davies Reporter, at page 48 (1604). [return]

[26] Yes, the Congress can do whatever it feels like with issuing currency, as an attribute of its sovereignty:

"Congress, as the legislature of a sovereign

> nation, being expressly empowered by the constitution to lay and collect taxes, pay the debts, and provide for a common defense... [and also] to charter national banks, and to provide a national currency for the whole people in the form of coin, treasury notes, and national bank bills, and [also has] the power to make the notes of the Government a legal tender in payment of private debts being one of the powers belonging to sovereignty in other civilized nations, and not expressly withheld from Congress by the Constitution..." - *Julliard vs. Greenman*, 110 U.S. 421, at 466 (1884). [return]

[27] Earlier, I mentioned that Contracts we enter into now down here with Heavenly Father overrule and supersede our First Estate Contracts, and that the First Estate Contracts then fade away in significance. The Principle of Law that this is based on is called by business lawyers in Commerce as the *Merger Doctrine*, contracts that we enter into today overrule and extinguish contracts entered into in a previous era; in other words, the most recent contract absorbs previous contracts. The application of this *Merger Doctrine* is found in many settings. For example, in real estate transactions, just as the old prior oral negotiations between a Seller and a Purchaser are washed out by the Deed [23 *Am Jur* Deeds Section 261], so too do oral precontract negotiations lose their identity and existence as those negotiations later unite in the confluence of the written contract [*Price vs. Block*, 124 F.2nd 738]. This *Merger Doctrine* is a correct Principle of Nature I touched on in the Armen Condo Letter [that Commercial contracts we enter into today with the King overrule the restrainments resident in the Constitution of 1787], and this Principle now operates, and has operated, in all factual settings. The Merger Doctrine recognizes that there are different levels of importance or priorities in *Nature*, and what is done in the past is always of less significance than what is done in the present (which is simply reason, logic and *common sense*); so lesser important contracts from out of the

past, together with their lingering oral expectations and the like, fade away in significance as they are *merged* into contracts of greater importance:

> "Whenever a greater Estate and a less [Estate] coincide and meet in one and the same person, without any intermediate estate, the less is immediately annihilated; or, in the law phrase, is said to be merged, that is, sunk or drowned in the greater." -2 *Blackstone Commentaries* 177.

When corporations are said to *merge*, what actually happens is that the two independent corporations lose their existence altogether as separate entities having separate assets, liabilities, franchises, legal rights, and powers; and are totally absorbed into the new single corporation [see *Morris vs. Investment Life Insurance*, 272 N.E.2nd 105, at 108].

And since *Nature*, so called, merely replicates the mind, will and intention of its great Creator, the Principle of Nature that lawyers practicing Commercial Law call the *Merger Doctrine*, also applies to have our great contemporary Celestial Contracts with Father overrule and wash out our lessor previous existence First Estate Contracts. Yes, when you know the Law in one setting, you know the Law in all settings, as nothing changes from one factual setting to the next. [return]

[28] When words have several different meanings, the word is said to be an *Entente*. In Law, the word *Currency* is such an *Entente*. Over a period of time, words change meaning as new factual circumstances surface to alter the use or perspective of something:

> "The meaning of words changes. It is curious to note how many words wholly lose their original or etymological meaning, and from usage and change of circumstances acquire sometimes an opposite and often a different meaning... The common legal word *indorse*, from the Latin *in*,

> upon, and *Dorsum*, the back. It used to be applied literally and strictly to a writing upon the *back* of a paper. It is now well settled that a good instrument may be made on the *face* of a bill or note." - *Pilmer vs. State Bank*, 16 Iowa Reporter 321, at 329 (1864).

And on one hand, speaking like an economist, *Currency* has been defined to be:

> "Currency is capital seeking investment. While invested, it takes the form of money, or of promises to deliver money on demand, but so soon as it is invested, it loses its character of currency, and assumes that of stocks, houses, or commodities." - Hugh Carey in *Answer to the Currency Question*, at page 6 [Lea & Blanchard, Philadelphia (1840); *Rare Book Collection*, University of Rochester, Seward Collection #410].

Before the Civil War there were actually few United States Treasury Notes floating around the Countryside, as Currency at that time, because the King's *Legal Tender Acts* had not yet been enacted, and the King had not yet decided that the time had come to pull another grab and enact penal statutes to create a national exclusive monopoly on currency instruments for himself. Privately minted coins, bank notes, and mining company script, and the like, then constituted the nation's currency. With that in mind, the Illinois Supreme Court once defined *currency* as:

> "By the term currency is understood bank bills, or other paper money issued by authority, which pass as and for coin... In the case of *Judah vs. Hains* [19 J.R. 144], the Court decided that a note, payable in bank notes current in the City of New York, was a valid note. The Court said they will take notice that notes current in the City of New York are of cash value throughout

> the State, and are distinguished by those words from other bank notes, which are received at a discount, and hence it is immaterial whether the notes of banks of other States might be tendered in payment, provided they are current in the City of New York; in that case they are considered cash, equally with the current bills of this State.
>
> "From those authorities, it would seem that current bills, or currency, are of the value of cash, and exclude the idea of depreciated money. If, then, currency is taken as and for coin, it follows that such is its value..." - *Richard Swift vs. James Whitney*, 20 Illinois 144, at 146 (1840).

The Supreme Court of Iowa once wrestled with a definition of *currency*:

> "Currency is bank bills or other paper money which passes as a circulating medium in the business community as, and for, the constitutional coin of the country. The term `current funds' means currency money, par funds, or money circulating without any discount..."
>
> "The word *currency* is, as we have seen, far from having a settled, fixed and precise meaning. And even if it had such a meaning in general, it might acquire in certain localities, or among certain classes, a different signification." - *Pilmer vs. State Bank*, 16 Iowa Reporter 321, at 328 (1864).

And in more recent times, the King, having sealed up with his gun barrel muscle tactics a national monopoly on circulating currency instruments, an Appellate Court in Illinois now changed the meaning of *currency* once again:

> "Currency has been defined as funds or money

> circulating in the business community without any discount, excluding the idea of depreciated paper money." - *Jake less vs. S. Alport*, 217 Illinois Appellate 14, at 17 (1920).

Here in the 1980's, the editors of *Black's Law Dictionary*, functioning as the Government Billboards in the sense that the focus point of everything is always juristic: Some slice of *Lex* over here, or some Case over there. Continuing on with their Government center of gravity on everything the way they do, *Black's* defines *currency* as only to include those coins, banknotes, and paper money that the King has officially recognized in his Legal Tender *lex* [as if either we or our Fathers in the 1800's really needed the King]:

> "*Currency*: Coined money and such banknotes or other paper money as are authorized by law and do in fact circulate from hand to hand as the medium of exchange. See... *Legal Tender* [no cases are cited]." - *Black's Law Dictionary*, 5th Edition.

When those cases from the 1800's stated that *Currency* meant Notes [and *Notes* are promises to pay] that are exchanged *at par*, what they mean is that those paper Notes carry an immediate or *current* maturity date. To redeem a *note at par* meant to receive 100% exchange for the Face Value that was stated on the Note; if the Note stated the Face Value of 10 Gold Eagles, then if the Note was redeemed *at par* 10 Gold Eagles would then be yours; if redeemed at 90% of par, then 9 Gold Eagles would be yours. Therefore, when the Maturity Date was current (immediate), the Note could be exchanged for gold or silver *at par*, if in fact you wanted the coin instead of the Note. If the Note was exchangeable for hard coin say, one or five years out in the future, then such a Note was not *current*, and would only be exchanged for coin at below par (the percentage differential between the par and the sub-par negotiated was the interest carrying cost the new Note

holder had to bear while he sat and waited for the Maturity Date to arrive). But today, *Black's* has done away with all of this, we have Legal Tender statutes now in the modern era, and you just don't need to concern yourself with none of that privately minted stuff. [return]

[29] The King modeled his bank after the *Bank of Amsterdam*. Before the Bank of England was established, English mercantile writers such as Sir Josiah Childe and Thomas Yaranton placed the Crown on notice that "... the Amsterdam bank was of so immense advantage to them..." because Dutch Government Debt Instruments "... go in Trade equal with Ready Money, yea, better in many parts of the World than Money." [quoted by Dickerson in *The Financial Revolution in England: a Study in the Development of Public Credit*, 1688-1756, at page 5 (MacMillian Company, London, 1967)]. The Bank of Amsterdam had begun as a Warehouse for the safe storage of gold and silver belonging largely to Merchants. A Merchant would deposit his precious metal for safekeeping, with a receipt given in return; and the banker charged a fee for the safekeeping. But soon a few Merchants wanted the receipts to be divisible, because they wanted to negotiate just the receipt itself, without having to bother making arrangements to physically arrange an exchange of the gold or silver. While the Merchants were looking at ways to save time here and there, the bankers themselves were developing a few ideas of their own; the bankers noticed that only some small percentage of the gold and silver actually came and went in and out the doors, so they started to loan out gold that was not theirs. Now this was getting interesting --charging both for the storage and also collecting interest on the property of others; and its allure attracted the attention of a Gremlin, Mr. John Law, who used this concept as a basis for developing a Government monetary theory similar to what Gremlin John Maynard Keynes would be writing about two centuries later:

> "This theory [of John Law's] was that the economic system of that day was being starved because of insufficient supplies of money. And using the Bank of Amsterdam as a model, he had a

> scheme for producing all the money a nation needed." - John Flynn in *Men of Wealth*, at 51 [Simon and Schuster, New York (1941)].

For nearly two decades, John Law shopped his theories around European Juristic Institutions, with his plans falling on death ears, but one day a window opened for his intrigues to be used. After King Louis the 14th of France had depleted his Treasury funds in 1716, he turned to John Law who he had previously rebuffed. John Law established the *Banque Generale* with himself at the top; soon it was named the *Royal Bank* with a monopoly charter granted on the issuance of money -- and John Law issued bales of paper money, and so, not surprisingly, prosperity was rampant:

> "It is not to be wondered that for a few brief months Paris hailed the magician who had produced all these rabbits from his hat. Crowds followed his carriage. People struggled to get a glimpse of him. The nobles of France hung around his anteroom, begging a word from him." - *Men of Wealth*, id., at 75.

John Law followed the Gremlin script for enscrewment right down the line; all gold and silver was accumulated in the hands of his *Royal Bank*; public ownership of gold was outlawed; devaluations transpired; inflation mounted and illiquidity was in the air as debt instruments began to be difficult to service. John Law fled France in 1720, with the mobs who had once hailed him for being a financial genius now calling for his head. If this economic scenario sounds at all familiar to you, it should, because Gremlins find it unnecessary to change, alter, modify, or rearrange Their *Modus Operandi* with the passage of time, as they go about their work running one civilization into the ground after another:

> "As a *New Dealer* [John Law] was not greatly different in one respect from the apostles of the mercantilist school -- the Colberts, the

> Roosevelts, the Daladiers, the Hitlers and Mussolinis... who sought to create income and work by state-fostered public works and who labored to check the flow of gold away from their borders. He introduced something new, however, that the Hitlers, the Mussolinis, the Roosevelts, the Daladiers and the Chamberlains have imitated -- the creation of funds for these purposes through the instrumentalities of the modern bank. Law is the precursor of the inflationist redeemers." - *Men of Wealth*, id.

So the Bank of England was modeled after the Bank of Amsterdam which had been created early in the 1600's, and the Dutch bank in turn had been modeled after the Bank of Venice [as reported by Charles Wilson in *The Dutch Republic and the Civilization of the Seventeenth Century*, at page 25; McGraw Hill, New York (1968)]. The Bank of England became so successful at selling Government debt instruments that it soon became the prototype for public banks where looters in other nations sought similar objectives of grabbing more money for themselves without having to ask their subjects for it. Under the direction of a series of astute financial moves, England's new Bank quickly created investor confidence in Government funded debt instruments, enabling the Crown to borrow large sums of money at steadily declining rates of interest, rather than go through the nuisance and irritation of raising taxes dramatically. Writing in *The Spectator*, Joseph Addison once compared Government credit loans to:

> "... a beautiful Virgin seated upon a throne of Gold possess'd of the powers of a Croesus to convert whatever she pleas'd into that precious Metal [*Croesus* was a King of Lydia in the 6th Century, B.C., and possessed vast wealth; hence *Croesus* means any fabulously wealthy man.]" - quoted by Dickerson in *The Financial Revolution in England: a Study in the Development of Public Credit*, 1688-1756, inside the front page [MacMillian Company, London, 1967)]. [return]

[30] "The history of the law of money evidences a constant struggle between the customs of trade and the doctrine of freedom of contract, on the one hand, and on the other, the exercise of the political power for the needs of Government or the relief of private debtors [meaning banking Gremlins]." - Phanor J. Eder, writing in "Legal Theories of Money," 20 *Cornell Law Quarterly* 52, at 53 (1934). [return]

[31] There is some value in turning around and looking back at the past to uncover the movements of men in other ages, because once their behavior in that setting is known, then the real meaning of the movements of men today are exposed:

> "If we consider the shortness of human life, and our limited knowledge, even of what passes in our own time, we must be sensible that we should be forever children in understanding, were it not for this invention, which extends our experience to all past ages, and to the most distant nations; making them contribute as much to our improvement in wisdom, as they had actually laid under our observation. A man acquainted with history may, in some respect, be said to have lived from the beginning of the world, and to have been making continual additions to his stock of knowledge in every country." - David Hume in *Philosophical Works* ["Of the Study of History"], at page 390; [Longmans Green, London (1898); Greene and Grosse, Editors].

But Anglo-Saxon Kings are not the only looters to play this game. For a discussion of Monetary Debasement being pulled off in B.C. times, see the writings of Phanor J. Eder in *The Gold Clause Cases in Light of History*, 23 Georgetown Law Journal 369, at page 722 (Part II) (1935). [return]

[32] The Queen died shortly after making this promise to her subjects, but her successor honored her commitment.

See Simon, *Historical Account of Irish Coins*, at page 38 (1749). [return]

[33] For additional Commentary on the use of debased currency against the Irish rebels, see generally, John Hannigan, *The Monetary and Legal Tender Acts of 1933-34 and the Law*, 14 Boston University Law Review 485, at 504 (1934). [return]

[34] "Once the Convention was under way, proposals that the Federal Government be given the power to coin money and fix its value and that both the Federal and State Governments be vested with authority to emit bills of credit triggered heated debate over the appropriate limits of governmental monetary power." - Getman, *The Right to Use Gold Clauses in Contracts*, XLII Brooklyn Law Review 479, at 489 (1976). See generally, Max Farrand, Editor, *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787* [Yale University Press (1937)], 4 volumes. So what we are left with today is the milktoast of Article I, Section 10. [return]

[35] *The Legal Tender Cases*, 79 U.S. 457, at 548 (1871). [return]

[36] Professors Peacock and Wiseman correctly point out that a Government's call for a spirit of sacrifice leads to the general acceptance of a higher tax rate at the end of a major war, rather than at the beginning of the war [see A.T. Peacock and J. Wiseman in *The Growth of Public Expenditures in the United Kingdom* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1961);] but as is the caliber of collegiate *intelligentsia*, never is there any discussion of the quiet movements of Gremlins in the shadows directing the administrative operations of their nominees that they had previously planted and placed in political jurisdictions; and so as a result, the true illicit nature of the *lex* designed to create Special Interest benefits and damages not related to legitimate juristic police power operations, remains obscured. The last annulment

institution in the United States for illicit *lex*, the Supreme Court, is moving in the right direction generally, but they still need some fine tuning:

> "The requirement of a legitimate public purpose guarantees that the State is exercising its police power, rather than providing a benefit to special interests." - *Energy Reserves vs. Kansas Power*, 459 U.S. 400, at 412 (1983). [return]

[37] "But the history of paper money, without any adequate funds pledged to redeem it, and resting merely upon the pledge of national faith, has been in all ages and in all nations the same. It has constantly become more and more depreciated; and in some instances has ceased from this cause to have any circulation whatsoever, whether issued by the irresistible edict of a despot, or the more alluring order of a republican congress." - Joseph Story, III *Commentaries on the Constitution*, at page 225 ["Prohibitions - Paper Money"] (Cambridge, 1833). [return]

[38] "... the reader should note especially the `striking parallels to modern times' [in comparison to King Solon in 594 B.C., when he pulled off currency debasement acts by]... military adventures draining treasuries, threats of national bankruptcy, inflations, massive liquidations of debt, debasement of all coinage, disputes over sovereign prerogatives concerning money..." -Henry Holzer, *Government's Money Monopoly*, page 15 [Books in Focus, New York City (1981)]. [return]

[39] Down to the present day, pleas and petitions for a reinstatement of the Gold Standard, of just some type, continuously falls on death ears in Congress [maybe because that is not OUR Congress]. In December of 1981, the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee entertained such a petition [see *Grassroots Hearings on the Economy, Part III*, "Petition for Hearings on HR 391 -- Rhode Islanders for a Gold Standard," 97th Congress, First Session, starting at 499 (GPO, 1981)], but the petition was tossed aside and ignored. [return]

[40] "A strange fallacy has crept into the reasoning on this subject. It has been supposed, that a corporation is some great, independent thing; and that the power to erect it is a great, substantive, independent power; whereas in truth, a corporation is but a legal capacity, quality, or means to an end; and the power to erect it is, or may be, an implied and incidental power. A corporation is never the end, for which other powers are exercised; but a means, by which other objects are accomplished." - Joseph Story, in *III Commentaries on the Constitution* 131, ["Powers of Congress"] (Cambridge, 1833). [return]

[41] *Lake County Estates*, 440 U.S. 391, at 401 (1978). [return]

[42] *In Re: Russo*, 53 Federal Rules Decisions 564 (United States District Court, 1971). [return]

[43] "The Bill of Rights is the primary source of expressed information as to what is meant by Constitutional liberty. Its safeguards secure the climate which the Law of Freedom needs in order to exist. It is true that they were added to the Constitution to operate solely against Federal power [*Barron vs. Baltimore*, 32 U. S. 243, at 247 (1833)]. But the Fourteenth Amendment was added in 1868 in response for a demand for national protection against abuses of State power. A series of decisions over the last 25 years has held that many rights were indeed extended against the states by that Amendment. It is indeed fair to say that from 1962 to 1969 the very face of the Law changed. Those years witnessed the extension to the States of nine of the specifics of the Bill of Rights, decisions which have profound impact on American life, requiring the deep involvement of State courts in the application of Federal Law." - Justice William Brennan in *Remarks*, 36 Rutgers Law Review 725, at 727 (1984). [return]

Patriots and Tax Protestors can carry on all they want with demanding, and believing, that they posses some

Constitutional Rights, and just like Justice Brennan's *remarks*, there are many high, noble and lofty characterizations of those Rights available -- but those *remarks*, together with the Tax Protestor's demands, are all for naught when one tiny little device surfaces in a grievance: A Commercial Contract. By the end of this Letter the elevated priority in Nature that contracts ascend to in settling grievances should become apparent, whenever they are in effect; a doctrinal concept if unlearned now, Mr. May, will be learned in on uncertain terms before Father at the Last Day.

[44] Inflation is a Tort, and can be claimed as such in damage awards. See the Supreme Court in *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation vs. Pfifer*, 462 U.S. 523 (1983). And Inflation is also a tax, and is treated as income by the Treasury Department; in the *Annual Report* of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1919, on page 213, there lies the interesting admission that the large federal deficits of 1917 to 1919, totaling then some $23 billion, were financed by money creation, and other devices. [return]

[45] "The purpose of the Federal Reserve System is to contribute, to the maximum extent that monetary policy can contribute, to the achievement of sustained high employment, stable values, and a rising standard of living for all Americans." - William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in *the Federal Reserve after 50 Years* ["Hearings before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance"], 88th Congress, 2nd Session, Volume I, page 16 [GPO Washington (January and February, 1964)]. [return]

[46] Economists watch Fed monetary statistics quite closely, as if they were national policy tools (which they are). Statistics generally targeted for close observation are those two monetary velocity instruments called M-1 and M-2, as they are indications of the direction of the future percentage advance of the GNP and Inflation. See *the Velocity of Money* by George Garvey and Martin Blyn, [Federal Reserve Bank, New York (1969)]. The true point of origin of all directional changes in the economy

necessarily originates with that institution that controls the aggregate issuance of its circulating instruments; at the present time, this is the Fed and its *Open Market Committee*, a fact that the Congress collectively is well aware of but not always acknowledged publicly. See *Conduct of Monetary Policy* in Hearings before the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, House of Representatives, 96th Congress, First Session, Serial Number 96-22 (July, 1979), which discusses the cascading effect of decisions of the *Open Market Committee* on multiple macroeconomic indicia. [return]

[47] An *Intelligentsia* clown once hired by Gremlins to do some writing for them wrote a few words to talk about the Gremlin perception of prosperity:

> "An economic system does not have to be expansive -- that is, constantly increasing its production of wealth -- and it might well be possible for people to be completely happy in a nonexpansive economic system if they were accustomed to it. In the twentieth century, however, the people of our culture have been living under expansive conditions for generations. Their minds are psychologically adjusted to expansion, and they feel deeply frustrated unless they are better off each year than they were the previous year. The economic system itself has become organized for expansion, and if it does not expand it tends to collapse [and when it does collapse, it is because the Gremlins were there]." - Carroll Quigley in *Tragedy and Hope*, at 497 [MacMillian Company, New York (1966)]. [return]

[48] The Federal Reserve Board is a very handy instrument to massage economies, create depressions, and run civilizations into the ground with. For example, in the late 1920's, there was an era of speculation in the securities markets of the United States; after a while in any market, what appears to be *speculation* will always

surface when rising prices and highly leveraged loans make their institutionalized appearance on the scene. Economists, bureaucratic theorists, and other clowns will cast *speculation* into an illicit image, but *speculation*, so called, is nothing more than a manifestation of strong prosperity -- and Gremlins do not want you and I to have sustained protracted prosperity, they want us to experience economic starvation like they wanted physical starvation for those millions of Ukrainians who were murdered in the great manufactured Famine of 1932-33. Easy high percentage loans are an important ingredient to create *speculation*, so one of the devices used by Rothschild Gremlins to create a balloon of American speculation was to lower the rate of interest charged by the Federal Reserve Board to member banks:

> "Nothing did more to spur the boom in stocks than the decision made by the New York Federal Reserve Bank, in the Spring of 1927, to cut the rediscount rate. Benjamin Strong, Governor of the bank, was chief advocate of this unwise measure, which was taken largely at the behest of Montagu Norman of the Bank of England [Montagu Norman was a Rothschild nominee planted in the Bank of England]. Ostensibly, this easy money policy was designed to stop the flow of gold out of England [as usual, *deception* is present when Gremlins are running the show]. Its primary effect, however, was to cause a reevaluation of all securities [upward], and to further inflate our already inflationary credit system by making large sums of money available for financing stock speculation." - Bernard Baruch,, in his autobiography *Baruch: the Public Years*, at 221 [Holt Rheinhart & Winston, New York (1960)].

The well known Gremlin economist John K. Galbraith dismisses the view that the action of the Federal Reserve Board authorities in cutting the rediscount rate in the Spring of 1927 had much effect on the elevated speculation which followed, on the grounds that this:

> "... explanation obviously assumes that people will always speculate if they can get the money to finance it. Nothing can be farther from the truth. There were times before and there have been long periods since when credit was plentiful and cheap -- far cheaper than in 1927 to 1929 -- and when speculation was negligible. Nor, as we shall see later, was speculation out of control after 1927, except that it was beyond the reach of men who did not want in the least to control it." - John K. Galbraith in *The Great Crash*, page 16 [Houghton Mifflin, Boston (1955)].

Speculation is actually fueled by the ability to easily obtain highly leveraged loans in a market characterized by rapidly rising prices. Your analogy of 1927, Mr. Galbraith, to previous eras is defective because other previous periods of cheap credit was deficient in possessing the twin important structural *speculation* requirements of easily obtainable highly leveraged loans and rapidly rising prices; if both highly leveraged loans and rapidly rising prices are not present, then cheap credit loans will not induce *speculation*. And so the failure of cheap and plentiful credit loans in previous eras to trigger *speculation* then, is not relevant and does not negate the highly stimulating effect that such inexpensive credit loans created in the American securities markets from 1927 to 1929, since declining rates of interest very much act as an accelerant on markets already structurally conditioned for *speculation* by the twin important indicia of highly leveraged loans and rapidly rising prices. You really are not competent to be an economist, Mr. Galbraith -- and incidentally, managing speculation, so called, was very much within the reach of your brothers who very much wanted to control it, *totally*. Sorry, Mr. Galbraith, but you don't do a very good job of covering the tracks of your Gremlin brothers from the First Estate who, like you, are repeating the same judgment mistakes now that you made then.

Having created something *illicit*, having created something that just *needs* and *is begging* for a corrective solution, Gremlins acting through their instrumentality, the Federal Reserve Board, in 1929 now had just the right medicine to fix this wicked *Speculation*, as one visible Rothschild nominee, Mr. Montagu Norman, once again made his descent sortie on Washington in vulture trajectory, and told Andrew Mellon what to do next:

> "... the Federal Reserve Board issued a formal statement today declaring that it conceived it to be its duty in `the immediate situation' to restrain the use, either directly or indirectly, of Federal Reserve credit facilities in aid of the froth of speculative credit...
>
> "No information could be obtained from Mr. Norman or American officials concerning the purpose of his visit [to Washington] other than he had come here for a general discussion of international financial conditions with the System and members of the [Federal Reserve] Board...
>
> "All efforts to obtain any further interpretation of the action of the Federal Reserve Board than that contained in its formal statement were futile...
>
> "The decision by the Federal Reserve Board to take so definite a stand in connection with its attitude towards speculative activities, was made, it is understood, only after a conference in which Secretary Mellon, as Chairman [of the Federal Reserve] *ex-officio* participated [meaning that Gremlin Andrew Mellon *directed*, after having received his instructions from the Rothschilds through Montagu Norman]...
>
> "The frankness of its announcement today therefore added to the interest it caused in financial circles." - *The New York Times* ["Loan

> Curb Hinted by Federal Reserve Board; States Duty in `the Immediate Situation' is to restrain Speculative Credit"], page 1 (February 7, 1929).

Who is Montagu Norman? A Gremlin who was recognized as being very powerful at that time [Carroll Quigley claims the *Wall Street Journal* for November 11, 1927 characterized Montagu Norman as "... the currency dictator of Europe."] Like all good hardworking Gremlins putting in their honest days' labor, they are answerable to another person up the line [even the Rothschilds know from whence their benefits originate]; and like a few other *world class* Gremlins, Montagu Norman held the high honor of running an entire civilization into the ground:

> "... Norman held the position [of *Chancellor of the Exchequer*] for twenty-four years (1920-1944), during which he became the chief architect of the liquidation of Britain's global preeminence." - Carroll Quigley in *Tragedy and Hope*, at 325 [MacMillian Company, New York (1966)].

He had brilliance, he had genius, he had *savior-faire*, and Montagu Norman tied it all together with slick Gremlin *finesse* when he so smoothly ran Great Britain into the ground with so very few people even knowing that he had done so; and so when Montagu Norman brought his conquests to other continents, for and on behalf of his Rothschild sponsors, he would also be leaving the ruins of those once majestic civilizations with little indication that he had been there.

The year 1929 started out to be a great year, and American businessmen had positive expectations [see the many businessmen quoted through the *Wall Street Journal* for January 1, 1929]; but the world's Gremlins had a few ideas of their own:

> "On February 15, 1929, the Federal Advisory Council adopted the following resolution:

> "The Council believes that every effort should be made to correct the present situation in the speculative markets before resorting to an advance in rates.
>
> "The Council in reviewing present conditions finds that in spite of the cooperation of member banks, the measures so far adopted have not been effective in correcting the present situation of the money market. The Council, therefore, recommends that the Federal Reserve Board permit the Federal Reserve banks to raise their rediscount rate immediately and maintain a rate consistent with the cost of commercial credit." - Transcript of the minutes of the 3:10pm Meeting of the *Federal Advisory Council* in the Federal Reserve Board Room (April 19, 1929) {National Archives ["Federal Reserve Board File"], Washington, D.C.}. The Federal Reserve Board's *Federal Advisory Council* was abolished in the 1930's.

The *Federal Advisory Council* had also met twice earlier that day, at 10:05am and at 12:10pm. There had been an ominous atmosphere of excitement in the air that day:

> "The prospect of further developments of importance in regard to the Government's attitude on the credit situation appeared today when members of the Federal Advisory Council... met in a special session and later held a joint conference with the Board [the 12:10pm meeting]. Resolutions were adopted by the Council and transmitted to the Board, but their purport was closely guarded. ... An atmosphere of deep mystery was thrown about the proceedings both by the Board and the Council. No advance announcement had been made that an extraordinary session of the Council was contemplated, and in fact that the members were in the city became known only when newspaper correspondents

> happened to see some of them entering the Treasury Department building. Even after that evasive replies were given, until it became apparent that such tactics were futile... While the joint meeting was in progress at the Treasury Department, every effort was made to guard the proceedings and a group of newspaper correspondents were asked to leave the corridor. The meeting of the Council attracted particular attention in view of the fact that it had met here in regular session on February 14th, a week following the Reserve Board's warning statement against the excessive use of Reserve System credit in speculative operations on the stock market." - *The New York Times* ["Reserve Council Confers in Haste: Atmosphere of Mystery is Thrown About Its Meeting in Washington"], page 9 (April 20, 1929).

A month later, one more Gremlin turn of the screws was administered to the economy:

> "The Federal Advisory Council has reviewed carefully the credit situation. It continues to agree with the view of the Federal Reserve Board as expressed in its statement of February 5, 1929 that `an excessive amount of the country's credit has been absorbed in speculative security loans.' The policy pursued by the Federal Reserve Board has had a beneficial effect due largely to the loyal cooperation of the banks of the country. The efforts in this direction should be continued, but the Council notes that while the total amount of Federal Reserve credit being used has been reduced, `the amount of the country's credit absorbed in speculative security loans' has not been substantially lowered.
>
> "Therefore, the Council recommends to the Federal Reserve Board that the time has come to grant permission to raise the rediscount rates to six percent to those Federal Reserve Banks

> requesting it, thus bringing the rediscount rates into closer relation with generally prevailing commercial money rates. The Council believes that improvement in financial conditions and a consequent reduction of the rate structure will thereby be brought about more quickly, thus best safeguarding commerce, industry, and agriculture." - Resolution approved by the *Federal Advisory Council*, in its 2:30pm Meeting on May 21, 1929 {National Archives ["Federal Reserve Board File"], Washington, D.C.}.

While the Gremlins controlling the Federal Reserve were busy raising interest rates, the analytical staff of the Federal Reserve was cognizant of the extreme economic damages such an elevated rate of interest was doing to Commerce, Industry, and Agriculture [directly contrary to the beneficial effect claimed by the Federal Advisory Council]:

> "The higher money rates do not appear to have restricted short term commercial borrowings, but in a number of ways the present high level of money rates is beginning to have a detrimental effect upon business.
>
> "1. The volume of building operations has been declining largely because of difficulty in obtaining second mortgage money and loans for building operations and also difficulty in selling real estate bonds. Stock financing which has been resorted to in some cases has only partly met the requirements.
>
> "2. A good many state, municipal, railway and other projects, ordinarily financed through bonds and notes, have been postponed because of difficulty in securing at reasonable prices...
>
> "3. Reduced foreign financing in the United States... are diminishing the purchasing power

> of those countries for our products, a tendency which is likely to be reflected sooner or later in reduced exports.
>
> "It thus seems reasonably certain that present money conditions, if long continued, will have a seriously detrimental effect upon business conditions, and the longer they are continued the more serious will be the effect. The volume of business now appears to be sustained in part by the production of automobiles considerably in excess of retail purchases with a consequent stimulating effect upon the steel industry..." - *Preliminary Memorandum for the Open Market Investment Committee* ["Effects on Business"]; Prepared for the 5:00pm Meeting of the Fed's Open Market Investment Committee on April 1, 1929 {National Archives ["Federal Reserve Board File"], Washington, D.C.}.

In September of 1929, the *Open Market Committee* would be warning that:

> "... there are some indications of a possible impending recession."

Six months earlier in April, the economy was still experiencing the stimulating effect of surplus automobile production, but by September, now automobile manufacturing was going to the dogs:

> "Building activity has been reduced still further; automobile production has been receding, and steel production has reflected these tendencies."

And as for the claimed *stimulating* effect high rates of interest would be having on agriculture, in fact Gremlin enscrewment was beginning to produce its desired objective of damages:

> "The size of the year's crops is expected to be

> generally smaller than a year ago. With higher prices the total return to the farmer may be not short of a year ago... The continued pressure on the credit situation has also been reflected by increasing reports from some localities of difficulties of agriculture in securing an adequate supply of credit." - All three quotations are from the *Minutes of the Open Market Investment Committee*, September 24, 1929 {National Archives ["Federal Reserve Board File"], Washington, D.C.}.

That greasy little Gremlin, Paul Warburg, very much had his nose in all of this. He slipped into a *Federal Advisory Council* Meeting that was held on May 21, 1929, as the alternate for W.C. Potter, and he made a Statement and engaged in conversation that Walter Lichtenstein, Council Secretary, did not feel like recording [See *Minutes of Federal Advisory Council* for May 21, 1929].

The combined effect of the many manipulative devices pulled by Gremlins in the Fed in the latter 1920's was a great contraction in the economy [see generally a protracted chapter called "The Great Contraction" in *A Monetary History of the United States*, 1867-1960 by Milton Friedman [Princeton University Press, Princeton (1963)]. [return]

[49] "Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of the liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding." - Justice Louis Brandeis in *Olmstead vs. United States*, 277 U.S. 438, at 479 (1927).

Although the Gremlins who sneaked the *Federal Reserve Act* through Congress were by no means well meaning, they did try to convey the image that this piece of legislation was

so oriented. [return]

[50] Greasy little Gremlins like Paul Warburg are steeped in the strategic use of deception as a tool to accomplish their objectives; and like the mentor from the First Estate, Lucifer, they find many circumstances come to pass where the use of such deception has yielded impressive immediate benefits --yet Father continues to warn against it. This deceptive intellectual orientation of Gremlins has been so ingrained in them from the First Estate, that Gremlins find the accurate presentation of facts now to be very difficult to construct. This deception surfaced, for example, when one Gremlin was speaking highly of another Gremlin:

> "... it is known only to a very few exactly how great is the indebtedness of the United States to Mr. Warburg. For it may be stated without fear of contradiction that in its fundamental features the Federal Reserve Act is the work of Mr. Warburg more than any other man in the country... the Federal Reserve Act has frankly accepted the principles of the Aldrich bill; and these principles... were the creation of Mr. Warburg and Mr. Warburg alone... But having set out on the task [to create the Federal Reserve], there was no stopping [Paul Warburg], and from year to year essay upon essay flowed from his facile pen, giving more precision and point to his fundamental principles until he was recognized as the real leader in the new movement. The Federal Reserve Act will be associated in history with the name of Paul Warburg..."

-Gremlin Edwin Seligman offering introductory remarks in *IV Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science #4*, at 387 [Columbia University, New York (April, 1914)]; there then follows numerous essays written by Paul Warburg praising the circulation of paper currency and the Federal Reserve System.

Yet Paul Warburg did not intellectually create the Federal Reserve System -- the Rothschilds did, but the Rothschilds wanted to stay in the background and blend themselves into the shadowy corners of Europe; Paul Warburg was hired by them to take all the flack among those who could be expected to probe a little deeper in searching for the Fed's Gremlin sponsors.

> "Paul Warburg is the man who got the Federal Reserve Act together after the Aldrich Plan aroused such nationwide resentment and opposition. The mastermind of both plans was Baron Alfred Rothschild of London." -Elisha Garrison in *Roosevelt, Wilson and the Federal Reserve Law* [Christopher Publishing Housing, Boston (1931)]. [return]

[51] The illicit statutory sponsorship of the Federal Reserve Board is often disputed by collegiate *intelligentsia* clowns who, without possessing any factual elements to countermand the background workings of determined Gremlins, continue to point to Congress itself as the institution responsible for the creation of the Federal Reserve. Gremlin Paul Warburg himself has had a few words to say about just where the true origin of statutes is to be found:

> "I am told that Congress and the State Legislatures make the laws... Instead of saying that legislators make the laws, it would be far more correct to say that legislatures merely put the finishing touches on the law. To say that they "make the laws" is like saying that the books are made by bookbinders, forgetting that there are authors, printers, and proofreaders too.
>
> "... The motive power in lawmaking is all supplied from somewhere outside the legislative halls... Some intellect outside the realm of active politics first conceives an idea. It spreads to the minds of other individuals,

slowly at first, but gradually gaining momentum. Presently there is an organized movement in its favor; then comes the deluge of propaganda, until the proposal becomes an issue and the politicians begin to take note of it. A law is half made, and more than half made, when a large body of aggressive support has been mobilized among the voters; yet during this part of the process the legislative bodies have nothing whatever to do with it." -Gremlin Paul Warburg explaining himself in Volume I *The Federal Reserve System: its Origins and Growth*, at 3 [MacMillian Company, New York (1930)]. [return]

[52] General Public accountability of the Fed is appropriate to the extent that the Fed has been endowed by its creator with a limited juristic mission in monetary areas touching a general public interest; and one of the most important instruments of Federal Reserve power lies in the *Open Market Committee*. Numerous attempts just to get some minimal public dissemination on transcripts of the Federal Open Market Committee meetings has fallen on death ears; shrouding their daily maneuverings behind a veil of secrecy -- a veil they would like to maintain erected for as long as possible (time has a way of greatly diminishing the possible adverse reaction that unfavorable information triggers). The Congress was once propositioned with the idea of requiring the FOMC to publish publicly, detailed minutes of their meetings. In trying to disable the Congress from doing this, an old Gremlin stratagem was relied upon: Agree with the necessity for the idea being expounded (so now your adversary is off guard), but create impediments to the idea by raising technical reservations that appear to be difficult to overcome and otherwise discredit the idea as being infeasible for some technical reason. And in overcoming HR 4478, this is just what Gremlins in the Fed did (Gremlins do not want Government in the sunshine) [see the testimony of imp bureaucrat Fredrick Schultz as he said he agreed with the objectives, but then turned around and threw technical reservations at the idea to try and discredit the idea on its merits, in *A Bill to Amend the Federal Reserve Act* ["Hearings Before a

Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy on HR 4478 of the House Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs"], 97th Congress, First Session (September, 1981)]. [return]

[53] "It is no secret that I have long been concerned about the aloofness of the Federal Reserve from both the executive branch and the Congress. Although the Federal Reserve System is a creature of Congress, it is not subject to any of the usual Government budgetary, auditing and appropriations procedures." -Wright Patman, Chairman of the House Committee on Domestic Finance, in *The Federal Reserve after 50 Years* ["Hearings before the Subcommittee on Domestic Finance"], 88th Congress, 2nd Session, Volume 1, page 8 [GPO, Washington, D.C. (January and February, 1964)]. [return]

[54] But don't expect such a repurchase to ever take place; the Federal Reserve Board gives the Congress all profits from certain selected trading activities. In the latter 1970's, this was amounting to approximately $10 billion a year; not an easy loss of revenue for a greedy fat Congress to go without. So the Congress does not want to disturb the Fed, and your letters to them, encouraging them to do so, will continue to fall on death ears. [return]

[55] Those Rothschild Gremlins never stop with their conquests. After mentioning the dominance of the Rothschilds in European financial affairs, a United States Senator once wrote:

> "... it might be... possible for 20 or 30 individuals if they controlled the United States Federal Reserve Board, the Bank of England, the Bank of France, and the Bank of Germany, to enter into a conspiracy to regulate the volume of the world's currency, thereby resultantly controlling the prices of the world's commodities, so vitally affecting the happiness, contentment, occupation, and prosperity of the world's population. If successful in effecting such a control, by expanding the world's

> currency they could inflate prices of all the world's commodities and then distribute at fictitious values the securities which they had accumulated. After such accomplishments the could then decrease the volume of money thus resultantly deflating or diminishing the prices of all the world's commodities with resultant greatly diminished prices in securities and then buy back at bargain prices the securities that they had distributed previously at inflated prices. If such a conspiracy existed and continued unchecked this expansion of the volume of money with increased prices and distribution of securities held by the few followed by a period of decreased volume of money with resultant decreased prices of all the world's commodities with reaccumulation of securities at bargain prices would ultimately result in all the people outside of the few conspirators becoming practically vassals and peons with the inevitable result that the people themselves would rise up in their wrath and take from the conspirators their wealth and probably their lives." - Senator Jonathan Bourne, Jr. of Oregon, expressing comments on the Wheeler Bill (S. 2487), in Senate Document #109 entitled *Independent Bimetallism or Bolshevis*m, 72nd Congress, First Session, pages 8 and 9 [GPO (June 15, 1932)].

Senate Bill 2487 provided for the free coinage of silver and gold at a ratio of 16-to-1. [return]

[56] After characterizing Gremlin Volcker's politics as being something of an enigma, the *New York Time*s went on to say that Paul Volcker:

> "... recognizes `that Gold and the fates have put him in a unique position,' a role for which he believes... that he is singularly well equipped." - *The New York Times* ["Sacrificial Way of Life for Reserve Chairman"], page 26

(Sunday, June 19, 1983).

Yes, Mr. Volcker is *very* well equipped for his mission -- but not to usher in a generation of prosperity; neither is his Federal Reserve position attributable to "God and the fates," but actually to his brother from the First Estate, Lucifer, whom Paul Volcker once betrayed -- and now Lucifer is going to get even at Father's Last Day. [return]

[57] The theft of American gold bullion deposits from the Fort Knox Depository in Kentucky by the Four Rockefeller Brothers, in which Paul Volcker participated, was a smooth inside job -- a job which only duplicated a previous inside Treasury job that was pulled off earlier in 1943:

"... 14,000 tons of silver from the Treasury reserve of American paper money was secretly taken from the Treasury vaults (although still carried publicly on the Treasury balance sheets)..."-Carroll Quigley in *Tragedy and Hope*, at 855 [MacMillian Company, New York (1974)].

[Mr. Quigley wants us to believe that the 14,000 tons of silver in its entirety went into an Oak Ridge Government building for electrical wiring]. [return]

[58] During a speech at a *Fred Hirsch Memorial Lecture* at Warwick University, Coventry, England, on November 9, 1978. [return]

[59] During Constitutional ratification discussions, our Founding Fathers did not want to even talk about the possibility that a National Bank might be created someday, due to the possible rejection the draft Constitution might encounter as it went from one State to the next for Ratification:

> "The power to incorporate a bank is not among those enumerated in the constitution. It is known, that the very power, thus proposed, as a means, was rejected, as an end, by the convention [of 1787], which formed the

> Constitution. A proposition was made in that body, to authorize Congress to open canals, and an amendatory one to empower them to create corporations. But the whole was rejected; and one of the reasons of the rejection urged in debate was, that they then would have a power to create a bank, which would render the great cities, where there was prejudices and jealousies on that subject, adverse to the adoption of the Constitution [Volume 4, Jefferson's Correspondence, pages 523 and 524]."
> - Joseph Story in *III Commentaries on the Constitution*, at 128 ["Powers of Congress"] (Cambridge, 1833).

However, just because the *Creation of Corporations Clause* never made it into the final draft of the Constitution, does not disable the United States today from creating corporations, since many other enabling acts were written into the Constitution that, although sounding nice and making the Constitution look complete in appearances, were actually jurisdictionally unnecessary.

[60] 17 U.S. 316 (1819). [return]

[61] "That a national bank is an appropriate means to carry into effect some of the enumerated powers of the Government, and that this can be best done by erecting it into a corporation, may be established by the most satisfactory reasoning. It has a relationship, more or less direct, to the power of collecting taxes, to that of borrowing money, to that of regulating trade between the states, and to those raising and maintaining fleets and armies. And it may be added, that it has a most important bearing upon the regulation of currency between the states. It is an instrument, which has been usually applied by Governments in the administration of their fiscal and financial operations." - Joseph Story in III *Commentaries on the Constitution* 134, ["Powers of Congress"] (Cambridge, 1833). [return]

[62] The IRS is not a Federal Agency; see:

- Title 5, Section 903 [*Presidential Reorganization Jurisdiction*];
- *Government Reorganization Order* Number 26 (1952);
- *Government Reorganization Order* Number 1 (1950);
- 39 *The Federal Register*, Number 62 (26 March 1974), Section 1111.4, et seq. [return]

[63] Responsibility for the administration and enforcement of the Revenue Laws is vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to Title 26, Section 7801(a). In turn, by one more layer of delegation, the Internal Revenue Service is vested with the tax collection responsibilities for the Secretary. See *Donaldson vs. United States*, 400 U. S. 517, at 534 (1970), and 39 *The Federal Register* 2417, et seq. (1970). [return]

[64] *Privateering* and all of its associated intrigue of smuggling, thievery, and pirates, was once quite active on the High Seas from the 1600's up until the American Civil War. On the North Coast of Africa there was once numerous occasions in the early 1800's when American hostages were grabbed and military engagements were entered into against those little hoodlums called the *Barbary Corsairs*. [See *The Barbary Corsairs* by S. Lane-Poole, State Mutual Books and Periodical Service, New York (1985)]. *Privateering* was somewhat abolished, or perhaps toned down, by the *Declaration of Paris* in 1856; but *Privateering* was extensive during the Civil War, and the United States Congress soon would be giving President Abraham Lincoln a grant of jurisdiction to commission Privateers. [See *The Barbary Coast* by Henry Field, C. Scribner's Sons, New York (1893); and *The Barbary Slaves* by Stephen Clissold, P. Elek Publishers, London (1977)]. For a short story on *Privateers* during the Civil War, see the *New York Times* for Tuesday, September 29, 1863, page 1, in an article entitled "Another Privateer Fitting Out," discussing how the Confederate ship *The Florida* was offered French police protection from seizure from Union ships by France while

she was parking at Brest shipyards for repairs. Yet, a variation on *Privateering* continued into the 1900's, as Russian volunteer vessels once seized neutral commerce in the Red Sea [see Edwin Moxen in *Russian Raids on Neutral Commerce*, 3 Michigan Law Review 1 (1904)]. For a discussion from a legal perspective on Privateering and *Letters of Marque*, see *The First Federal Court* by Henry J. Bourguignon, page 3 [American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia (1977)]. Today, *Privateering* is a crime for American Citizens [see Title 18, Section 1654 "Arming or Serving as Privateers"]. [return]

[65] *How Anyone Can Stop Paying Income Taxes* [Freedom Books, Hamden, Connecticut (1982)]. [return]

[66] *To Harass Our People: the Irs and Government Abuse of Power* [Positive Publications, Washington, D.C. (1984)]. [return]

[67] Federal Judges took their cue long ago to lay off legislative prerogatives in this area of circulating paper money:

> "The case of *Trevett vs. Weldon*, in 1786, in Rhode Island, is an instance of this sort... The judges in that case decided, that a law making paper money a tender in payment of debts was unconstitutional and against the principles of magna carta. They were compelled to appear before the legislature to vindicate themselves; and the next year... they were left out of office for having questioned the legislative power." - Joseph Story in *III Commentaries on the Constitution*, at 469, footnote 1 (Cambridge, 1833). [return]

[68] Whether or not there was a legal minimum quorum in the United States Senate on that pre-Christmas December day of 1913, is disputed. [return]

[69]

- *M'Culloch vs. Maryland*, 17 U.S. 316 (1819);
- *Hepburn vs. Griswold*, 75 U.S. 603 (1870);
- *Knox vs. Lee*, 79 U.S. 457 (1871);
- *Julliard vs. Greenman*, 110 U.S. 421 (1884).

[return]

[70] The Legal Tender statutes were enacted in the Civil War era, when national resources were stretched thin:

> "... to handle the vast amount of means necessary for the prosecution of this war, to enable the people to pay in and the Government to pay out, we must have a larger and more abundant currency that we have heretofore found to be necessary. The accustomed currency [of hard gold and silver] is wholly inadequate. The Government has for many years used only gold and silver for this purpose, and it is deeply lamented that it is obliged to depart from this desirable standard. But we are left with no option." - Representative John Crisfield of Maryland, in a speech before Congress on February 5, 1862 [*Congressional Globe*, 37th Congress, 2nd Session, Appendix, page 48 et seq.]. [return]

[71] "... the National Government [can] exercise... its powers to establish and maintain a bank, implied as an incident to the borrowing, taxing, war, and other powers specifically granted to the National Government by Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution." - *Helvering vs. Gerhardt*, 304 U.S. 405, at 411 (1937). [return]

[72] "The power to regulate commerce is general and unlimited in its terms. The full power to regulate a particular subject implies the whole power, and leaves no residium." - Joseph Story in *III Commentaries on the Constitution*, at 513 ["Powers of Congress -- Commerce"] (Cambridge, 1833). [return]

[73] "Here the substantive power to tax was allowed to be employed for improving the currency." - *Knox vs. Lee*, 79 U. S. 457, at 544 (1871). [return]

[74] "The power to coin money is one of the ordinary prerogatives of Sovereignty, and is almost universally exercised in order to preserve a proper circulation of good coin of a known value in the home market... In England, this prerogative belongs to the Crown; and in former ages, it was greatly abused; for base coin was often coined and circulated by its authority, at a value far above its intrinsic worth; and thus taxes of a burdensome nature were indirectly laid upon the people." - Joseph Story in III *Commentaries on the Constitution*, at 17 ["Powers of Congress -- Coinage"] (Cambridge, 1833). [return]

[75] "A bank has a direct relation to the power of borrowing money, because it is an unusual, and in sudden emergencies, an essential instrument, in the obtaining of loans to Government. A nation is threatened with a war; large sums are wanted on a sudden [basis] to make the requisite preparations; taxes are laid for this purpose; but it requires time to obtain the benefit of them; anticipation is indispensable. If there is a bank, the supply can at once be had; if there be none, loans from individuals must be sought. The progress of these is often too slow for the exigency; in some situations they are not practical at all." - Joseph Story in III *Commentaries on the Constitution*, at 139 [footnote -- "Powers of Congress -- Bank"] (Cambridge, 1833). [return]

[76] "We do not propose to dilate at length upon the circumstances in which the country was placed when Congress attempted to make Treasury Notes a Legal Tender. They are of too recent occurrence to justify enlarged description. Suffice it to say that a Civil War was then raging which seriously threatened the overthrow of the Government and the destruction of the Constitution itself. It demanded the equipment and support of large armies and navies, and the employment of money to an extent beyond

the capacity of all ordinary sources of supply. Meanwhile, the public Treasury was nearly empty, and the credit of the Government, if not stretched to its utmost tension, had become nearly exhausted. Moneyed institutions had advanced largely of their means, and more could not be expected of them. They had been compelled to suspend specie payments. Taxation was inadequate to pay even the interest on the debt already incurred, and it was impossible to await the income of additional taxes. The necessity was immediate and pressing. The army was unpaid. There was then due to the soldiers in the field nearly a score of millions of dollars. The requisition from the War and Navy Departments for supplies exceeded fifty millions, and the current expenditure was over one million per day. The entire amount of coin in the country, including that in private hands, as well as that in banking institutions, was insufficient to supply the need of the Government for three months, had it all poured into the Treasury. Foreign credit we had none. We say nothing of the overhanging paralysis of trade, and of business generally, which threatened loss of confidence in the ability of the Government to maintain its continued existence, and therewith the complete destruction of all remaining national credit.

> "It was at this time and in such circumstances that Congress was called upon to devise means for maintaining the army and navy, for securing the large supplies of money needed and, indeed, for the preservation of the Government created by the Constitution. It was at such a time and in such an emergency that nothing else would have supplied the absolute necessities of the Treasury, that nothing else would have enabled the Government to maintain its armies and navies, that nothing else would have saved the Government and the Constitution from destruction, while the Legal Tender Acts would, could any one be bold enough to assert that Congress transgressed its powers? Or if these enactments did not work these results, can it be maintained now that they were not for a legitimate end, or `appropriate and adapted to

> that end?' in the language of Chief Justice Marshall? That they did work such results is not to be doubted. Something revived the drooping faith of the people; something brought immediately to the Government's aid the resources of the nation, and something enabled the successful prosecution of the war, and the preservation of national life. What was it, if not the Legal Tender enactments?" - *Knox vs. Lee*, 79 U.S. 457, at 539 (1871). [return]

[77] *Knox vs. Lee*, 79 U.S. 457 (1871). [return]

[78] *Julliard vs. Greenman*, 110 U.S. 421 (1884). [return]

[79] As a point of beginning, Article I, Section 10 limits itself to the *States* ["No State shall..."], and not to the Congress.

> "The states can no longer declare what shall be money, or regulate its value." - *Knox vs. Lee*, 79 U.S. 457, at 545 (1871).

Protestors trying to argue now that Article I, Section 10 restrains the Congress -- meaning something directly contrary to what is written, is considerable foolishness. [return]

[80] *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787* [Yale University Press, New Haven (1937); 4 volumes]. [return]

[81] See *The Federal Taxing Power as a Means of Establishing a Unified Banking System*, Notes ["Legislation"], 46 Harvard Law Review 143 (1932). [return]

[82] "It is absolutely essential to independent national existence that Government should have a firm hold on the two great Sovereign instrumentalities of the sword and the purse, and the right to wield them without restriction on occasions of national peril. In certain emergencies

Government must have at its command, not only the personal services -- the bodies and lives -- of its Citizens, but the lesser, though not less essential, power of absolute control over the resources of the country. Its armies must be filled, and its navies manned, by the Citizens in person. Its materials of war, its munitions, equipment, and commissary stores must come from the industry of the country. This can only be stimulated into activity by a proper financial system, especially as regards the currency." - *Knox vs. Lee*, 79 U.S. 457 [Justice Bradley, concurring] (1871). [return]

[83] "The power of Congress over interstate commerce is `complete in itself, may be executed to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the Constitution'." - *United States vs. Darby*, 312 U.S. 100, at 114 (1940). [return]

[84] Remember the Legal Tender statutes were born in the fires of the Civil War, when there was a great exigency and importance associated with the idea of raising a lot of money very quickly; yet, there were also disagreements on the floor of the Congress, and reservations were expressed then as to the Constitutionality of the proposed paper money that would be circulating:

> "The sum of the whole argument has been made in favor of the Constitutionality of the power of Congress to declare the Treasury notes contemplated by this bill a legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private, may be stated in these three propositions:
>
> "First, Congress may declare these notes a legal tender because it is not inhibited;
>
> "Secondly, the Government must maintain itself, and Congress may exercise all the power and adopt any measure it judges necessary for that object;
>
> "Thirdly, that the power to declare these notes

> a legal tender is a means necessary and proper to the full execution of the power to regulate commerce.
>
> "This provision is as inexpedient as it is unconstitutional. It is a legislative declaration of national bankruptcy. It is saying to the world that this Government is unable to meet its obligations at their real value; and must compound with its creditors at a discount...
>
> "This provision attempts the impossible thing of giving to paper the value of gold..."

-Representative John Crisfield of Maryland, in a speech in Congress on February 5, 1862 *[Congressional Globe*, 37th Congress, 2nd Session, Appendix, page 48 et seq.] [return]

[85] Edwin Vieira represented Richard Solyom in a Stated related *Eminent Domain Proceeding*, and challenged the right of a State to force the acceptance of Federal Reserve Notes as the *quid pro quo* for his land that the State wanted to grab. Edwin Vieira argued the monetary disabilities of Article I, Section 10 in an action against a STATE, which at least is a correct point of beginning -- a lot more than what I can say for Tax Protestors throwing Article I, Section 10 arguments at *The Congress*. Edwin Vieira also wrote a book discussing the monetary powers and disabilities of the United States Constitution; see *Pieces of Eight* by Edwin Vieira, Jr. [Devin-Adair, Old Greenwich, Connecticut (1983)]. [return]

[86] You lawyers use that license of your's as a tool to impress and intellectually intimidate people, and since that is your standard, I would then hold you to it and order your disbarment if I had any supervisory jurisdictional interest in your license, just like Jerome Daly from Minnesota was once suspended from the Practice of Law for his flaky money arguments. In the *Justice of the Peace Court* for Credit River, Minnesota, on December

7, 1968, Jerome Daly once scored an impressive victory before a jury, on what was largely a stipulated factual setting of *Failure of Consideration* on a $14,000 mortgage that Jerome Daly had defaulted on. Seemingly, he was off to a good start, but a continuing series of rebuffments later on before judges cast his money arguments off on an illicit tangent, and when he refused to back off, his license was suspended. [return]

[87] 75 U.S. 533 (1869). [return]

[88] *Hepburn vs. Griswold*, 75 U.S. 603 (1870). [return]

[89] When I advocate folks taking cognizance of the fact that the King has many different independent sources of jurisdiction to pull from in order to justify the existence of the Federal Reserve Board and those paper notes that his Legal Tender statutes have designated to be his currency, please do not construe that with any philosophical inclination on my part that might appear to favor the King issuing out such paper based circulating instruments that excite Gremlins so much in elevated enscrewment ecstacy; I am different from Protestors only in the limited sense that I always evaluate both sides of an issue before throwing something at a Judge. Refusing to badmouth adversaries does not mean that you agree with them philosophically, nor does it inferentially suggest that one is in alignment with the adversary's objectives; refusing to badmouth means no more than realizing that the true remedy for correcting these currency Torts will not lie in a Courtroom. Therefore, by examining the case from the adversary's perspective, frequently I uncover real error in positions taken by Protestors, but by examining the case from the King's perspective, that does not mean that I am sympathetic with the King's *modus operandi* or his objectives. Unlike Protestors, I do not walk into a judicial confrontation with anyone assuming that I am absolutely right, convinced that there is nothing the other fellow has to say that is of any value, and then simply expecting justice to be administered in my favor -- such a person is necessarily in a very *unteachable* state of mind -- he will miss many low profile movements going

on that are suggestive of error. There may very well be some error in my position that I did not see (or understand the significance of), so my excursions into judicial arenas are always exploratory in nature, and I keep myself in a teachable state of mind (a *modus operandi* Protestors would be wise to consider emulating). [return]

[90] Some Federal Reserve Protestors I know are planning to throw some novel protesting arguments at Federal Judges. Having concluded that quoting Constitutional restrainments is unlikely to perfect judicial dissolution of the Federal Reserve System [and correctly so as a factual matter], these Protestors have decided to step down one level and just cite judicial reasoning in an attempt to dismantle a small appendage of the Fed, called the *Federal Open Market Committee*, or FOMC. By researching Supreme Court cases back in the 1930's, an era when Judicial annulment of Nelson Rockefeller's social welfare *lex* [through his public nominee, imp FDR] was in vogue, these Protestors intend to cite Cases like:

- *Panama Refining Company vs. Ryan*, 293 U.S. 388 (1934);
- *Schechter Poultry vs. United States*, 295 U.S. 495 (1935);
- *James Carter vs. Carter Coal Company*, 298 U.S. 238 (1936);

and then pursuant to reasoning in those Cases, argue that the delegation of regulatory commercial matters by the Congress to a non-juristic business association of some type, is unConstitutional:

> "But would it be seriously contended that Congress could delegate its legislative authority to trade or industrial associations or groups as to empower them to enact the laws they deem to be wise and beneficent for the rehabilitation and expansion of their trade or industry? Could trade or industrial associations or groups be constituted legislative bodies for

> that purpose because such associations or groups are familiar with the problems of their enterprises? And could an effort of that sort be made valid by such a preface of generalities as to permissible aims as we find in [this *National Industrial Recovery Act* that the Supreme Court is about to run into the ground]? The answer is obvious. Such a delegation of legislative power is unknown to our Law and is utterly inconsistent with the Constitutional prerogatives and duties of Congress." - *Schechter Poultry vs. United States*, 295 U.S. 495, at 537 (1935).

No where in the Constitution does it state that "... the Congress shall not delegate any of its regulatory powers over Commerce to business associations..." -- as there are numerous negative restrainments and positive requirements deemed binding on the Congress, but no where appearing in the Constitution; many are reasonably inferred as existing incidental to what the Constitution otherwise expressly mandates.

By going after just the *Federal Open Market Committee* appendage within the Fed, and not the Fed itself, these Protestors are emulating a successful *Modus Operandi* used extensively by Gremlins themselves -- by selectively hacking away at something here a little, and there a little -- slowly and patiently.

Whether or not these Protestors will ultimately succeed is inconclusive at the present time. There is some merit to their *Delegation Question* arguments as limited just to the *Federal Open Market Committee* itself within the Fed; and these arguments are not overruled by the other wide ranging fundamental sources of jurisdictional fuel the King has to create the larger Federal Reserve.

... And for Protestors searching for something to throw at the Gremlin's enrichment Goliath, that's enough.

I am concerned about whether or not these Protestors can create a sound *Justiciable Controversy*, which is another question; to the extent that the *Federal Open Market Committee* massages around and regulates with juristic force banks and related financial institutions, *Standing* is necessarily limited to the affected parties absent an evidentiary presentation of the cascading train of damages originating within the inner sanctums of the FOMC, that were eventually experienced by the Plaintiff. I would feel more comfortable with the probable outcome of this impending Case if an FOMC regulated institution itself appeared as the Plaintiff. Nevertheless, these Protestors will find that judicial reaction will be mixed -- there are Federal Judges who are sympathetic with their arguments (as there is merit to them), while there are other *tough cookie* Federal Judges who will take advantage of the factual opportunity this impending Case presents to them, by throwing snortations at the Protestors. [return]

[91] Gremlin Zbigniew Brzezinski writing in *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Age*, once advocated that the fiction of Sovereignty must be replaced with reality:

> "The doctrine of sovereignty created the institutional basis for challenging the secular authority of established religion, and this challenge in turned paved the way for the emergence of the abstract conception of the nation-state. Sovereignty vested in the people, instead of Sovereignty vested in the king, was the consummation of the process which in the two centuries preceding the French and American revolutions radically altered the structure of authority in the West and prepared the ground for a new dominant concept of reality...
>
> "The nation-state as a fundamental unit of man's organized life has ceased to be the principal creative force: `International banks and multinational corporations are acting and planning in terms that are far in advance of the

> political concepts of the nation-state.' But as the nation-state is gradually yielding its sovereignty, the psychological importance of the national community is rising, and the attempt to establish an equilibrium between the imperatives of the [Corporate Socialist Rockefeller Cartel's] new internationalism and the need for a more intimate national community is the source of frictions and conflicts." - Gremlin Zbigniew Brzezinski in *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Age*, at 70 and 56 [Viking Press, New York City (1970)]. [return]

[92] Juristic institutions descend to the level of Commercial game players whenever they enter into the world of Commerce; so it can be argued that Sovereignty takes a back seat under some circumstances [this interesting Supreme Court Doctrine on the declension in status and loss of Sovereignty whenever the King enters into Commerce, appears in this Letter later with discussing those *circulating evidences of debt*, Federal Reserve Notes]. [return]

[93] For example, the original draft versions of the Second and Fifth Amendments were far more specific and restrictive than the negotiated comprised milktoast versions that finally made it through the Congress of 1787. Yes, the Constitution was an *Inspired Document*, but an *inspired document* does not mean *Perfect Document*:

> "We believe that God raised up George Washington, that He raised up Thomas Jefferson, that He raised up Benjamin Franklin and those other Patriots who carved out with their swords and with their pens the character and stability of this great Government which they hoped would stand forever, an asylum for the oppressed of all nations, where no man's religion would be questioned, no man would be limited in his honest service to his Maker, so long as he did not infringe upon the rights of his fellow men. We believe those men were inspired to do their

work, as we do that Joseph Smith was inspired to begin this work; just as Galileo, Columbus, and other mighty men of old... were inspired to gradually pave the way leading to this Dispensation; Sentinels, standing at different periods down the centuries, playing their parts as they were inspired of God; gradually dispelling the darkness as they were empowered by their Creator so to do, that in culmination of the grand scheme of schemes, this great nation, the Republic of the United States, might be established upon this land as an asylum for the oppressed; a resting place [a sanctuary] it might be said, for the *Ark of the Covenant*, where the Temple of our God might be built; where the *Plan of Salvation* might be introduced and practiced in freedom, and not a dog would wag his tongue in opposition to the purposes of the Almighty. We believe that this was His object in creating the Republic of the United States; the only land where His work could be commenced or the feet of his people come to rest. No other land had such liberal institutions, had adopted so broad a platform upon which all men might stand. We give glory to those Patriots for the noble work they did; but we given first glory to God, our Father and their Father, who inspired them. We take them by the hand as brothers. We believe they did nobly their work, even as we would fain do ours, faithfully and well, that we might not be recreant in the eyes of God, for failing to perform the mission to which He has appointed us." - Orson F. Whitney, in a discourse delivered at the Tabernacle on April 19, 1885; 26 *Journal of Discourses* 194, at 200 [London (1886)]. [return]

[94] For example, in the Continental Congress on August 28th, 1787, "Article 12 was being discussed. Article 12 was proposed to be as follows:

> "Article XII. No state shall coin money; nor grant letters of marque and reprisals; nor enter into any treaty, alliance, or confederation; nor grant any title of Nobility."
>
> "Mr. Wilson and Mr. Roger Sherman moved to insert after the words *coin money* the words *to emit bills of credit, nor make any thing but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debts*, thus making those prohibitions against paper money absolute.
>
> "Mr. Ghorum thought the purpose would be well secured by the provision of Article XIII, which makes the consent of the General Legislature necessary, and in that mode, no opposition would be excited; whereas an absolute prohibition of paper money would rouse the most desperate opposition from its partizans.
>
> "Mr. Sherman thought this a favorable crisis for crushing paper money. If the consent of the Legislature could authorize emissions of it, the friends of paper money would make every exertion to get into the legislature in order to license it." - see Max Farrand's *II Records of the Federal Convention of 1787*, at page 439 [Yale University Press, New Haven (1911-1937)].

Notice how Mr. Sherman and Mr Ghorum were concerned, knowledgeable and aware of the exterior opposition to prohibiting the emission of paper bills. There was opposition lying around the Countryside, opposed to making hard gold and silver mandatory with no legislative discretion allowed to substitute paper bills for gold and silver coin. So the reason why we have fraudulent Federal Reserve Notes running around today is because our Founding Fathers failed to tie the King down yesterday -- and Federal Judges are not Commie pinkos when tossing out arguments attacking Federal Reserve Notes. Our Founding Fathers specifically declined to make explicit and blunt prohibitions against the emission of paper bills because

they knew then that few people wanted such a mandatory restrainment operating on the Congress, and our Fathers in 1787 did not want to create opposition to the proposed new Constitution designed to replace the *Articles of Confederation*. So what we are left with today is the milktoast of Article I, Section 8. Gremlins have merely take advantage of what our Fathers circumvented back then; and our Fathers found themselves in such a position because a lot of folks did not want prohibitions against the emission of paper bills. We did this to ourselves, and Patriots are snickering at the wrong people. [return]

[95] Alexander Hamilton was born Alexander Levine, of Jewish lineage, in St. Croix, the West Indies. After changing his name and his geographical situs, he married Elizabeth Schuyler, the second daughter of Phillip Schuyler, at the bride's home in Albany, New York, on December 14, 1780. The bride's mother was Catherine van Rensselaer, daughter of Colonel John R. van Rensselaer, who was the son of Hendrik, the grandson of Killiaen, the first Partroon, and Engeltke (Angelica) Livingston. The bride had been characterized as:

> "... a brunette with the most good natured, dark, lovely eyes that I ever saw, which threw a beam of good temper and benevolence over her entire countenance."

The bride was just over 23, and the groom was 25. Alexander's courtship with Elizabeth that year had been very brief, as the arranged marriage that it was. While others have uncovered payment records in the British Museum in London from the Rothschilds to their nominee Alexander Hamilton, an examination of his political orientation [particularly his drive to create a national bank] magnifies his Gremlin stature. There is quite a large number of Alexander Hamilton related biographics and profile sketches floating around. See *The Intimate Life of Alexander Hamilton*, by Allan Hamilton [Charles Scribner's Sons, New York (1910) [quote on the bride's description, id., at page 95]; and *Alexander Hamilton: Youth to Maturity, 1755 -1788*, by Broades Mitchell [MacMillian

Company, New York (1957)]. [return]

[96] There has always been a period of Time in the United States when well sponsored imps have ascended into positions of political prominence; sometimes into Juristic Institutions, and other times they operate on the outside, perhaps as a director of a foundation, a historian, or a university professor of some type. One such imp, financially sponsored by Rockefeller Cartel interests, has been Rexford Tugwell, who likes to create the image that he is a historian. In one of his books, Entitled *The Emerging Constitution*, he really shows off his Gremlin colors. He tries to throw derogatory characterizations at our Founding Fathers by pointing attention over to such things as the acreage of land once owned by Thomas Jefferson and other economic profile information; but the fact that the Four Rockefeller Brothers are financially sponsoring little Tug himself to write a new Constitution to enrich the Brothers is, of course, something this little imp, speaking with a forked tongue, remains silent on. And he has, of course, just the right solution for all those *crucial* American legal ailments: A new Constitution -- designed along *Corporate Socialist* lines that would enrich his sponsors in the Rockefeller Cartel. Under this new Constitution, large private corporations assume several of the functions once held exclusively by Juristic Institutions -- such as criminal prosecutions, the regulation of business, issuance of commercial licenses, and, of course, there is no Trial by Jury. Rexford Tugwell shows off his true Gremlin colors by coming down on those great triple Gremlin irritants: *Laissez-Faire, Individualism*, and the *Independence* of national Sovereignty:

> "So much for the Constitution. But it did not end there; continuing suspicion of authority allowed *laissez-faire* to thrive beyond its time and allowable scope; and the propensity to contrive produced an affluence we did not use to advantage because we held to *individualism* and *independence* in theory although we created a

> system of social and economic complexes requiring integration and organic management. If these generalizations are accepted, they describe a curious and unanticipated outcome. It is not certain, for instance, how much of our affluence is owed to the *individualism* that now threatens to choke its own further growth...
>
> "Yet the myth of *independence* and *individualism* persists, mostly nowadays as a political appeal, but it furnishes assurances to unthinking citizens. These words are regarded with cynical tolerance by intellectuals; but they still have an appeal to the electorate, and they will until a more realistic approach has made its way into people's minds...
>
> "The laws establishing [administrative] agencies did not clearly recognize that the businesses involved were using resources belonging to the people, and lacking this, their authority to make allocations was hazy. They were handicapped also by the prevailing belief in *laissez-faire...*" - Rexford Tugwell in *The Emerging Constitution*, at 17, 27 and 145 [Harper & Row, New York (1974); Sponsored by the Rockefeller's *Fund for the Republic* in Santa Monica, California].

Notice what difficulty Gremlins like little Tug have in restraining themselves not to throw invectives at those heinous institutions of *Individualism, Laissez-Faire*, and the *Independenc*e of national Sovereignty. Gremlins do not want *Individuals* to amount to something great on their own volition [they want men to remain boys, and for everyone to keep their diapers on by looking to Government for security, for protection, and as a source of remedies for society's problems]; they do not want *Laissez-Faire* [they want total top down Government control of everything, so that when Government controls it, then they can control it]; and Gremlins do not want the world divided up into

multiple independent Sovereignties [they want a *One World Government*, under their control]. Those are the great Gremlin objectives, and getting rid of that United States Constitution --and everything else Majestic, Celestial, and developmental of *individuals* that it represents --is a glorious dream for imps to bask in. [For other attacks on the Founding Fathers by sponsored self-proclaimed "historians," see imp Charles Beard in *An Economic Interpretation of the United States Constitution* [The Free Press, New York (1913)]; who uncovered detailed financial profile information on the Founders, and then came to the conclusion, as he was paid to do, that the Constitution was just a legal instrument to self-enrich its creators. Like his brother Rexford Tugwell*, Charles Beard should be the very last one to talk*.] [return]

[97] If you *Conservatives* were smart, you would not consider donating money or voting for any candidate expressing sympathy with either the milktoast Democratic or Republican Party Platforms; such a candidate is no adversary of Gremlins. As far as I am concerned, if in fact the Gremlins can pull off this Constitutional switch at the impending Constitutional Convention, then they fully deserve the avalanche of benefits such a juristic instrument will generate for them. I admire victors of battles for their tactical *savior faire*, even though I may not be sympathetic with their doctrines or objectives. [return]

[98] "In connection with the attack on the United States, the Lord told the Prophet Joseph Smith [that] there would be an attempt to overthrow the country by destroying the Constitution. Joseph Smith predicted that the time would come when the Constitution would hang as it were by a thread, and at that time... the Elders of Israel, widely spread over the nation, will, at the crucial time... [participate by providing] the necessary balance of strength to save the institutions of Constitutional Government. Now is the time to get ready." - Ezra Taft Benson in *Conference Reports*, page 70 (October, 1961). [return]

[99] If you are unaware of the interest certain Gremlins have towards using that impending Convention for their own proprietary purposes, then consider these words from our Gremlin friend *extraordinaire*, Zbigniew Brzezinski:

> "The approaching two hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence could justify the call for a national constitutional convention to reexamine the nation's formal institutional framework. Either 1976 or 1987 -- the two hundredth anniversary of the Constitution -- could serve as a target date for culminating a national dialogue on the relevance of existing arrangements, the workings of the representative process, and the desirability of imitating the various European regionalization reforms and of streamlining the administrative structure. More important still, either date would provide a suitable occasion for redefining the meaning of modern democracy -- a task admittedly challenging but not necessarily more so than when it was undertaken by the founding fathers -- and for setting ambitious and concrete social goals." - Gremlin Zbigniew Brzezinski in *Between Two Ages: America's Role in the Technetronic Age,* at 258 [Viking Press, New York City (1970)].

Those "social goals" that Brzezinski wants involve a *New Economic Order* which Brzezinski openly admits would seriously threaten "the traditional American values of individualism, free enterprise, the work ethic, and efficiency." -- but pesky little anachronisms like those are nuisances today, and his employer David Rockefeller has no room for nuisances. What David decrees is what's important, and David has decreed that Corporate Socialism is important.

[Index | Next]